



SAMPLE CHAPTER

www.juliandoyle.info

Throughout the history of Christianity there have been those amongst esoteric circles in France claiming to know a Monumental Secret. As alleged Grand Master, Claude Debussy wrote in a review:

“Perhaps it’s to destroy that scandalous legend that Jesus Christ died on the cross.”

But more startling is the knowledge these esoteric circles contain about an extraordinary self-mutilation, which Origen underwent and reported by Eusebius:

‘While Origen was conducting catechetical instruction at Alexandria, a deed was done by him, which gave the highest proof of faith. For he took the words: ‘There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake’, (Matthew 19:12) And in order to fulfil the Saviour’s word, he carried out in action the word of the Savior.’

This is alleged to parallel events carried out by Arimathea in the tomb as his relics reveal: a cup to catch the blood, a sponge and a reed to keep open the urethra. In 1117 the same year as the formation of the Knights Templar, another insider, Peter Abelard was famously operated on in a secret room, by Fulbert, the Canon of Notre Dame, to also become semi-Angelic. These are not the only occult secrets to be revealed and are not the most startling. But to understand the real story of Jesus and certain features of the Parisian Church of St Sulpice and the one at Rennes-le-Château these secrets true or false are essential.

*First published by Chippenham Films
London. UK Edition*

*All rights reserved. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms of licenses issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.
www.chippenhamfilms@icloud.com*

THE MONUMENTAL SECRET
OF THE
CRUCIFIXION

Julian Doyle

Copyright © 2018 Julian Doyle

Introduction

As I was writing, “Who Killed Jesus?” I kept coming across information that seemed so astonishingly weird that I was scared to put it in the book because it would, without doubt, undermine my whole research and leave me open to ridicule. Since publication and further research on the subject I have decided to put in print the five astonishing claims that appear to be the ‘Monumental Secret’ held by esoteric circles in France.

Here for instance is a letter sent by Louis Fouquet to his brother Nicholas Fouquet after a meeting in Rome with the mysterious painter Poussin.

‘He and I discussed certain things, which I shall with ease be able to explain to you in detail – things which will give you, through Monsieur Poussin, advantages which even kings would have great pains to draw from him, and which, according to him, it is possible that nobody else will ever rediscover in the centuries to come.’ (Letter: Louis Fouquet)

Fouquet was subsequently arrested and imprisoned soon after and held strictly incommunicado for the rest of his life. Some historians regard him as a possible candidate for the ‘man in the iron mask’. All his correspondence was confiscated by King Louis XIV, who inspected them personally. The King went on to obtain Poussin’s arcane painting of ‘Les Bergers d’Arcadia’, which he kept in his private apartments.

The painting figures significantly in the book ‘Holy Blood and Holy Grail’ and after publication the authors received a letter from an Anglican Priest who claimed he had incontrovertible proof that the crucifixion was a fraud and that Jesus was alive well after the date of the supposed crucifixion. On the authors visiting the cleric, he claimed to

have received the information from Canon Alfred Leslie Lilley who died in 1940. Lilley is well known and studied manuscripts in Paris at the church of St. Sulpice where he met Emile Hoffet. Hoffet was associated through the symbolist circles of Paris with the mystic composer, and supposed Grand Master, Claude Debussy, who wrote,

“Perhaps it’s to destroy that scandalous legend that Jesus Christ died on the cross.”

You may be surprised that there is some evidence for this esoteric belief that Jesus was still alive after Pilate left Judea. The evidence for the other extraordinary claims is not always so substantial but still very compelling, enough for me to believe they are probably true. But you can decide for yourselves whether these esoteric circles had any real basis for the astounding beliefs that they held.

Chapter 1

THE FIRST CONTRADICTION

We do not know what documents Canon Alfred Lilley had seen that convinced him Pilate did not crucify Jesus but actually we do not need them because there are two totally different stories running in parallel in the Gospels. One has been emphasized by the church so you know it well and the other contradicts the known, but is so completely ignored that it is virtually unknown. I would say that it is reasonably easy to spot which side of the two stories is true and which is an interpolation; that is, once you know what the purpose of the insertion is. The first of these contradictions happens right at the beginning of Jesus ministry when he finds his first disciples.

'As Jesus walked beside the Sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and his brother Andrew casting a net into the lake, for they were fishermen. Jesus said, "Come, follow me,"(Mark 1:16)

And just like that they follow him. A lovely story we all marvel at. And many academic papers have been written about the Sea of Galilee fishermen, the type of boats they used, etc, etc. I should add that an official part of the regalia worn by the Pope as head of the Catholic Church and successor to Peter is the Fisherman's Ring. So you might believe there is absolutely no question, Simon Peter and his brother are Galilean fishermen who suddenly drop their nets and follow Jesus. You may then be surprised that a totally different story of the finding of these very same disciples, Andrew and Simon Peter appears in the Gospels!

‘The next day John the Baptist saw Jesus and said to two disciples, “Look, the Lamb of God!”

When the two disciples heard him say this, they followed Jesus. Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, “What do you want?”

They said, “Rabbi, where are you staying?”

“Come,” he replied, “and you will see.”

So they went and saw where he was staying, and they spent that day with him. It was about four in the afternoon. Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, “We have found the Messiah.” And he brought him to Jesus.’ (John 1:40)

Suddenly they are not the romantic fishermen at all, they are just boring followers of John the Baptist who spend some time with Jesus before deciding to become his disciples. And the event is not happening in Galilee at all but Judea, by the river Jordon about eighteen miles from Jerusalem.

Furthermore it says, Andrew immediately goes to find his brother Simon Peter who is living somewhere in Judea, not by the Sea of Galilee.

But even more to the point, in ‘Acts of the Apostles’, Simon Peter is actually reported as saying:

‘Now I, and those with me, can witness to everything he did throughout the countryside of Judea and in Jerusalem itself.’ (Acts 10:39)

So they are witnesses to everything Jesus did in Judea but they are not witnesses to anything going on in Galilee. In fact, scholars have noticed that all the passages that mention Galilee are later additions, which are oddly incorrect. For instance, Mark says that Jesus went through

Sidon on his way from Tyre to the Sea of Galilee. Problem is Sidon is in the opposite direction and there was no road anyway in the first century. And Mark writes:

*'And passing **along by the Sea of Galilee** he saw Simon and Andrew.'* (Mark 1:16)

In Greek the verb *passing along* is not used with the preposition *by*. So if one removed the bold part of this sentence you will have the correct syntax.

'And passing he saw Simon and Andrew.' (Mark 1:16)

Furthermore in Mark 5 there is a story where Gerasa slopes down to the Sea of Galilee, but Gerasa (modern Jerash) is thirty miles away from the sea.

Although John's version of recruiting the disciples is less remarkable, it does seem the more likely, so why do the synoptic Gospels move all this to the Sea of Galilee and make these same disciples, fishermen who leave their employ on a silly whim? (Synoptic Gospels - seen through one eye as the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke have many of the same stories, in the same order and using similar words)

In fact John's Gospel places most of the Jesus story in Jerusalem.

'Now there is in Jerusalem near the Sheep Gate a pool, which in Aramaic is called Bethesda and which is surrounded by five covered colonnades. Here a great number of disabled people used to lie.' (John 5:2)

By this pool, Jesus famously tells the lame man to pick up his mat and walk. Then on another day (John 9:7) he cures a blind man by the pool of Siloam. And in wintertime we get this:

'At that time the Feast of Dedication took place at Jerusalem. It was winter, and Jesus was walking in the temple, in the colonnade of Solomon. (John 10:22)'

So Jesus is in and out of Jerusalem all the time not just at the end of his ministry.

John even contradicts the other Gospels about the overturning of the moneylenders outside the Temple. He places it right at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, while the synoptic Gospels delay the event till they have Jesus arrive in Jerusalem at the end. This contradiction could well be the reason they are making a big deal of his grand entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, riding on the donkey, but then ignore the fact that he does this same journey at least four more times that week with no such fuss. Also a week before Palm Sunday we have the raising of Lazarus in Bethany, just a mile and a half from Jerusalem, which makes it hard to imagine that Jesus did not go to visit the Temple then.

If you are still not sure which version is the truth, we have many references to Jesus' brother, James, in the works of the early church fathers and they all talk about James being in Jerusalem and spending a lot of time in the Temple, which suggests that Jesus was there or thereabouts too. And so it seems, because Jesus appears to have his base two miles from Jerusalem in Bethany, where he and his disciples often go overnight. The evidence seems to point to the fact that Jesus spent most of his time in Judea not Galilee and even the name Jesus of Nazareth appears to be part of this process of deception.

It is easy to show that Jesus never lived in Nazareth, as he was never originally called Jesus of Nazareth. Firstly, he was originally called Jesus the Nazarene not Jesus of Nazareth and secondly we have very little evidence that Nazareth, as a village, existed at the time; if it did then it was a very small village. So why was this insignificant

appellation added to Jesus' name. Thomas of York makes sense, as York is a well-known town; or Alfred of Wessex after a known region, but Erik of Ecclesfield makes no sense whatsoever, as nobody but the people of Ecclesfield (apologies to the villagers North of Sheffield) would have any idea what the hell we are talking about. So Jesus of Nazareth is not only very unlikely, it is silly! Jesus of Sepphoris is more likely, after the major town three miles from Nazareth; or Jesus the Galilean after the region. Unfortunately, we already have the important rebel, Judas the Galilean functioning at the time so two Galileans at the same time would be a bit weird.

There is a document, alleged to have been written by a Roman official, Publius Lentulus, in Jerusalem during Jesus lifetime. You will probably see it is a flattering forgery but it has some interesting points:

'There has appeared in our city a man of great power named Jesus. The people call him a prophet and his disciples the Son of God. He is in stature a man of middle height and well proportioned, with a venerable face. His hair is the colour of ripe chestnuts smooth almost to the ears, but above them wavy and curly with a slight bluish radiancy. And it flows over his shoulders. It is parted in the middle after the fashion of the people of Nazareth.'

Okay, the usual flattering description of Jesus except for one point, his hair is parted in the middle after the '*fashion of the people of Nazareth*'. What a crazy and extremely unlikely idea! I'm sure the nine or ten adult males of this village of Nazareth did not have a particularly distinctive well-known hairstyle. The Bible does give us this:

'Having been warned in a dream, he withdrew to the district of Galilee, and he went and lived in a town called Nazareth.

So was fulfilled what was said through the prophets: 'He will be called a Nazarene.' (Matthew 2:23)

There actually is no prophesy in the Old Testament that says *he will be called a Nazarene*? The word only appears in the New Testament. But Nazarene must have some meaning other than a person, with a particular hairstyle, from a probably non-existent village in Galilee. The Old Testament tells us:

"The Lord said to Moses, "If a man or woman wants to make a vow of separation to the Lord as a Nazirite, he must not eat anything that comes from the grapevine. During the entire period of his vow of separation no razor may be used on his head; he must let the hair of his head grow long." (Numbers 6:5)

A Nazirite then is someone dedicated to God. Samson for instance says to Delilah:

"No razor has ever been used on my head," said Samson, "because I have been a Nazirite set apart to God since birth. If my head were shaved, my strength would leave me." (Judges 16:17)

If Jesus was not dedicated to God; not a Nazirite; it would be a bit of a surprise and the very earliest images of Jesus show him with long hair, often parted in the middle, a distinct feature of a Nazarene; not a villager from Nazareth! So Nazarenes are a group of people, a movement, perhaps started by Jesus or that Jesus belonged to because Paul is found guilty of being one:

"We have found this man to be a troublemaker, stirring up riots among the Jews all over the world. He is a ringleader of the Nazarene sect." (Acts 24:5)

Changing Jesus the Nazarene to Jesus of Nazareth appears to be part of the same attempt to link Jesus with Galilee. But what possible reason could there be for this desperate attempt to place Jesus in Galilee? It clearly was extremely important to someone for all the machinations that have been shown. As Professor Robert Eisenman wrote:

'A great deal of trouble is taken by these writers to get Jesus to Galilee.'(Robert Eisenman: *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*)

Eisenman is just stating a fact as he sees it, with no particular conclusion. He is mystified by the trouble the writer, or writers of the synoptic Gospels have taken to place Jesus in Galilee. But you may be surprised by the fact that, before you get half way through this book, you will know the answer that has eluded the Professor all these years.