

The Myth of Jesus: A Critical Examination of His Historical Existence

Marie Seshat Landry
Marie Landry's Spy Shop
www.marielandryceo.com

February 7, 2025

Abstract

This paper critically examines the historical claims of Jesus Christ's existence, arguing that Jesus never existed except as a mythological construct. Utilizing methodologies such as critical thinking, the scientific method, and historical analysis, this study evaluates the lack of contemporary evidence, the presence of mythological archetypes in the Jesus narrative, and the absence of reliable primary sources. Through an analysis of historiographical patterns, comparative mythology, and textual criticism, we demonstrate that the figure of Jesus is more likely a product of religious syncretism and literary invention rather than a verifiable historical individual.

1 Introduction

The historicity of Jesus Christ has long been a subject of debate among scholars. While mainstream historical discourse generally presumes the existence of a historical Jesus, many critical analyses suggest that the narrative surrounding Jesus is deeply interwoven with mythological motifs and later theological embellishments. In this paper, we examine whether the evidence supports the existence of a historical Jesus or if the narrative should be understood primarily as a product of mythologization.

Scholars like Carrier [1] and Price [7] argue that the earliest textual evidence does not substantiate a historical individual, while others such as Ehrman [3] defend the historicity based on available sources. This dichotomy sets the stage for our investigation using the general scientific method.

2 Methodology

Our approach follows these steps:

1. **Observation and Problem Definition:** We note that early accounts of Jesus are derived predominantly from Christian texts written decades after the purported events, lacking contemporaneous corroboration.
2. **Background Research and Literature Review:** We analyze both sides of the debate by reviewing literature from historical Jesus proponents (e.g., Ehrman [3]) and mythicist perspectives (e.g., Carrier [1], Doherty [2]).
3. **Hypothesis Formulation:** Our central hypothesis posits that Jesus of Nazareth did not exist as a historical figure, but rather as a mythologized construct developed through religious syncretism.

3 Data Collection

Our investigation draws upon a diverse array of sources:

1. **Primary Sources:** The canonical Gospels and Pauline epistles constitute the earliest narratives concerning Jesus. These texts, although written decades after the purported events, form the backbone of the traditional account.
2. **Secondary Sources:** Historical writings from non-Christian sources—such as Tacitus, Josephus, and Suetonius—are examined to provide an external perspective on the early first century context. Despite debates about their reliability, these sources are critical for our analysis.
3. **Comparative Mythological Sources:** Works by scholars such as Frazer [4] and Freke and Gandy [5] are used to highlight recurring mythic motifs. This comparative approach allows us to assess whether elements of the Jesus narrative align with common archetypal patterns found in other mythological traditions.

4 Data Analysis

We analyze the collected data using multiple methodologies:

- **Textual Criticism:** By closely examining the internal consistency of the Gospel narratives, we identify contradictions and potential interpolations that raise questions about their historical reliability [3].
- **Comparative Analysis:** A systematic comparison is conducted between the Jesus narrative and mythological figures such as Horus [6], Mithras [8], Krishna, and Dionysus. The aim is to uncover similarities in themes such as virgin birth, resurrection, and the presence of a select group of followers.
- **Historical Contextualization:** The socio-political and religious landscape of the early first century is examined to evaluate the likelihood of a historical figure emerging under the documented conditions. This includes considering the impact of religious syncretism and the evolution of oral traditions in ancient societies.

This multifaceted analysis provides a framework to rigorously test the hypothesis: that the narrative of Jesus is primarily a product of mythologization rather than a record of a verifiable historical figure.

5 Results

The analysis yields several key findings:

- **Absence of Contemporaneous Evidence:** There is a marked absence of non-Christian records from the early first century that directly reference Jesus. This supports the notion that the narrative of Jesus emerged well after the purported events [1, 2].
- **Mythological Parallels:** Comparisons with mythological figures such as Horus [6], Mithras [8], Krishna, and Dionysus reveal strong similarities. Common themes include miraculous births, resurrection narratives, and the presence of select groups of followers. These parallels suggest that the Jesus narrative fits within a broader archetypal framework common to many ancient religions [5].
- **Textual Inconsistencies:** Textual criticism of the canonical Gospels uncovers contradictions and evidence of later theological embellishments. Such findings indicate that these texts may have undergone significant redaction, complicating efforts to reconstruct an accurate historical account [3].

6 Discussion

The evidence analyzed in this study suggests that the narrative of Jesus, as transmitted through centuries of textual and oral traditions, is more accurately understood as a mythological construct rather than a straightforward historical record. The lack of contemporaneous corroboration combined with the integration of mythic motifs challenges the traditional historical account of Jesus.

While some scholars maintain that a historical kernel may exist beneath these layers of myth, the degree of mythologization and syncretism observed dilutes the possibility of reconstructing a reliable historical figure. Instead, the narrative appears to have evolved as a product of cultural and religious storytelling, shaped by the socio-political contexts of the early first century.

Moreover, these findings underscore the importance of applying rigorous scientific methods to historical inquiries. By systematically collecting and analyzing data from a variety of sources, we gain a deeper understanding of how historical events can be transformed into enduring mythological narratives.

7 Conclusion

The comprehensive analysis presented in this study leads to the conclusion that the narrative of Jesus is more plausibly understood as a mythological construct rather than a factual historical account. The following key points summarize our findings:

- **Lack of Direct Evidence:** The absence of contemporaneous non-Christian records corroborating the existence of Jesus indicates that the traditional narrative may have been formulated long after the events it purports to describe.
- **Mythological Integration:** The strong parallels observed between the Jesus narrative and mythological figures such as Horus [6], Mithras [8], Krishna, and Dionysus [4, 5] suggest that the story of Jesus draws on widespread archetypal motifs.
- **Textual Redaction:** The evidence of later redaction and theological embellishment within the canonical texts further complicates efforts to extract an objective historical account.

7.1 Implications for Historical Research

The findings underscore the importance of a rigorous, multidisciplinary approach when investigating historical phenomena. The methodology employed—combining textual criticism,

comparative mythology, and historical contextualization—demonstrates that modern historical inquiry must remain open to revising long-held assumptions in light of new analytical frameworks.

7.2 Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides substantial evidence for the mythological construction of the Jesus narrative, certain limitations must be acknowledged:

- **Source Limitations:** The reliance on texts that were composed long after the purported events introduces inherent challenges in verifying historical accuracy.
- **Interpretative Variability:** The analysis of mythological parallels is subject to interpretative biases; alternative readings of the same data may yield differing conclusions.

Future research should aim to integrate archaeological findings, refine comparative methodologies, and explore additional historical contexts to further elucidate the processes of mythologization in ancient narratives.

References

- [1] Richard Carrier. *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt*. Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014.
- [2] Earl Doherty. *Jesus: Neither God Nor Man – The Case for a Mythical Jesus*. Age of Reason Publications, 2009.
- [3] Bart Ehrman. *Did Jesus Exist?: The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth*. HarperOne, 2012.
- [4] James George Frazer. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. Macmillan, 1922.
- [5] Timothy Freke and Peter Gandy. *The Jesus Mysteries: Was the "Original Jesus" a Pagan God?* Three Rivers Press, 1999.
- [6] W. Massey. *Ancient Egypt: Its Life and Gods*. Unknown, 1883.
- [7] Robert M. Price. *The Christ-Myth Theory and Its Problems*. Unknown, 2003.

- [8] David Ulansey. *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries: Cosmology and Salvation in the Ancient World*. Oxford University Press, 1989.