

Insights that can be drawn from Articles 9 and 10

Michael Menasgotz

Copyright © M. Menasgotz 2025

All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission.

Abstract

This paper brings together my 4th (or in shorter form 9th) article describing the APTVS pattern, and my 10th article describing the triangle number puzzle in John and Acts, showing that whilst the former aims to promote Emperor Titus, the latter aims to promote his successor and brother, Emperor Domitian, and how it is now possible to show that all four Gospels derive from a common origin, which is the Flavian Roman Government.

Introduction

This paper assumes the reader has already read my work describing the parallels between Jewish War and Luke which form the APTVS pattern when plotted (e.g. my book, my 4th paper or my 9th paper) AND my work describing the triangle number sequence leading to 666 in John and Acts (e.g. my 10th paper).

If you haven't read both of them, please don't read this article, as the logic behind it won't be apparent. Please read them first.

By way of brief recap, in my 9th article (or my 4th article, or indeed my book) I show that Jewish War and Luke both contain incredibly detailed and carefully hidden parodies of each other, with the parallels arranged intentionally to form lines when the locations of those parallels are plotted.

- One of those lines primarily involves parallels which equate Emperor Titus with Jesus, with the apparent goal that followers could be lead to see Titus as the 2nd coming of Jesus.
- When all of the lines are taken together, they are seen to involve both documents parodying each other, and they an intentional pattern, indeed a message in Latin 'APTVS', which can be readily understood as a reference to an Agion Pneuma Titvs (Holy Spirit Titus).

Compared to my 4th article, the 9th one includes a more extensive discussion of whether this pattern could be 'finding patterns in noise' or simple coincidences, showing that the pattern is so distinct and detailed that these scenarios are impossible. In doing so I rely also on an interesting sequence of parallels where both texts evoke the requirements of the Jewish Passover ritual, and how their locations also align with this APTVS pattern, as do parallels identified by the independent scholar Carrington.

The likely motive for, and order of, writing Jewish War:

"Jewish War" is very much a book of two halves. The war referred to in its title is only described in the second half – and this is the section that presents the letters 'VS' when the parallels are plotted. There is no surviving copy of the 1st version of Jewish War which is so dubiously claimed to be in the *'father'* tongue (modern linguists have demonstrated that the 2nd version is not a translation), but I suggest that it may have been a shorter document, only presenting the message 'VS'; written to promote worship not of Titus, but his *father*: Emperor Vespasian.

It was Vespasian had enough time on the throne for his government to organize a new religion, and also the clearest life-or-death motive to drive both Jews and Legionaries to first worship Jesus, and then to worship him as the 2nd coming, and finally, to relinquish their faith in Jesus leaving them as pure Emperor worshippers (this being achieved by revealing to them, that Luke and Jewish War intentionally parody each other, and thus Luke was co-written with Jewish War, which is undeniably from the Roman government.

Having obtained the throne with the support of the Legions, and also by winning his war against the Jews, it was critical for Vespasian to influence both the Jews and Legionaries to become intensely loyal to him, since this would prevent those two great wars rekindling, which risked him being toppled from his throne and suffering a grim death like his four very recent predecessors (the famous 'year of four emperors' – AD 69).

So in short, whilst the lost 1st version was probably commissioned by Emperor Vespasian (reigning 69-79 AD) to make people worship Jesus and then himself as the 2nd coming, and the surviving version shifts the emphasis mainly onto his son, Emperor Titus (who reigned 79-81 AD), so Jesus would be seen as the 1st coming of Titus and Vespasian (who is emphasized as being the 'old man') could then be equated with Jesus' father – the creator God.

In the process of showing that Jewish War parodies Luke back, I demonstrate that the stated author is very improbable, and probably is a propaganda model held up convince Jews to convert to the roman side, with other authors of the time taking pains to mention they knew him personally. As an example I show that his entire life story, as written in Jewish War, is a parody of Jesus' story, with the parallels arranged to help form the APTVS pattern. The implication, especially since notable authors of the time go out of their way to mention 'in passing' how they know him personally, is that Roman propaganda in the 1st Century was much more pervasive and convincing than previously thought.

Private revelations, not public ones:

By the time I published my book, I came to realize that it would make little sense for the planned 'revelations' to be done publicly, since if you revealed that Jesus was a prophetic forerunner of Titus, it would suddenly be difficult to recruit new followers of Jesus, doubly so if you revealed that Jesus' story in Luke can be proven to have been co-

written with the roman government's document, Jewish War. From this it follows that these revelations were to be done in secret, which happens to match a popular model for roman religion in the 1st Century, known as the secrecy cult (e.g. Isis and Mithras).

The explanatory power of this thesis

Before I move on to the content of my 10th article, I show here just how many things this explains, which other theses (E.g. Christianity and general Mythicism alone) cannot explain. These include:

- Why Jesus Christ left no writings, monuments, remains, family etc and why nobody wrote his Gospel story until the reign of Vespasian (the Pauline literature predates Vespasian's reign, but it offers virtually no details about Jesus' life – not even what century or country he lived in – making it a convenient story to build upon).
- Why Jesus foretells that his second coming will be revealed within a generation (i.e. near the end of Vespasian's reign) by the fall of Jerusalem (the crowning achievement of Titus).
- Why Jewish War has references to Jesus' story that appear rudely 'inserted' at seemingly random locations – since the original author needed to do this to arrange those parallels at the right locations to form the APTVS pattern, and indeed why those references don't align well with what early Christians would think about Jesus.
- Why Jewish War's references to Jesus go unmentioned by Christian apologists in later centuries, despite them clearly knowing about Jewish War – this being because rather than helping their cause, telling people about Jewish War's references to Jesus posed a threat to belief in Jesus, and thus the early Catholic church.
- Why the parallels between Jesus and Titus were not publicly known (the first and most important sequence was largely published by Joe Atwill).
- Why only the second half of Jewish War is actually about the Jewish War (rather the previous century of conflict), and why only the second half of Jewish War both parodies and is parodied by Luke (and in the first half - apparently added later under Titus' orders - Jewish War only parodies Luke).
- Why Jesus is presented with Emperor's gifts as a baby, an Emperor's robe at his death, an Emperor's quantity of spices at his funeral, and an entrance to Jerusalem evoking an Emperor's triumph.
- Why Jesus teaches Jews to pay tax to the Roman Emperor, chose the slave of a Roman Centurion's to heal, taught Roman soldiers to accept low pay (noting that their cost was nearly crippling the Empire), and even declares that a Roman Centurion 'is' (*not 'had'*) the greatest faith in Israel.
- Why Jesus' teachings lead people to see humility, poverty, and acceptance of oppression as a virtue, and why it is so easily interpreted as encouraging antisemitism, e.g. that Jews of that time are an 'evil generation' or that the Jews have Jesus' blood forever on their hands.
- Why Jesus claims predicts his second coming (so people could be guided to see this person as Emperor Titus), and why believers should expect it 'imminently', and that it would be revealed by the fall of Jerusalem (the act defining Titus' crowning victory), and why Jesus came with a sword, declaring that he does not come to bring peace, and why his face appears 'transfigured' with a different 'white' face (Titus being a Caucasian Commander), and why Jesus rose on the third day (i.e. Titus' birthday, the third day of their calendar).
- Why Jesus' story evokes so many pre-existing myths, including Mediterranean deities such as Mithras, Zeus, Samson and more i.e., the goal was to construct a Messiah story that would attract people from many faiths.
- Why Matthew/Mark have a different layout, but have nearly matching text, and are written for Jewish and Roman audiences – the goal was to attract both Jews and Legionaries, and initially they should not spot the pattern so the story needed to be arranged in a different order to Luke.
- Why all the Gospel books are written in koine Greek - a language Jesus wouldn't have spoken. This is because the goal was to influence diverse peoples of the Empire, but writing in Latin would have made the roman origin too obvious.
- Why Jesus tells Simon that he will be dragged to his death and should feed his four-legged beasts (because this is what Titus did to the Jewish General, Simon) and a Simon is made to lead Jesus' procession to Golgotha, and why Golgotha is described as the place of the skull (i.e., it is a parody of the Triumph parade up to the Capitoline which was named after a skull). It explains why Jesus refers to Jerusalem as a den of thieves (since Jewish war argues that the Jewish leaders stole Judea from Rome), why John says he should be plunged in the river Jordan by Jesus (this being a parody of Titus drowning John's forces in that same river), why Jesus sends pigs to drown in the Jordan (for the same antisemitic reason), why Jesus' Gospel story keeps

mentioning Hades (the roman concept) rather than Hell, why Jesus described a Samaritan when asked who you should love (because Titus conquered Samaria before helping his fallen troops at Jerusalem), etc.

- Why the Romans were expert strategists, yet seem strangely mute when it comes to propaganda. It turns out that their expertise extended very much to propaganda too, and their propaganda was effective and pervasive that modern historians have been deceived into not realizing that supposedly independent writers of the time who all seem to back each other's narratives up and seem very convincingly independent, *were* the media by which government propaganda was promulgated.
- Why so many unsupported claims were made in later centuries that the Romans persecuted the earliest Christians. Once you know that there is a way to demonstrate that the Roman government created the Gospel story, you can then see the strong motive that the later Church rulers had to distance early Rome from early Christianity.
- Why Emperor Constantine and the early Catholic Church went to such lengths to convince people that Jesus was historical (Constantine even announced that his mother found Jesus' cross and that the nails still possessed power over the elements). It also explains why the early Catholic Church was famously paranoid, and why it only made the Bible available in a language none of its peoples could read.
- Why the Gospels contain the exact evidence required to prove that they were created by the Flavian Roman Government. This being to enable the temples of Titus' secrecy cult to reveal this under oath of secrecy to help convince followers of Jesus who had accepted Titus as the 2nd coming and started worshipping him as god, to abandon faith in Jesus and become pure Flavian Emperor worshippers.

Turning to the Triangle Numbers in John and Acts

I have also shown in my 10th article that John and Acts don't merely contain four famous triangle numbers, but rather they work together to present a numerical puzzle.

This puzzle involves sequences of special triangle numbers and notable triangle number calculations all pointing to the numbers 180 (the internal angle of all triangles), and 666 (the most 'three' related number one can think of, indeed the same number which Revelation tells us that 'those with insight should calculate').

There are a surprising chain of insights that can be drawn from this, and I will set these out below:

1. Firstly, we can see that John and Acts are promoting the idea that Jesus' divinity has a triangular nature (the Holy Trinity in modern terms).
2. This helps explain why John and Acts urges the reader to see the Holy Spirit as a person, far more strongly than the synoptic gospels do (if indeed they do at all). Examples of this are easily found:

John's Gospel presents the Holy Spirit as a distinct person (John 14-16), or as the "Paraclete" (meaning "one called to one's side", or "the Helper"). Repeated use of pronouns (he/his) to refer to the Spirit (John 14:26; 15:26) reinforces this personal identity. And Acts takes the same approach, portraying the Holy Spirit as an active agent in the early church and speaking (Acts 8:29; 13:2; 15:28; 16:6-7).

By contrast, the Synoptic Gospels (Luke, Mark, Matthew) often describe a variety of individuals being "filled with" or "led by" the Holy Spirit, as if it were a characteristic like holiness or divinity, and do not emphasize personal characteristics of the Holy Spirit as John and Acts do.
3. It also helps explain why the earliest Christians often used the *triangle* as their favored symbol.
4. When Revelation says "This calls for wisdom: let anyone with understanding calculate the number of the [second] beast, for it is the number for a person. Its number is 666." Revelation likely uses 666 to reference the Holy Spirit.

It helps to be aware that all the associations between 666 and the devil arose through Church tradition *centuries after Revelation was written*. This "666 = the mark of *devil*" idea is now firmly cemented in our minds thanks to it becoming an inescapable trope found in absolutely every book and film where the devil is a character, but it simply has no basis in the Bible. Revelation refers to the second of two beasts - not the devil.

However, there's more if we dig a little deeper:

5. The author doesn't merely scatter the clues between John and Acts, but arranges them to span both books:
 - To appreciate that the author is pointing to 666 you need to realize that the author is evoking both Triple Triangle Numbers and Triple Triangle-Pair Numbers:
 - o The former requires the number 153 (in John) and the latter requires the number 276 (Acts).
 - o Even to see that Triple Triangle Numbers are being used, this also requires John (the miracle of the 6 jars, 2 or 3 measures each), and Acts (21 'three' numbers arranged in 15 and 6).
 - To appreciate that the author is pointing to 180, requires the reader to see that the Triangle Numbers 120 and 300 are the lowest pair that can be used in simple arithmetic to arrive at 180, and again the author splits them between the two books (120 in Acts and 300 in John).
6. Since the two books were written to jointly pose this puzzle, it follows that John and Acts have the same source.
7. The numerical puzzle consistently uses simple arithmetic, so if a Lukan follower of Jesus was shown the solution, they too, would realize the two texts were written together. Indeed the author must have known this.
8. **Therefore, the author clearly intended that 1st Century readers who were shown the solution, were to conclude that John and Acts are from the same author.**

If the author wanted to lead readers to identify that they wrote John and Acts together, what was their motive?

There is nothing in Acts that challenges or contradicts Luke, and it is well known that Acts appears - very obviously in fact - to be from the same source as Luke:

- They both begin with a dedication to Theophilus,
- They share a common style and common vocabulary,
- Acts coherently presents a continuation of the narrative in Luke,
- Acts refers to its author's 'former book'.

So, a 1st Century follower of Luke might very readily accept the Book of Acts, taking it to be a second volume written by the author of Luke.

However, it is also well known that the anonymously written 'Gospel of John' differs significantly from the three 'synoptic' Gospels, Luke Matthew and Mark, and I will argue that a 1st Century follower of Luke might have been reluctant to accept it as truth. My reasons for this include:

- Unlike Luke, John directly indicates that Jesus is divine, which was blasphemous to Jewish followers of Jesus,
- Unlike Luke, John emphasizes the Holy Spirit as a divine person. By contrast Luke talks about it as though it were a divine *characteristic* that various characters are filled with or led by,
- Unlike Luke, John contains a passage directly suggesting that Jesus has literal brothers,
- Absent from Luke, John introduces a new disciple, Didymus, who I will come back to later.

To sum up - Since there was no canonization in the 1st Century guiding believers as to which books to accept, a follower of Luke might happily accept the uncontroversial Book of Acts as a second volume of Luke, but might reject the noticeably different story in the anonymously written Gospel of John.

Appreciating this allows us to infer a motive for why John was so demonstrably co-written with Acts:

The author of Acts made sure followers of Luke would see Acts as clearly originating from the same source as Luke, and also hides this great numerical puzzle spanning John and Acts, in order that followers could be led by their priests to see that John must have the same origin as Acts, **so that those 1st Century followers of Luke could be led to accept John.**

If the author was willing to insert various numbers into John to ensure followers of Luke could be led to accept it, then there must be some different teaching in John that was terribly important. What could it be?

There are several places where John refers to Jesus having brothers. John 7:3 stands out because the description of Jesus' brothers cannot be easily dismissed for example by suggesting it merely refers to Jesus' disciples. This is because in that verse, Jesus' 'brothers' are indicated to be discussing Jesus' disciples who are far away. Whilst the Greek word used here for 'brothers' (adelphoi) is one that can mean countrymen or male siblings, John uses the same word elsewhere to undoubtedly mean male siblings. This apparent contradiction to the Church view that Mary remained a virgin, is a well-known controversy in Christian scholarship.

And on the topic of brothers, John introduces a disciple of Jesus who followers of Luke would not have heard of. He is introduced in John 20:24 as "Thomas, one of the twelve, who was also called Didymus". Notice that Thomas is the Aramaic word for twin (which derives from the Hebrew word for twin), whilst Didymus is the Greek word for twin.

Noting that the text of John *is* in Greek, to a Greek reader this reads as follows: "Thomas, one of the twelve, who was also called 'the twin'". I.e. the text really goes out of its way to emphasize that he is called 'the twin'.

The story John tells us about Didymus – who I will now simply refer to as "the twin" – is a very interesting one:

1. After dying and resurrecting, Jesus tells Mary to fetch his brothers, adding for good measure that his own father is also their father. Immediately the story says that his disciples are assembled that very evening, but it only identifies the twin by name, omitting to say which others are present. Jesus then "breathed on to them" declaring to them "receive the Holy Spirit" and saying to them that they now have the power to forgive sins.

Notice how **the only named individual that Jesus 'breathed the Holy Spirit' onto, and is given the power to forgive sins, is 'the twin' who was referred to five verses earlier as Jesus brother who he shares a father with!** – and for good measure, once Jesus has done this, it is specifically the other (unnamed) disciples who tell this twin that "we have seen the lord".

2. This same 'twin' immediately proposes to place his hand on Jesus' cross where Jesus' hand had been – this arrangement would be akin to the 'twin' being on Jesus' cross – and then the 'twin' proceeds to "put his hand in Jesus' side". Notice that the physical arrangement of a side-by-side embrace, evokes the way John refers to the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete meaning "one called to ones' side".

And that physical side-by-side embrace also evokes the pose of the *Gemini* twins (one of the twelve zodiac deities; the twins who shared a divinity and are depicted with their arms embracing side by side). The reason I highlight the Gemini, is that Acts describes how the Gemini (the symbol of the twin brothers) is the figurehead of the ship used for Paul's sea voyage (Acts 28:11). It surely cannot be a coincidence that both John and Acts mention a twin who is one of 'the twelve' (in John's case one of the 12 disciples. In Acts, one of the 12 zodiac deities).

In short, there seems to be a hidden message saying that the twin is Jesus' twin sibling, who goes by various names such as Didymus, the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete.

3. Now, the only other place in John which mentions this ‘twin’, Didymus, is earlier in John 11, which by the way also takes time to emphasize that he is not just called Thomas, but was called ‘the twin’.

From a plain reading, John 11 tells the story of a man called Lazarus who falls sick, dies and gets resurrected from the grave by Jesus.

Lazarus is a name that evokes the phrase “he whom god helps”, or more precisely Lazarus is derived from Eleazar which means ‘whom god helps’ (El means god, and Azar means help).

The author hints at ‘*he whom god helps*’ being an important interpretation of the word Lazarus, since at the beginning of this very story, Jesus (who is to be seen as god of course, so I can substitute that word in place of Jesus) is told that **Lazarus is “he whom [god] loves”**.

But there is one occasion in the story where Jesus doesn’t say the word Lazarus in the nominative form, and instead uses the vocative form ‘Lazare’ – i.e. phonetically evoking the name Eleazar! – which literally means “he whom god helps”.

Now, suppose a priest suggested to a 1st Century follower that when Jesus calls out ‘*Lazare*’ he is not saying Lazarus, but rather is uttering the Hebrew version of the word, Eleazar, literally meaning ‘he whom god helps’, and that when the term Lazarus is used, the reader should consider whether these too are simply supposed to refer to ‘he whom god helps’.

The story begins by saying that the character Lazarus is sick. Mary and Martha go to Jesus and tells him that Lazarus is sick. The story adds that Jesus loved Mary, Martha and ‘Lazaron’ – the word here is in the accusative, perhaps to differentiate it and help suggest it might simply mean ‘he whom god helps’.

Jesus, either misunderstanding Martha and thinking she refers to ‘he whom god helps’, or alternatively knowing (since he is a prophet of course) that Didymus will go to die with Lazarus, declares that “this sickness will not end in death”, and sets off to Judea, declaring that he will wake Lazarus (which now could mean either of them) from sleep. Jesus then declares that ‘plainly that Lazarus is dead’, which presumably means the character Lazarus.

The story continues saying that ‘Therefore Didymus, the twin, said that he should go with his disciples, to die with Lazarus.’ The story offers zero explanation for why Didymus volunteers to die in Lazarus’ grave. Our notional priest and follower would take this to mean that Didymus (Jesus’ twin) wishes to be resurrected by Jesus.

Jesus arrives at Lazarus’ tomb, which presumably now contains the corpses of Lazarus and ‘he whom god loves’ (i.e. Didymus the twin). Jesus has the stone moved aside and declares **“‘*Lazare* [a form of Lazarus which more strongly evokes the word Eleazar, meaning: *he whom god helps*’] - come out!’”, whereupon a man rises from the dead and leaves the tomb. The story indicates that the man’s face was covered by a cloth, making his identity ambiguous.**

Clearly, most modern Christians are wedded to the idea that Jesus did not have a sibling, but I should point out how if the reader identifies Didymus, the twin, as not only *the disciple whom Jesus loved* but also Jesus’ sibling, it finally makes sense why John 19:26-27 says: **Jesus [looked down from the cross and] saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, and told his mother ‘Woman, here is your son!’, and then told the disciple ‘Here is your mother!’**

To sum up; the text in John might be written to permit a priest to lead a reader to disregard the story’s face-value meaning, and to settle on an interpretation in which Jesus and his ‘brother’ ‘the twin’ who puts his arm in Jesus’ side like Gemini’s divine twin brothers, are to be seen as exactly that – as divine twin brothers.

From this, and the statement in John that the Holy Ghost is the Paraclete (one who comes to ones’ side), such followers would understand Didymus to be the Holy Spirit.

So who is Didymus? Why is he important?

At face value, Didymus is a character with a cameo role in the final Gospel, and we learn little about him, other than that he was not in Judea when Jesus came, and that there's a hidden message that he is Jesus' twin brother, and indeed the Holy Spirit, and indeed the Paraclete (he who comes to one's side). It's interesting that the manner this twinship is presented has the form of the zodiac deity, Gemini, which is a Greek/Roman tradition. But as character profiles go, it's on the weak side.

However we already know that the purpose of Luke and Jewish War working together was to lead followers to see the Flavian Emperor as the 2nd coming of Jesus. Originally, via the lost 1st version of Jewish War, this probably aimed to help lead followers to see Vespasian as god, and the surviving 2nd version appears intended to drive worship of his son Titus.

I propose we consider Joe Atwill's identification that the triangle numbers in John/Acts relate to the third Flavian Emperor, Titus' younger brother Domitian.

Upon realizing this, the rest of the puzzle falls into place, and much credit here is due to Joe Atwill too. The huge effort John and Acts go to, to emphasize that god has three persons, sits extremely well with a desire to lead followers who already worship the first two Flavian Emperors, to accept the third one as divine too.

Indeed if followers saw Titus as the 2nd coming of Jesus, and saw in Jesus' godly father a message about Titus' father Vespasian being the creator god, then by suggesting that Jesus has a divine brother who also gets resurrected, it follows that Titus' only brother is the 2nd coming of Didymus.

And it continues. Domitian's first initial is D, which in Greek is Delta. The capital letter delta is literally a triangle written in Greek as: Δ, so if you wanted to guide worshippers to accept Domitian as god, making them adopt the first letter of Domitian's name as their holy symbol makes sense. Hence early Christians using the triangle as their favored symbol, not the cross. The name Didymus also begins with Δ, which is probably intentional.

Similarly, when Titus went to conquer Judea, Domitian didn't go with him, being too young to do so, and that matches the description in John of Didymus who "was not in Judea when Jesus came". Even on close inspection, the character Didymus evokes Domitian.

Indeed after Jesus has breathed the Holy Spirit onto Didymus, the story concludes with Didymus declaring "My Lord and God". This has an astonishingly strong connection to Domitian, who is recorded as insisting that everyone must refer to him, whether in writing or verbally, by that same phrase: "Lord and God".

Joe Atwill points out that there is a reason that Didymus is equated with the Gemini, which isn't as banal as trying to insert Roman deities (use of any Zodiac deity would achieve that), and it relates to the way that Didymus (aka Thomas) is presented as the doubter – hence the modern phrase a 'Doubting Thomas'.

Whilst Titus was no doubt proud of his crowning achievement, the destruction of Jerusalem, Domitian had no such war victories as accolades. He did however take the 14th Legion to crush revolt in Germania which proved quite easy, and it's noteworthy that he took the 14th Legion because this was the main one that had hesitated to accept Flavian rule – that is to say that he forgave and redeemed it.

The name of that Legion? It was called the Gemini since it was formed by the twinning of two defeated Legions. Admittedly it is not the only Legion that was called the Gemini – the divine twins, but here we have a Gemini that was a 'doubter' which was treated favorably – i.e. loved and forgiven. And that's the story of Didymus in John. He was the doubter, who Jesus gave power to forgive to, and is the divine twin, and the disciple whom Jesus loved.

These parallels are summarized in the following table:

	Didymus the Doubter	Domitian's demonstration of power with his 14 th Gemini Legion
The first letter	'D'	'D'
His arrival in Judea	Didn't come with Jesus in Judea	Didn't come with Titus to Judea
He was a doubter	His name (Didymus and Thomas) is stated as meaning 'doubter' and indeed it means this in both in Greek and in Hebrew.	His Legion initially doubted Flavian rule, and normally might have expected punishment for this (e.g., lower pay / less opportunity for glory).
His story involves a third aspect of god, and also the narrative of forgiveness	The very sentence prior to Didymus being introduced, has Jesus breathing the Holy Spirit on them, saying "If you forgive, they are forgiven". John 20:22-233	Despite that legion doubting the Flavians, Domitian forgave it. By choosing to lead them in his Germania campaign, Domitian effectively made a show of forgiving them.
He gains divinity	By deciding he should 'go to die' for no apparent reason with Lazarus, and then Jesus resurrecting a person from that tomb, the hidden message is that he was resurrected, but by doing so with Lazarus, which is a metaphor for "all divinity", the implication is he gains divinity thanks to Jesus. This is reinforced by him then placing his hand in the imprint of Jesus' hand on the cross where the nail was and 'stretching out his arm and putting it into Jesus' side' .	By associating himself with the 'Twin' ship in Acts, and the 14 th 'Gemini' Legion (meaning 'twin' Domitian links himself to the roman zodiac god Gemini, the twins, who share a divinity. The Gemini are depicted in embrace/holding hands. As such the message is that Domitian gains his divinity from his sibling Titus.
He was one of the 12	Didymus is described as one of Jesus' 12 which at face value means disciples, but in roman mythology would mean the zodiac.	Domitian's legion is the 14 th Legion, but being called the 'Gemini' this identifies with one of the 12 zodiac constellations / gods.
The honorific he uses is 'lord and god'	Yes, Didymus' story ends with him speaking to Jesus saying 'my lord and my god' .	Completing the parallel narrative, Domitian ensures it is known that his title is always 'lord and god' and never anything different.

In my 10th paper describing the triangle numbers, there's one relationship I omitted. This is because I didn't plan to discuss the meaning of these triangle numbers in that article, beyond that the author is suggesting a three-fold divinity.

When I discussed how John uses the number 6 in the context of it being the first triple triangle number, I showed how John uses the 'bases' of that triple triangle number, that is to say that 6 is the 3rd triangle number, and its side length 3 is the 2nd triangle number. So the relevant numbers are 6,3,2 and 1, and I showed that these were present in the first miracle in John with the 6 jars.

With the number 21 this wasn't necessary because its key numbers are 21, 15 and 6 (its value, periphery and base length), and merely including those was sufficient for the author to signify that 21 was being used in the context of being a triple triangle number.

But what about 666? It's the all-important third 'triple triangle number'. Its key numbers are its value (666), its periphery (105) and base length (36) are all absent!? Surely some reference to 666 would be expected? And if those numbers were deemed too obvious, then what about the 'bases'? 105 is the 14th triangle number, and 36 is the 8th triangle number. Why aren't at least those numbers, 8 and 14, placed together, e.g. in the same sentence?

Well, it turns out that they are. I didn't discuss this in my 10th article because it takes us beyond the scope of what I planned to discuss in that paper.

So where are they? In John, the number 8 is trivial to find in the story of Didymus, the doubting Thomas. It's in John 20:25-26 where Thomas/Didymus says "unless... I will my hand in [Jesus'] side, I will not believe. 26: And after eight days again his disciples were there with Thomas... 27: ... And Jesus said to Thomas... thrust your hand in my side." Yet the number 14 is absent. It doesn't appear anywhere in John!

Our notional follower is forced to look elsewhere, and as Joe Atwill astutely pointed out, it's found in the story of... Domitian! Why? Because that doubter, the Legion called the Gemini, which doubted Flavian rule but was forgiven by Domitian who personally led it in his campaign – it was Legion 14.

If Revelation is talking about Domitian as the second beast with the number 666, who is the first beast?

Everyone has heard of the ‘number of the beast’ being 666. Revelation says this is the number of a man, and he has two horns ‘like a lamb’, and he required everyone to have his number on their foreheads or right hands.

But it’s rarely mentioned that the text of Revelation 13 discusses *two* beasts, *both of which have numbers*. It’s also rarely mentioned that after mentioning 666, the very next verse mentions a lamb who has with him 144,000 who had his name and his fathers name – again on their foreheads.

Indeed the first beast is introduced as wearing crowns, being male, capable of waging war, having the power to continue 42 months, given authority over every people and nation, and that one of his heads was mortally wounded, yet it healed. And then having discussed these beasts in Revelation 13, the next verse introduces the number 144,000 as relating to the lamb o , as relating to 12,000 of each of the 12 tribes of Israel who were ‘sealed’.

If you know that the second beast refers to Vespasian’s second son, Domitian, then it’s hardly difficult to guess that the first beast might relate to Vespasian’s first son, Titus, who is represented by Jesus – who of course is considered to be the lamb of god. This would explain why the second beast – Domitian – who is represented by Didymus, Jesus’ hidden twin, isn’t described as ‘being a lamb’ but merely ‘like a lamb’.

Once you realize this, everything about the first beast becomes clear:

- The first beast “having power to rule 42 months” is transparently a reference to Titus’ crowning achievement, his destruction of Jerusalem, which took 42 months from his arrival in Judea.
- The first beast wearing crowns, and having authority over every nation is plainly describing that Titus was an Emperor, ruling most of the known world at the time.
- It also explains why the first beast has a head which was “mortally” wounded (i.e. fatal), but yet healed. It’s a reference to Jesus’ resurrection, and we know from my 9th article that Luke and the surviving version of Jewish War aim to establish Titus as the 2nd coming of that mortally wounded, yet still living Messiah.

But what about the reference in the very next verse to the lamb who has with him 144,000 who have his mark or their foreheads, matching the same number of Jews mentioned earlier who were ‘sealed’? Well, the lamb is clearly Jesus representing Titus, and indeed 144,000 turns out to be a reference to the number of Jews killed/captured (i.e. ‘sealed’, in some of Titus’ key victories.

Jewish War records that two of Titus’ land battles resulted in specific number of thousands of Jewish casualties:

- **4,000** Jews killed as Titus leads his men over Gamala’s walls assisted by a ‘divine storm’ (4.1.10)
- **40,000** Jews killed as Titus leads his men over Jotapata’s walls assisted by ‘sudden mist’ (3.7.36).

The 100,000 is found in the number captured in the war as a whole. Jewish War records that

- **97,000** Jews were captured in the war.

What about the remaining 3000? I don’t think the author of Revelation was able to edit Jewish War and was instead using what numbers happened to be there. So the author may have decided that this was close enough to 100,000 as not to matter.

Another possibility is that the author expected the reader to identify another event where Jewish War says Titus killed ‘more than 2500’ in Cesarea to celebrate Domitian’s birthday, and a great multitude more when repeating this in Phoenicia (War 7.3.1).

Comparing these numbers, it is easy to see that the author of Revelation found **144,000** to be a convenient number by which Titus could be subtly referred to.

In summary, the entire discussion about the two beasts in Revelation makes sense now:

- The first crown-wearing beast whose numbers are 42 and 144,000 refers to how Jesus represents the first brother (Titus) in the synoptic Gospels, and is thus the lamb.
- The second beast that ‘looks like a lamb’ is the second brother, whose number is revealed by calculations in John and Acts to be 666 (the common denominator of Triple Triangle Numbers and Triple Triangle-Pair Numbers).

Conclusion:

My 9th Article (or 4th article or my book) shows that the story in Luke and that the second half of Jewish War were co-written, since they parody each other, in doing so presenting Jesus as a prophetic forerunner of Emperor Titus, and those parallels form a pattern presenting a message, which can be shown to be impossible to occur by chance or be the result of finding patterns in noise. This means that the story in Luke originates with the Roman government, although it does not entirely preclude there being an earlier version of Luke (E.g. Q document).

This appears to have been done so that once followers were convinced to follow Titus as the 2nd coming of Jesus and hooked on Emperor worship, this information could be revealed (presumably under oath of secrecy), to convince them that Jesus is merely a parable about Titus, and become pure Flavian Emperor Worshipers.

The surviving second version of Jewish War is written to focus worship specifically on Emperor Titus, whilst the lost first version might have emphasized his father Vespasian, who had enough time on the throne to implement this plan, and the strongest motive to do so.

Vespasian's goal appears to have been to convince both Jews and Legionaries to become intensely loyal to the Emperor, thereby preventing the Jewish and Roman civil wars from reigniting and destabilizing his grip on the throne – i.e. Vespasian had a life-or-death motive to pursue this plan, and following his death Titus had very similar needs.

My 10th Article shows that the author of John and Acts includes very specific triangle numbers, chosen to present a specific, detailed and clever numerical puzzle, which points the reader to the numbers 180 and – as suggested by Revelation – to calculate the number of the second beast, 666.

More generally this points the reader to the idea that God is triangular, or in modern terms; a Holy Trinity. However this puzzle is established jointly by the texts of John and Acts working together, and as a consequence *it can be demonstrated that John and Acts originate from the same source.*

It is clear that the author of John and Acts wanted followers to appreciate that they have a common origin, once the puzzle was explained to them, and this appears to be to help followers of Luke, who would willingly embrace Acts as its 2nd volume, to then accept the Gospel of John, and with it, the idea that God is triangular, and thus that the third Flavian Emperor, Domitian, shares Titus' divinity in the manner of the divine twins, the Gemini.

John and Acts were therefore undoubtedly produced during Domitian's reign, to ensure that he too would be worshipped as God, thereby strengthening his hold on the throne.

It is almost universally accepted that Acts and Luke share a common source (together forming a two volume story), and that the three synoptic gospels must share a common source (due to the great prevalence of nearly-identical text).

Putting all of this together:

- The story in Luke can be proven to have the same author as the story in the second half of Jewish War
- Luke can be demonstrated to share or derive from a common origin with the other synoptic Gospels
- Luke is clearly, and indeed universally agreed to, share a common origin with Acts
- Luke can be shown to have same author as John

Whilst I accept that the Pauline literature precedes the Flavian era – noting that it has virtually nothing to say about Jesus' life story, neither suggesting what country or century he lived in nor mentioning any of his miracles – and I accept that Revelation was clearly written later, this upshot is that:

All four of the supposedly independent and anonymously written accounts of Jesus' story derive from a single source, which is the Flavian Roman Government.

These connections are illustrated overleaf.

Key connections between the origin of the relevant texts:

