

CHAPTER 23

Was Jesus a Jew?

Over and over we are told that Jesus was a Jew, so most accept it without question. However, when one studies the Jews, and Jesus, the contradictions between the two become quite apparent.

Regarding the claim that Jesus was a Jew, I have long wondered at how someone so good could possibly have come from such wicked people.

“Ye shall know them by their fruits. *Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?*” (Matthew 7:16).

“For *every tree is known by his own fruit*. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes” (Luke 6:44).

Following are some reasons why I am certain that Jesus was not a Jew.

The following is from Jewish businessman Benjamin H. Freedman’s Speech, *Germany and the Jews: The Role of the Jews in WWI and WWII*, presented earlier in this book:

“If Jesus was a Jew, there isn’t a Jew in the world today, and if those people are Jews, certainly our Lord and Savior was not one of them, and I can prove that.”

“In the time of Bible history, there was a geographic area known as Judea. Judea was a province of the Roman Empire. Now, a person who lived in Judea was known as a Judean, and in Latin it was Judaeus; in Greek it was Judaius. Now, in Latin and Greek there is no such letter as ‘j,’ and the first syllable of Judaeus and Judaius starts ‘ghu.’ When the Bible was written it was first written in Greek, Latin, Panantic, Syriac, Aramaic—all those languages. Never was the word Jew in any of them because the word didn’t exist. Judea was the country, and the people were Judeans, and Jesus was referred to only as a Judean. I’ve seen the earliest scripts available.

“In 1345, a man in England by the name of Wycliffe thought that it was time to translate the Bible into English. There was no English edition of the Bible previously because few could read. The educated people could read Latin and Greek, Syriac, Aramaic and other languages. Anyhow, *Wycliffe translated the Bible into English but he had to look around for some words for Judaeas and Judaius. There was no English word because Judea had passed out of existence. There was no Judea; people had long ago forgotten that so in the first translation he used the word, in referring to Jesus, as ‘gyu,’ ‘jew’*

“Between 1345 and the 17th century, when the printing press came into use, that word passed through many changes. The word “Gyu” in the Wycliffe Bible became “giu,” then “iu” (because the “i” in Latin is pronounced like the “j.” Julius Caesar is “Iul” because there is no “j” in Latin) then “iuw,” then “ieuu,” then “ieuy,” then “iwe,” then “iow,” then “iewe,” all in Bibles as time went on.

Then “ieue,” then “iue,” then “ive,” and then “ivw,” and finally in the 18th century, “Jew.”

“I’ve lectured in maybe 20 of the most prominent theological seminaries in this country, and two in Europe—*there was no such word as Jew. There only was Judea, and Jesus was a Judean and the first English use of a word in an English bible to describe him was “gyu,” Jew. A contracted and shortened form of Judaeus*, just the same as we call a laboratory a “lab,” and gasoline “gas.” In England there were no public schools; people didn’t know how to read; it looked like a scrambled alphabet so they made a short word out of it” (Benjamin H. Freedman, Speech, *Germany and the Jews: The Role of the Jews in WWI and WWII*).

The Linage of Jesus The Christ

Jesus stated His Father was God the Father, and we know His Mother was a Levite, a true Israelite; quite a different people than the Edomite Khazarian Zionist devils who call themselves Jews.

Some attempts have been made to insist that Jesus was the physical Son of God and at the same time apply contradictory lineages to him such as found in Matthew 1 and Luke chapter 3.

The Bible is quite explicit that the lineage must be a “physical” lineage. We find this stipulation spelled out quite clearly in the Bible in Acts chapter 2:

“Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that *God had sworn with an oath to him [David], that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne*” (Acts 2:30).

And in Romans,

“Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*” (Romans 1:3).

The only way that Jesus could be the physical Son of God and also be the physical son of king David “according to the flesh” is if his lineage from king David passes through his mortal mother Mary. However, if we were to read the two contradictory lineages found in Matthew 1 and Luke 3 we would find that *both attempt to make his lineage pass through a mortal father*. In one it is “Joseph the son of Jacob” and in the other is “Joseph the son of Heli.” Joseph was Christ’s foster father—of that I am certain.

In Matthew 1:1–16 and Luke 3:22–38 of the New Testament, Jesus the Christ is described as a member of the tribe of Judah (I repeat, a true Israelite) by lineage. *However, this lineage was noted by those who believe, falsely, that his father was Joseph.*

“And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ” (Matthew 1:16).

“And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli” (Luke 3:23).

Note the insert in the scripture quoted above. (as was supposed) “the son of Joseph.” I didn’t insert that there.

The Many Contradictions

With all the contradictions, it might seem strange that “everyone” seems to believe that Jesus was a Jew: Jews have been the main source of the misunderstanding, so let us begin with them.

- 1) Jews have less interest in salvation than any people I have ever heard of.
- 2) Jews hate Jesus – venomously, as revealed throughout this book. No other people I am aware of have hated Him as they do.
- 3) No people are more different in nature than Jews and Jesus the Christ.

Bombarding us with Lies

When the Jews go about promoting a lie, and they do this often, they do not use logic and reason. Owning virtually all the news media, they simply bombard us with lies. The result of this is that people hear these lies so often, that they simply assume they are true, and never question them.

Jesus Himself warned us that Jews lie.

*“Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for **he is a liar, and the father of it**” (John 8:44).*

A Jewish Dilemma

The so-called Jews hate Jesus more than anyone else who ever lived. They certainly know better than to believe that He was one of them. Their dilemma here, is that the following verse of Scripture, which implies that Jesus was a Jew, implies that we need to go to them, the Jews for salvation. They love that, as it empowers them, and allows them to lead us astray.

The Basis of the Misconception

*“Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for **salvation is of the Jews**” (John 4:22).*

There is more than one problem with the modern-day translation of John 4:22. The word “of” and the word “Jews.” I will explain these shortly but first ask yourselves, is salvation through Jesus Christ, or is salvation “of the Jews?”

The Translation Issue

“If the generally accepted understanding today of the English “Jew” and “Judean” conveyed the identical implications, inferences and innuendoes as both rightly should, it would make no difference which of these two words was used when referring to Jesus in the New Testament or elsewhere. But the implications,

inferences, and innuendoes today conveyed by these two words are as different as black is from white. *The word “Jew” today is never regarded as a synonym for “Judean” nor is “Judean” regarded as a synonym for “Jew.”*

*“When the word “Jew” was first introduced into the English language in the 18th century its one and only implication, inference and innuendo was “Judean” (Willie Martin in, *Origin of the Word Jew*).*

“The history of the origin of the word “Jew” in the English language leaves no doubt that the 18th century “Jew” is the 18th century contracted and corrupted English word for the 4th century Latin “Iudaeus” found in Jerome’s Vulgate Edition. . .

“The available original manuscripts from the 4th century to the 18th century accurately trace the origin and give the complete history of the word “Jew” in the English language. In these manuscripts are to be found all the many earlier English equivalents extending through the 14 centuries from the 4th to the 18th century.

“From the Latin “Iudaeus” to the English “Jew” these English forms included successively: “Gyu,” “Giu,” “Iu,” “Iuu,” “Iuw,” “Ieuu,” “Ieuy,” “Iwe,” “Iow,” “Jewe,” “Ieue,” “Iue,” “I’ve,” “Iew,” and then finally the 18th century, “Jew.” The many earlier English equivalents for “Jews” through the 14 centuries are “Giwis,” “Giws,” “Gyues,” “Gywes,” “Giwes,” “Geus,” “Iuys,” “Iows,” “Iouis,” “Iews,” and then also finally in the 18th century, “Jews.

*“Jesus is referred to as a so-called “Jew” for the first time in the New Testament in the 18th century editions in the English language of the 14th century first translations of the New Testament into English” (Benjamin H. Freedman, *Facts Are Facts: The Truth about the Khazars*).*

The 1611 Authorized King James Version

“In the original King James 1611 Version the word Judean, was used. In John 4:22, where Jesus spoke with the woman at the well of Samaria, the words in the present King James Version make little or no sense: “for salvation is of the Jews.” What intelligent Christian would believe that salvation came through any nation, or religion? We know this is untrue. But *in the original 1611 Version of the King James Bible this verse reads: “But salvation cometh out of Judea”* (Brig. Gen. Jack Mohr in, *The Inside Story of International Judaism*).

“. . . any modern, so-called “1611 Authorized King James Version” available today is *not* a facsimile of the original 1611 “Authorized Version” but a copy of the 1769 revision. Even those editions that may even proclaim “1611” in the frontispiece to promote sales are deceptions, for, they too are simply modern print runs of the Blayney’s 1769 edition. These are editions in which the original text and words of the “1611 Authorized King James Version” have been altered with spellings revised and some words changed in almost every printing done since 1769 and, also, with fourteen entire books plus extra prefatory features removed from almost every printing done since 1885. *To get an original, un-redacted “1611 Authorized King James Version” is more problematic and far*

more expensive. Originals are rare and eminently collectible and fetch huge prices while facsimiles and exact photographic facsimile edition are less exorbitant but still expensive (Overlords of Chaos, The Jewish Conspiracy, Origin of the Word “Jew”).

“. . . . *A much more accurate translation* [of John 4:22] *comes from the Ferre-Fenton translation, which is made directly from the Greek It says: “Salvation cometh out of Judea. This makes sense, the KJV does not”* (by Lt. Col. Gordon (Jack) Mohr, A.U.S. Retired in, *Race, Not Grace*).

Of, or Out of?

The Greek word used in John 4:22 for “of” is “Ek” (#1537) which means “origin.” The correct translation of this word is “out of” not “of.”

Consider the following verses of Scripture. Every place the word “Ek” is used, it is always translated “out of” not “of.”

“And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of [”Ek” #1537] thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel” (Matthew 2:6).

“And thou, Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, art few in number to be reckoned among the thousands of Judah; yet out of [”Ek” #1537] thee shall One come forth to me, to be a ruler of Israel; and His goings forth were from the beginning, even from eternity” (Micah 5:2, from the Greek Old Testament).

“For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of [”Ek” #1537] Juda. . . “ (Hebrews 7:14).

It is clear that the word “Ek” in the Greek should be translated as, “out of.”

Because Jesus was born in Judea and because He identifies Himself as the “Saviour of all men” (1 Tim 4:10), the phrase should be translated, “*Salvation is (or cometh) out of Judea.*” (John 4:22) Salvation is found only in Jesus, who came out of Judea.

Is Salvation “of the Jews?”

Is salvation “of the Jews,” or is salvation through Jesus the Christ? No, He did not come through the Jews—He made that quite clear in John chapter 8. If He were “of the Jews” wouldn’t His verbal attacks against them also apply to Himself?

“And he said unto them, *Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world*” (John 8:23).

“I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with *your* father.

“They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

“But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham.

“*Ye do the deeds of your father.* Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.

“Jesus said unto them, *If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God;* neither came I of myself, but he sent me.

“Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.

“*Ye are of your father the devil,* and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for *he is a liar, and the father of it*” (John 8:38–44).

Pilate’s “King of the Jews” Inscription was a sarcastic Joke

“At the time of the Crucifixion of Christ, Pontius Pilate was the administrator in Judea for the Roman Empire. At that time in history the area of the Roman Empire included a part of the Middle East. As far as he was concerned officially or personally, *the inhabitants of Judea were “Judeans” to Pontius Pilate and not so-called “Jews” as they have been called since the 18th century.* In the time of Pontius Pilate . . . there was no religious, racial or national group in Judea known as “Jews” nor had there been any group so identified anywhere else in the World prior to that time.

“. . . . As the administrator for the Roman Empire in Judea it was the official policy of Pontius Pilate never to interfere in the spiritual affairs of the local population. Pontius Pilate’s primary responsibility was the collection of taxes to be forwarded home to Rome, not the forms of religious worship practiced by the Judeans from whom those taxes were collected.

“The Latin word “rex” means “ruler or leader” in English. During the lifetime of Jesus in Judea the Latin word “rex” meant only that to Judeans familiar with the Latin language. *The Latin word “rex” is the Latin verb “rego, regere, rex, rectus” in English means “to rule, to lead.”* Latin was of course the official language in all the provinces administered by a local administrator of the Roman Empire. This fact accounts for the inscription on the Cross in Latin. With the invasion of the British Isles by the Anglo-Saxons, the English language substituted the Anglo-Saxon “king” for the Latin equivalent “rex” used before the Anglo-Saxon invasion. The adoption of “king” for “rex” at this late date in British history did not retroactively alter the meaning of the Latin “rex” to the Judeans during the time of Christ. The Latin “rex” to them then meant only “ruler, leader” as it still means in Latin. Anglo-Saxon “king” was spelled differently when first used but at all times meant the same as “rex” in Latin, “leader” of a tribe.

“During the lifetime of Jesus *it was very apparent to Pontius Pilate that Jesus was the very last person in Judea the Pharisees or scribes would select as their “ruler” or their “leader.”* In spite of this situation in Judea Pontius Pilate did

not hesitate to order the inscription of the Cross “Jesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum.” By the wildest stretch of the imagination *it is not conceivable that this sarcasm and irony by Pontius Pilate at the time of the crucifixion was not mockery of Jesus by Pontius Pilate, but was mockery of the Pharisees and the scribes, whom we know today as “Jews.”* After this reference to “Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans” the Priests, Pharisees and scribes (Jews) forthwith proceeded to crucify Jesus upon that very cross. It was the Chief Priests, Pharisees and Scribes (The Jews), Who crucified our Lord Jesus Christ: Not the Romans!

“If one is to be honest, *it is Utterly Impossible to give any other English translation to “Iudaeorum” than, “of the Judeans.”* Qualified and competent theologians and historians regard as incredible any other translation into English of “Jesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum” than “Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans.”

“At the time Pontius Pilate was ordering the “Jesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum” inscribed upon the Cross the spiritual leaders of Judea (The Jews) were protesting to Pontius Pilate “not to write Jesus was the ruler of the Judeans” but to inscribe instead that Jesus “had said that He was the ruler of the Judeans.” The spiritual leaders of Judea made very strong protests to Pontius Pilate against his reference to Jesus as “Rex Iudaeorum” insisting that Pontius Pilate was not familiar with or misunderstood the status of Jesus in Judea. . . .

“Pontius Pilate “washed his hands” of the blood of Jesus and the protests by the spiritual leaders (Jews) in Judea who demanded of him that the inscription on the Cross authored by Pontius Pilate be corrected in the manner they insisted upon. Pontius Pilate very impatiently replied to their demands, “What I have written, I have written.” (John 19:22); “Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum,” or “Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judeans” in English” (Willie Martin from, *The Inscriptions on the Cross*).

Jews Know

“The modern Jewish claim that Christ was of their race, though not the messiah looked for, is a flimsy absurdity. It has no basis in history. It is a frantic attempt of their rabbis to revive the “earliest of heresies,” Ebionitism, and its purpose is to drag His divinity down to the Jewish level” (Jacob Elon Conner, A.B., Ph.D. in, *Christ Was Not a Jew: An Epistle to the Gentiles* p. 43).

An interesting admission regarding this was made by Rabbi Finkelstein earlier in this book in my chapter titled, “The Rabbi Finkelstein Interview.” When accused of being Christ murderers by pastor James Wickstrom, Rabbi Finkelstein, his guest, replied,

“Well, that’s, that’s true. We killed him, but he was Jewish too.”

Pastor James Wickstrom fired back.

“Oh, no, he was mighty Yahweh, got into flesh/body. That’s the problem you got.”

Rabbi Finkelstein, sounding a bit off guard (I heard the interview) replied,

“Well, *we tell all the goyim that they worship a Jew and they believe it*, so what’s the difference?”

Harold Rosenthal stated:

“The Founder of Christianity made no secret of his estimation of the Jews and the fact that he was not one of us. When he found it necessary he drove us out of the temple of God, because then, as always, we used religion as a means of advancing our commercial interest” (Harold Wallace Rosenthal, quoted earlier in this book in my chapter titled, “The Harold Wallace Rosenthal Interview”).

The utterance by the Clergy

“The utterance by the clergy which confuses Christians the most, is constantly repeated from the pulpit and on the written page, this is that “Jesus was a Jew’!” This is not only a misrepresentation, but a distortion of incontestable historic facts. Yet it is uttered by the clergy on the slightest pretext. They utter it without provocation. They appear to be “trigger happy” to utter it! They never miss an opportunity to proclaim it to their congregations.

“When Jesus was crucified, the Roman Governor Pontius Pilate, had an inscription placed on the cross. It was written in Latin, IEUS NAZARENOUS REX IUDEUM. Since Latin was Pilate’s mother tongue, he was able to express his ideas in this language. Authorities competent to translate from Latin to English agree that this inscription said: JESUS THE NAZARENE RULER OF THE JUDEANS! Then why have our Bible translators, almost to a man, translated this to read: JESUS THE NAZARENE, KING OF THE JEWS?”

“There is little doubt that Pilate was being sarcastic when he put this inscription on the cross. He was mocking the Pharisees, whom he hated, knowing that they had denounced Jesus, defamed Him; that He had been denied by the majority of the Judeans and that they had insisted on His crucifixion” (Brig. Gen. Jack Mohr in, *The Inside Story of International Judaism* p. 7)

“Whoever makes the assertion that Christ was a Jew is either ignorant or insincere: (in the case of most Christian ministers, it is a matter of intellectual dishonesty.) ignorant when he confuses race and religion; insincere, when he knows the history of Galilee, and partly conceals, and partly distorts the very entangled facts in favor of the Jews. The probability that Jesus Christ was no Jew; that he had not one drop of Jewish blood in His veins, is so great as to be a certainty!” (Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Foundations of the XIX Century*, p. 211, quoted by Willie Martin in, *Christ was Not a Jew* and also by Lt. Col. Gordon (Jack) Mohr, A.U.S. Retired in, *Thank God My Savior Was Not a Jew* Part 2 of 8).