

An Identity Commentary on the Gospel of Mark



And looking up he said "I see men, that as trees I see walking!" [Mark 8:24]

The Gospel of Mark - Part 16: Sons of Alphaeus

In our previous commentary, we discussed the apostles Simon Peter and the sons of Zebedee, and the epithets *Petros* and *Boanerges* which rested upon them respectively. Now we are left with nine more of the original twelve, of whom for the most part we know comparatively less, but that does not mean that there is not still much to discuss. Sometimes less is more, and a small set of interesting details concerning one apostle can reveal a volume of wisdom.

There is also another controversial truth for us to thunder, which is that the apostles James and Jude, are the half-brothers of Christ through His earthly mother Mary and a man named Alphaeus. And we will not stop there, as hidden among the apostles might even be a third son of Alphaeus.

Let's get started.

3:18 and Andreas and Philippos and Bartholomaios and Maththaios and Thomas and Iakobos the son of Alphaios and Thaddaios and Simon the Kananian

Andrew is listed beside Peter, his older brother, in Matthew and Luke, but not here in Mark. As we had discussed in our commentary, [*Reckoning the Twelve*](#), the unique placement here of Andrew *after* the sons of Zebedee is apparently so that the epithets of *Petros* and *Boanerges* can be seen side by side.

So this results in Andrew's name being placed beside Philip's, and here in Mark (and also Acts) is not the only place where you will see the names side by side, because twice in the gospel of John we see Andrew and Philip mentioned together. It is possible that these two men had a particular bond with one another, since they were both from the town of Bethsaida, which means *house of fish*:

John 1:44 [And Philippos was from Bethsaida, from the city of Andreas and Petros.](#)

John 6:5-9 [Then Yahshua raising His eyes and observing that a great crowd comes to Him, says to Philippos: "From where could we buy bread, that they may eat?" But He said this trying him, for He knew what He was going to do. Philippos replied to Him: "Two hundred denarions' worth of loaves are not sufficient for them, that each would receive a little!" One of His students, **Andreas** the brother of Simon Petros, says to Him: " There is a young boy here who has five barley loaves and two fishes, but what are these for so many?"](#)

John 12:20-22 [Now there were some Greeks among those going up that they may worship at the feast. Then these had come to Philippos who is from Bethsaida of Galilaia and had asked him, saying: "Master, we wish to see Yahshua." Philippos comes and speaks to **Andreas**, Andreas and Philippos come and speak to Yahshua.](#)

It is interesting how the Greeks (likely Hellenized Judaeans from Greece) had come to Philip and that Philip went to Andrew, since the names of these apostles are both Greek in origin. They are also the *only* two apostles with Greek names, and no Hebrew names are attributed to them. The names of Andrew and Philip are representative of a widespread and mild Hellenization of Judaeans at the time, where there was also an ongoing friction between traditional Judaeans who sought to conserve the ancient customs, and Judaeans who more radically embraced the Greek manners of dress and other things, who were called Hellenists. Luke mentions the Hellenists three times in the book of Acts, and in Acts 6:5 mentions one among them who was named *Philip*. With the name belonging to a known Judaeans Hellenist, it is possible that the apostle Philip might have also been from what could be called a Hellenist Judaeans family, and this would explain why the Greeks in the gospel of John singled him out from the twelve. As for Andrew, the names of his brother and father (unless he is on the slight chance Simon Peter's half-brother) are Hebrew.

Andreas means manly, being derived from ἀνδρεία, an ancient Greek word for manhood and valor. A related word, ἀνδρίζομαι, is used by Paul of Tarsus where he wrote to the Corinthians “Be alert, be established in the faith, behave as men, be strong.”¹ Philippos means *fond of horses*, a compound of φίλος (friendly - #5384) and ἵππος (horse - #2462).

To continue with a theme from the last presentation, of course, those who are “alert” and “established in the faith” and “behave as men” (Andrew) will be invited as sons of thunder to ride on horses (Philip) when Christ comes to make war with the deranged. As we read in the Revelation, “And the armies in heaven follow Him upon white horses, clothed with clean white linen”,² and then in a related prophecy found in Habakkuk 3, the very same chapter which we cross referenced to the sons of Zebedee, where it says “in wrath, remember mercy”, we also read concerning the Wedding Supper, “Was the LORD displeased against the rivers? was thine anger against the rivers? was thy wrath against the sea, that thou didst ride upon thine horses and thy chariots of salvation?”³

The placement of the names of Andrew and Philip side by side is therefore also prophetic of the Wedding Supper war, albeit more slightly than in the case of the sons of Zebedee, where it had become so explicit it was essentially beaming out towards all of us. To summarize: those who are strong (Andrew) in the faith (1 Cor 16:13) will ride on horses (Phillip) with Yahshua. It is interesting that Paul writing to Philemon, mentioned an Archippos, a name which means *master of the horse*, and called him “our fellow soldier”.

Philemon 1:2 and to Apphia the sister, and to Archippos our fellow soldier, and to the assembly at your house,

Andrew was a former student of John the Baptist and along with the apostle John was one of the first two apostles to follow Christ; (being the younger brother of Peter and spending time with John the son of Zebedee apart from his older brother, he might have been close in age to the youngest apostle).⁴ Apart from this, the two brief mentions of him and Philip we cited earlier from the gospel of John, and when he inquires of Yahshua along with the sons of Zebedee and his brother Peter on the Mount of Olives (Mk 13:3), not much else is known of the apostle Andrew.

Philip was from the town of Bethsaida, and was the fourth apostle to follow Christ after John, Andrew, and Peter; and he then later went and told his friend Nathaniel of Kana that they found the Messiah, who might have been the apostle Simon the Kananian,⁵ or even the apostle Bartholomew. It is Philip who later asked Yahshua during His last earthly Passover, “Prince, show us the Father, and it shall satisfy us.”, to which Christ responded in part “For so long a time I am with you and you do not know Me, Philippos? He who has seen Me has seen the Father! How do you say 'show us the Father'? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in Me?”⁶ Apart from this and the two accounts we cited earlier from the gospel of John, there is not much else the gospels tell us concerning Philip.

The book of Acts might appear at first to tell us more concerning the apostle, since there is a Philip who is described as immersing the Ethiopian eunuch (*a Judahite in the employment of the Ethiopians*) ntext of Acts strongly suggests that he was not the same man.

There is a Philip who was among seven chosen to administer the needs of the widows among the Hellenists in Acts 6, and then in Acts 8, we read of a Philip preaching in Samaria, who must be this same man, as Luke writes much later in the book of Acts of a “And on the next day departing we came into Caesarea and entering into the house of Philippos the preacher of the good message, being from of the seven, we stayed with him.”⁷ This Philip must be the one who preached the good message to the Samaritans, and we see that he was dwelling in Caesaria, which is where the Philip of Acts 8 went after immersing the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:40). So there is no doubt that the Philip who preached to the

¹ 1 Corinthians 16:13

² Revelation 19:14

³ Habakkuk 3:8

⁴ John 1:40

⁵ John 1:43-35, 21:2 (Kana)

⁶ John 14:8-10

⁷ Acts 21:8

Samaritans and then later immersed the Ethiopian eunuch is not the apostle, but is the Philip of the seven.

Returning to the apostle Philip, we discussed in our commentary, [Reckoning the Twelve](#), how the apostle Matthew in his gospel lists the twelve in pairs, and one of those pairs is Philip and Bartholomew. These two men are also listed side by side in the reckonings of the twelve found in Mark and Luke. This consistency has led some to conjecture that Bartholomew is Nathaniel, since it is Philip who had quickly come to inform Nathaniel that he and the others had found the Messiah.

John 1:45 Philippos finds Nathanael and says to him: "He whom Moses and the prophets had written about in the law we have found: Yahshua the son of Ioseph from Nazaret."

This identification of Bartholomew is plausible, as there is indeed some logic behind the pairings in Matthew, and it is also intriguing since Bartholomew is the only apostle we know nothing about, and it is always enticing to see a possible hint of information about him. It is also possible, however, that Nathaniel was Simon the Kananee, as Nathaniel was of the town of Kana. In my opinion, the mutual identification with the town of Kana is a slightly stronger argument than the pairing of the names.

When we say that "we know nothing about" Bartholomew, perhaps that is not entirely true, since the name Bartholomew means son of *Tolmai*, and that revelation ends our arsenal of facts concerning Bartholomew. He is certainly the most mysterious of the apostles. Tolmai means *ridged* (#H8525) and refers to furrows, so perhaps the name of Bartholomew was prophetic of his destiny as an apostle working in the harvest. As Christ said, "[Great is the harvest, but the workers are few! Therefore it is necessary for the lord of the harvest, that he send out workers into his harvest!](#)"⁸ That is how the quote is rendered in Matthew's gospel, who is the next apostle in the list.

Matthew pairs himself with Thomas in his gospel, and there is no doubt that the tax-collector Levi called by Christ in the previous chapter is this apostle, where we read:

Mark 2:14 And going by He saw Levei the son of Alphaios sitting at the tax-office, and He says to him "Follow Me!" And arising he followed Him.

Matthew identifies himself as this Levi in his own gospel, and then also uniquely and humbly calls himself the tax-collector in his listing of the twelve:

Matthew 9:9 And Yahshua passing from there sees a man sitting at the tax office, called Maththaios, and says to him "Follow Me", and arising he followed Him.

Matthew 10:3 Philippos and Bartholomaaios, Thomas and Maththaios the tax-collector, Iakobos the son of Alphaios and Thaddaios,

Because Mark and Luke call the apostle Matthew by the name *Levi* in their accounts of his calling, but then by his more famous name in their listing of the apostles, I wonder if Levi was the more intimate name as opposed to Matthew, which might have become a more public name associated with his ministry. If Levi was a more intimate name, it would also explain why Matthew does not refer to himself by that name in his own gospel.

It was the responsibility of Levites to collect the tithes in the ancient Kingdom (Numbers 18:21), and sons often took on the vocations of their fathers, therefore being a tax collector and having the name Levi makes it a credible possibility that Matthew was a Levite. Furthermore, Levites were often scribes in former times (Ezra being one notable example)⁹ and that tradition seems to have continued to some extent, considering that the contemporary historian Flavius Josephus was a Levite, and also that Mark, being the cousin of the Levite Barnabas, was allegedly Peter's transcriber. It would have been natural for the first gospel, that of Matthew, to have been penned by a Levite.

Once again, names are important. *Matthew* combines the Hebrew word *mattâth* (#4991) with *Yah* and thus means "*gift of Yahweh*".

⁸ Matthew 9:37-38 [...]

⁹ 1 Chronicles 24:6, 2 Chronicles 34:13, Ezra 7:6

Something I had not realized when writing on Matthew in the past is that his name appears in the Old Testament, where it belongs to at least four distinct Levites according to my reckoning,¹⁰ and so this might be another hint towards Matthew being a Levite. The name might have been popular among Levites due to the use of the word *mattāth* in regards to sacrifices (see Ezekiel 46:5, 11).

1 Chronicles 9:31 And Mattithiah, one of the Levites, who was the firstborn of Shallum the Korahite, had the set office over the things that were made in the pans.

The fact that Matthew was a tax-collector and author of the first gospel are both strong indications that he might have been a Levite, but this “coincidence” of nearly every Matthew of the Old Testament being of Levi is a cherry on top. More subtly, the name of Matthew’s father, *Alphaeus*, can be interpreted to mean *changing*, as it derives from the Hebrew noun *chêleph* (#2500), and it might have been prophetic then of the *change* in priesthood from the Levitical to the Melchizedek, which was a *gift* for all of us. This is why we titled the commentary in which we discussed these things, *Changes and Transitions*. (the noun *chêleph* is itself derived from the verb *châlaph* (#2498), which is only seen twice in Numbers 18 where it described some Levitical duties)¹¹

There is not much else we know about Matthew apart from his vocation, his calling, the dinner he held for Yahshua at his house, (which could suggest he was a man of some wealth and means), his possible Levite lineage, and the fact that he is the author of the first gospel. The early Christian writers universally agree that Matthew wrote the gospel attributed to him, and there is no reasonable cause for doubt. Speaking of doubting, that brings us to Thomas:

Unlike Simon Peter and his brother Andrew, or the sons of Zebedee, or Bartholomew, or Matthew, we do not know the name of Thomas’ father. But we do know this: he was a twin. The name Θωμᾶς (Thomas) is derived from the Hebrew word *taom* (#8380) which means twin (see Genesis 25:24). In the gospel of John, the apostle Thomas is thrice recorded as having had the nickname Didymus,¹² the adjective δίδυμος meaning *double*, *two-fold* or *twain* in Greek. Wherever it appears in the gospel of John it is in the singular form, which according to Liddell & Scott, was used to describe one of a pair of twins. It appears then, that the name Didymus was only the Greek equivalent of his Hebrew name Thomas, both having the same meaning of *twin*.

The fact that the form of the name Didymus is in the singular and not in the dual or plural seems to indicate that Thomas’ twin brother was not one of the twelve. Furthermore, since the label is uniquely placed upon Thomas in the gospel and no one else, this could seem to indicate that the three apostolic pairs of brothers were not themselves twins.

We can all remember how Thomas is famous for being the apostle who was not present when the resurrected Christ first appeared to the apostles in the barred room, and he doubted that they had truly seen the Christ:

John 20:24-25 Now Thomas, one of the twelve, who is called "Twin", was not with them when Yahshua came. Therefore the other students said to him: "We have seen the Prince!" But he said to them: "Unless I could see the imprint of the nails in His hands and I put my finger in the imprint of the nails and I put my hand in His side, I shall not believe!"

Eight days later Yahshua appeared again in the room, and famously summoned Thomas forward to feel the imprint of his wounds, urging him to be faithful. Now, as we have routinely seen in this commentary: names are important. The adjective δίδυμος has a meaning of *double*, and because Thomas doubted, perhaps the account can bring to mind the words of the apostle James in his lone surviving epistle:

James 1:6-8 But he must ask with faith doubting nothing. For he who doubts is like a wave of the sea being driven and blown about by the wind. For that man must not suppose that he shall receive anything from the Prince, a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways.

¹⁰ 1 Chronicles 9:31, 15:18 & 15:21 & 16:5, 25:3 & 25:21, Nehemiah 8:4

¹¹ Numbers 18:21, 31

¹² John 11:16, 20:24, 21:2

It is evident then that Thomas' name of **δίδυμος**, which is *double*, was also prophetic of his doubting nature within that episode of the Gospel.

There is one other unique account where Thomas plays a role, where Christ's words that they were going to Lazarus were misinterpreted by him, and he responded by saying "**Must we also go, that we may die with him?**" (*It is open to interpretation if Thomas' words were a question or statement*)

John 11:14-16 So then Yahshua said to them frankly: "Lazaros has died, yet I rejoice on account of you, that you shall have faith, because I was not there, but we must go to him." Then Thomas, who is called Twin, said to the fellow students: "Must we also go, that we may die with him?"

This had transpired near the end of Yahshua's ministry, and by that time He had already informed His apostles of His imminent death on at least three occasions,¹³ which likely also influenced Thomas' interpretation and response.

We do not know when or how Thomas was called to be an apostle, but we do know that he was a fisherman like the majority of the others, since in the closing chapter of his gospel John records him as fishing with Peter, Nathaniel, the sons of Zebedee, and two other students. This summarizes most of what we know concerning the apostle Thomas.

Speaking of twins, the patriarch Jacob was the twin brother of Esau, and the next apostle of the list once again bears his name, just like James (Jacob), the son of Zebedee. This time it is James (Jacob), the son of Alphaeus. No one should be a doubting Thomas when presented with the proof that this James (along with Jude Thaddeus) is the half-brother of Christ by the same mother. He is the only apostle called "**the brother of the Prince**" by Paul of Tarsus,¹⁴ and if the designation was spiritual then why is it uniquely placed upon James? Even Josephus called James the brother of Yahshua, which was certainly a literal and historical application, because Josephus was not a Christian!¹⁵

It is not a coincidence that the two men who can be identified as brothers of Christ, Jacob (James) and Jude, have names which are listed among the four recorded brothers of Christ, where we read for instance later in Mark:

Mark 6:3 Is this not the craftsman, the son of Maria and brother of Iakobos and Ioses and Iouda and Simon? And are His sisters not here with us?" And they were offended by Him.

The fact that Mariam is mentioned in Mark 6:3, but not Joseph, certainly suggests that he had fallen asleep (died) by this time¹⁶. There is little doubt then, that Alphaeus, the father of James (and presumably the others as well), was the kinsman redeemer for Joseph, the next of kin who would be lawfully required to redeem his brother's widowed wife.¹⁷ Mariam certainly changed husbands, and it is quite interesting then that the name Alphaeus can mean *changing*, as we already said in regards to Matthew's father who had the same name, but who was certainly not this same Alphaeus.

Concerning when Mariam remarried, we cannot know when Joseph died, and so it is unclear whether the "father" which Mariam mentions in the account of Luke 2 was Joseph or Yahshua's earthly "step-father" Alphaeus:

Luke 2:48 And seeing Him they were astonished, and His mother said to Him "Child, why have You done thusly to us? Behold, Your father and I traveling have sought You!"

¹³ A. Matthew 16:21-23 | Mark 8:31 | Luke 9:21-22

B. Matthew 17:22-23 | Mark 9:30-32 | Luke 9:43-45

C. Matthew 20:18-19 | Mark 10:32-34 | Luke 18:31-34

¹⁴ Galatians 1:19

¹⁵ Antiquities 20.9.1

¹⁶ John 6:42 is not a contention. In any language one can say "We know Adolf Hitler" meaning "we are familiar with who he was." Koine Greek does the same; the tense choice does not signal whether the person is living.

¹⁷ Deuteronomy 25:5

This *father* whom Mariam speaks of is never identified by name in the oldest surviving manuscripts of the passage, and the Greek word for step-father is rare, never appearing in Scripture and not very fitting in the Hebrew cultural context.

Christ was twelve years old in the account of Luke 2, and so if the father which Mariam speaks of is Joseph, then Jacob not yet being born would not have been any older than 18 years of age when Christ began His ministry at 30.

Jacob was ostensibly the second oldest son of Mariam, behind Yahshua whom Luke describes as her “[first-born son](#)”¹⁸ (*another statement which explicitly proves that Mariam went on to have more children*). The logical presumption of Jacob’s age lies in the fact that he is mentioned first in the reckoning of Yahshua’s brothers at Mark 6:3 and Matthew 13:55, and where Mary is mentioned as a witness of the crucifixion in each of those gospels, James is mentioned first there also:

Mark 6:3 [Is this not the craftsman, the son of Maria and brother of Iakobos and Ioses \[...\]](#)

Mark 15:40 [\[...\] and Maria the mother of the lesser Iakobos, and the mother of Ioses, \[...\]](#)

Matthew 13:55 [\[...\] Is not His mother called Mariam and His brothers Iakobos and Ioseph \[...\]](#)

Matthew 27:56 [\[...\] and Maria the mother of Iakobos and Ioseph \[...\]](#)

The fact that the naming conventions in the Passion accounts are consistent with what was established earlier in the respective narratives of each gospel proves that this Mary of Mark 15:40 and Matthew 27:56 is the mother of Christ, who certainly witnessed the Crucifixion, as we see in John’s account. There is little doubt then that James was the eldest of Yahshua’s brothers. Furthermore, Jude identifies himself as “[the brother of Iakobos](#)” in his epistle (1:1), which would have been inappropriate unless Jacob was his older brother.

We cannot know if the father described in Luke 2 is Joseph or Alphaeus, but if it is the former, then this would mean that the brothers of Christ were all quite young and it would explain them being present with their mother.

Mark 3:32 [And a crowd sat around Him, and they said to Him: "Behold, Your mother and Your brothers seek You outside!"](#)

In fact, because Mark later calls Jacob “the lesser Jacob”, this can certainly imply that Jacob the brother of Christ was even younger than Jacob the son of Zebedee, whom we have already conjectured to have been quite young. This is all we will say concerning the maternal lineage of James and Jude for now, and Yahweh willing, we will resume the topic in more detail when we provide a commentary on the above account.

We do not see James ever singled out in the Gospel, though Paul did write to the Corinthians that the resurrected Christ had personally appeared to His half-brother, an event which is not recorded in the gospel accounts:

1 Corinthians 15:3-8 [For you are among the first that I had transmitted to that which I also had received. That Christ had been slain for our errors, in accordance with the writings; and that He had been buried, and that He was raised in the third day, in accordance with the writings; and that He had appeared to Kephas, then to the twelve. Thereafter He had appeared to more than five hundred brethren at the same time, of whom the greater number remain until presently, but some have died. Then He had appeared to Iakobos, then to all of the ambassadors; and last of all, just as if from a wound, He had appeared to me also.](#)

Although Jacob remains in the background of the Gospel narratives, he has a major role in Acts, where he has a leadership type position in Jerusalem several years after Peter. We have already suggested in this commentary that Peter was likely the eldest, or at least among the eldest, of the apostles, and that the earlier leadership type role fell to him for that reason. If Jacob the brother of Christ was even younger than Jacob the son of Zebedee, then it makes sense that he was not immediately graced with such a position.

¹⁸ Luke 2:7

Paul wrote to the Galatians that three years after his conversion on the road to Damascus, that he went up to Jerusalem, “[to relate an account to Kephas](#)” (Gal 1:18). This was ostensibly Paul’s first meeting with an apostle, and the fact that he traveled to Jerusalem to expressly relate an account with Peter implies that the apostle still held a leadership role among the brethren in Jerusalem at this time, which was circa 37-38 AD. Paul then writes “[the other ambassadors I saw not, except Iakobos the brother of the Prince.](#)”

James might have taken on the leadership role while Peter was imprisoned and being held for execution in Jerusalem three to seven years later circa 41-44 AD, because being rescued by Yahweh through His messenger and fleeing to John Mark’s house, we read:

Acts 12:17 [But he motioning to them with the hand that they be silent, described for them how the Prince delivered him from the prison, and he said "Report these things to Iakobos and to the brethren!" And departing he went to another place.](#)

Luke informs us that Peter did not go and inform Jacob of his release, ostensibly since that would needlessly endanger the assembly on account of any forces hunting Peter down as an escaped convict, and we read that Peter departed and went “[to another place](#)”. If Jacob’s station was merely a temporary necessity given Peter’s arrest, then the office would have apparently become permanent after Peter’s departure from the city.

We next see James in Acts 15, where during the council in Jerusalem (48 AD) he plays a significant role. We should note how during that council, James exercises no lordship over his fellow apostles or brethren, which refutes any notion of popery.

The council was convened so as to reach a consensus on what was expected of the nations of dispersed Israel, and those gathered affirmed the fact of their mutual liberty from ritual observances while emphasizing their responsibility, as followers of Christ, to uphold the moral precepts of the law, not for eternal salvation, but as Christians. The themes of the council could suggest that James’ lone surviving epistle, which he addressed to “the twelve tribes in the dispersion,” was written around the same time. In fact, this is the only plausible anchor point I can currently think of for an otherwise ambiguously dated epistle.

The last we see of James is around ten years after the council in Jerusalem, in an account recorded in what is now the 21st chapter of Acts, where Paul having traveled to Jerusalem with a collection of charity for the poor of the saints there, met with James and certain elders (c. 57 AD). James appears to have been the only apostle in the city at this time, where we read “[And on the next day Paul went in with us to Iakobos, and all the elders were present.](#)”¹⁹ (Luke had already distinguished apostles from elders earlier in the book of Acts, at Acts 15:2 and 16:4.)

Five years later around 62 AD, James was murdered by the high priest Ananus and certain others of the Sadducees. This we read in Book 20 of Josephus’ Antiquities, and his mention there shows that James was no obscure person in the eyes of the public:

“198 Now the report goes, that this oldest Ananus proved a most fortunate man; for he had five sons who had all performed the office of a high priest to God, and who had himself enjoyed that dignity a long time formerly, which had never happened to any other of our high priests; 199 but this younger Ananus, who, as we have told you already, took the high priesthood, was a bold man in his temper, and very insolent; he was also of the sect of the Sadducees, who are very rigid in judging offenders, above all the rest of the Judaeans, as we have already observed; 200 when, therefore, Ananus [the younger] was of this disposition, he thought he had now a proper opportunity [to exercise his authority]. Festus was now dead, and Albinus was but upon the road; so he assembled the Sanhedrin of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others, [or some of his companions]; and, when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned: 201 but as for those who seemed the most equitable of the citizens, and such as were the most uneasy at the breach of the laws, they disliked what was done; they also sent to the king [Agrippa], desiring him to send to Ananus that he should act so no more, for what he had already done was not to be justified; 202.”

¹⁹ Acts 21:18

It was necessary that the same demonic party of bastards responsible for the murder of Christ also slay His half-brother, for the Prince Himself said that the blood of all the saints and prophets was required of the Edomite jews²⁰, [who are not Judah, but are the Synagogue of Satan](#).²¹

Speaking of the name *Judah*, another one of Christ's half-brothers bore that name, though he is called Jude in most translations so as to distinguish him from Judas Iscariot, who also bore the name *Judah*.

The *Thaddeus* mentioned here in Mark and Matthew is no doubt the apostle Jude, brother of Christ and of James, and the author of the lone epistle which bears his name. This can be confirmed through the fact that *Jude* takes the place of *Thaddeus* in Luke's reckoning of the twelve, and that an apostle by the name was present at the Last Supper, where we read in John's gospel:

John 14:22 Iouda (not Iskarioth) says to Him: "Prince, what comes to pass that You are going to make Yourself manifest to us and not to Society?" (John makes the parenthetical clarification because Jude and Judas shared the same name.)

Now we know from the accounts cited earlier that Mary had a son named *Judah*:

Mark 6:3 Is this not the craftsman, the son of Maria and brother of Iakobos and Ioses and Iouda and Simon? And are His sisters not here with us?" And they were offended by Him.

Matthew 13:55 Is this not the son of a craftsman? Is not His mother called Mariam and His brothers Iakobos and Ioseph and Simon and Iouda?

The apostle James (Jacob) is mentioned first in both those accounts, which indicates seniority, and the author of the epistle of Jude also points towards the seniority of James when he identifies himself as his brother:

Jude 1:1 Iouda, servant of Yahshua Christ and brother of Iakobos,

The James mentioned by Jude must be the brother of Christ and apostle, and this confirms he is the Jude mentioned among Yahshua's brothers in Mark 6:3 and Matthew 13:55. In Luke's reckoning of the twelve, where he alone calls *Thaddeus* by the name *Jude*, he also informs us through the genitive case that this Jude is the brother of James, providing a third and final undeniable witness:

Luke 6:16 and Iouda the brother of Iakobos, [...]

Lastly, in the pairings of Matthew's gospel, we see James paired with Thaddeus/Jude, and it would have been natural for Yahshua to have sent these two half-brothers of His off together when He dispatched the twelve "in pairs".²² James and Thaddeus are listed together in Mark also. With all these things, there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that this Thaddeus is Jude, the half-brother of Christ.

(While Jude is mentioned last in Matthew 13:55, he is mentioned pen-ultimately in Mark 6:3, and so it is not entirely clear whether or not Jude was the youngest of Yahshua's brothers.)

Jude might have become known as *Thaddeus* so as to distinguish him from the other Judah, the betrayer. It is also possible that Thaddeus already one of Jude's names, and that it became preferred whenever it was beneficial in avoiding any confusion with Judas Iscariot. It would have been an easy mistake to make, and it is why John had made a clarifying parenthetical remark in his gospel to clarify that Jude was not Judas (John 14:22).

The meaning of the name *Thaddeus* is disputed. A common theory is that it derives from the Aramaic *taddai*, which means *heart* or *breast* (related to affection or courage). This is substantiated by the fact that a later variant in Matthew 10:3 calls Thaddeus by the name Lebbaeus, which may come from the Hebrew *leb* (*heart* - #3820), thus doubly reinforcing the hypothesis.

²⁰ Matthew 23:35, Luke 11:50

²¹ Revelation 2:9, 3:9

²² Mark 6:7

Taddai may be derived from *taddā'*, related to Hebrew *shad* (*breast* - #7699), this word was used in prophecy in regards to the breasts of Mary at Psalm 22:9, and it is certain that the apostle Jude suckled upon those same breasts.

I believe there is an interesting type which can be gleaned from the name *Thaddeus*, because just as the name may have served a purpose to distinguish *Judah* the brother of Christ from *Judah* Iscariot, so did the *hearts* of these two men reveal their very different origins! It is the heart (character) of the man which brings forth the fruits of his actions, and his character is determined by his family tree, for as Christ said, “*from of the fruit the tree is known*”.²³ The heart being used as a symbol for character has precedence in Scripture, where it is written concerning David, “*the LORD hath sought him a man after his own heart*”²⁴ And so the son of David, Yahshua Christ, had a brother after His own heart also.

Christ had said during His Sermon on the Mount, ostensibly shortly after naming His apostles on the mountain, “*Blessed are those who are pure in heart, because they shall see Yahweh.*”²⁵ And then during their last earthly Passover with Him, the faithful and pure-hearted Jude asked, “*Prince, what comes to pass that You are going to make Yourself manifest to us and not to Society?*”²⁶ The wicked-hearted Judas Iscariot had already left the dinner by the time Jude asked this question, and Yahshua’s response could have never applied to the bastard Judas, as He explained that He would make Himself manifest to the Society through dwelling in obedient and law-abiding men as the Holy Spirit.

The apostle Jude having asked Yahshua such an earnest and loving question was a witness of the good treasure laid up in his heart, for as Christ said in a discourse on race and fruits:

Luke 6:43-45 *For there is not a good tree making rotten fruit. Contrarily, neither is there a rotten tree making good fruit. For each tree is known by its own fruit. Indeed they do not gather figs from thorns. Nor could they harvest grapes from bramble-bush. The good man brings forth good from the good treasure of the heart, and the wicked brings forth evil from the wicked. From the abundance of the heart his mouth speaks.*

The heart of a man reveals his origin. The pure-heart of Jude is evident in his loving question to Christ at his last earthly Passover with Him, and it is also evident in the words of his lone-surviving epistle. This shows that Jude was from a good family tree: that he was a *fig* and not a *thorn*, that he was a *grape* and not a *bramble-bush*.

In much this same way, the heart of Judas, a branch of a corrupt family tree, was made manifest in his words also, for as we read in John:

John 12:4-6 *then Ioudas Iskarioth, one of His students - he who is going to betray Him - says: "For what reason has this ointment not been sold for three hundred denarii and given to the poor?" (But he said this not because he had care in him for the poor, but because he was a thief and carried the case holding the savings.)*

The hissing of a snake! As Christ said to the Edomite portion of the Pharisees, “*Offspring of vipers! How are you able to speak good things, being evil? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks!*”²⁷

The fruits of Judas Iscariot and his racial inability to abide in the commandments culminated in the ultimate and inevitable betrayal building up *in his heart*, where John wrote “*And dinner taking place, with the False Accuser already putting into the heart of Ioudas the son of Simon Iskarioth that he would betray Him*”²⁸ This was the fulfillment of a prophecy in the 55th Psalm, where speaking of Judas Iscariot in the near vision it says, “*The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords.*”^{29,30}

²³ Matthew 12:33 [...]

²⁴ 1 Samuel 13:14

²⁵ Matthew 5:8

²⁶ John 14:22 [...]

²⁷ Matthew 12:34

²⁸ John 13:2

²⁹ Psalm 55:21

The hearts of Jude, brother of Christ, and Judas Iscariot, the bastard Edomite, were made manifest in their actions. To this very day, through the examination of hearts, men should be able to discern the true Judah, pictured in the faithfulness of genuine Jude, from the false Judah, pictured in the treachery of the Edomite Judas. As Paul wrote, “[The Word of Yahweh is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, even penetrating as far as a division of life and Spirit, of both joints and marrows, and critical of the devices and notions of a heart.](#)”³¹ The true tribe of Judah can observe the laws written on their hearts, as it was written on the hearts of all the tribes of Israel, and therefore as Paul wrote to the [Zerah-Judahite Romans](#), “[but you obeyed from the heart, into which a form of instruction was transmitted.](#)”³²

The Romans were of the tribe of Judah, they were genuine, and they accepted the Gospel, just as Jude did. The Edomites are not of the tribe of Judah, they are liars, and they deny the Gospel to this very day. They would gladly kill Christ a second time. Through the reasoning of hearts, the true Judah can be discerned from the false. This, I believe, is a type made manifest in the name *Thaddeus*. Judas, being an Edomite, having the name *Judah* served as a type for the Edomite Jews who claim to be Judahites but are not, whereas Jude, the brother of Christ, represents a type of the true Judah.

The many *Judas* of the world today still hate Christ and would hand Him over to be crucified a second time, as some Edomites such as Sarah Silverman even publicly boast, and she is hissing out the abundance of her bastard heart. It is in their blood to hate Christ. But the Judes of the world today, the remnant of the tribe of Judah that can be found in the White European peoples, they still love Him and follow Him, having heard His voice and converted to Christianity long ago. That, too, is in their blood.

The fact that Jews are the kin of Judas is evident in their hearts. The fact that White-European people are the kin of Jude is evident in their hearts.

Now, apart from the fact that Jude was also called Thaddeus, and that he was the younger brother of James and thus the half-brother of Yahshua, and that he had asked the above cited question during the apostles’ last earthly Passover with Yahshua, and the fact that he is the author of the epistle which bears his name, we know little else concerning him.

Before continuing, I believe there is a type in the names of the two brothers of Christ who were appointed as apostles. Jacob and Judah: these are racial names. Firstly, Christ is of course kindred to all of the seed of Jacob, for as Paul wrote, He was “[obliged in all respects to become like the brethren](#)”, taking on the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob.³³ Most specifically, Christ had risen out of the tribe of Judah.³⁴ Therefore, the names of these two brothers of Christ, are indicative of who His true racial brothers are: the children of Israel. The brethren are always reckoned according to the flesh, as Paul for instance illustrated in his epistle to the Romans. While Christ is recorded as having said later in this chapter, “[For he who should do the will of Yahweh, he is My brother and sister and mother!](#)” (3:35), this must be interpreted in line with Scripture, for only the children of Israel were chosen to know the will of Yahweh God through His holy writings and effect it upon the earth.

There is another type I would like to illustrate with the names of Jacob and Judah, and that is how their names interact with their parents. The name Mariam can be interpreted to mean *rebellious people* or perhaps *bitter people* - either *meri* (rebellious - #4805) or *mar* (bitter - #4751) being compounded with *am* (people - #5971). The name Alphaeus, as we have said, can be interpreted to mean *changing*.

Therefore, the names of the brothers and their parents were perhaps prophetic of how the *rebellious people* of Jacob and Judah were *changed* into obedience through Yahshua Christ, for as He said to the apostle Paul:

³⁰ The word Χαίρω (#G5463) recorded as being said by Judas at Matthew 26:44 can mean be of good cheer, and would represent the fulfillment of the prophecy of the “words softer than oil” in Psalm 55. Sick Edomite.

³¹ Hebrews 4:12

³² Romans 6:17 [...]

³³ Hebrews 2:17 [...]

³⁴ Hebrews 7:14

Acts 26:17-18 taking you out from among the people and from the nations to whom I send you, to open their eyes, for which to turn them from darkness to light and from the authority of the Adversary to Yahweh, for them to receive a remission of errors and a portion with those being sanctified by the faith which is in Me.'

This *turning* of the tribes of Jacob was prophesied of in the writings, such as in Isaiah:

Isaiah 59:20 And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the LORD.

Indeed, the *rebellious people* were to make a *transformation* through their conformance to Christ, a process which they are still undergoing, and which the third ministry of Elijah will, through Yahweh's favor, accelerate, in the anticipation of the Prince's arrival:

2 Corinthians 3:18 And we all, with uncovered faces, are beholding as in a mirror the honor of the Prince. We are being transformed into that same image, from honor into honor, just as a Spirit from the Prince.

We will now proceed with the apostle Simon, who was certainly a genuine child of Jacob, and not an accursed *Canaanite* as some translations such as the King James atrociously feel content as identifying him as.

In Mark, the oldest 4th century codices read Simon as a Kananean, which we would presume to infer a man from the town of Kana, which was near Nazareth, the place where Yahshua attended the wedding feast and turned the water into wine. In addition to the 4th century codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the 5th-century manuscripts Bezae, Washingtonensis, and Ephraemi Syri also render Simon as Kananean. The only major ancient manuscript that differs is the Codex Alexandrinus, and the fact that the King James follows it is indicative of how the Textus Receptus tends to favor the Alexandrian tradition. Simon being a Canaanite is a scriptural impossibility, and the King James has no excuse for following such an oddball reading.

The situation in the gospel of Matthew is more complex, but the answer is just as simple. In Matthew, we see a division from an early time: the 4th-century codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus have "Canaanite" (κανανί) and "Cananean" respectively. From there, the split continues right down the middle, with roughly equal support on both sides. But the reading that should be followed is a simple matter, not because of the weight of the readings favoring Kananean in Mark, but because of Truth.

Once again, it is a Scriptural impossibility that Simon was a Canaanite. There is no room for bastards in the covenant with Abraham's seed through Isaac and Jacob, and neither is there room for bastards in the New Covenant exclusively made with Israel and with Judah. As Paul wrote concerning the Abrahamic Covenant, "even a validated covenant of man no one sets aside, or makes additions to for himself."³⁵ And also to the Thessalonians, Paul wrote "the faith is not for all".³⁶

Yahshua Christ was not a hypocrite, He was not standing with a Canaanite apostle at His side when He expressly told the supplicating Canaanite dog that "I have not been sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel".³⁷ Neither was He a liar, when He told the apostles, "Have I not chosen you twelve? Yet one from among you is a false accuser!"³⁸ If Simon was a Canaanite, then Yahshua would have said *two* and not *one*. The Canaanites descending from the fallen angels would have made Simon just as much a *false accuser* (a devil) as Judas Iscariot, since the Canaanite tribes were thoroughly mingled with the Kenites, the Rephaim, and other corrupt lines. Such admixture with the descendants of the fallen angels makes them devils, for the fallen angels themselves are called the devil in the Revelation, and men called devils in the Scripture are merely being identified by their patriarchs, just like whenever we are called *Jacob*.

³⁵ Galatians 3:15 [...]

³⁶ 2 Thessalonians 3:2 [...]

³⁷ Matthew 15:24

³⁸ John 6:70

As Christ said to the Edomite portion of the Pharisees concerning their ancestor Cain, who was begotten through Eve's fornication with a fallen angel or a descendant thereof, "[You are the sons of a father: the False Accuser!](#)"³⁹

The seed which originates from the fallen angels is cursed from the beginning on account of its corrupt origin, the fallen angels having mingled with various kinds.⁴⁰ In fact, Solomon used the phrase "cursed from the beginning" in reference to the Canaanites!⁴¹ Are we going to say that Christ broke His covenants by adding this cursed seed to the promises, even though He has promised to annihilate that cursed seed?⁴² Are we going to say that He profaned racial sanctification and committed adultery by allowing the bastard races to force their way into the bride-chamber?⁴³ Are we going to say that Christ is a hypocrite? A liar? We should never suggest such things, but that is what the King James does by choosing a reading which flies in the face of all Scriptural Truth. The Canaanites, like all bastards, will be exterminated at the Second Coming. If Simon was a Canaanite, lacking the Adamic Spirit which is passed on [genetically through pure parents](#), he would not even be able to be resurrected. Canaanites will not abide in the Kingdom, for as it is written "[in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of hosts](#)."⁴⁴ It says there in Zechariah, Yahweh of *hosts*, that is, *armies*, because Christ and His armies will slay those Canaanites.

Names are important. The name Simon means *hearing*, those who have ears to hear should understand that Simon's racial purity is a certainty!

On that same note, Kana, the town from which Simon hailed, apparently derives from a Hebrew word for *reed* (#H7070), that same word describing a reed which was used to measure the temple in the temple vision of Ezekiel,⁴⁵ but as Paul for instance explained, Yahweh's true temple is His people.⁴⁶ A true and accurate measurement reveals the Canaanites to not be a part of God's temple. Those who would favor the reading of Canaanite over Kananean are ironically unable to use the measuring reed.

Apart from his listing here, Simon the Kananean is never mentioned again at least by that name in the gospels, but it is not unrealistic to conjecture that he is one and the same with Nathanael of the gospel of John. In the opening chapter of that gospel, John records the first interactions of Yahshua with the first four of His apostles: Andrew, John, Peter, and Philip. Then we see Nathanael enter the scene, and the account of his interaction with Christ is longer than all the others. We could wonder why John would have included this account of Nathanael with the calling of these apostles if he were not an apostle much like them?

John 1:43-51 [The next day He desired to depart for Galilaia and He finds Philippos. And Yahshua says to him "Follow Me." And Philippos was from Bethsaida, from the city of Andreas and Petros. Philippos finds Nathanael and says to him: "He whom Moses and the prophets had written about in the law we have found: Yahshua the son of Ioseph from Nazaret." And Nathanael said to him: "Can anything good be from Nazaret?" Philippos says to him: "Come and see!" Yahshua saw Nathanael coming towards Him and He says about him: "Look! An Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile!" Nathanael says to Him: "From where do You know me?" Yahshua replied and said to him: "Before Philippos called you, being under the fig tree I saw you." Nathanael replied to Him: "Rabbi! You are the Son of Yahweh! You are King of Israel!" Yahshua replied and said to him: "Because I said to you that I saw you under the fig tree, you believe? Greater than these things you shall see." And He says to him: "Truly, truly I say to you: You shall see the heaven having been opened and the messengers of Yahweh ascending and descending before the Son of Man."](#)

That account is in what is now the opening chapter of John's gospel. We do not see Nathanael mentioned again until the final chapter, when he is fishing with some of the other apostles in the Sea of Galilee, and the resurrected Christ appears to them on the beach. We can see then, that Nathaniel is

³⁹ John 8:44 [...]

⁴⁰ Matthew 25:41, 2 Peter 2:14, et al

⁴¹ Wisdom 12:11

⁴² Psalm 21:10, Isaiah 14:20-21

⁴³ Luke 16:16-18

⁴⁴ Zechariah 14:21

⁴⁵ Ezekiel 40:3

⁴⁶ 2 Corinthians 6:16

there at the very beginning of Yahshua's ministry, and he is there in at least one of the moments near its very end. This could imply that Nathanael remained a part of the core group throughout the entire course. After all, are we really to assume that Nathanael, a man who confessed that Christ was the Messiah upon first meeting Him, one of the very first men in the world to make such a declaration, simply vanished during the entire three-and-a-half-year period in between? This man who was filled with such passion and zeal?

John 21:1-2 After these things Yahshua showed Himself again to the students, by the sea at Tiberias. Now He showed Himself thusly: there were together Simon Petros and Thomas who is called "Twin" and Nathanael who is from Kana of Galilaia and the sons of Zebedaios and two others of His students.

There are seven men on the boat, and four of the five who are named can be identified as apostles. So it stands to reason that the remaining students on the boat were likely apostles as well, including Nathanael. But the real hint to Nathanael's identity is in the fact that John tells us that he was from Kana. The only other named man in the gospels identified as being from that town is the apostle Simon the Kananean. It is most logical, then, assuming that all the men on the boat were apostles and also understanding that Nathaniel's significance in the narrative is a strong signal of apostleship, to conclude that Simon the Kananean of the synoptic gospels is one and the same as Nathanael of John's gospel. There is no difficulty with Simon being known by more than one name, of which the gospels yield many examples.

There is another hypothesis: that Nathanael is Bartholomew. This is based on the fact that Philip brings Nathanael to Christ, and then that Philip and Bartholomew are paired together in Matthew's list of the apostles, and also consistently listed side by side in the reckonings of the other gospels. While that is possible, I believe the shared association with Kana between Nathanael and Simon offers a stronger witness.

Once again, names are important. So what about the name Nathanael? It is a compound of nathan (he has given) and El (God), thus meaning *God has given*. Assuming that Nathanael is Simon the Kananean, then we can see the prophetic wordplay between Nathaniel (God has given) and Simon (hearing); as whoever has *been given* ears to *hear* should recognize that Simon was not a Canaanite, *“an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile”*.⁴⁷

Luke in his gospel calls this apostle Simon “the zealot”, and that label is quite harmonious with the zeal and enthusiasm which Nathaniel is depicted as having displayed. However, this brings us to a short digression which must be addressed:

It has been argued that *Kananaïos* (Kananean) is not a demonym, for reason that it has the additional *v*, and that it should have been rendered as *Kanaïos* if it were intended to refer to someone from the town of Kana. It is conjectured therefore that *Kananaïos* is a transliteration into Greek of the Aramaic קַנְאָיָא (*qan'ayya*) - related to the Hebrew קַנְאָ' (#7065), which is *jealous*. The suffix *ayya* in *qan'ayya* would apparently be a common Aramaic gentilic or adjectival suffix, often indicating someone characterized by a trait or association with a place or group, (*perushayya* is Pharisee, for example). It is theorized that Matthew (10:4) and Mark (3:18) are transliterating the Aramaic word into Greek, Simon *the Kananean*, while Luke actually translated the epithet, Simon *the Zealot*. (6:15)

The argument concerning the double *nu* appears to work against this hypothesis, however, since *qan'ayya* only has one *n* and so does not account for the extra *v* in *Kananaïos*. In response to this, it is conjectured that the additional syllable in Greek is an attempt to preserve the phonic gemination of the double *yy* in *qan'ayya*.

I would raise some contentions with this entire hypothesis. First of all, Aramaic phrases (especially in Mark) are often interpreted by the author, such as Βοανηργές (3:17), Ταλιθα κουμ (5:41), Ἐφφαθά (7:31). To me, it would be strange for Matthew and Mark to leave *Kananaïos* untranslated if it was an epithet instead of a demonym, especially since Mark just interpreted the label Βοανηργές a few clauses earlier.

⁴⁷ John 1:47 [...]

Secondly, why would the Hebrew evangelists not translate a word from their native language, while Luke, who was ostensibly a Greek convert at Antioch, would? Matthew's gospel seems to have had a Hebrew audience, that is fine, but Mark's gospel clearly did not, and he would have had no reason to assume his Greek or Latin readers would understand the meaning of an obscure Aramaic phrase that can not be easily found in any surviving Aramaic texts today. In fact, Mark did not even assume that his readers understood the basics of Hebrew culture and geography (7:3-4, 12:42, 13:3), and yet we are to assume that he leaves Kananian untranslated?

Thirdly, the suffix *αῖος* in *Καναναῖος* implies source and origin, so why should we assume that an additional syllable nullifies that? Kana was an unremarkable town, and as far as I know we are not aware of how it was referred to in local dialects.

I do not know enough about Aramaic to provide any other opinions besides these; and I should emphasize that my contentions might have ready answers. I will also admit that it is interesting how *qânâ'* (#7065) means *jealous / zeal*, and I do not know how to account for it apart from the possibility that Luke might have misinterpreted the demonym as an epithet. It may also simply be a coincidence, or a nickname which arrived out of wordplay.

On the chance that the hypothesis concerning qan'ayya is true, then perhaps Simon is not Nathaniel, and the possibility of Nathaniel being Bartholomew becomes slightly greater. But there is another possibility for the apostle Simon besides him being Nathaniel:

We titled this commentary, *Sons of Alphaeus*, and a third son of Alphaeus may be hidden in the midst. There is a *Simon* among the four brothers of Christ named in Mark 6 and Matthew 13, and the fact that Simon the Kananian is listed alongside the brothers of Christ James and Jude, and especially the fact that Luke even places Simon in-between James and Jude, may infer that the apostle Simon the Kananian was also a half-brother of Christ. While Yahshua and His brothers were from Nazareth, His mother was present at the wedding supper in Kana, which could suggest that they had family in that village (John 2:1). If this is true, then the apostle Simon cannot be Nathaniel, as Nathaniel did not know Christ, evident in his words, *"from where do you know me?"*

So these are two theories that can be reasonably proposed for Simon the Kananian: that he is Nathaniel, or that he is another one of the brothers of Christ. It is also possible that Simon the Kananian was neither.

We touched earlier on how Nathaniel's name means "God has given", and if Nathaniel is Simon the Kananian, then perhaps it was prophetic of himself and the rest of the apostles, for as Christ said concerning them in prayer on the night of His arrest: *"I have made manifest Your Name to the men whom You have given Me from out of Society. They were with You and to Me You have given them and they kept Your Word."*⁴⁸

Christ also later said in that same prayer: *"not one from among them is lost except the son of destruction, in order that the writing would be fulfilled."*⁴⁹ Having touched on Simon Peter, the son of Jonah, the sons of Zebedee, who were sons of Thunder, the sons of Alphaeus, and others of the apostles: we will now conclude by discussing that son of destruction:

3:19 and Ioudas Iskarioth, he who also betrayed Him.

Unlike Simon the Kananian - Judas Iscariot was actually a Canaanite, which is why I deliberately refer to him in the past tense, for being a bastard, he is truly dead, while the other apostles having the Adamic Spirit are certainly alive, never having truly died.⁵⁰

Judas' racial corruption is not conjecture. Yahshua Himself exclaimed that Judas Iscariot was a bastard when He called him a devil, which is *a false accuser*, a racial designation referring to the descendants of the fallen angels, who are identified as the False Accuser by Christ in His Revelation. He is also

⁴⁸ John 17:6

⁴⁹ John 17:12 [...]

⁵⁰ Mark 9:1, 12:27

called a false accuser in the Septuagint translation of Psalm 109 which Peter quoted as being prophetic of Judas.⁵¹ As we have discussed often in this commentary, the fallen angels certainly have [descendants on this earth](#), and these bastards are the plants which Yahweh did not plant.⁵² These bastards have the same fate as their patriarchs, which is why Christ says to the goat nations, “[Go from Me, accursed \[2 Pt 2:14, Ws 12:11\], into the eternal fire which has been prepared for the False Accuser and his messengers!](#)”⁵³ The apostles having elaborated on the origin of the bastard races with the fallen angels (*2 Peter, Jude*), Paul of Tarsus often referred to the bastard races by their patriarchs.⁵⁴ It is certainly interesting then, that Judas Iscariot, the descendant of those angels who rebelled against God, was himself a traitor much like them. The treachery of Judas Iscariot against Yahshua Christ, who is God, was therefore a direct figure and illustration of the rebellion of the angels from long ago.

The word rendered as *betrayed* does not mean rebellion, however, but is primarily to *deliver* or *hand over* someone or something ([παραδίδωμι, #3860](#)), implicitly to *betray*, and it is used in all of the gospels in reference to Judas’ treachery, as it is he who gave Yahshua up to the High Priests. This handing over was prophesied of in the 55th Psalm, where it is written concerning Judas in the near vision: “[He hath put forth his hands against such as be at peace with him](#)”⁵⁵ That prophecy found in the 55th Psalm and elsewhere was certainly alluded to by Christ when He said on the night of His arrest, “[The hour has come, behold! The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of wrongdoers!](#)”⁵⁶

We should remember, however, that our Prince, being God, was not Himself deceived or taken off-guard, and that all these things worked towards the fulfillment of the prophets. Paul of Tarsus used the same word [παραδίδωμι](#) when describing this fact to the Galatians:

Galatians 2:20 [Now I live no longer, but Christ lives in me. And that I now live in flesh, in faith I live: in that of the Son of Yahweh, who having loved me then surrendered \(#3860\) Himself on my behalf.](#)

It is simple to discern the fact that Judas Iscariot was a bastard, as all we need to do is believe the testimony of our Christ. Tracing Judas’ genealogy more finely requires a little more detective work, but Yahweh be praised, our God has left us the necessary clues.

The first piece of the puzzle is found in the surname right in front of us: Iscariot is commonly and logically interpreted as a compound of the Hebrew word *ish* ([#H377](#)), meaning *man*, and the town *Kerioth* ([#H7152](#)). Thus, the surname can be understood to mean *man of Kerioth*. It should not be assumed that this was just another ordinary Galilean village. While the two angels (or messengers) referred to the apostles as *Galileans* immediately after Yahshua’s ascension (Acts 1:11), it must be remembered that Judas had since gone off and hung his contemptible neck by that time, and if Judas had still been among them, the angels would not have done so, because it is actually evident, based on the location of Kerioth, that all of the apostles *except* Judas were Galileans.

In the Old Testament we see that Kerioth was the name of a town in Moab (Amos 2:2, Jeremiah 48:24, 41), and also the name of a town in southern Judah (Joshua 15:25). The town which was in southern Judah is the much more plausible candidate given certain historical circumstances as well as the context of the Gospel. This town of southern Judah was situated near what was originally the border of Judah and Edom: is it a coincidence the betrayer among the twelve hailed from such a place? Those of us who have been mercifully blessed into Christian Identity are not surprised by this fact, but how often is the peculiarity ever examined elsewhere, or its implications considered? The Edomites had migrated into and settled much of ancient Judah and Israel after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities of the Israelite population, and they seized the land for themselves. The Edomites continued to occupy these places for hundreds of years until they were forcibly converted to Judaism in the time of the Hasmonaeans, from about 125 BC, and then came to dominate Judaea from the time of Herod, from about 40 BC. What we call “[jews](#)” are the descendants of these Edomite converts.

⁵¹ Psalm 109:6, cf. Acts 1:20 (Psalm 109:8)

⁵² Matthew 13:27-28, 15:13, Jude 1:12

⁵³ Matthew 25:41 [...]

⁵⁴ 1 Corinthians 4:9, 11:10, Romans 8:38, Hebrews 2:16

⁵⁵ Psalm 55:20 [...]

⁵⁶ Mark 14:41

Here is something else which is interesting: as we discussed in our commentary, [Sons of the Land](#), because the boundaries of Edom prophetically crawled upwards⁵⁷ and absorbed much of the territory of Judaea following the Babylonian deportations, it came to pass that the Roman province of Idumea (Edom) during the time of Christ encompassed what was formerly southern Judah. This included the town of Hebron, and Kerieth is estimated to have been about ten or fifteen miles south of there. So what does that mean? It means that Judas Iscariot, coming from Kerieth, would have been demographically classified as an Idumean. How ironically fitting! Yahweh our God does indeed have a sense of humor. It is important to remember that Idumea almost certainly had a higher density of Edomites than any other province of Judaea, and that is likely why Yahshua Christ is never recorded as having ministered or even traveled there.

Now both Judas and his father Simon were called after the town of Kerieth:

John 6:71 (Now He spoke about Ioudas the son of Simon Iskarioth, for he was going to betray Him, being one of the twelve.) [cf. John 13:2, 26]

This generational stamp being applied to both Judas and his father suggests that his tainted family tree had a long history and deep roots in that town. The case just gets worse and worse for the devil Judas. Being from Kerieth was simply something both he and his father were known for, as Luke wrote, “[Ioudas who is called Iskarioth](#)”, which explains why the label appears consistently across all four gospels.⁵⁸

Being from the province of Judaea (specifically Idumea), and not from the province Galilee, might have filled Judas’ wicked heart with a sense of superiority over the other apostles. It could be inferred from the Gospel that Judaeans sometimes looked down on Galileans (John 7:52), a type of disdain Edomite Jews are still known for today, especially in the way they deride salt-of-the-earth Christians from rural areas like West Virginia. But our Christ spent much of His ministry in the countryside and among small villages, because that is where most of the children of Israel were to be found, and not in the major cities like Tiberias, which were often hotspots for bastards, just as they are today. Funnily enough, the word *Kerieth* is believed to mean *cities*. Judas, *man of the cities*? How poetically masterful is our God!

These matters, along with the direct proof from Yahshua’s own mouth that Judas was a bastard, should be more than enough to draw a conclusion about his Edomite ancestry. But there is yet another witness, a spiritual one, spoken by Christ Himself while praying in the garden of Gethsemane, which brings the case to a close. There, in His prayer, Yahshua referred to Judas as a “[son of destruction](#),” in much the same way that Paul of Tarsus, in the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, labeled the Edomites as “[vessels of destruction](#).”

John 17:12 When I was with them I kept and I guarded them in Your Name which You gave to Me, and not one from among them is lost except the son of destruction (#684), in order that the writing would be fulfilled.

Romans 9:22 Moreover, if Yahweh wishes to display wrath, and to make known His power, with much patience having bore vessels of wrath furnished for destruction; (#684)

And so the bloody trail of evidence demonstrates that Judas Iscariot was an Edomite, which is not at all surprising, considering how many Edomites were in Judaea during the time of Christ, and they are the [ancestors](#) of those who falsely claim to be Judahites today.

Judas was certainly a bastard, for in addition to the manifold witnesses we have already cited, such as his being a devil and son of destruction, Yahshua said to the apostles, “[And you are clean, but not all!](#)”⁵⁹ If Judas was not clean, then this means he was not an Israelite, for Yahweh had promised through His prophets to cleanse all of Israel without exception.⁶⁰ It is the bastard races, broken vessels, strange and degenerate vines of fornication, which can never be cleansed (Jeremiah 2:21-22).

⁵⁷ Ezekiel 35:12

⁵⁸ Luke 22:3 [...]

⁵⁹ John 13:10 [...]

⁶⁰ Jeremiah 33:7-8, Ezekiel 37:22-23, Isaiah 1:18, Daniel 9:24 (make an end of sins), et al

Yahshua Christ taught us that a family tree is known by its fruits, and the fruits of Judas Iscariot were horrible; no one but an embodied demon could have done what he did.

Besides his most infamous crime, the apostle John tells us that Judas held the purse with the savings and was a thief, much like the Edomite Jews of today. There is no changing in them, they will always do the works of their fathers (John 8:39-41) because genetics determine behavior, and therefore even Doeg the Edomite was described by David as being a lover of money.⁶¹ The Jews should label David as an antisemite!

Judas also criticized Mariam, the sister of Lazarus, for anointing Yahshua with expensive ointment for His burial, a hypocritical act that may have been prophesied in the 109th Psalm, which speaks of Judas, where it says, “[as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.](#)”⁶² That Psalm contains many brutal declarations concerning Judas, which give weight to Yahshua’s own words where He said: “[woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It was good for him if that man had not been born!](#)”⁶³

The name *Judah* יהודה Yehudah (#H3063) is defined by Strong’s as meaning *celebrated*, which is certainly ironic being labeled upon Judas, though it may still be fitting, since we can celebrate our God’s victory over Judas through which He also saved His people while simultaneously condemning the rest of the Jewish race guilty for deicide.

Psalm 109 also appears to reveal a few more details about Judas that the Gospel does not touch upon, perhaps suggesting that he had a wife and children if it is to be taken literally, where it says, “[Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow.](#)”⁶⁴ This would imply that Judas was among the older of the apostles, ostensibly like Peter. Apart from this and the name of his father, we know nothing else concerning Judas’ brood.

On that note, it is interesting that Judas’ father’s name was Simon, since, as we have said, the name means *hearing*; and Judas, being a racial goat instead of a racial sheep, would *never* have been able to hear the voice of the Shepherd! As Christ said to the Edomite goats among the Pharisees, “[But you do not believe, because you are not My sheep! My sheep hear My voice, and I know them and they follow Me](#)”⁶⁵ Earlier in His ministry, Yahshua had also said to them in part, “[For what reason do you not perceive My speech? Because you are not able to hear My Word! You are the sons of a father: the False Accuser!](#)”⁶⁶ They, being Edomites, were false accusers much like Judas, and they could hear Yahshua’s Word, and so the name of Judas’ father, Simon, is certainly ironic.

One might ask why Yahshua knowing “[what is in a man](#)” chose to have a devil among the original twelve, and the most immediate answer is this: a betrayal at the hands of a bastard was prophetically required.⁶⁷ It is the result of the enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, and as Christ said, “[all the prophets spilled from the foundation of the Society should be required from this race](#)”⁶⁸ Since the Edomites are descendants of Cain through their Hittite admixture with the Kenites, the slaughter of Abel by his half-brother Cain can be seen as a type for Christ (the seed of Jacob) being slain by Judas and the High Priests (the seed of Esau). As Paul wrote, Yahshua’s blood is “[speaking better than Abel.](#)”⁶⁹ There are many other types which are illustrated in the prophets.

We cannot imagine that Yahshua would have ever allowed one of His own children to be responsible for what Judas did, but such a thing was not even possible anyways, as the children of Israel recognize and love their God.

The story of Judas is a valuable lesson which teaches us that no Jew can ever possibly convert to Christ, because even the one who spent three and a half years by Yahshua’s side as an apostle was not even

⁶¹ Psalm 52:7

⁶² Psalm 109:17 [...]

⁶³ Matthew 26:24 [...]

⁶⁴ Psalm 109:9

⁶⁵ John 10:26-27

⁶⁶ John 8:43-44 [...]

⁶⁷ John 2:25

⁶⁸ Luke 11:50 [...], Genesis 3:15

⁶⁹ Hebrews 12:24 [...]

able to abide in Him. The apostle John illustrated that being an antichrist is a racial phenomenon when he wrote in his first surviving epistle that many were being born, which compounds with the rest of his epistle and also with the words of Christ and the prophets.⁷⁰ As Christ said to the Edomites among the Pharisees, “If Yahweh was your father you would have loved Me, for I have come from of Yahweh and am here.”⁷¹ The Edomite jews are corruptions of Yahweh’s creation, and for that reason He is not their father; being bastards their origin is evil and they are not able to recognize or love God. Look at how much they hate Adolf Hitler, who was one of the most Christian men of recent memory.

Another lesson of Judas is that it teaches us the consequences of associating with and showing kindness towards jews. As it is written in the 109th Psalm which speaks of Judas, “For my love they are my adversaries”.⁷² Today many Judeo-Christians blindly cling to, support, and even worship the accursed Edomite jews, not realizing that their love will never deter the jews from indiscriminately slaughtering their race and enslaving their children. It is no accident that the name of Judas was *Judah*, which was prophetic of how many Judeo-Christians today cling to the Edomite jews falsely claiming to be Judah, never realizing that a devil is in their midst, just as the apostles were ignorant of it while it was happening. So in Judas, we see both a parable and a prophecy, with a severe warning attached. Any Christian who sides with the jews, if they are not simply corrupted and brought to ruin, will in the end be betrayed, handed over, and nailed to a cross.

The naivety of Judeo-Christians in their love for all the Judas’ of today in blind Christian Zionism was certainly made evident in the opening of the prophet Malachi:

Malachi 1:2-3 I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. [...]

Therefore, Yahshua Christ provided a prophetic picture of Judeo-Christians today in His selection of Judas. Just as His life mirrored the history of Israel in the past, in His coming out of Egypt, His temptation in the wilderness, and other such events, so too did His life mirror the history of Israel as it would unfold in the future, and especially in the closing of the age. Even for the Christians who are deceived and ensnared by the jews, the mercy of Christ is evident in how He made himself a figure for that blindness, demonstrating how He died even for the sake of the most ignorant among us.

But the day will come when Christians awaken to realize that Judas was a devil, just as the apostles did, and when we are all in the Kingdom, we will abide in the God whom we love and whom cherishes us, while the Judas’ of the world will be nowhere to be found. Many of them would rather hang themselves if they knew the destruction which awaits them.

In the conclusion of this commentary on Mark’s reckoning of the twelve, I would like to share a simple poem I wrote, based on the names of the apostles, their meaning, and how they are ordered in this gospel:

Those *hearing* (Simon) should understand that Yahweh is our rock, and that we are all living *stones* (Peter) of His assembly. Through the strength of His saving right hand, we will *supplant* (Jacob) His enemies through the *gift* (Zebedee) of mercy on account of *favor* (John). In that day, the saints will *thunder* (sons of thunder) from heaven with their God, and they will be *manly* (Andrew) in war as they ride on *horses* (Philip), charging on their chariots of salvation and deepening into the *furrows* (Bartholomew) of the harvest of the wheat and the tares. This too is a *gift of God* (Matthew), because through His Spirit the seed of *Jacob* (Jacob) will *change* (Alphaeus), rendering their *hearts* (Thaddeus) towards God in their *hearkening* (Simon) towards His Elijah ministry. Whenever that obedience is accomplished, the war to break the bruised *reeds* (Kana) will begin, to avenge disobedience and cast those who claim to be Judah but are not (Judas) out from their strong *city* (Iskarioth) and into the deepest pit, and in that promise we must all *celebrate* (Judas)

Praise Yahweh, the God of Israel, and thank you for reading.

⁷⁰ 1 John 2:18

⁷¹ John 8:42 [...]

⁷² Psalm 109:4 [...] [there is no definite article in the Greek of Rahlfs - it should be rendered as “a devil” (false accuser) in Brenton.]

Published: June 7th, 2025

For those who have questions or desire fellowship: lionofpatmosvideos@gmail.com

For those who wish to support these projects:

Paypal: lionofpatmosvideos@gmail.com

Bitcoin address: bc1qmacfmk9f4mgwmjgra2h6wwgyecd2806myqtkqh

Etherium address: 0xC39b0362341301635c070108B50E5AB64d53ddB8

Solana address: GpwywDLAN2fEpyisQ7eRBrtiNTsAQMytBahoPhbrpggV