

Eliseo Ferrer
About His Book “The Christian Myth”
**From Greek Myth to
the Judaized Fiction of History**



Interview

TO CONSTRUCT HISTORY WITH SCIENTIFIC
PRETENSIONS ON THE GROUNDS OF
AN IDEOLOGICAL FABLE IS A FRAUD — A TASK
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE NAÏVE OR THE DERANGED

*This is a summary for Academia.edu of a lengthy interview conducted with Eliseo Ferrer on July 17, 2025, about his book *The Christian Myth, According to the Texts*. The full interview, as planned, will be published in various media, both digital and print, in mid-August. And it is likely that with it a new forum will open - Spanish and English - here at Academia.*

—Is this new book, *The Christian Myth, According to the Texts*, published at the beginning of 2025, a continuation of your 2021 work, *Sacrifice and Drama of the Sacred King*, or is it a standalone book?

—It’s a continuation of my research, of course; but not explicitly a continuation of that 2021 book. Although I must say that many Spanish-American readers have interpreted it that way. Even a very faithful reader from the United States told me he was pleased with “the closure of the trilogy with this work.” Of course, this reader included here a work he read last year, *Human Sacrifices...*, with sacrificial evocations that he associated with ecclesiastical Redemptorism, and he thought it appropriate to include it as an interlude between *Sacrifice and Drama of the Sacred King* and *The Christian Myth*. But no... I don’t

consider this year’s book a continuation of SDRS, from 2021, and even less so of *Human Sacrifices*. It addresses the same broad field of research, true; but they are different books.

—What are those differences, Eliseo?

—*Human Sacrifices...*, from 2023, was a work on a certain primitive ritual, of a purely anthropological nature. In *SDRS* (2021), on the other hand, I developed the Christian mythological origins through a long perspective of ten millennia. It was an anthropological work, certainly, based on dialectical approaches, on the myth of the death and resurrection of the son of the Neolithic goddess or the ancient god. A work that, ultimately, required and necessarily led me to an interdisciplinary approach, which included ancient history and pre-Christian history, as well as the study of certain texts of Hellenistic mysticism.

In other words, it was a very broad, an eight hundred page work, starting from the Neolithic myth of the death and resurrection of a divine being, and concluding with the death and resurrection of the Jewish Jesus Christ created by the Church.

—And the new book, *The Christian Myth, According to the Texts*?

—Now, in this new book, I get straight to the heart of Christian mythical origins, straight to the point; therefore, the perspective is very different from SDRS. I approach the root and essence of the Christian myth from an analytical perspective, although not a radically formalist one, since I subject the analysis of the myth, or myths, as you prefer, to the evolutionary timeline that runs between the Jewish Wars of the Maccabees—two decades before the fall of Carthage—and the theology of Irenaeus of Lyons as embodied in his *Adversus Haereses*—the years between the emperors Commodus and Septimius Severus, between 180 and 200. In SDRS, there was an interdisciplinary approach that started from anthropological foundations and continued with ancient and Hellenistic history and the study of early Christian texts. In "The Christian Myth," however, I have dispensed with history in favor of the primacy of the Texts, ordered chronologically, of course, because I understand that proto-Christianity, from a historical perspective, is nothing more than a

vacuum that leads only to a dead end. I do, however, present an interdisciplinary basis represented by anthropology, more specifically by mythology, and, of course, by the history of ideas, by textual criticism, and by literary criticism.

—Is there, therefore, no history of nascent Christianity in the sense that we have been taught in school and university?

—No... Of course not. And this for a simple reason. Because making history with scientific pretensions of an ideological fable is a fraud and a task worthy of the naive or the insane. This useless exercise, as I say, leads down a dead end that takes us nowhere. It's something similar to what happens with what they call "the historical Jesus," which I consider an absurd and incoherent proposition, devoid of any foundation, and which, truthfully speaking, leads us nowhere. Another issue, of course, is the faith of devout people, which I respect; or the beliefs and superstitions passed down within the family clan and all those subjectivities intertwined with the tribal ties of affection and blood.

—Eliseo, if you don't mind, I'd like to leave that whole 'historical Jesus' thing for last, as we agreed, since I think there are many other, more serious and important things we should talk about first.

—Perfect, Celia, but keep in mind that "The History of the Origins of

Christianity" in my book is a point of arrival. It's something like the end of a journey, and never a point of departure based on prejudices and preconceived ideas from the Church.

—However, all academic and non-denominational studies on the subject, non-ecclesiastical, in short, are always presented as historical research.

—Yes, indeed, that is what happens... And perhaps that is why studies on Christian origins have made so little progress. And it's not that they haven't made progress; it's that I find in the second half of the twentieth century a considerable setback compared to the previous research of the great scholars of the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. The Loisy, the Boussets, the Bultmanns... Fortunately, in this century things seem to be changing... And I think I make myself clear. I repeat, so that you and your readers understand perfectly, that it is difficult to create History, with a capital H, with the materials of the apostolic fable created by the Church at the end of the second century and based on the *Acts of the Apostles*. All these supposedly historical works, which are nothing more than rehashes of other works (glosses of glosses), based on what I call "ecclesiastical textual self-referentiality," strictly speaking, invariably lead to that dark alley I'm talking about. And be very careful with the other extreme as well...

Because, on the other hand, we cannot abandon the axiomatic prejudices of the churches to replace them with the prejudices of militant atheism.

The history of Christian origins must be the end of the journey, never the point of departure.

—You have declared yourself an atheist on countless occasions.

—Yes, that's true, but I don't consider myself a militant atheist. My atheism is more of an "essential" or "essentialist" order, in line with the Philosophical Materialism of the Oviedo School, created by Gustavo Bueno.

—I underline and reiterate, so our readers can take note: anthropology-mythology, literary criticism, and textual criticism. These are the disciplines that "The Christian Myth" focuses on. And pre-Christian and Christian texts, of course, as the basis for any possible interpretation. Isn't that right?

—Correct. You've summarized it perfectly.

—Well, after these general considerations, we are ready to begin our journey. Away from history, but located within that "diachronic line" you establish between the Maccabees and Irenaeus of Lyons and the multiple Christianities, tell us what the starting points of this work are. The reason for the title!

—First, myth, myths and their

evolution, along with the history of ideas, and, primarily, the religious interpretations of Platonism throughout the Hellenistic period. Second, the philosophy of Philo of Alexandria, and, finally, the first apostolic theology, shaped by Irenaeus of Lyons. All of this is concretized, of course, through the structure of meaning offered to us by the texts. So, once all this is processed, we will find three founding myths of the different original “Christianities.” The first—in order of appearance in the texts—and the most important, is the one that defines the essence and genuine origin of these primitive Christianities. This is the Platonic Orphic myth, of Hellenistic origin and Greek provenance, of the incarnation of divinity in the human soul. This theme of divine incarnation in the soul is explicitly reflected in the theology of Philo of Alexandria. Then, surprisingly, we find a myth that is at the ideological antipodes of the previous one: the myth of the presence in the world of the judge-savior, also of Hellenistic origin and Persian origin. And finally, in the Pauline letters, we find, alongside the fusion of the two previous ones, the myth of the death and resurrection of divinity, also of Hellenistic origin and ubiquitous origin; and which I developed in *Sacrifice and Drama of the Sacred King*. Here, to continue using its metaphor, is the authentic guide for our journey.

—You’ve surprised me with your proposal, honestly... Seeing the cover and the title of the book, we all thought you were referring to the falsehood or unreality of Christianity; that you were alluding, in short, to that “ecclesiastical fable” you speak of.

—No, not at all... Christianity was — and still is — something profoundly true and real, historically evident and verifiable. It emerges right there, with a clear and undeniable presence. And the same is true of the figure of Jesus Christ. This is something no one can doubt, since the role of both in the medieval and modern history of the West has been essential, all-encompassing, and fundamental. Keep in mind that if Dionysus Zagreus prefigured the spiritual destiny and anthropology of Hellas; if Buddha determined the fate of the Far East, Jesus Christ prefigured the future of all Western culture without any other figure to compete with him, not even the Father.

—So, how do we understand the word “myth” that precedes the term “Christian” in the title of your work?

—This is very important, and I think it’s very appropriate that you emphasize and insist on it, so that potential readers know what I mean when I talk about “Christian myth.” And I explain this clearly in the introduction... I’m referring to the vision that anthropo-

logy, since Tylor and Malinowski, has of myths and mythology. A perspective that doesn't refer to the false or unreal, which, to avoid confusion, I call "fable," "fabulation," or "legend." The meaning of myth I'm referring to is the meaning proper to anthropology and mythology as a science. That is, a narrative or oral or written discourse that, when read literally, appears to be mere fiction, but which, on closer inspection, expresses decisive and true propositions. That is to say, it is a prelogical discourse, but one that comes much later than magical thought, which, in the ancient world, led to a foundation of reality and which, on many occasions, became the basis of societal behavior. These are seemingly inconsequential and fictitious stories with a timeless script starring heroes, gods, or demigods, tales for children and old women that, nevertheless, express very profound "truths." In this sense, and answering your question, "the Christian myth" is the myth of Dionysus Zagreus from the religion of Orpheus, whose children's story of his adventures with the Titans expressed the depth of Greek anthropological dualism: the soul and the body as separate entities, and the incarnation of the Child God himself in the human soul.

—And this, in your opinion, summarizes the complexity of Christian origins?

—No, of course... It's a first step, since

everything is much more complicated and convoluted... Alongside this religious thought of late Orphism, in which Hellenized Hebrews of Samaria, Hellenistic Jews of the Decapolis and Alexandria, and Greeks of Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, etc. participated—and which gave rise to the early Christian gnosis, of an individual nature and centered on Joshua-Jesus—there developed, within the intertestamental apocryphal literature of certain Hellenized Jews, what we can summarize as ideology, mythology, and apocalyptic literature. In these apocalyptic texts of Hellenized Jews, and in the style of the Persian canons spread throughout the Middle East after Alexander's conquests, the Judge-Savior—the Son of Man, generally identified with the heavenly Anointed One, Christ—descended to earth to judge and save the collective of the righteous, the chosen, or the blessed.

However, it must be borne in mind that both were two independent, separate, and radically different movements, which, unnaturally, appeared amalgamated and fused in the Pauline letters. In them, the Joshua-Jesus of early Christian gnosis and the Christ of the intertestamental apocalyptic apocrypha became the exclusive figure of Jesus-Christ—or Christ-Jesus—with his soteriological power defined through the mystery myth of the death and resurrection of divinity; an allegory

of the revelation of the Savior in the subjective consciousness of the chosen. That is to say, what we find in the Pauline letters is a mystical synthesis that confirms the double origin of its textual and ideological antecedents (gnosis and apocalyptic), but which offers an inexplicable and strange meaning to its fusion, that I can only understand in terms of the sociology of power, or perhaps motivated by an ideology foreign to the mysticism resulting from the fusion: The restoration of primitive Israel, as they say out there? Who knows, Celia.

—Well, Eliseo, the time has come for you to tell us what these texts are that predate the Pauline letters you are discussing. I think this is one of the most important aspects of your book.

—I think it's very appropriate that you asked me about the texts before delving deeper into this three-headed myth, or the three myths, that I'm developing. If we deduce from the texts the ideologies contained in them and the myths they convey, we'll have gained a lot of ground. This will prevent us from the risk of excessively formalizing ideas. However, I must not fail to comment that what we find is a chaos that is very difficult to formalize, to which we only find an evident meaning through the surprising fusion achieved in the Pauline letters. And I'll get to it... But if you think it's appropriate, and to ease the work of

whoever transcribes the recording, I can offer you a cheat sheet with a detailed summary of the classification of the texts, which, although certainly not numerous, must be referenced and organized with varied labeling.

—That seems perfect to me. I can place that text at the end of the interview, so that the reader can delve deeper into the matter, and everything will be more graphically organized. At the same time, it will be easier to read.

—Well, if it's okay with you, here I'll simply present a brief, schematic summary, to point out that the texts of early Christian gnosis, in which there is no death or resurrection of the Revealer, appear dominated by the figure of Joshua-Jesus. And, in a very different way, the apocryphal texts of intertestamental apocalyptic, in which there is no death or resurrection either, appear dominated by the figure of the heavenly Anointed One, Christ. Among the texts of early Christian Gnosis, I find the *Gospel of Thomas*, the early Samaritan text of the *Gospel of John*, the early text of the *Second Hymn of Philipians*, the *Odes of Solomon*, and the early text of the *Epistle to Diognetus*; with the exception that, in these last two texts, there are clear variations. In the *Odes*, written by highly Hellenized Jews, Jesus does not appear, but Christ. And in *Diognetus*, of Alexandrian character, the references to Jesus and Christ do not

appear. The agent of salvation here is the Son, presented as the Logos. On the other hand, among the texts of intertestamental apocalyptic, I include *1 Enoch*, *4 Esdras*, *2 Baruch*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, among many others.

—The truth is that the rejection of “the apostolic fable” and the “zero point of Christianity,” which you spoke of in *Sacrifice and Drama of the Sacred King* and now in *The Myth*, is made evident in everything you’re saying.

—Celia, it’s dizzying to immerse oneself in the dark night of Christian origins. In that dark alley, heterogeneity and difference are the norm. I’m speaking of the multilateralism and multiplicity from which any serious investigation that seeks to transform this chaos into a structure of meaning must begin. And all of this can be discovered and addressed not only from the anthropological-textual framework I’ve applied. This chaos, with the exception of history, is open to an infinite number of expectations and proposals... A mythological, ideological, textual, soteriological multiperspective; even a sociological multiperspective, which would be one that, beyond cultural contexts, would find different Christianities ascribed to different social groups; even, as has been said so often, to different cities.

—However, I have a doubt...

Regarding all this, there is something that is not entirely clear to me. If at the beginning of the first century there was no such thing as what you call “ground zero of Christianity,” which is what the Church describes based on what the Gospels tell us, what was the lever that activated the religion of Christians?

—With the exception of a Samaritan, Syrian, and Alexandrian gnosis, “the first of the heresies,” according to Irenaeus; and despite the evident presence of an apocalyptic mysticism of Hellenistic Judaism, there was nothing else in the first century, except for the long process of formation of the Pauline letters. It must be said clearly... There was no apostolic Christianity in the first century and a half AD. Nor were there any relevant historical events, either in Judea or in later Palestine. All that literature from the *Acts of the Apostles* is part of the construction of the fable of apostolic Christianity, created by the Church at the end of the second century. How was Christianity born before the Church?—if we can speak of “Christianity” as opposed to the Christianities of the time. What, in short, was the mechanism that activated the spring, which allowed for unified inter-Christian criteria? Based on the data and materials available to us, we must answer these questions:

were the Pauline letters, through their long and tortuous process of writing and editing, the literary elements that offered uniformity with the fusion of the two main ideological currents of that heterogeneous magma of the first century: gnosis and apocalyptic eschatology? But note, you and your readers, that, just as the Pauline letters relatively unified the heterogeneity of early Christianities, their complex and unnatural fusion of ideological, mythical, and mystical elements fostered a new rupture and continued disintegration among many other, more elaborate Christianities that, throughout the second century, proclaimed themselves followers of the figure of Paul. It should not be forgotten that before this figure was labeled by the bishops of the Church as "the apostle of the Gentiles," he had been known as "the apostle of the resurrection" and "the apostle of heretics." Tertullian of Carthage, in the early third century, continued to call Paul in this very way in his work *Against Marcion*: "the apostle of heretics."

—Well, Eliseo, I believe that with everything you've just shared, we're reaching the end of this interview — in which you committed to discussing the 'historical Jesus'; more specifically, as we've seen, the absence of the 'Jesus of history' in the earliest texts.

—As I mentioned in the forum

currently open on Academia.edu, in which you, by the way, also participate, this idealistic and abstract scholasticism that separates the "Jesus of history" and the "Christ of faith" hasn't just ceased to interest me over time. It's much worse; it bores me to death... Of course, you'll understand that my boredom is neither a very scientific nor a very convincing argument. But keep in mind that if it bores me to death, it's precisely because of its fallacious and ignorant arguments. This is a path that fails due to its absurd and unfounded approach, leading nowhere, as it presents a false and misguided problem that violates the most basic historical and textual methodology. A problem that is completely meaningless, artificially and fictitiously created, trapped in its own hermeneutical circularity and crying out for "the beginning." In other words, a senseless intuition, typical of people with little formation, if I may be clear. A superstitious prejudice, in short, that prevents the normal development of research into Christian origins.

Why separate the "Jesus of History" from the "Christ of faith" and not separate the "extraterrestrial Jesus" (*The Urantia Book*) from the "Christ of biblical theology," or why not separate the "Hindu Christ" (Raimon Panikkar) from the "Apostolic and Roman Jesus-Christ"? These are seemingly absurd questions, I know;

But, from the seriousness of humor, they place us before the mirror of the incoherence and the persevering, stubborn mendacity of many of the academics of our time. This separation leads us to an apotheotic begging of the question, which appears to be founded on nothing other than the ideology and prejudices of self-proclaimed scholars anchored in—I repeat for the umpteenth time—ecclesiastical textual self-referentiality. Based on the texts, undeniable and clear in their manifestations, we would be authorized, yes, to separate the Joshua-Jesus of early Christian gnosis and the Christ of the apocalyptic literature of early Christianity. But nothing more.

—And all this ideological construction derived from the Gospels?

—Everything else is the devious sleight of hand of deceitful gamblers or fraudulent magic tricks with which magicians deceive the audience by waving their hats and staffs. An ideological and religious construction derived from structures of domination and power... Beyond a possible purely Greek Chrestós, a Joshua-Jesus of the early Gnostic texts, of Platonic inspiration, and the Hellenistic Christós of apocalyptic literature, there is absolutely nothing in the texts of Christian origins. For the rest, as I have commented in that Academia forum and you may have read, I am contributing to a theory of Christianity

in which “the man Jesus” does not appear anywhere. What I find is the Jesus-Christ “true god and man” of Irenaeus, and the Jesus of early Gnosis, as opposed to the heavenly Anointed One of apocalyptic literature. I insist and reiterate... In order to separate Jesus-Christ beyond the graphic nature of the script, and based on the undeniable reality of the texts, I distinguish between the Joshua-Jesus of early Christian gnosis (a spiritual figure) and the heavenly Christ, or Anointed of God, (another spiritual figure) of apocalyptic literature with a Hellenistic basis. These two figures were amalgamated in the Pauline letters through the double formula “Jesus Christ,” and this Pauline figure, Gnostic and apocalyptic, was enshrined in the theology of Irenaeus with his “True God and True Man.”

—Thank you very much. As we agreed, we will prepare a preliminary summary of the interview to publish on the Academia.edu forum. And in mid-August, we will edit and publish the full interview.

— It is what was agreed... Thank you for your interest.

© **Celia Erdozain.**

Sociologist and professor.
(For Messidor Comunicación and Deepomatic R.).
Transcription and editing:
Mara Durán.