

## Welcome To Kurt's Practical Atheist Section

# JESUS ANOINTED?

by Kurt Saxon

(To access all the rest of the pages in this section, please click the "[ [Up](#) ]" link found at the bottom of this page.)

Robert Ingersoll, the great atheist lecturer of the 19th century made the greatest omission since the writer of John 18:38 failed to answer Pilate's "What is truth?" (Any sort of drivel would satisfy a believer, but a non-believer would demand a definition acceptable by all).

Throughout Ingersoll's works he refers to Jesus mainly as "Christ", believed to be a title of honor and majesty. But the real definition of the word "Christ", explained as to its importance, shows it was not a title at all and so destroys the beliefs of those who consider themselves Christians. "Christ", from the Greek "krist" means only to anoint. (Anoint. To smear or pour oil or ointment on the head or body of a person or an object). So why wasn't Jesus called "Anointed", "Jesus Anointed" or "Anointed Jesus"?

Anointing was a ceremony, a ritual, recognizing a person as deserving of a certain title. Queen Elizabeth was anointed by the Arch Bishop of Canterbury. He rubbed some oil on her forehead, before an audience, and pronounced her the rightful Queen of the United Kingdom. Note; she is not called "Anointed", "Elizabeth Anointed" or "Anointed Elizabeth". She is addressed by her title "Queen", not the name of the ceremony recognizing her as queen.

Had the word "anointed" been used in place of "Christ", too many Bible readers would have realized Jesus had never been anointed and therefore was not to be considered the Messiah sent to the "Lost sheep of the house of Israel", the Jews. The only person who could have anointed Jesus as Messiah was Caiaphas, the high priest of the Jews that year. But Caiaphas, far from recognizing Jesus as the Messiah and anointing him, wanted him dead. (John 11:47-51).

John 11:48 says "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation".

So Caiaphas didn't anoint Jesus. Okay; so what about Acts 10:38 where it says "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power..."? Did the god smear Jesus with the Holy Ghost" Did it smear him with power?

The way the claimed anointing was phrased shows it was either hearsay or made up by the writer long after Jesus' death. No one knows who wrote it anyway. Would not a god who sent it's son to a people let them know in a better way than a one-liner by an anonymous writer? And yet, one of the world's greatest religions hangs on that one unreliable comment by an unreliable, unknown author.

Did that person even know the original stories of Jesus? Apparently not. We must suppose the same writer told of the second death of Judas. Acts 1:16-19 tells us that Judas, instead of throwing the thirty pieces of silver on the temple floor and then hanging himself (Matt. 27:3-8), bought a field with the reward, fell headlong and all his bowels gushed out. The author might as well have written that his head came off, both equally impossible.

If you want some fun, ask any Bible bandit how Judas died. He will nearly always tell you that Judas hanged himself. Then have him read the foolish story in Acts.

It has come down to us that the Jews were too stupid to recognize Jesus for what he was, so we got him. Whoopdee-doo! But if Caiaphas had anointed Jesus as the Messiah the Romans would have done then what they did in 70 A.D. when they destroyed Jerusalem, leaving nothing but the Whining Wall you see on TV today.

Jesus wasn't the king of the Jews; Herod was. Nor was he the Messiah. His last words on the cross were "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46). Any Jewish child of the time could have told him that he was neither sent nor forsaken. He wasn't what was hoped for or would have been sent.

The Romans occupied, oppressed and exploited the Jews. The Messiah would have liberated them. He would have been a super David with all the powers of their god to utterly defeat and drive out the Romans. This god would have demonstrated its power and re-won the recognition and devotion of its chosen people.

But what did Jesus do? The foolish stories built up about him were that he went around preaching sweetness and light. He raised the dead, gave sight to the blind, cast out devils. Even if these stories had been true, his acts were unimportant. The Messiah would have gotten rid of the Romans. Caiaphas would have been a shoo-in for the office of high priest for another term. The Jews could then have run their own lives and economy.

But would Jesus have driven out the Romans, anyway? No. He said in Matt. 22:21 "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's...." It's as if the Soviets had won the Cold War and occupied the U.S. and a hoped for liberator

had said. "Give to the Soviets the things that are the Soviets". Any American patriot would have protested that the Soviets owned nothing here as any Jewish patriot would have said the Jews owed the Romans nothing. Jesus was not a liberator but a collaborator who preached accommodating the hated Romans and basically giving up any hope for a real Messiah as described below:

#### THE INTERPRETERS DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE

##### Messiah, Jewish

##### Person and work of the Messiah.

The king and son of David has the task of purging Jerusalem of the heathen and destroying the godless (Psalms of Solomon: 17:21-25). Then he will establish the realm of holy people; strangers are not admitted (vss. 26-29). The subjugated heathen come from afar to Jerusalem to see her glory and bring back the scattered members of the nation (vss. 30-31). The just, wise, strong, and sinless king depends on God alone; he introduces a blessed era (vss. 32 ff; 18:6-9). Here as also elsewhere (II Esd. 12:31-34; II Bar. 40: 1-2) it is clear that the Messiah plays a considerably more active role in the deliverance of Israel and the subjugation of the enemies than in the OT.

To add a note of harsh realism; consider the image we've been given of Jesus hanging on the cross. Note the loin cloth. But he was stark naked. The Romans had no hang-ups about nudity. Besides, crucifixion was the total awfulness. It was agony. It took a long time to die and it was a public humiliation. It was the Roman way of saying, "Whether thief, revolutionary or self-deluded demigod, see what happens to anyone who might be a threat to Roman rule".

Seeing that Jesus was definitely not what the Jews expected or wanted, how come his memory didn't fade away as did the memories of so many other wannabe Mesiahs before him? Many scholars believe that Paul, a Jew and second-class Roman citizen, had evil intentions in his spread of Jesusitis. He hated Rome and all Gentiles and wanted to infect them with an alien belief system which could only confuse and weaken them. After all, the Biblical god chose only the family of Abraham (Genesis 12:1-3). It was Paul who chose the Gentiles. Was Paul a god?

Read "A real Case Against The Jews", by Marcus Eli Ravage, a Jewish scholar who seems to back up the idea that Paul's inflicting Jesus on the Gentiles was with deliberate malice.

Believers might call themselves "Jesusites" but there are no Christians, no Christian churches nor a Christian religion. Even so, I wish you all a very merry Anointmas, indeed.

**Please forward all your questions &/or comments concerning  
this section of my site to the address directly below this text.  
[atheist@kurtsaxon.com](mailto:atheist@kurtsaxon.com)**

[ [Home](#) ] [ [Up](#) ] [ [Next](#) ]

*Website Contents © 2007 Atlan Formularies, P.O. Box 95, Alpena, AR 72611-0095  
Phone - 870-437-2999, Fax - 870-437-2973, Email - [cary@survivalplus.com](mailto:cary@survivalplus.com)*

---