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INTRODUCTION

"Islam is a religion without any mythology. Its teachings are simple and intelligible. It is free from superstitions and irrational beliefs... Islam awakens in man the faculty of reason and exords him to use his intellect. It enjoins him to see things in the yellow light of reality..." (ISLAM—OUR CHOICE, P. 7, Compiled & Edited by EBRAHIM AHMED BAWANY) "The assimilation of fact is one of the aims of Islam," says Dr. Muhammad Sadiq Dudley Wright Ph.D. F.S.P.

As a Truth-Seeker, with these opinions I go beyond the dogmatic border to scrutinize with the Islamic point of view, the narratives of the Gospel writers concerning the movements of Mary Magdalene and Jesus, son of Joseph (Carpenter) & his wife Mary, who also was the Prophet of God sent specially to seek and deliver the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Cf- Matt. 10:6, & 15:24). And I have come to the conclusion that, in all probability he was the holy consort of the repentant Mary Magdalene.

This pamphlet is written to give the reader a bird's eye view of the fact that the records of the gospel writers are closely given the clue to admit the possibility of the matrimonial life of Jesus. In the face of the heavy evidence in the gospels, it would be blasphemous to say otherwise as it would be ridiculous to uphold that those glaring facts are mere sentimentality of faith. My conclusion is without prejudice and I humbly say that, it is a challenge which I believe, all truth-seekers and free-thinkers would support to put to the dogmatic believers to deny if they can, the
fact from the pages of the four Gospels in the New Testament of the Holy Bible, known as the life history of Jesus Christ.

"Marriage is honourable in all" so goes the golden saying. Islam enjoins every male to get married, if he has the means to do so. It also gives no exemption to any one including the Prophets of God in matters matrimony.

I cannot close this short introduction without expressing my sincere thanks to my master, Ch. M. S. Bhutta (Missionary in-charge), whose assistance I had in compiling this pamphlet and my friend, Mr. I. B. K. Addo B.A. of Ahmadiyya Secondary School, Kumasi, who with courtesy perused the contents and approved the conclusion.

Salah-Uddin P. Tayo
(Assist. Missionary)

Ghana Muslim Mission
P. O. Box 3564
Kumasi City.
21/2/66
"THE BRIDEGROOM OF CANA
— WHO AND HOW?
(AS A TRUTH-SEEKER SEES IT)

The problem of the Bridegroom of the marriage ceremony held at Cana of Galilee, popularly known as the scene where Jesus Christ performed his first miraculous work, remains unsolved for centuries by Biblical Teachers, Scholars and Clergymen of the Christian religion.

About sixteen years ago, Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, the Biblical Lecturer in the Birmingham University, who tried to break the string of silence over the issue by publishing a thought-provoking book entitled "The Rise of Christianity" received a cold reception from the Ecclesiastical Council of the London Westminster Abbey. We were told that as soon as this book was published, the market report of the booksellers showed an amazing figure of four hundred copies a day.

Before long, this book was officially banned and Bishop Barnes was sent for, to face a query. In his reply before the Christian Council, the learned Bishop is reported to have said that he was handicapped by the rigorous questions from his students at the University about the narratives in the Bible, especially the missing name of the Bridegroom of the marriage of Cana. The report also said: the Bishop noted that, taking this and other things together in the Bible as far as the modern scientific research is concerned, he can not do anything but to form a different opinion. The judgment is that, he should resign his post in the Ministry of the Holy Order, as he was kicking against his cooking pot. But the Bishop refused to comply with this request.
Now, as a believer in a sister religion, and at the same time a truth-seeker, I shall implement the Islamic point of view to review the same problem in accordance with the record of the Gospel writers. Therefore, here goes the story of the marriage in full:

"On the third day there was a marriage at Cana in Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there; Jesus was also invited to the marriage, with his disciples. When the wine failed, the mother of Jesus said to him, "They have no wine." And Jesus said to her, O woman, what have you to do with me? My hour has not yet come. His mother said to the servants, "Do whatever he tells you." Now six stone jars were standing there, for the Jewish rites of purification, each holding twenty or thirty gallons. Jesus said to them, "Fill the jars with water." And they filled them up to the brim. He said to them, "Now draw some out and take it to the steward of the feast. So they took it. When the steward of the feast tasted the water now become wine, and did not know where it came from (though the servants who had drawn the water knew), the steward of the feast called the bridegroom and said to him, "Every man serves the good wine first; and when men have drunk freely, then the poor wine; but you have kept the good wine until now." This, the first of his signs, Jesus did at Cana in Galilee, and manifested his glory; his disciples believed in him."

(John 2:1-11, R.V.)

This is the historical marriage ceremony held at Cana and we have to face the following pertinent questions:—

(a) If Jesus, his mother and a few earliest disciples were merely invited to attend the ceremony, why should the mother of Jesus be the right person to
know the shortage of wine? Again, she knew of this, why, instead of going to the bridegroom, who should have been the host, she went straight-away to her son Jesus? And she asked him to produce more wine. Is there any sense in her concern, if all of them were invitees?

(b) Mary, the mother of Jesus displayed herself as a mistress of the ceremony. If not, why did she care to advise the disciples to abide by Jesus instructions?

(c) Jesus addressed his mother in this tone: “O woman! what have you to do with me? My hour has not yet come? Here, I do not confine myself to the correctness of this language whether it befits a son to address his mother as “O Woman”! or not. But, my concern here is that, Jesus protested to his mother’s action, because, it was a premature action for him to embark on evangelical life while he had not yet fulfilled the domestic obligations at his age of maturity. If this opinion is wrong, then, why should he vex with his mother like that?

(d) After tasting the new wine, the steward of the feast complained to the bridegroom (Jesus) to have kept aside the superior wine until the guests had drunk the inferior one. If this assumption is wrong, again, Was there any one besides Jesus known as the bridegroom who produced the magical wine for his guests? The answer is an emphatic NO.

(e) The die-hard Pauline doctrine believer might say that this opinion is fantastic. But, can any such believer tell us, why the writer of the Gospel under reference deliberately omitted the real name of the bridegroom of the day throughout his story? No doubt, the marriage was a remarkable one and the
name of the bridegroom should not have been treated in camera, if Jesus was not the one.

CHAPTER TWO

JESUS AND MARY MAGDALENE

FIRST IMPRESSION: The intimacy of Jesus and Mary whose appellation is Magdalene is another critical question to be settled.

ST. LUKE writes:

"And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house brought an alabaster box of ointment. And stood at his feet, behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment."

"Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him; for she is a sinner" (Luke 7:36–39)

In this first impression, it is obvious that St. Luke did not mention the name but writes, a woman of the city and also described her as a sinner. Saying this by him, does not mean that the said woman was the only sinner in the world by that time. It must have been that she was a popular lady but leading the life of a spinster. As the statements of the Bible are oftenly interpolated, we may not hold the view that the woman was a significant sinner in the city.
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But, in any circumstances, her weeping and kissing the feet of the Lord proved her resignation from her worldly affairs to a spiritual one. She was doing this with the determination of leading a pious life.

On the other hand, the action of this lady creates a doubt in the host’s mind but, being a prophet of God, Jesus outwitted him by telling a parable to Simon, one of his disciples at the table with him thus:

“There was a certain creditor which had two debtors; the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most? Simon answered and said, I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged” (Luke 7:41-43).

The theological meaning of this parable is that, that woman was the greater debtor for her sins and for that reason her love too must be greater. Then Jesus gave her this assurance: “Thy sins are forgiven . . . Thy faith saved thee, go in peace” (Verse 48—50).

Though, St. Luke omitted the name of the particular woman, but she was the same Mary Magdalene, of whom we shall discuss further. This is the basic love between Jesus and Mary Magdalene. Obviously speaking, as the contradiction is the order of the day for the Bible writers, we should assume that their meeting at the Pharisee’s house was not the first one. It must have been that Jesus had more material connection with her than a mere forgiveness of sins. Because, it would sound unprophetic idea for Jesus to allow himself to be so unlawfully rubbed by a public woman of that nature. Again, it is possible for St. Luke to interweave every statement during his fact finding commission about the life history of Jesus.
In order to justify my claim, read what the same St. Luke writes in another page: "And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him. And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils" (Luke 8:1-2). In the light of this quotation, Is it not a glaring evidence that, Mary was the one described previously as a sinner and whose sins were forgiven? As for me, I am at a loss to know what those seven devils formerly living in her were. Or we may take them to be seven assorted vanities of the world which can be found in the character of a public lady.

SECOND IMPRESSION:

Again St. Luke writes:

"Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat Jesus' feet, and heard his word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore, that she help me. And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: But one thing is needful and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." (Luke 10:38-42)

In this quotation, one fact must first of all be noted, i.e., Jesus left his disciples somewhere and came all alone to lodge in Martha's house where Mary Magdalene her sister lived. But, instead of helping her busy sister in preparing the supper for the honourable guest, Mary stuck to Jesus'
feet enjoying the spiritual conversation with him. In Jesus' word, Mary had attained a perfect position to suit a prophet's wife and nobody can deprive her of this honourable attainment. This conclusion as usual may be fantastic to a dogmatic believer, then, we want to know: Why should Jesus alone go there to spend the night? Is it lawful to a perfect Prophet of God to sleep in the same room with a woman, who has no husband? The answer is an emphatic NO. And if he slept there for certain, then for what? Can we assume that he was preaching the Kingdom of heaven to them at such hour of the night? Without any abrogation, this is a hard fact and we are bound to face it.

THIRD IMPRESSION:

St. John writes:

"Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha"  
(John 11:1)

Here we come to know that the village where Mary Magdalene and Martha lived was called Bethany. The above mentioned chapter is full of story about Lazarus' illness, death and burial. In this occasion, Jesus and Mary were significant. Because, when Jesus saw the sign of Lazarus' death in a journey, he hurriedly came back to Bethany to see things for himself. On his arrival at the village he did not go straight into the house but sent for Mary Magdalene to meet him in private before hand. To this end, John chap, 11:28 – 29 reports: "She (Martha) went her way, and called Mary her sister secretly, saying, The Master is come, and calleth for thee. As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto him." After this private meeting, Jesus raised the dead Lazarus to life. And if we are to be fair to our conscience, this sort of intimacy between Jesus
and Mary has a great deal in it. The ecstasy of Mary as she learnt about Jesus' arrival was shown in her hasty movement towards where Jesus was and it made the sympathisers opined that she was going to weep at her brother's grave, not knowing that it was all about her beloved consort. (See John 11:31—32)

FOURTH IMPRESSION:
St. John writes as follows about the aftermath of Lazarus' resurrection: "Then Jesus six days before the Pass-over came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom Jesus raised from the dead. There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him. Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment" (John 12:1—3)

A panic was arranged to mark the thanksgiving of the risen Lazarus. But, in her usual manner, Mary Magdalene disclosed her love for Jesus and lavishly rubbed his feet with costly fragrant ointment. Taking this action into account, if we go beyond the dogmatic border, it must be admitted that Mary Magdalene was in all probability the Jesus Christ's consort.

FIFTH IMPRESSION:
St. Matthew writes:
"And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he lodged there. Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered. And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it,
Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth for ever."

(Matthew 21: 17 - 19)

In the light of the St. Matthew’s statement, it is clear that Jesus had chosen Mary’s house as his permanent abode and not for any thing short of matrimonial connection with Mary Magdalene. If this conviction is wrong in opinion of the Churchman, then one should like to know why Jesus left his disciples at Jerusalem and ran down quickly to pass the night at Bethany the village of Mary, which is only two miles from the city? It is also significant in the report that he returned to Jerusalem in the morning to join his disciples. We shall be guilty of a diverted opinion if we close our eyes to this plain fact.

SIXTH IMPRESSION:
St. Mark writes:

“And Jesus entered into Jerusalem and into the temple and when he looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out to Bethany with the twelve. And on the morrow, when they were coming from Bethany, he was hungry. And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon; and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves: for the time of figs was not yet. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter forever. And his disciples heard it.” (Mark 11: 11 -- 14)

I have to introduce St. Mark whose full name is John Mark (Cf. Acts 12: 12 -- 25), as the first gospel writer, and a convert of St. Peter and became one of the St. Paul’s secretaries. (See II Timothy 4: 11). It is a pity to note that this earliest gospel writer happened to differ from others on certain points in our topic. Of course, this difference
can not deter the plain fact we have already adduced from the majority opinion and we must count his as minority opinion.

Another matter which is worthy of notice is the misrepresentation of Jesus Christ's character. In that, he said that Jesus was searching for figs on the tree when it was not season for it. This means that Jesus was ignorant of the time he could find the fig tree bearing fruits. Again, he described Jesus as "A hungry man is an angry man!" Because, he said that, when Jesus failed to find any fruit on the tree, he cursed it to dry away. If my suggestion is wrong, then, why for no apparent reason, he made the tree to dry away so that no one should eat from it forever?

Under any circumstances, whether contradictions or not, one fact must be observed and that is, Jesus hurried down to sleep at Bethany from Jerusalem when it was getting dark. It was he alone who slept in the same house with Mary Magdalene excluding his disciples according to the majority opinion. Interpolations or contradictions as enshrined in the Bible moved Dr. Stanley Cook to declare that: "But human fallibility being what it is, the Bible is not free from contradictions and errors, and is by no means of equal religion value throughout."

An Introduction to the Bible, P. 193)

SEVENTH IMPRESSION:

Now, let us deal generally with the movements of Mary Magdalene during the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus Christ the Prophet of God, sent specially to search after the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The part played by Mary as reported by the gospels disclosed the ardent love of husband and wife.
Therefore, in Matthew chap. 27: 55 – 61, we read that many women came to witness the crucifixion of Jesus, but Mary Magdalene showed an anxiety more than others. She was reported sitting down afar off, watching the sepulchre of Jesus. Under this sympathetic condition she might have been in a great distress for the loss of a loving one.

In the early morning of the third day, St. Matthew says that, Mary Magdalene and her friend were the first to visit the grave yard. Her friend, who is also her name-sake shared with her the sorrowful event.

Another Mary mentioned might have been the bosom friend of Mary Magdalene, because, St. Mark also reports in chapter 15: 40 – 41, that both were at the scene of crucifixion with other woman but both waited till Jesus Christ was laid down in his grave. In chapter 16: 9, he says that Mary Magdalene was the first person to visit the grave on the third day, and the first to see the risen Lord.

St. Luke, the apostle of St. Paul and his secretary, was appointed in 85 A.D. by His Excellency Theophilus of Rome to probe into the life history of Jesus (Cf. Luke 1: 1 -- 4). Among other things, he noted in chapter 24: 50–51, that after resurrection, Jesus went to Bethany, Mary's town and there he parted from his disciples. So you see, my dear readers, Mary's place was dearest to Jesus. Even, as soon as he was saved from that terrible incident, he ran off to visit the house once more. In Jesus Christ's words, "Where one's wealth is, there the heart will be!"

St. John's gospel, is a Gospel that I can term as a gospel with a difference. It was written, we are told, in 110 A.D, by an unknown disciple. Similarly, the gospel according to St. Matthew is also claimed by the Bible historians to have been written by an unknown writer in A.D. 75. This is exactly five years after the siege of Jerusalem by Nero. Frankly speak-
ing, there are many things in that gospel which Matthew could not have written or claimed for himself if he were the real writer.

Now, back to our topic, in John chap. 19:25, we read that Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus were at the crucifixion scene weeping as well as other sympathisers. On the third day, when Mary Magdalene came early in morning and could not find the body of Jesus, she began to weep without realising that the man in a gardner’s dress was the same Jesus who disguised himself with that dress, so that the soldiers might not re-arrest him. She immediately recognised him when he called her name, and with a joyous mood, Mary wanted to embrace Jesus with her usual kiss. But, Jesus defied this action by saying to her: “Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father . . .

(See John 20:11—18, R.V.)

It is very unusual for Jesus to deny her, her usual wish but this denial might have been ensued from the wounds sustained by him. However, the alleged language used to give an excuse, is in the real sense, irrelevant to the action. As it is quite impossible to suppose that Jesus should have wanted to ascend into heaven and back before his wife could touch him. Perhaps, the correct language should have been, “Do not hold me, I have not yet cured my wounds.” This sort of mistakes could have made Cannon H.G.G. Herklots say: “Copyists make mistakes. Those who make further copies usually repeat the mistakes that have already been made and make fresh ones of their own” (How the Bible Came to Us: P. 143)
CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSION

In scrutinizing the story of the marriage ceremony held at Cana of Galilee, we have a possible fact that, in all sincerity, Jesus son of Joseph the Carpenter born to him by Mary, might have been the bridegroom of the day and nobody else. The marriage was also done when he had just abandoned his father’s professional work—carpentry. This should be the reason why he said to his mother that his time of miracle performances had not yet come.

Moreover, the intimacy between Jesus and Mary Magdalene according to the record of the four Gospels gives us a clue in all probability that the Bride of the day at Cana was the same Mary. Also the frequent lodging of Jesus at Bethany adduced a fact that Jesus and Mary moved from Cana of Galilee after the marriage ceremony and lodged in the same house with Martha the sister of Mary and Lazarus. Bethany is an outskirt village town of Jerusalem about two miles distant. Jesus made this arrangement because his ministry figured more prominently in Jerusalem than in any other place.

The golden saying is “Marriage is honourable in all.” Therefore, every well formed male and female is entitled to it. This educates us that matrimony is not a pollution to a prophet and it has nothing practically to do with the spiritual enhancement of a man if not an adultery.

If, on the other hand, the matrimonial life degrades or pollutes a man’s prophethood or spirituality, then, those great Biblical personalities would not have been in the
history. In order to bring my point home, I should like to mention a few of them here:

Abraham, the common ancestor of the Israelites and the Ishmaelites is accepted by all as the Father of the faith and he was also styled as the friend of God. Yet, he married three wives, viz: Sarah, Hagar and Keturah. He had eight children from them all, namely: Ishmael, Isaac, Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Ishbak and Shuah, (See Gen. 16:15, 21:3 & 25:1 – 2)

Jacob, the progenitor of the Israelites married wives and had twelve children known unto this day as the twelve tribes of the house of Israel. (See Gen. 35:22—26)

Moses, the Law-giver and the greatest of all the Israelites Prophets, married a Midianite-damsel, daughter of the priest of Middian. And before the Almighty God spoke to him word for word, his wife, Zipporah bore a son to him and he named the child, Gershom, because he had sojourned in a foreign land (Exodus 2:21 – 22). After the holy conversation with God, he had another son (Exodus 4:20).

David was a King of Israel and also a Prophet, yet, he married wives and had nineteen children excluding those born to him by his alleged concubines. (See I Chronicle 3:1-9).

Solomon (the wise) was a King of Israel and also a Prophet. He was reported as having seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines. (Vide I King 11:3). In a Chronicle chap. 3:10—14, we read that he had fifteen sons. Despite all those worldly enjoyments and domestic blessings that great Semitic King was reported to have received the grace of God thus: “And he said unto me (David), Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts” for I have chosen him to be my son and I will his father (I Chronicle 28:6) Even the same title was given to King David according to the Songs of Psalm. Therefore, it is written: “I will
declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee;" (Psalm 2:7).

Zacharias also was one of the notable Prophets of the house of Israel. Yet, when he found himself childless, because his wife was barren, he prayed fervently to God to bless him with a child, so that he might not die childless. The acceptance of this prayer resulted in the birth of John known as John the Baptist, through his wife Elizabeth. John the Baptist was so great and filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, that the spirit and the power of the translated Prophet Elijah or Elias was endowed on him. (See: St. Luke 1:12—19).

These few, not to speak of the rest in the Bible, suffice for us to realise the importance of the matrimonial life. If wives and children are forbidden to prophets, those few mentioned above would not be so close to God. It is significant outside the dogmatic conception that, Moses, who had wife and children was greater than Jesus Christ. Because, Moses brought the law which Jesus claimed to have come to fulfil. More-over, Moses fasted forty days and spoke with God on Mount Sinai, but, Jesus on the other hand, fasted the same forty days without eating any food throughout. Yet, he could not speak with God but with Satan!

As far as the matrimonial life is concerned, the Holy Quran which is the unrevised Sacred Book of God has come to clear our doubts about the Prophets of God thus:

"And certainly, we sent messengers before thee (O Muhammad), and appointed for them, wives and children . . . " (Quran 13:38)

"And Zacharia and John and Jesus and Elias: each one, (of them) was of the righteous. And Ishmael and Elisha and Jonah and Lot : and each one (of them) . We made to excel the people; And some of their fathers and their descendants and their brethren. And we chose them and guided them to the right way" (Quran 6:86—88).
This is the revelation sent to the last Prophet of the Semitic race, (Muhammad) Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him and it shows that Jesus was not excluded from those prophets who had wives and children. Regarding the general rule for marriage in Islam, the Holy Quran says:

"Marry such women as seem good to you, two or three or four, but if you fear that you will not do justice, then (marry) only one..." (Quran 4:3)

This Quranic injunction allows both monogamy and polygamy so as to safeguard our prestige. It is the will of our Creator, the Almighty God, that we abide by. His ordinance, and if we try to follow the otherwise we shall no doubt put ourselves in the wrong way which may be liable to punishment. In this wise, monogamy as the Christian doctrine and marriage abstinence as practised by the Roman Catholic priests are not divine but man-made or self-imposed laws. It is significant to note that, two Dutch Catholic priests were reported to have resigned their unwarranted marriage abstinence to lead a matrimonial life (Vide MORNING POST of 8/2/66, "A Nigerian Daily"). These two former priests have shown their good gesture to the remaining comrades in the holy order.

Now, turning to our topic, attribution of marriage to Jesus is fantastic only to a die-hard Church devotee who lives by a dogmatic conception that Jesus was more than human being and he was the only begotten son of God, sent to be born by the virgin Mary through the Holy Ghost according to the doctrine of the Pauline Christianity. The believer of this dogma should not think of Jesus as having anything to do with the material life, because, he was sent to shed his blood to wipe away the sins of the world. Though, the believer may with common sense know that
the sins of the world referred to are perpetual, and nothing was wiped away by the death of Christ since then.

To a free thinker such belief is ridiculous as it has no foundation in the face of heavy evidence which we adduced from our scientific achievement in conjunction with our age of reason. The confusion and the contradicted report about the birth of Jesus as given in the Gospels made the world renowned religious leader and scholar, Revd. Dr. Charles Francis Potter M.A., B.D., S.T.M., LITT. D., write in his book: “The Gospel accounts are sadly confused” (The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed, P. 113). Furthermore, the position in which St. Paul’s doctrine put Jesus, has made the learned Parson say:

“His own people, the Jews, said and still say that Jesus was a man, a teacher, a prophet, a healer of the sick. They say he was a good man, but, if he or his followers thought he was God, or the son of God, he and they were terribly mistaken; for it is not only an error, but blasphemy, according to the strictly monotheistic (One God) Jewish religion, to say that a man can be God or that God could have a son! (page 122)”

Let us see what the Gospels say inter alia about the opinion of that learned leader, Dr. C. F. Potter:

“Mark 6:3 says, Is this not the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?”

“Jesus also remarked:

“A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house”

(Mark 6:4 R.V.)

John chap. 6:42–43 says:

“And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph,
whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven? Jesus answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves”

“Matthew chap. 13:55—56 also says:

“Is not this the carpenter’s son? Is not his mother called Mary? And his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man these things? Unambiguously, Jesus also said about Oneness of God thus:

“Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind and with all your strength” (Mark 12:29—30 & Deut. 6:4—5)

No doubt, readers would see for themselves that the opinion of the Revd. Dr. Potter is reflected in the light of the Bible and we must admit the fact that the ingredients of the Christian doctrine are the inventions of St. Paul the chief builder of the Christianity. To drive my point home, let another erudite writer explain for us better:

“Chief among the makers of the Christian doctrine was St. Paul. He had never seen nor heard him preach . . . He did very little to enlarge or develop the original teaching of Jesus, the teaching of the Kingdom of heaven. But he taught that Jesus was not only the promised leader of the Jews but also that his death was a sacrifice, like the deaths of the ancient sacrificial victims of the primordial civilisations, for the redemption of mankind . . . St. Paul familiarised his disciples with the idea that Jesus, like Osiris, was a god who died to
rise again and give men immortality... The Sabellians taught that Jesus was merely an aspect of the Father and artificer at the same time: and Trinitarians taught a more subtle doctrine that God was both one and three, Father, Son and Holy Ghost” (A Short History of the World, Collins Classic Edition, P. 38) H.G. Wells, the author was regarded in his time as an erudite writer of the world history.

Explaining the Christianity, Professor John Lewis B.Sc., Ph.D., (Lecturer in Philosophy, Morley College, London), says: “If it was Judaistic in origin and subsequently Roman, in organization, it was Greek in language and thought” (The Religions of the World Made Simple, P. 97)

Taking these facts into consideration as far as dogmatic belief and the Bible are concerned, we have to conceive that the Almighty God in His infinite wisdom outwitted the Gospel writers by placing a certain garb over their knowledge. Therefore, they were not aware that what they wrote to exonerate Jesus of the affairs of the material world rather put him under more. They lucidly adjusted the story of Jesus and Mary Magdalene to appear to us as if there was nothing in common between the two. More significant still, the following is an extract from the book called "The Secret Sayings of Jesus" (According to the Gospel of Thomas). The fragment of the Gospel of Peter in it says:

“At dawn on the Lord’s day, Mariam Magdalene, the Lord’s disciple (afraid because of the Jews, since they were inflamed with wrath, she had not done at the Lord’s sepulchre what women are accustomed to do for the dead and for those who love them), took with her, her friends and came to the sepulchre where he (Jesus) had been laid” (Page 40-11. Translated by Robert M. Grant & David Noel Freedman).
Let us note one thing in this Gospel. Instead of writing THE LORD'S WIFE, the translators write "The Lord's disciple." This is another dodging away from the glaring fact. To say that Mary or Mariam Magdalene was Jesus' disciple is ridiculous. Because, none of the Biblical Gospels dare say so. The custom referred to in the same quotation is often performed by the wife of a dead husband not for ordinary lover as those translators who translated the work would like us believe. There is nothing short of their manner to isolate Mary or Mariam from being the wife of the Lord Jesus Christ.

However, I should like to remark that, the quoted translators are men of high intelligent scholar. Because, Robert M. Grant is Professor of New Testament at the University of Chicago and David Noel Freedman is also Professor of Old Testament at Pittsburg Theological Seminary. But still I can not, in my free opinion exonerate them of a biased conclusion, as they are men of our time who may one day or the other believe in the divinity of Jesus and his superhuman degree. Regarding the self-adjustment of the writers or interpolations, Professor J. M. Dummelow, in his Commentary of the Bible says:

"A copyist would sometimes put in not what was in the text, but what he thought ought to be in it. He would trust a fickle memory, or he would make the text accord with the views of the school to which he belonged. In addition to the versions and quotations from the Christian Fathers, nearly four thousand Greek MSS, of the New Testament were known to exist. As a result the variety of reading is considerable ... (Commentary on the Bible, P. 16) Mr. Bernard M. Allen, also confesses in his "The Story Behind the Gospel" that: "We have, therefore, no security that the narratives
and sayings as given in the Gospels necessarily represent what actually happened and what was actually said”.

Now, in the long run, if this is Christianity and the teaching of the Pauline doctrine, how on earth, would it be blasphemous to attribute marriage of Mary Magdalene to Jesus, who was a prophet and Jewish teacher in the like manner as others before him. Those who had wives and children, but, still close to God more than Jesus. Because, none of the prophets before him cried that, God has forsaken him. And again, one should like to know, why it accounted so terrible for a clergyman to express openly on the pulpit, the opinion he had gained in his academic lecture room or the opinion entertained in the privacy of his study room and then call spade a spade; we the laymen are not infants in arms.

In conclusion, the Bible admits that Jesus is not the son of God, but son of Joseph the carpenter. He too was wont calling himself Son of Man. The Bible also proves that, Jesus son of Joseph was in all probability the bridegroom of the marriage held at Cana of Galilee and the events that followed prove that Jesus was the lawful consort of Mary Magdalene. HE WHO HAS EARS TO HEAR LET HIM HEAR!