



[HOME PAGE](#) | [PROEMIUM TO THE STUDY](#) | [PROFILE AND CONTACTS](#)

[LANGUAGES](#)  

The great lie of the gospels: Jesus and the Apostles did not know their homeland

Through the analyses published thusfar we have stated again and again that the Christian scribes, authors of the Gospels, were not of Jewish extraction and never bothered to verify whether the localities, cities and places of worship recalled in their writings truly existed in the first century: the time of the ministry of Christ and of his Apostles. We have already seen this in the previous study regarding the city of Nazareth, which according to the Gospels was "[built on the brow of the hill](#)" (Lk 4, 29) and east of Lake Tiberias, while present-day Nazareth is located in a valley west of the lake.

In the sixth study we verified that **the codexes of the current Gospels were drawn up after 381 A.D.** but, in these, we found many errors; in fact, the description of the holy places - where the protagonists of first century "primitive Christianity" carried out their mission - is in compatible with the ancient reality brought to light by archeology, toponymy and orography, thus making unlikely the astonishing deeds of the heroes who are said to have ginning of the fourth century), the Christians, thanks to Eusebius of Caesarea, consulted the imperial library of Constantine in Nicomedia and wrote the first canonical holy texts on the basis of the doctrine popular at this time, therefore different from the Gospels written thereafter. But the scribes of Eusebius were unabwitnessed the advent of the Jewish Saviour in their land. Even prior to 381 (at the bele to verify all the original names of the sites (especially with regard to the lesser known Palestinian localities), nor were they capable of foreseeing the later archeological discoveries. In addition, the problem of Jewish typonomy was underestimated even by the authors of the subsequent Greek codexes (like the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus), manuscripts which were drawn up at roughly the same time as the Latin Vulgata of Saint Jerome; all of these were given to the Bishops of the Provinces of the Roman Empire at the beginning of the fifth century.

As the centuries passed, the powerful Catholic clergy identified the mistakes in the divine scriptures, so serious as to undermine the credibility of the doctrine of "eternal salvation". Therefore, every time a contradiction was discovered, the problem was solved through the aid of the scribes of God; although unable to modify the bible which by this time had spread throughout the former Roman Empire, they invented special "Commentarii" of the canonical Gospels in order to "clarify" the passages object of theological controversies and those in contrast with history and geography.

It is foregone that all the "Commentarii" were opportunely predated so as to make it appear that every contradiction contained in the New Testament documentation had already been "explained" and solved from the very moment of Christ's Advent.

The subtle minds of the Clergy have always behaved in this manner, but it is no longer possible to handwrite new Codexes; as a result, rather than have naive age-old calligraphers draw up new writings, the Church prefers to have titled ecclesiastical teachers to further "reinterpret" the ancient "Biblical Commentarii" through the aid of "lessons". Let's see how.

Bethany, Bethsaida, Gerasa, Gadara, Gergesa, Arimathea, Capernaum: the holy deception

Bethany

*"This happened at **Bethany**, on the far side of the Jordan, where **John was baptising**. The next day, he saw Jesus coming towards him and said, «Look, there is the lamb of God»" (Jh 1,28-29);
"All Judea and all the people of Jerusalem made their way to him, and they were baptised by him in the river Jordan" (Mk 1,5).*

Therefore Jesus met John the Baptist in Bethany "[where he was baptising](#)" in the Jordan. Unfortunately, for the evangelists (and for today's believers) the only Bethany which existed in Judea was located (and still is) less than four kilometers from Jerusalem, not "on the far side" but "on this side of the Jordan", or rather "over forty kilometers on this side of the Jordan" (the distance was measured in "stadia"). This "mess" was made by the evangelist of God, John the Apostle, a Jew who should have been aware of the places where he carried out his miracles, and who, accordino to ecclesiastical history, lived until 104 A.D. and often in Jerusalem. Considering that the three Gospels clearly attest that Jesus went to John the Baptist, immediately had himself baptized in the Jordan and then began his divine ministry; inevitably, the fact that the Gospel of John has the Jordan flow through Bethany (1,28) demonstrates that the Christian scribe of this narration had never visited this city, thus casting a dark shadow on the credibility of Christ ...

While still young, John - being a faithful "disciple who Jesus loved" - followed his Teacher when he visited the Holy City in order to be hailed as "King of the Jews".

At this time, in Jerusalem, the best-loved John spent forty days awaiting the Holy Spirit after the Ascension into heaven of the risen; afterwards, along with other fellow Apostles, he went to the Temple to heal crowds from any sickness at the inexistent "Portico of Solomon" (Acts 5,12) ... the same portico (destroyed by the Romans in 4 B.C. and never rebuilt; cfr Ant. XVII 262 and XX 222) under which the Apostle John sent his Teacher to meditate (Jh 10,23).

But, for the grey eminences of the Clergy, the problems do not finish here. In Bethany, near Jerusalem, the Jewish "favourite disciple" - through the hands of Mary Magdalene - had His Messiah undergo an incredible pre-burial foot lubrication (Jn 12,3), on the basis of rituals different from those of the other Gospels; John goes as far as to condemn to "damnatio memoriae" Saint Mary of Magdala, who resided in Bethany along with her brother Lazarus. An unction which, in the immediate sequence of the evangelical account, is targeted at the triumphal entry in Jerusalem of an authentic Jewish Messiah and King, and as such acclaimed by the crowds as "*King of Israel*" (Jh 12,13). In Bethany Jesus carried out the prodigious resurrection of his friend Lazarus, buried in the sepulchre four days earlier and already decomposing: "*Lazarus, come out!*" (Jh 11,43). A resurrection narrated only in the Gospel of John which certifies the notoriety of the miracle in Jerusalem and in the surrounding area ... thus convincing the High Priests to decree the re-execution of the re-surrected Lazarus (Jh 12,9-11). A wonder hailed by practicing humanity... yet unknown to the other evangelists. On the contrary, the three synoptic Gospels refer to another resurrection, that of the "daughter of Jair", unknown to the evangelist John. The indoctrinators fail to document this information to the devout masses.

After becoming aware of the evangelical oversight (which brought about the consequences described above), the scribes of God - in order to hide the fact that they themselves were the true artificers - with a delay of a millenium decided to "bring forward" the explanation of the holy "misunderstanding" through the intervention of no less than Origen Adamantius, the great Christian apologist of the third century. It was at this time that the scribes drew up the "**Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis**", pseudoepigraphical text (under false name) apparently narrated by Origen himself. It can be found in the "**Codex Monacensis Gr 314**", paleographically dated to the thirteenth century; it was followed by a "Commentarii" copied into the fourteenth century "**Codex Venetus 43**" and, later on, into four subsequent codexes.

Let's read what Origen is said to have affirmed.

Origenes. "Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis" - XL -

*"I am well aware that the lesson of **almost** (?) all the manuscripts is: "This happened in **Bephany** (?) we are aware and [this **substitution**] seems (?) to have happened some time ago because we already read Bephany in Heracleon (?). But I am also just as convinced that the exact **lesson** (?) is not Bethany but **Bethabara** as I have visited these places in order to reconstruct the itinerary of Jesus, his disciples and prophets. **Bethany** in fact, the homeland of Lazarus, of Martha and of Mary, is fifteen stadia away from Jerusalem ("less than two miles", Jh 11,18), as attested by the evangelist himself, and the distance separating it from the River Jordan is equal to one hundred and eighty stadia. Nor is there in the surroundings another locality bearing this name. While instead it is said (by whom?) that on the banks of this river can be found **Bethabara** where it is narrated that John baptized".*

After verifying that "Bethabara" was the toponym of the locality closest to the hypothetical spot in which John the Baptist is said to have practiced the initiation rite, the thirteenth century scribes of God had Origen make false declarations one thousand years after his death. As if it were a "lesson" they even had him visit "*these places in order to reconstruct the itinerary of Jesus, of his disciples and prophets*" and cite an ignorant "**Heracleon**" (a second century gnostic father), well aware that no Gospel existed, whose task it was to "bring forward" obscure "testimonies" through the hypocritical "primitive Bephany lesson".

A useless toil which the grey eminences of the Byzantine Church had already embarked on after the end of the Roman Empire (fifth and sixth century). The Churchmen built, in several areas adjacent to the Jordan, Sanctuaries containing cisterns and plumbing needed to feed the baptismal font of John the baptist ... and by doing so inevitably created further lies. In fact, as these buildings were scattered in localities* having names different from those found in the "Bethabara lesson", this **demonstrates that the Church of that time did not know where Jesus was baptized.**

*The sites identified are: Saphsaphas, Ainon, al-Maghtas, Tell Mar Elias, Tel al-Karrar and Ain Karim. The latter, located to the west of Jerusalem, dating back to the seventh century, was discovered in 2004 by archaeologist Shimon Gibson.

The subtle Byzantine minds, once understanding that the geographically disparate locations of the baptismal structures of Christ built by monks were proof of their falsehood, abandoned them one after another. Today in fact, in order to avoid archeological contradictions, the exegetical spiritualists have taken the evangelists' place and claim that the Baptist lived in a "hole", "discovered" by the former of course. But where? ... Here is the solution.

In spite of the "ancient fiascos", the Churchmen belonging to "Studium Biblicum Franciscanum" - in order to fool the blessed who are poor in spirit - take action: the top-of-the-range is called in to defeat the Devil who managed to deceive the naive "disciple who Jesus loved".

The friars are aware that the statements attributed to Origen did not eliminate the diabolical Bethany "trap" but just made matters worse. Therefore? They relaunch the "big bluff". In addition to Origen, they have others offer "testimony": Eusebius of Caesarea, Constantine the Great and the holy imperial family, all the Bishops from the Council of Nicea I and a series of pilgrims who, from the third century onwards, all went to Bethabara.

In order to strengthen their theory the friars cite the Onomasticon by Eusebius of Caesarea, a list of people's names and places links to the history of Christianity ... but they make no mention of the fact that the oldest manuscript of this work is the "**Codex The Vaticanus Gr 1456**" dating back to the **eleventh century.**

The infinite analysis was published by the "**Studium Biblicum Franciscanum**" on 6 March 2000 for the Grand International Catholic Jubilee and entitled "**The Sanctuary of Bethany on the Far Side of the River Jordan**" and was signed by the friar Michele Piccirillo. Aware of the upcoming Jubilee, friars had already inaugurated the "**Sanctuary of Bethany in Perea**" along with a related study in which we find the itineraries of the "Great Pilgrims of the Fourth Century" cited with meticulousness; yet, starting with Eusebius, **no handwritten Codex dating back prior to the Monacensis Gr 314 makes mention of "Bethabara".**

No Father, Bishop or Doctor of the Church, at least until the end of the fourth century (by this date the Gospels had been written in Greek and were then translated into Latin at the beginning of the fifth century), had ever heard about the "sanctuary of Bethabara" nor the "sanctuary of Bethany", both "on this side" and on the "the far side" of the Jordan.

The reason is very simple and we have already mentioned it: **the Gospels that we read were written after the Council of Constantinople of 381 A.D.** As a result - even if we went as far as to absurdly affirm that Eusebius, Emperor Constantine and the Bishops of the Fourth Century had all known about "Bethabara" ... in the hundreds of ancient biblical Codexes we would have found written "**Bethabara**" rather than "Bethany". And not only in the Gospel of John, but **in all the canonical Gospels which cite the Baptist** and, dulcis in fundo, **in all the "Commentarii" of the Gospels** - written by Fathers, Bishops and Doctors of the Church - we would have found the same identical, **stupid and false lesson: "Bethabara".**

Eight centuries ago the scribes of God lied by writing the commentary in the name of Origen; but even today the franciscans, driven by an "overabundance of Christian charity" stimulated by the Grand Jubilee of 2000 A.D., have made another attempt, convinced that no one would have bothered to verify whether the countless quotations mentioned (in order to impress the naive) were true. A hypocritical charity which aims at modifying the evangelical findings through the **duplication of Bethany**, which was moved "*motu proprio*" over 40 km into the region of Perea and placed in a "hole" "on the far side of the Jordan" ... et voilà! Problem solved: here is Bethabara! After which ... Parish Priests, Popes,

Pastors, Reverends, Fathers and Ministers of God, all focused on indoctrinating others and well-coordinated with Tour Operators in order to guarantee "widespread happiness", organize convoys of pilgrims (unaware of the Gospels) headed towards the false "second Bethany in Perea", where in the vicinity of the "hole" there "bodies" are lowered into the River Jordan ... with the promise of eternal life. For the pilgrims and believers, who do not read the holy texts, here are the passages of the Gospel of John regarding Bethany and the location of the ancient city (which still **exists today**), mentioned along with precise distances:

"This happened at **Bethany, on the far side of the Jordan, where John was baptising. The next day he saw Jesus coming towards him and said...**" (Jh 1,28-29); **Bethany is only a about two miles from Jerusalem**" (Jh 11,18).

Bethany, where John was baptising, was near Jerusalem, therefore **more than thirty Roman miles** (40 km) **away from the Jordan**: in other words, the only true **Bethany** is the one which today is located in **the vicinity of Jerusalem** ... of course **without the Jordan**.

Following the scheme of the falsification carried out by the ancient Fathers of the Church with regard to the toponym "Gamala" disguised by "Nazareth" (see previous study), the shrewd clergymen - well aware that the two quotations of the Gospel of John prevent any possible speculation and convinced that the world is full of naive people - through a straining of the truth have reinterpreted the passage, written clearly in the Bible, and have demonstrated to everyone their desire to sidetrack those who wish to know the truth.

A deontological duty belonging mainly to those who, by profession, teach religion in schools.

Therefore, we believe it to be our duty to highlight the improper "technique" of indoctrination of young students, disguised behind harmless "educational goals". Click on:

Bethabara - Il Battesimo di Gesù -
Maria Grazia Montuolo
Istituto Comprensivo G. Micali - Livorno -
Anno scolastico 2008 - 2009

After reading the Gospel of John and aware of the negative repercussions on the propagation of faith, the religion teacher Maria Grazia Montuolo assessed the devastating effects caused by the incredible miracles attributed to Jesus Christ in a Bethany which the evangelist erroneously placed "on the far side" of the Jordan; she published a very long, complicated study on the "Baptism of Jesus" along the lines of the one written by the above-mentioned friars. Like the franciscans, Montuolo has passed her analysis off as truthful and has "fed" it to students in the schools where she has taught without verifying beforehand whether **the ideological content aimed at modifying the evangelical findings** is based on correct documentation, with regard to both the quotations and the ancient archeological and historical evidence. It is not by chance, in fact, that in her long study the teacher avoids any reference to **Eusebius** of Caesarea's "**Historia Ecclesiastica**" (subject which she is an expert on), where it is attested that, **unlike what is attested in the Gospels**, John the Baptist was eliminated by Herod Antipas in 36 A.D., that is to say **many years after** Jesus's death:

"Herod Tetrarch married Herodiade, the wife of his brother, after repudiating his first wife who he had married according to the laws (she was the daughter of Aretas, King of Petrea) after separating Herodiade from her husband, who was still alive. And as a result of this woman he had John the Baptist executed and waged war on Aretas, whose daughter he had dishonored" (op. cit. I 11,1).

It is evident that the causes of the war produced immediate effects, and history confirms that Aretas IV opened the conflict against Herod Antipas in the summer of 36 A.D.

In addition, in Josephus's "Jewish Antiquities" we see that John the Baptist, when alive, worked in Galilee, not in Bethabara (according to the friars in Perea), as the latter was located in the desert and therefore had no listeners:

"When the people came in crowds about John the Baptist, for they were very very greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod (Antipas), who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion, thought it best by putting him to death ... Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, the castle in Perea ... and was there put to death. Now the Jews had an opinion that the destruction of this army was a vendetta of John and sent as a punishment upon Herod, and a mark of God's displeasure to him" (Ant. XVIII 118/9).

The Baptist was brought to Macherus **after** stirring up the people. The territories under the jurisdiction of the Tetrarch Herod Antipas were Galilee and **Perea**, but it is important to remember that the latter **was in the desert while Galilee was crowded** and its inhabitants belonging to the the most extremist and revolutionary anti-Roman Jewish faction.

For the reasons expressed above, there is clear evidence of the improper employment of religion teachers whose institutional duty cannot be that of preventing both the history of Christianity and the Gospel itself from becoming known, going as far as to alter the true information contained in this writing. As a result, it is simple to understand the *modus operandi* of the Italian religion teacher is shared by all religion teachers, all of whom coordinate their efforts in respect of the supreme interests of the Church, which adopted a similar strategy in the subsequent, compromising evangelical passages.

Bethsaida

In the "live" chronicle concerning the ministry of Christ we learn:

*"These approached **Philip**, who came from **Bethsaida in Galilee** ..." (Jh 12,21);*

*"The next day, after Jesus had decided to leave for **Galilee**, he met Philip and said, «Follow me». **Philip came from the same town, Bethsaida, as Andrew and Peter**" (Jh 1,43-44).*

"Bethsaida" (Aramaic name meaning "house of hunting") was an ancient village located at the northernmost end of Lake Tiberias (or Gennesaret). It was mentioned by **Josephus** after it was enlarged, fortified and elevated to the rank of city (polis) by the Tetrarch Philip (son of Herod the Great):

"Philip enlarged Panea, the city near the source of the Jordan and called it Caesarea; and the area of Bethsaida on the Lake of Gennesaret was elevated to the rank of city, its inhabitants increased in number and its fortifications were strengthened, and it was named Julia, after the daughter of Caesar" (Ant. XVIII 28);

also mentioned by the Jewish historian in "The Jewish War":

"When, upon the death of Augustus, who had reigned for fifty seven years, six months and two days, the Empire of the Romans passed into the hands of Tiberius, son of Julia (no: son of Livia Drusilla), the Tetrarchies remained in the possession of Herod and Philip. The latter founded a city by the name of Caesarea at the source of the Jordan in the

region of Pnias, and another city by the name of **Julia in lower Gaulanitis**" (Bellum II 168;ib. cfr III 56);
"the Jordan ... **beyond the city of Julia, flows into Lake Gennesar**" (Bellum III 515).

After enlarging Bethsaida Philip inaugurated the new city under Tiberius and called it "**Julia**" in honour of Julia, **daughter** (Ant. XVIII 28) of Emperor Caesar Augustus, and in the latter's memory for having given him the territories after the death of Herod the Great.

Having identified the precise location of first century Bethsaida, we are able to verify the oversights "dictated" by God to the naive Christian scribes. In fact, unlike what is stated in the evangelical testimonies, **Bethsaida did not belong administratively to Galilee** (under Herod the Tetrarch) **but to Trachonitis** (Ant. XVII 319; Bellum II 95); as seen in the correct historical quotations confirmed by archeology, the city was located in lower Gaulanitis, due east of the Jordan, near the point in which the river even today flows into Lake Tiberias. But **Galilee was west of the Jordan** ... so this is where the problems start for the wonders described in the holy scriptures:

*"They came to **Bethsaida**, and some people brought to him a blind man whom they begged him to touch. He took the blind man by the hand ... he was cured and he could see everything plainly and distinctly"* (Mk 8,22-25);
"And he immediately constrained his disciples to enter the ship and go before him to the other side of Bethsaida ... and he came towards them, walking on the sea" (Codex Sinaiticus: Mk 6,45-48).
*"Then he took them with him and withdrew towards a **town** called **Bethsaida**. But **the crowds** got to know and they went after him..."* (Lk 9,10-11).

The passage from Luke continues and describes the spectacular miracle of the "multiplication of the loaves and fish":

"...Then he took the five loaves and the two fish , raised his eyes to heaven, and said the blessing over them; then he broke them, and handed them to his disciples to distribute among the crowd. They all ate as much as they wanted ..." (Lk 9,16).

This is the prodigy which the evangelists refer to as Christ, he who two milleniums ago fed thousands of his believers - men, women and children; this miracle is described in detail in all the Gospels ... but in none of these do the evangelists, starting with Luke, realize that **"the crowd" had to cross the River Jordan** to go from Bethsaida to the locality on the west side of the river, in Galilee, where the multiplication of the loaves took place.

If the evangelist John, who was a native of Bethsaida, **had truly existed, he would never have made such a mistake** because the Jordan flowed near his own house. And there is more. **Saint Hieronymus** in the biography of the Apostle contained in "**De viris illustribus**" (Chap IX) he writes:

*"John, after reading the volumes (scrolls of the Gospels) of **Matthew, Mark, and Luke** certainly approved the text of their narration, underlining **their total truth**".*

The lack of knowledge of the places in which Jesus and the Apostles lived is even demonstrated by the Doctor of the Church when, at the beginning of the fifth century, he personally translated from Greek into Latin the famous Vulgate Bible. In fact, the "total truth" mentioned by Jerome is disavowed by the lack of knowledge of the land of Christ, starting from John, who should have taught his fellow Apostles - **Peter, Andrew and Philip** - like him **all born in Bethsaida, that this city was in Gaulanitis, not in "Galilee"**, as affirmed in the Gospel (Jh 1,44).

As a result of the contrasts highlighted above, we can confirm what has already been demonstrated in the previous studies: **neither the Apostle nor the evangelists ever existed**. Instead, the Christian scribes who attested the imaginative events four centuries later did truly exist, and they craftily passed themselves off as first century Jews and followers of the "Saviour" in order to make the lies they were inventing seem truthful ... so as to deceive people through the promise of eternal life.

As in the case of Bethany, the locality in which the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fish took place was deliberately chosen in Galilee during the Byzantine period, after the break-up of the Roman Empire: it was called "Tabgha" and here a Sanctuary was built, later abandoned but identified the beginning of the twentieth century. Through the construction of a Sanctuary (with beautiful mosaics) in Galilee, in Tabgha, on Lake Tiberias, indicated as the place where the miracle of the loaves and fish took place, the High Byzantine Clergy wished to "show" the whole world the precise point in which the great event had taken place ... without understanding the grave incompatibility with the Gospel of Luke (Lk 9,10-17), thus forcing the large crowd (gathered in the parable) to cross the holy river in order to travel from Bethsaida to Tabgha. All this happened without Jesus having carried out any miracle prior to the one of the loaves, so as to allow River Jordan to open up and permit the crowds to cross it, as done by his namesake "Joshua" (Yehoshua) when the latter allowed the Israelites (including the Arch of the Alliance) to go beyond the biblical tributary of Lake "Kinnereth" (later "Genesareth" and finally "Tiberias") ... or fall back on the less spectacular, but simpler, miracle in order to allow the multitudes of believers to **"walk on the water"** like He did (... like Mk 6,48).

But the height of the contradiction can be found in the **Gospel of John**. The favourite Apostle has the miracle of the loaves and fish take place upon a mountain, **east of Lake Tiberias** not west, on the bank opposite Capernaum ... **rather than in the bogus "Tabgha"**, venerated by both Byzantine Orthodox and Roman Catholics:

"After this, Jesus crossed the Sea of Galilee - or of Tiberias - and a large crowd followed him ... Jesus climbed the hillside ... Jesus saw the crowds approaching" (Jh 6,3-5) ... "As many as five thousand men sat down. Then Jesus took the loaves, gave thanks, and distributed them to those who were sitting there; he then did the same with the fish, distributing as much as they wanted" (Jh 6,10-11) ... "That evening the disciples went down to the shore of the sea and got into a boat to make for Capernaum on the other side of the sea." (Jh 6,16-17)

Since Capernaum was located West of the lake of Tiberias (where it presently is), the miracle of loaves and fish took place on a mountain situated on the opposite shore of Capernaum, East of the lake.

*"Next day, **the crowd that had stayed on the other side** (still **East** of the lake) saw that only one boat had been there, and that Jesus had not got into the boat with his disciples, but that the disciples had set off by themselves. Other boats, however **had put in from Tiberias** (located **West** of the lake), **near the place where the bread had been eaten** (again **East** of the lake, the opposite shore). When the people saw that neither Jesus nor his disciples were there (**East**) , **they got into the boat and crossed to Capernaum** (**West** of lake) to look for Jesus. When they found him on the other side (thus, **West** of lake) they said to him, «Rabbi, when did you come here?»* (Jh 6,22-25).

Today the Church - so embarrassed by the contradictions generated as a result of a Bethsaida located east of the Jordan rather than west in the region of Galilee - has chosen to distance itself from this city ... on its tip toes. In fact, all you need to do is go onto Internet and click on "Cathopedia" and type in "multiplication of the loaves and fish" in order to read elusive comments like: "symbolic meaning", "Messianic fame". "New Testament accomplishment", "direct terms", "broad and prophetic terms" ... as long as no mention is made of Bethsaida, let alone the miracle of loaves and fish. The only thing missing is the final and mandatory statement needed to avoid any fastidious misunderstanding: "Any reference to people or to events which never occurred is purely incidental" ...

In Parishes, as in the Christian Scismatic Churches, it is a whole different story. Like in the case of Bethany: Parish Priests, Popes, Pastors, Ministers, Fathers, Mothers, Sisters, Reverends and all those interested in indoctrinating others, well-coordinated with Tour Operators, organize caravans of pilgrims who are in the midst of a total mystical crisis; yet they are all careful not to follow Luke's teaching which has crowds swim across the Jordan from Bethsaida to Tabgha.

Gerasa and Gadara: where Jesus exorcized the demons

*"They came to land in the territory of the **Gerasenes**, which is opposite **Galilee**. He was stepping ashore when a man from the **city** who was possessed by devils came towards him ... Catching sight of Jesus he gave a shout, fell at his feet and cried out at the top of his voice, «What do you want with me Jesus, son of the Most High God? I implore you, do not torture me.» ... Jesus asked him, «What is your name?» ... He said, «Legion» - because many devils had gone into him. And these begged him not to order them to depart into the Abyss. Now there was a large herd of pigs feeding there on the mountain, and the devils begged him to let them go into these. So he gave them leave. The devils came out of the man and went into the pigs, and **the herd charged down the cliff into the lake and was drowned**" (Lk 8,26-33).*

The most famous exorcism in history - carried out by Christ against the demonic powers of darkness - is described in a way which is colourful but adolescent, obscurantist and medieval, intended for the portion of humanity devoted to prayer: the only form of protection against Evil. In like manner in both Matthew and Mark:

*"When he reached the territory of the **Gadarenes** on the other side, two demoniacs came towards him out of the tombs..." (Mt 8,28-34);*

*"They reached the territory of the **Gerasenes** on the other side of the lake, and when Jesus disembarked, a man with an unclean spirit at once came out from the tombs towards him ... The Jesus asked, «What is your name?». He answered, «My name is Legion, for there are many of us» ... Now on the mountainside there was a great herd of pigs feeding ... The herd of about **two thousand** pigs charged down the cliff into the lake, and there they were drowned" (Mk 5,1-13).*

Wow! Through only one exorcism Jesus managed to eliminate two thousand devils which had entered two thousand pigs patiently waiting to be drowned in an impossible city called "Gerasa" - mistakenly located evangelist on the shore of Lake Tiberias - to be drowned. As in the "Bethany case", when in the holy texts dictated by God divine mistakes were found, the scribes sought the help of "Commentarii". In the thirteenth century, the authors of "Codex Monacensi Gr 314" once again turned to Origen in order to solve the "Gerasa case" and the "Gadara case".

Josephus mentioned the ancient city of Gerasa which in 84 B.C. was conquered by the Jews led by Alexander Ianneus (Bellum I 104). After being conquered by Pompeus Magnus in 63 B.C., the city reached the peak of its splendour under Roman domination but ... **Gerasa is fifty kilometers south of Lake Tiberias** and twenty kilometers east of the Jordan. At that time it was part of the region of Decapolis while its spectacular remains were, through the centuries, preserved intact beneath the sand.

Gadara, which is ten kilometers from Lake Tiberias, was mentioned several times by Josephus; in Bellum I 7,3-6 he described the revolt of the Jews of Gadara defeated by Vespasian in 68 A.D. It was a beautiful Greco-Roman city with theatres, thermal baths, a hippodrome and a mausoleum; it became part of Decapolis after being conquered by Pompeus, although never reaching the magnificence of Gerasa, also as a result of the fact that it became involved in the Jewish War.

We will now read about what the exegetical scribes did eight centuries ago in order to "save" the credibility of Jesus the exorcist who had the possessed pigs of **Gerasa** and **Gadara fall into an inexistent lake in the vicinity of the two cities**. It is once again Origen who spoke in "direct streaming" in the thirteenth century.

Origenes. "Commentarii in evangelium Ioannis" - XLI -

*"With regard to the fact that in Greek manuscripts scribes often make mistakes when copying down names, one could even be convinced by these cases which we find in the Gospels. The raising of pigs who fell down the cliff and drowned in the sea (lake) in the Gospels can be found in the region of the Gerasenes. Now, **Gerasa** is a city of Arabia and in the vicinity **has neither a sea nor a lake**. Nor could the evangelists have said such an evident and easily disavowable inexactitude, all the more so as they knew the regions around Judea perfectly. As in certain manuscripts we find «**In the region of the Gadarenes**» we must also demonstrate **the deceitfulness of this lesson**. **Gadara** is of course a city of Judea, but in its surrounding area there are famous thermal springs, **not a lake below a cliff nor a sea**".*

The scribes of God had a difficult problem to solve (let's say impossible), because they forced Origen's poor little ectoplasm to climb up onto the Old Testament; and while walking through it, from the time of Abraham onwards, he interviewed a series of Prophets in order to find localities with names similar to Gerasa and Gadara by means of a miraculous "lesson" ... but in vain. The holy pens of the late Middle Ages filled up many pages, which we will spare our readers as poor little Origen did not manage to solve the evangelical mistake. At the end of this string of names, Origen cut it short and arbitrarily chose the "Gergasa lesson".

*"But there is **Gergesa**, from which the Gergesenes take their name, an ancient city on the shores of what today is called Sea of Tiberias, which nearby has **a cliff overlooking this sea**: it is here, as is [still] pointed out, that the pigs were thrown down by the demons. The name Gergesa in fact means "house of those who have driven away": a name which perhaps contains a **prophetic allusion**." (ibid. XLI).*

Gerasa of the gospel passed off as "Gergesa"

Gergesa is a locality **unknown** to the evangelists, to Josephus and to the Old Testament. Inevitably, the straining of the name is incapable of replacing the lemmas "Gadara" and "Gerasa"; as a result, no archeologist (starting from those of the Vatican) dares make theirs the unsuccessful choice of "Gergesa", written into the "Origenian lesson" by the medieval scribes. **In fact, the city of Gergesa never existed.**

Even in this case the subtle minds of the Byzantine clergy - who became aware of the bad evangelical mistake even prior to the Roman clergy - identified a locality adjacent to the eastern shore of the lake with a few abandoned remains of an ancient Jewish fishing village and here built a monastery and an attached Church. The name of the locality is not "Gergesa" but "**Kursi**", but as we are dealing with an ancient Israelite settlement, there was the problem of the herd of two thousand pigs awaiting Jesus. Therefore the spiritual indoctrinators, in league with Tour Operators, "exorcize" the contrast with Jewish customs by stating that it are dealing with an ancient Pagan Roman village having a small port. Obviously, the clever indoctrinators do not go as far as to say that the Romans built the small harbour for their triremes used for fishing in the waters of Lake Gennesar, aware of the fact that when Pompeus Magnus conquered Palestine he deliberately did not have "Gergesa" built so as to spite the future evangelists.

The faithful pilgrims, convinced by catechizers that the Gospels speak about the exorcism in Gergesa (**rather than in Gerasa**), visit this locality (Kursi) in the hope of obtaining eternal life and immunity from the devil.

In conclusion, **neither Gerasa nor Gadara** - the cities mentioned in the holy text - are located on the shores of Lake

Tiberias; therefore a true Jewish Messianic God would have never "revealed" to his evangelists "good tales" with such mistakes. The same applies to His Apostles and evangelists; if they (who were supposed to be native Jews) had truly existed, they would never have witnessed the prodigies of their own Messianic King in the wrong places in their own homeland.

With the aim of correcting the gross error made in the New Testament, the Byzantine Primates chose a locality on the lake that could have corresponded to the Gospels and called it "Gergesa", aware that the Gergesites were an ancient pagan people that was driven away from their own land by Joshua. But, later on, even the ancient biblical name "Gergesites" was transformed into "Gergesenes" so as to prevent the correlation between the pigs "driven away" by Christ and the pagan Gergesenes "driven away" by Joshua from highlighting the ideological origin of the lemma; such a correlation would have demonstrated the solely doctrinal value of this lemma, different from that of the true toponym which, as we have seen, is "Kursi".

Nevertheless, indifferent to the evangelical findings referring to "**Gerasa**", the catechizers and Tour Operators, in compliance with Origen's ectoplasm, direct the "pilgrims" to "**Gergesa**": *a name with a prophetic allusion*.

Arimathea

*"And now a member of the **Council** arrived, a good and upright man named **Joseph**. He had not consented to what the others had planned and carried out. He came from **Arimathea**, a Jewish town, and he lived with the hope of seeing the kingdom of God" (Lk 23,50-51).*

Well! Here we are again ... The Christian scribes keep repeating the same mistake: an authentic Jewish witness would have been obliged to give both his first name and patronymic, so: "Joseph, son of (bar) ..."; in consideration of the fact that "Joseph" was one of the most common Jewish appellatives and, according to the Gospels, even an authoritative member of the Sanhedrin involved in handling Christ's body. But according to the evangelist (as we are about to verify) Joseph of Arimathea had the duty to carry out a task which was even more important from a doctrinal perspective. Joseph of Arimathea's fame was due to the fact that *"This man went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. The Pilate ordered it to be handed over"* (Mt 27,58). Isn't this something! The Governors would have never allowed a stranger to take the body of someone they had executed: only a relative could have made such a request for a funeral in order to prevent the body from being thrown into a common grave.

As a result, several exegetes, even those having faith, believe that Joseph of Arimathea was one Jesus's relative belonging to the first seventy disciples-apostles; therefore it is not by chance the Christians sanctified him, even if it is important to remember that "Joseph" (Mt 13,55) was in reality the name of one of Jesus's blood brothers (for the identification of Joseph, Jesus's youngest brother, we ask readers to refer to the fifteenth study).

In respect of Catholic doctrine the divine evangelists called in "Joseph of Arimathea" so as to prevent the putative father of the Messiah King, Saint Joseph the carpenter (who was never born and never died), to explain his own genealogy to Pilate; Pilate would have got flustered and also ended up on the cross for even donkeys know that the "Saint Joseph" of Luke and the "Saint Joseph" of Matthew had different fathers.

As a result the evangelists were aware that they could not have the Holy Spirit or the Archangel Gabriel claim the body of Christ King and Son of God. As a result of this impediment, the calculating Catholic scribes opportunely decided not to call in the Mother of God so as not to force the Blessed Virgin Mary to give an embarrassing explanation to the Roman Governor Pontius Pilate regarding the man to whom she was "betrothed" (Lk 1,27), man who was also the parent of the Christ just executed: in other words the "Holy Spirit". As a result, for the scribes of God it would have been obligatory to avoid running the risk of having the Blessed Mother beheaded by the inquisitor ... as no imperial governor would have allowed anyone to make fun of him by means of a "sanctified spirit". In addition, **the lack of an interrogation**, which would have been useful to Pilate in order to discover the name of the "Christ King", **not appointed by Tiberius**, and that of his father (mandatory for the Jews of the Sanhedrin and for the imperial governors whose duty it was to certify the acts of the hearings), demonstrates that the ludicrous trial was made up by people with no knowledge of Roman and Jewish Law.

Ultimately, the silence of the evangelist - who **could not force the Mother of God** "Teotòkos" (Mary) **to claim the dead body of the Son of the Holy Spirit** - demonstrates that **the Mother of Jesus Christ** (differently from the Council of Nicea of 325 A.D.) **was "conceived", along with Pontius Pilate**, by the Catholic doctrine sanctioned **in the Creed of the Council of Constantinople of 381 A.D.** This is further proof that the current Gospels were written after this date. In fact, for a Gospel drawn up prior to this Creed it would not have been a problem to have Jesus's dead body claimed by his mother, wife of a simple "Joseph, son of...".

Being that after Jesus's execution someone, in place of his relatives, had to be called in to take care of the God just sacrificed, the evangelist attached the name "Joseph" to a strange lemma passed off as the name of a city: **Arimathea**. The choice made by the evangelists at the end of the fourth century was unsuccessful and superficial, unable to foresee the future consequences of such a decision; unfortunately (for the faithful) the "city of Arimathea" never existed but was simply an invention of the Lucan scribe.

Aware of the fact that the devout masses were solely interested in the promise of eternal life, the theologists of Christianity, after exempting the Mother of Christ from the duty to ask Pilate for the dead body of the Saviour for his funeral, forgot about "Joseph of Arimathea" until the time of the Crusades in the Holy Land. Indeed, prior to the current Gospels **there is no reference to a "Joseph of Arimathea", starting from Eusebius of Caesarea. Saint Jerome also makes no mention of this "Joseph"** but, being that the most ancient codex of "**De viris illustribus**" ("The Illustrious Men") dates back to the end of the ninth century (**Codex MS "Q Neoeboracensis**), we can work out that at the time in which the scribes copied the text "Joseph of Arimathea" had yet to become "illustrious", let alone "beatified". Therefore it is no accident that the Eminences of the Byzantine Empire did not, from the very beginning, commemorate him in the numerous Sanctuaries built in honour of the "Holy Places" of the universal Saviour.

The "additional deeds" (prior to the biblical codexes dating back to the end of the fourth century) attributed to the Saint of Arimathea - not contemplated in the Gospels but mentioned by other "Saints", starting from Ireneus of Lyons - were all copied into **codexes dating back to the tenth century onwards**, therefore well after the time of Jerome's "De viris illustribus".

The search to find the city of Arimathea got underway at the time of the Crusades, when the Crusaders went to the Holy Land to free the Holy Sepulchre. It was then that the "comrades-in-arms" of Christ assessed the importance of the "buriers of God": Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. In the Crusaders inaugurated and concluded their search. Through a straining of the truth they identified the delightful city of Ramla as being the biblical "Ramathaim" (the birthplace of the prophet Samuel) and then assimilated the latter to the more Jesuit and Grecized "Arimathea".

The "fruits" of the Crusades - including the Holy Graal and the blood of Christ collected by Joseph of Arimathea - were inserted into the oldest manuscript which mentions their deeds in detail: the **Codex Ambrosianus Gr E 140**, paleographically dated to the **twelfth century**.

We are dealing with an apocryphal New Testament text cited as "Acts of Pilate" or "Gospel of Nicodemus", whose puerile and imaginative description is, today, disavowed by the Church itself ... but not in the Middle Ages.

Instead at that time the detailed story, glorified from the pulpits, uncorked numerous legends and was so successful that "Joseph of Arimatea" was beatified by Cardinal Baronio in 1585, that is to say 1500 years after his holy burial; and we all know that when the Church sends someone up into Heaven, well, there they remain ... otherwise their infallibility would cease. The logical consequence was that at that time caravans of pilgrims headed towards the Holy Land driven by a profound "spiritual need" prompted by the promise of eternal life. But the straining of the truth carried out by the Crusaders could not withstand the pressure of modern analyses; therefore, Rev. William F. Albright (famous archeologist and biblicist famous for his studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls) attempted to find a solution and half a century ago identified the city of Arimathea as being "Rainallah" (previously called "Rarnataim"). Yet not even the explanation given by the Reverend was convincing due to the lack of archeological support and, until the year 1998, any search for "Arimathea" proved to be unfruitful. That year, the gifted paleographer Luigi Moraldi completed his translation of "Jewish Antiquities" (UTET 1998), written in collaboration with Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini who allowed him to consult the Codexes of the Ambrosian Library. Moraldi very discretely, on page 787 note 29, makes reference to the Joseph of Arimathea of the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 27,57) and points out three Jewish localities standing for election to the "post" of "Arimathea": Ramathaim, Armathain and Ramath. The location of the city of Ramathaim, as in the case of the other two, offers no certainty due to the total lack of archeological evidence and Cathopedia is the first to keep away from the inexistent "city of Arimathea". As a result, no pilgrimages to any "Arimathea" are organized, but to make up for this "Joseph of Arimathea" is commemorated through a visit to the Holy Sepulchre.

In conclusion, if the favourite disciple John - a native of Bethsaida according to the Church and therefore a trueborn Jew - had truly existed, he would never have linked the name "Joseph" to an inexistent city in Judea called "Arimathea". The same goes for the other Apostles and evangelists passed off as Jews. In reality, Christian scribes with evangelical pseudonyms limited themselves to narrating tales set about four centuries prior to their lifetime in a faraway land which they knew little or nothing about; these men never visited Palestine nor did they verify beforehand the historiographical and geographical validity of the "truths" fed to the naive masses so as to justify the illusion of eternal life after death. The fact is that these "details" are never pointed out to the "blessed who are poor in spirit".

Capernaum: Jesus carries out a miracle in a Synagogue built over a century after his lifetime

The evangelists always turn to the "demon" for help due to the fact that the universal monotheistic doctrine had an absolute need for an "Entity" that could be blamed for all the evil afflicting humanity: "the Evil One". This evil force constitutes the Alibi of God, creator of Light and Life, but unable to prevent the woes which have always distressed mankind. The religious concept of catechizers is founded upon the interaction between "Good" and "Evil" so as to guarantee the subordination of the faithful masses who do not wish to go to hell and thus do not ask themselves: why did God, "the perfect Being, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth" ... create the "Evil One ... who, in turn, will become the cause of inevitable human suffering? Therefore the evangelists are bound to this demand of the doctrine, and repeatedly call in the Saviour in order to drive off the Demon but ... are careful not to eliminate him once and for all; otherwise, in the absence of an omnipresent Devil, the cause of all future evil would fall upon the Son and His Father. It is no coincidence that today's "exorcists" limit themselves to "driving off" the Demon because if they kept on going they would become unemployed ... just like Christ:

*"Jesus went down to **Capernaum**, a town in Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath...In the **Synagogue** there was a man possessed by the **spirit of an unclean devil**, and he shouted at the top of his voice, «Ha! What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are: the Holy One of God!». But Jesus rebuked it, saying, «Be quiet! Come out of him!». And the **devil**, throwing the man into the middle, **went out** of him without hunting him at all" (Lk 4,31-35) .*

But in this parable, as in the previous ones, the scribes of God forced the Saviour to demonstrate His wonders in contrast with history and archeology.

Capernaum - a compound word deriving from the Aramaic "**Kefar**" meaning "**village**", and "Nahum" name of an Old Testament prophet - throughout its history has always been referred to as a **village (never as a town)** located in Galilee.

Josephus does the same at the end of the first century. This highlights the fact that the evangelists and Apostles, though living in Galilee, were unaware that "Kefar" was a "village" in name and in fact.

The scribes wrote the Gospels after the Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 A.D.; these writings were substantiated through the aid of historical references taken from first century scrolls lying in the imperial library of Theodosius the Great. Nonetheless, the hasty exorcism described by Luke did not take into account the historical and archeological findings because the evangelist of God sent the Saviour into the most beautiful and spectacular Jewish place of worship two centuries before it was built: the **Synagogue of Capernaum**.

According to the Lucan scribe: "*The **centurion** deserves this of you, because he* (Jesus) *is well disposed towards our people; **he built us our synagogue himself**" (Lk 7,5). Therefore, according to the Gospel, the Synagogue was built by a Roman centurion who, of course, had to be v(ery rich and at the same time very, or better, overly pro-Jewish in a Galilee ... very, or better, overly nationalistic against the domination of Rome.*

The commander of a Roman century and his men always had to be ready to engage in battle in order to repress any act of rebellion in the land with the highest concentration of Zealots in all Palestine. However, as the usual indoctrinator would say: "God works in mysterious ways". Well, having verified that up to now the "Lord" has done nothing but trip while travelling along the "ways" of his land, let's establish if he is able to surmount the historical and archeological findings and come out intact.

Let's begin with history. The Lucan scribe does not explain what a Roman century - at this time commanded by a Centurion who was subordinate to the Prefect Pontius Pilate - was doing in Galilee: a region which, through a decision of Caesar Augustus, belonged to the Tetrarchy subject to the jurisdiction of **Herod Antipas** with the power, conferred by the Emperor, to have **its own army**. Having taken such absurdity into consideration, let's carry on with the study. The historian Josephus, made commander of the Jewish forces in Galilee, mentions "Capernaum" and praises highly the rich spring (Bellum III 519) and, unlike the Gospels which always refer to it as a "city", calls it a simple "**village**" when he makes a brief stop there because of a slight injury (Bios 403). This incident is reported in "**Autobiography**", drawn up by the Jewish historian **at the end of the first century**, twenty-five years **after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem** and more than half a century after Jesus's miracle. But, as Josephus was an eminent Jewish priest, his failure to report a chronicle concerning the existence of the **Synagogue of Capernaum, the most beautiful and monumental Jewish place of worship in Palestine**, proves **that it did not exist in the first century A.D.** The Synagogue of Capernaum had four hundred seats and, like all the Synagogues of the post-war Jewish diaspora, aesthetically had a lot in common with the beautiful pagan Roman temples. It must be highlighted that the Jewish historian mentioned the details of less majestic synagogues: in **Tiberias** (Bios. 54,277), in **Dora** (Ant. XIX 300) and in

Caesarea Maritima (Bellum II 285).

In addition, through the comparison of the Lucan parable with history we notice that in the scenario there is a centurion and a Jesus who are both carrying out their mission in a territory that is much more populated than the one described by the eyewitness Josephus; this means that **the settlement of Capernaum developed after the Jewish War** of 66/70 A.D. Later on, the Galilean urban centre expanded and its residents eventually were able to afford a beautiful, new synagogue along with a few priests who were in possession of scrolls of the Law; these men were experts in divine cult rites and dedicated to the maintenance of the building.

In effect, the urban development of Capernaum was incentivized under Emperor Hadrian who, after founding the new Province of "Syria Palaestina", built the "cardo maximus", the consular road (having a discovered lapis miliaris) which brought to Damascus, while the Romans built a monumental pagan mausoleum. However the settlement of Capernaum was never qualified as being a "city" for its population never exceeded 1700 inhabitants nor were any fortified walls ever built, and therefore it always remained a village; while the presence of a pagan mausoleum prompted the Jews to emulate, and thus they built a synagogue which was even more beautiful from an aesthetic point of view (and for this reason famous).

When the evangelists drew up the current Gospels at the end of the fourth century, they were convinced that the synagogue already existed in the fourth century; in addition, for these men the ruins of the pagan temple and the consular road were proof of the fact that in the past Roman military garrisons had operated in Capernaum, so they stationed a century (Lat. centuria) here in the first century. In Capernaum the Christian scribes, unaware of the historical findings, installed "Matthew Levi" as head tax collector, in charge of tax collection on behalf of Rome, while in reality this task was delegated to Herod Antipas who, being that his Tetrarchy was considered to be a Roman protectorate, operated independently from Rome (just like his father Herod the Great). Antipas was obliged to pay Emperor Tiberius a fixed annual tribute deducted from his own territorial income equal to two hundred talents of gold (Jewish Antiquities XVII 318), while the administrative apparatus in charge of tax collection was located in the capital of Galilee: Tiberias. It is unfortunate for the scribes, but the consular road, the pagan temple and the Roman settlement were built after Josephus's death, otherwise he would have mentioned them in his detailed chronicle on the village of Capernaum. A similar consideration must also be made with regard to the impossible presence of a Roman tax station, which in fact was unknown to the historian. So let's carry on with our research in order and compare the above-mentioned historical evidence with the evangelical testimonies.

In contrast with the extermination carried out by the Roman legions at the expense of the Jewish rebels - martyrs against the pagan domination of their homeland who sacrificed themselves - the Jewish faith was never prohibited in the Roman Empire until the Catholic decrees of Theodosius the Great promulgated at the end of the fourth century. This is demonstrated by the right given to the Jews, after the destruction of the Temple ordered by General Titus, to build many synagogues (evidence of these based on archeological findings) in Palestine between the second and fourth century, in addition to the one in Capernaum; as took place, for example, in Kfar Bar'Am (third century), Meiron (third century), Korazim (fourth century) and Hammat Tiberias (fourth century). The great synagogues were considered as holy by the Jews after the first century and all the monumental facades faced Jerusalem, home to the Temple destroyed by the Roman commander Titus, well aware of the fact that the Romans would have no longer given them the right to build a new Temple.

Having already demonstrated, through the published analyses, the inexistence of Christ Saviour, the Apostles and their successors, let's now verify whether the historical findings - which offer no presence of the Synagogue in which Jesus performed a miracle - are also confirmed by archeology.

Source: **Israeli Foreign Ministry** 26 nov. 2003

<http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/israelexperience/history/pages/capernaum%20-%20city%20of%20jesus%20and%20its%20jewish%20synagogue.aspx>

Here is the essential information:

Capernaum-City of Jesus and its Jewish Synagogue

Researchers'opinions differ regarding the date of the synagogue's construction. **All agree that it is not the 1st century CE synagogue from the time of Jesus.** According to most, the Galilee synagogue type, to which the Capernaum synagogue belongs, dates to the Roman period (**2nd and 3rd centuries CE**). It includes **Roman architectural elements** (the columns and the architectural elements above the columns: the architraves, the friezes and the cornices) with emphasis on the external form and decoration of the structure. **Historical data also support this construction date.** In this period, **following the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, the Jewish population and its religious institutions were concentrated in the Galilee**, where their political and economic predominance made the building of so elaborate a synagogue possible.

In new excavations, **in the foundations of the artificial podium** on which the synagogue stood, some **remains of the 1st century village** were found, **which existed until the 4th century**. Pottery and coins found beneath the floor of the synagogue and in the fill of the podium date the structure, in the view of the Franciscan fathers who excavated them, to not earlier than the 4th, or the beginning of the 5th century.

An Aramaic inscription, found on a column which apparently stood in the courtyard of the synagogue, reads: **Halfu son of Zebida**, the son of Yohanan, made this column. May he be blessed.

Source: **Jewish Virtual Library**

<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Archaeology/capesyn.html>

Here is the essential information:

The Synagogue at Capernaum

"They went as far as Capernaum, and at once on the Sabbath he went into the synagogue and began to teach" (Mk 1,21).

The ruins of a **great synagogue** were first identified in 1866 during a survey by the British cartographer Captain Charles W. Wilson. Partially reconstructed in 1926, the dating of the Capernaum synagogue continues to be a matter of debate.

What is certain is that the imposing ruin is not the synagogue referred to in the Gospel of Mark, though it seems to have been built on the site of an earlier 1st-century building.

Built of **imported white limestone** on basalt stone foundations, the floor plan is similar to the 4th-century synagogue at Chorazim (Korazim, 4 km to the north), and the 3rd-century synagogue at Bar'am (in the northern Galilee), but the architectural ornamentation of **the Capernaum building is far more elaborate**, with Corinthian capitals and intricately

carved stonework reliefs (vine and fig leaves, geometric designs, eagles, etc.). One relief carving of a cart may depict a portable Ark of the Covenant. Visitors are sometimes disconcerted by the fact that the architectural decoration also includes swastikas; but this was a common geometrical design of the period.

A 4th-century Aramaic inscription on one of the broken columns records the name of the donor, "Halfu, son of Zebida". These names in the Greek form (Alphaeus and Zebedee) are mentioned in the New Testament.

The synagogue as it appeared in 381 was described by the Spanish pilgrim, the Lady **Egeria***, who reported that the way into the structure was up many steps, and that the building was made of dressed stone.

The very grandeur of the Capernaum synagogue has contributed to the controversy concerning the actual dating of the building. Various theories have been proposed. Evidence for a 4th-century date is based in part on coins and pottery found beneath the floor. Proponents of an earlier 2nd-century date say these may have been left during later repairs and reconstruction, possibly following the earthquake of 363. Another possibility is that the synagogue was built during the short reign (361-363) of the Emperor Julian "the Apostate", which would also correspond with the date of the earthquake.

* In a shortwhile we will deal with the file-card regarding the inexistent pilgrim "Egeria".

It is easy to understand why *"everyone agrees that it is not the first-century synagogue from the time of Jesus"*; in fact, the names of the **Jewish donors** (and **not** that of the **Roman centurion**) are carved upon the white limestone columns. Instead, the **supporters** who have the construction of the church *date back prior to the second century* belong to the evangelical clergy ... starting with the owners of the holy area: **"CUSTODIAE TERRAE SANCTAE - Franciscan missionaries at the service of the Holy Land"**.

After purchasing the area, let's see how the friars - acting as rigorous custodians - "interpreted" the archeological data collected during their excavations. Click on the link, and then in the bottom right-hand corner we read:

<http://www.cafarnao.custodia.org/default.asp?id=4653>

"In the Byzantine era both the synagogue and the octagonal church were rebuilt in an elegant and monumental manner, which was also evidence of the increased economic and social growth of the inhabitants and of the attention which the two Christian and Jewish communities gave to the area of Capernaum ... In the first century A.D. a Judeo-Christian community gathered together in Capernaum and founded in the house of Peter an assembly meeting place, creating a domestic place of worship".

This is really something! If in the first century a *"community of Judeo-Christians"* had truly existed in Capernaum, Josephus would have mentioned them in his "Testimonium Flavianum" on Jesus Christ and also included the exorcism carried out by the Saviour inside the Jewish synagogue.

If we go onto the Franciscan website and click on the topic entitled "History and Archeology", we discover that, according to the monks, at the time of Jesus there not only was a synagogue but also the house of Saint Peter, which **at the end of the first century**, in their opinion, **became a church that the "Christian Jews"** regularly went to. The friars, however, affirm that the buildings were rebuilt during the Byzantine era, that is to say: "the synagogue of Capernaum was redone at a later date **above the synagogue of Jesus**", just like the "re-house re-church" of Saint Peter, also redone above its "original". This is the conclusion offered by the catechistical congregation at the end of the sinuous journey undertaken in order to overcome the unsurmountable archeological and historical obstacles. But on the basis of what evidence? All you need to do is click on "Synagogue" and:

*"The enquiries aim at identifying the location of the synagogue built by the Roman centurion and frequented by Jesus". The new archeological digs have brought about the **discovery** of the structures belonging to the **more ancient buildings replaced by the fifth century synagogue**".*

The Franciscan archeo-mystic website is also interesting:

http://www.christusrex.org/www1/ofm/sites/TScpsyn1_It.html

In light of these precise archeological findings, the spiritualistic archeologists, although bound to the preservation of the Gospels, for the last forty years have conducted enquiries under the guidance of the brilliant friar Virgilio Canio Corbio; their work "aims at understanding" that the "more ancient buildings" were made up of a "primitive" synagogue upon which a Byzantine synagogue was rebuilt as well as the house-church of Saint Peter, also rebuilt by the Byzantines. But if this were true, as a result of the importance of the events concerning the two great holy "relics" touched by the "hand of Jesus, the Christian scribes of the time would have been the first to feel obliged to document both reconstructions ...not present-day monks. On the basis of the reasoning of the Franciscans - entirely founded upon the use of conditional verb tenses - and due to the fact that beneath the raised podium of the current synagogue the foundation was built by using **dark basalt** blocks different from those used for the external building, the friars conclude that *"almost certainly"* these stones belong to the original synagogue of Jesus upon which, in the fifth century, the new one was built. Are we dealing with the primitive first century black synagogue which looked like the other homes in the village built up until the fourth century?

In reality, for economic reasons all the family dwellings in this area were built with local dark stone, of low quality, thus freeing the owners from the burden of having to import stone which was more beautiful but also more expensive. But here we are dealing with a holy building, so this is why the builders of the Galilean synagogue only saved on the underground foundation (within the large podium which was two meters high) made up of the walls of an old private dwelling. Of course, they did not save on what was built above ground and for which a high-quality white limestone was used, in contrast with the black basalt of the local homes. Just like when the Byzantine clergy, for the one and only time, built the fifth century octagonal Church (incorporating an old house falsely attributed to Saint Peter); in fact, the Byzantines used local dark basalt for the underground foundation while all that was above ground was built using imported white limestone.

The datings of the archeological remains are clear: the house-**Church** of Peter is built in the **Byzantine style**, therefore dates back to the fifth century, while the **style** of the **synagogue** is clearly **Roman** and has characteristics which are typical of the **second and third century**. Therefore both were built after Jesus's ministry, as a result the **Gospels** describing Jesus inside the Jewish synagogue were drawn up at the end of the **fourth century** by imaginative scribes who knew nothing about Judaism ... apart from a bit of hearsay information. The friars have understood this, and in order to defend the evangelical truths they have obliged themselves to give no consideration whatsoever to the dating imposed by the numerous coins recovered, which were hidden in dedicated deposits located in the basements, dated to the IV and V centuries, and by the tiles and architectural features of the synagogue ... which were in imperial Roman style, not Byzantine. But why did the friars date the reconstruction (according to them) of the synagogue to the fifth century, while

in reality they could have the reconstruction date back to the second or third century ... in any case after Jesus's ministry? They reason is that they absolutely need to furnish **evidence** so as to contradict the unexceptionable archeological findings, and even seek the help of an **"eyewitness"** who claimed to have seen and touched the house of Saint Peter transformed into a Church (near the synagogue) before it was rebuilt: the "famous pilgrim **Egeria**". Let's see what the friars have to say about the "CUSTODIAE TERRAE SANCTAE" on their website:

"The Holy Land became the destination of many Christian pilgrims and the famous Egeria left this news upon the house of Peter: «In Capernaum the house of the prince of the Apostles was transformed into a Church; but its walls remained unchanged». And towards the end of the fourth century, the construction of the stunning synagogue got underway and was completed after the middle of the fifth century. Even the traditional location of the house of Peter underwent many changes, and towards the middle of the fifth century the Byzantines, after demolishing the previous domus ecclesia, built above the house of Peter an elegant octagonal Church. It is truly strange that the rabbinical sources never mention the synagogue".

As we are about to verify, it is not at all "strange" that no one ever mentioned the demolition-rebuilding of the synagogue of Jesus and the "domus ecclesia"; the fifth century Christian scribes could not have mentioned any knocking down and reconstruction of the church-house of Peter as the Byzantines built the Church for the first time long after the "Advent of Jesus", while the synagogue was built in the second or third century.

Since ancient times the need to demonstrate the existence of the buildings frequented by Christ has obliged the Clergy to invent "pilgrims" whose task it was to draw up the "diary" of a trip, which took place at an earlier time, containing detailed descriptions of holy places. In reality we are dealing with "documents" written in Abbeys centuries after the narrated events took place so that, when necessary, these could be recovered and exhibited as authentic "past evidence".

Caught out by the archeological remains and without no historical data to support their theories, the Franciscans have clung themselves to "Egeria" (who according to the spiritualists is famous); they are aware that, on the basis of an ecclesiastical hype attested in a medieval manuscript, she is said to have been the protagonist of a pilgrimage (to holy places) which took place between **363** and **540** A.D. (dating obtained through the chronology cited in the text). But, as we are about to verify, being that such a dating is not very useful to the set objectives, modern-day contemplative experts "force" it between **391** and **394** A.D. Therefore, as planned, the consecrated archeologists call in "**Egeria**" as a direct witness to testify against the archeological blasphemy in order to "demonstrate" that **up until the year 381** A.D. (a fundamental date for Christian doctrine), in Capernaum could be found the authentic house of Saint Peter next to the synagogue which Jesus healed miraculously. Now let's try to verify the theories - aimed at safeguarding the credibility of the Gospels - based upon the "registry" document of the "eyewitness" and check whether or not she actually existed. Here is the file-card on ...

Egeria, the most famous "pilgrim" in history imaginative

"Egeria" is simply a name without any biographical specification; such information was obligatory during the imperial era and had the legal status needed to identify all *cives romani*, through blood relations (*gentes*) founded upon the aristocratic system. Egeria was an appellative which "appeared" by means of a stratagem a few decades ago and it represents the final act of a pseudo-historical production started in 1884; we will now describe its **motive**, the **journeys undertaken by these manuscripts and the reasons behind such movements**.

As we have seen, after the first millenium all the places in the "Holy Land" and the buildings visited by Christ set in the wrong location by the evangelists were artfully "substantiated" by a Clergy who, through the aid of the above-mentioned "**lessons**", managed to add other lies to the ones contained in the original holy texts. The same ancient Clergy, prior to Egeria, also sought the help of "eyewitnesses", deliberately set in vague remote times and personified by invented travellers lacking any sort of ground as a result of the errors contained in their writings. As in the case of the pilgrim "**Antoninus of Piacenza**" (beatified) whose trip the Church, up until a century ago, dated to the end of the third century A.D. but, due to the contradictions found, the chronology was moved, unavoidably, to the seventh century; but it is important to consider that the oldest narration, which is incomplete and full of mistakes, can be found in "**Codex Sangallensis MS 133**" dating back to the ninth century. This codex was followed by another 21 (until the seventeenth century), in which the initial oversights were eliminated through gross interpolations; nevertheless the experts in love with the Afterlife have the courage to say that that **the belated codexes represent the archetype**. In order to protect "**Saint Antoninus patron of Piacenza**" - identified as "**Inventio corporis Sancti Antonini martyris**" in the nineteenth century **Codex Vaticanus Lat. 5571** and recognized with this name until the twentieth century - from a historical fiasco, today's mystical exegetes have kept their distance from "Antoninus martyr" and have rebaptized the original pilgrim as "**Anonymous Piacentinus**" ... so much for the "anonymous relics" preserved in the Basilica of Piacenza.

Between the **eleventh** and **twelfth century** the scribes in the Abbey of Montecassino (Italy) drew up further documentation in **late Beneventan Latin** so as to "**certify**" the **precise dating** given by a "witness" who had visited the sites and holy buildings in the in the Holy Land: the same which, according to the Gospels, were frequented by the Lord. **Buildings**, therefore, **which had to appear as standing long before the document was drawn up**. The manuscript - made up of 74 sheets of parchment - is today classified "**Codex Aretinus 405**" and preserved in the Arezzo City Library (Italy). It was found in the middle of the 1800s in the Library of the "Fraternità di Santa Maria di Arezzo" by Gianfrancesco Gamurrini, librarian at the "Confraternità dei Laici" in Arezzo; here a "**Peregrinatio ad loca sancta**" (Pilgrimage to holy places) was described on 44 sheets by an anonymous female visitor whose place of origin was unknown. The lack of biographical data (indispensable finding out the name and extraction of a traceable witness) as well as the inexistence of convincing chronological information (mandatory for establishing the precise chronology of the pilgrimage carried out) demonstrates that the work was abandoned before being completed; as a result of its content, the work from the very beginning was viewed as mad by high-ranking clergymen and was thus put aside. In essence, a ready-made package which proved to be unsuccessful as a result of its totally unconvincing narration.

However, being that there is nothing better, the discoverer published the work in 1884; it was entitled "**Dell'inedita peregrinazione ai Luoghi Santi nel IV secolo, scoperti in un antiquissimo codice**" (of course still anonymous) and contains no useful information for the completion of the personal details. The following year, in 1885, Gamurrini republished the study "**Dell'inedita peregrinazione ai Luoghi Santi nel IV secolo**" (anonymous once again) and without useful personal details. Two years later, in 1887, Gamurrini - with the clear intention of "supplementing" the missing historical data - again published the text in the magazine of the "**Biblioteca dell'Accademia storico giuridica**" (located in Rome); it had the contemplative title "**Sanctae Silviae Aquitaniae. Peregrinato ad Loca sancta annis fere 385-388**". Here, for the **first time**, "**Silvia of Aquitaine**" appeared as the the name of the alleged author "unearthed" by Gamurrini himself in "**Lausiaca History**" written by the hagiographer and Bishop of Helenopolis (Bithynia) "**Palladius of Galatia**" (lived between the fourth and fifth century) who, during one of his journeys wrote down: "**...we accompanied the blessed Sylvania, the virgin who was the sister-in-law of the former prefect Rufinus**". This is it.

But in spite of the evident forced overlapping of characters and the Church's immediate "beatification", Silvia, a native of

the Roman Province of Aquitaine, proved to be a historical flop (she was sanctified and commemorated in Church martyrology) as a result of the problem concerning the age of the "virgin saint" (by now in her sixties, as affirmed by Palladius of Galatia* himself) and the **grave error** regarding the dating of the event. In fact the journey of the alleged pilgrim (according to the forced chronology hypothesized by Gamurrini) **began in 385 A.D.**, that is to say **three years** before (Itinerarium 17,1) the drawing up of the diary which is said to have taken place in **388**, at journey's end. But the powerful Consul Flavius Rufinus, at the time imperial Catholic Minister, was appointed Prefect of the Pretorium in **392** by Theodosius I, thus **seven years after the departure of Egeria**. Palladius's reference to the **ex**-Prefect Rufinus also implied the latter's loss of his prefectorial post upon the death of Theodosius, which took place on 15 January **395**, date in which the former Prefect became the Military Advisor of Arcadius, the elder son of the late Emperor: that is to say seven years after the end of Egeria's alleged journey (388). Needless to say, the entire testimony of the medieval manuscript fell apart thus "stripping"

the holy buildings of Christ of the chronological certification granted by an "eyewitness" **before** being rebuilt, according to the theory offered by friars during the Byzantine era.

* The chroniclers' fixation to qualify "virginity" as a female virtue forces us to ask this question: did Bishops, like Palladius, check that what they were saying was true before making such "historical" affirmations?

It is easy to understand that the Church, since its founding as an organized entity, has mystified documents so as to remove the New Testament contradictions in contrast with history and archeology. The need to remove such contradictions forces us to highlight that, "in execution of their duty", the devout scribes of Montecassino were careful to furnish the holy virgin with a special trunk containing: the text of the "**Onomasticon**" (the dictionary of biblical places attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea but written in the "**Codex Vaticanus Gr 1456**" dated to the **eleventh century**); the eleventh century "**Codex Laurentianus Gr 70.20**" regarding the "**Historia Ecclesiastica**" of the Bishop himself; the "**Vulgata Bible**" **drawn up by Saint Jerome over ten years after the departure of Egeria** and, *dulcis in fundus*, the entire set of handwritten Old Testament scrolls containing Psalms, Prayers and Canticles which she recited, partially or entirely, just after reaching each destination, leg after leg. Ridiculous!

The scribes directed a nun towards the desert localities (starting with Mount Sinai) crossed by the Jews during the exodus, areas also considered holy by the Christians; they obliged her to travel for three years and count the footsteps of every leg of her journey so as to offer proof of the distance covered (measured centuries later by Crusaders and monks assigned this specific task). This childish, unrealistic story was written up by a quill undergoing mystical ecstasy. The pilgrim was sent to important cities where she interacted with "Very Venerable Bishops" and high-level civil authorities; but the hypocritical scribes prevented her from writing their names in her diary ... in order to avoid dangerous historical comparisons. But there is more. A reading of the original text reveals that the **twelfth** century scribes had an anonymous **fourth** century nun write several letters, without specifying the address, to imaginary fellow sisters "**venerabiles dominae sorores**" ("venerable lady sisters": another historical blunder) belonging to a **female monastic order**. A type of womanly monasticism founded in the sixth century by Benedict of Nursia, that is to say at least two centuries after the false journey of Egeria. And finally, to crown all these lies, the scribes had the latter draw up a **diary** - written in their **twelfth century Beneventan Neo-Latin way of speaking** - of a journey which took place in the **fourth** century.

At the end of the 1800s, after banally "burning" a blessed "virgin Silvia" sister of the Prefect Rufinus - as a result of the gross chronological mistake concerning a true personality called in as a "witness to the facts" - the lovers of Heaven, astutely, have enough time pass in order to help believers forget the initial failures. After spending fifteen years rummaging through piles and piles of papers, an old letter (with no relationship whatsoever with the codex of Montecassino) written by an insignificant monk named "Valerio del Bierzo" to an anonymous fourth century nun; this was preceded by an arbitrary "assembly" with a **reference added at a later date** (a non-original marginal note), and aimed at giving concrete form to five hypothetical female appellatives ... finally, in 1903, the Benedictine friar Dom Mario Fèrotin chose one of these: "**Etheria**" of Galicia (Spain). Therefore: a **fourth** century Spaniard, "discovered" in the **twentieth** century, who wrote in **twelfth** century Beneventan Neo-Latin; she was, of course, an expert of Greek and Aramaic Syriac, thus allowing her to travel in the Eastern Empire. But that's not all. Once and for all, having **established the dating** of the imaginary journey, begun **in 391** and completed in **394 A.D.**, we witness several more decades of fideistic theories advanced by about fifty contestants; in 1982 the playoff was finally won by the professor of ancient Christianity, the Frenchman Pierre Maraval, thanks to a "profound lesson" in contemplative spirituality. As of this date, finally, with the blessing of the High Clergy, the name of the pilgrim is officialized, she who "will enlighten" the historiography of the "Holy Places", from Abraham to Christ and who, from the end of the **twentieth century** onwards, is considered by archeologists undergoing mystical catharsis the most reliable witness capable of "scientifically" dating every ancient excavation: "**sanctimonialis Egeria**" ... or rather the "nun **Egeria**".

But in their "lessons" the blessed experts deliberately avoid any reference to "Egeria", the most famous pilgrim of Christianity, who is unknown to all the Fathers, Doctors of the Church, Bishops and Christian historians who have succeeded one another through the centuries, starting with those of her time. The most important and significant of whom is the Bishop Palladius of Galatia, the unsuccessful "witness" to the initial "Sylvania-Egeria" flop, followed by: Saint Jerome, Paulus Orosius, Saint Augustine of Hippo, Socrates Scholasticus, the monk Rufinus of Aquileia, Saint John Chrysostom, Salminio Sozomeno, Saint Chromatius of Aquileia and Quintus Iulius Hilarianus. No Christian, Roman or Byzantine clergyman had ever heard about a "pilgrim Egeria" or any "Ethèria", "Eicheria", "Eiheria", Eucheria ... until the twentieth century.

The attestations concerning the holy places became indispensable when, at the end of the 1800s, the Church realized that the archeological excavations were progressing, with the risk of uncovering the lies devised by the Clergy through the centuries. It is not a by chance that the "Capernaum purchase", after the 1866 archeological discovery, was carried out by missionary friars on 19 September 1884 on behalf of the International Custodian of the Holy Land and, nine years later, in 1903, the monk Dom Mario Fèrotin "inaugurated" the second name of the pilgrim "Etheria of Galicia" after the initial "Silvia of Aquitaine" fiasco. The need for an "eyewitness" - **alive before** the "Holy Places" of Christ were built by the Byzantines - was acknowledged by compliant "pro.Church" experts, around fifty swindlers willing to change, through their "lessons", the senseless "Diary of Egeria's Journey", and they go as far as to "rebuild its archetype with likely verisimilitude" (sic) where there is clearly wrong, foolish or insufficient information. This is all done under the supervision of scholarly clergymen who wish to make the adventurous and childish walk of a nun seem credible, but who are careful not to highlight the contradictions so as not to frustrate the "evidence" aimed at the blessed who are poor in spirit.

The content of the book on "Egeria" is conceptually screwy, but becomes offensive to all when it is passed off as the true, detailed account of a three-year journey whose protagonist is a nun who travels across territories located within the far-flung and uncertain borders of a Roman Empire on the brink of disintegration. An implausible journey of an apparent protagonist, described in a **dateless** diary, written by a **nameless** author, with **non-specified origins** and with no biographical sources; all this information to be passed on to others must be offered spontaneously by all those who compile diaries regarding their own deeds. The total lack of personal details, indispensable for all diaries, was devised by the scribes when they drew up the Codex Aretinus 405 so as not to run into trouble. An absolute void which today's heavenly scholars, well-coordinated by the High Clergy, attempt to fill through contrived "deductions" (both unfounded

and arbitrary); they offer one another mutual support and pass themselves off as authoritative so as to make such absurdity sound truthful.

The missionary friars of the "International Custodian of the Holy Land", convinced that outside the convents there is a world of simpletons: in vain. The above-mentioned quotation concerning "Egeria" is clearly false as **their spokesman never wrote anything about the house of Saint Peter and the synagogue of Capernaum**. The reference to "Egeria" made by the Franciscans is in reality a forced overlapping with an ulterior motive, drawn on by the work "**Liber de locis sanctis**" written in Latin by **Pietro Diacono**, a twelfth century monk who reported the following passage on the "locality Capernaum" without ever naming "Egeria":

*"In Capernaum the **house** of the prince of the Apostles was **transformed** into a **church**. Its walls are still standing to this very day and here the Lord healed the paralytic. In this place **there is also the synagogue** in which the Lord cured the man possessed by the devil. This synagogue is built of square stones and **there are many steps which bring to its entrance**".*

Pietro Diacono **speaks in the present tense** and describes the state of the two buildings - the house-church and the synagogue - as these **appeared to him at his time**, without mentioning any pilgrim, let alone "Egeria" ... nor could he have done so, for eight centuries had to pass before she was invented. But, first of all, Pietro Diacono, unlike the Franciscans, does not affirm that the synagogue of Capernaum is a **structure rebuilt** (ex novo) above an older synagogue: for him **the synagogue of Capernaum is the one upon which the Lord performed a miracle** (as stated in the Gospels) and he says nothing else. The atavistic monk was unaware of the archeological and historical findings capable of demonstrating the inexistence of Capernaum at the time of Jesus; therefore, unlike the "missionary" friars in the Holy Land, he did not deem it necessary to go on a "mission" in order to "deceive" others.

In 388 A.D., the Roman Empire's economic and political crisis was deepening; as a result, the pressure exerted by the Barbarians along its borders was steadily growing, while internal religious strife was becoming more and more intense. In 388 A.D. the Bishop Aurelius Ambrosius of Milan (Saint Ambrogius) wrote a violent reprimand to Emperor Theodosius the Great because he had dared to condemn the Christians and force them to rebuild the synagogue of Callinicus (Syria) which they had set fire to:

*"Setting fire to the synagogue of the Jews is shameful for the law of the State, but **the credit is to be given to the law of God, who ensures grace, so that there is no place where the divinity of Christ is denied**" (Epistolarium 40).*

In conformity with the will of the Bishops, the Theodosian decrees outlawed all cults apart from Catholicism and went as far as to persecute all the other "heretical" Christian cults. For the first time in its history the Roman Empire witnessed religious civil war with two opposing fronts: on one side the Pagans and the dissident Christians, outlawed by Theodosius the Great through the 380 A.D. **Edict of Thessalonica**, and on the other side the Catholics. The armed conflict took place in September 394 A.D., along the Isonzo River (northeastern Italy); here the Catholic forces defeated their adversaries in the "**battle of Frigido**", which marked the definitive triumph of their doctrine. The victory immediately brought about the resumption of the systematic demolition of pagan temples, which had got underway after the death of Constantine the Great but had been interrupted by Julian the Apostate. This was the political and religious climate which was hanging over a **Roman Catholic Empire** on the brink of its final disintegration; its subjects were indoctrinated on the basis of an absolute evangelical dogma, **true word of God**, and after the Jews' condemnation of the Messiah Saviour it obliged its citizens to cast eternal malediction against one another and the future generations:

*"And the people, every one of them shouted back, «Let his blood (of Jesus) **be on us and on our children!**»" (Mt 27,25).*

In those same years, **John Chrysostom**, Patriarch of Constantinople, Saint and Doctor of the Church, distinguished himself as a fanatical theologian who manifested Christian rancour in his "**Homilies against the Jews**":

*"For **Jewish decide** no indulgence, no possible forgiveness ... **The Jews massacre their children and sacrifice them to the devil**" ... "run away from the assemblies and meeting places of the Jews, and **do not venerate the Synagogue for its books, on the contrary for this reason feel hatred and aversion towards it**" ... "books possess their own holiness, which they do not transmit to the place which preserves them, as a result of the godlessness of the people who meet here. One must think likewise with regard to **the Synagogue**. Also here there is no idol, nevertheless **the demons live here**" (Op. cit. "First Homily").*

It was in this incessant climate of religious violence that Theodosius II, Emperor of Constantinople, in 438 A.D. decreed in the new "Theodosian Codex" the inferiority of the Jews ...

But, being these the circumstances of this critical period, the idyllic relationship between Jews and Christians, described in such a sweet manner by the missionary archeologists of the "Custodiae Terrae Sanctae", is just a present-day pious dream, useful to them solely for affirming that the Jews rebuilt the synagogue of Jesus in the ultra-Catholic Byzantine Empire during "**the second half of the fifth century**".

In reality - **as was the case for the other holy buildings** mentioned above - in the fifth century the Byzantine clergy, in fulfilment of the Gospels, chose a house in the village of Capernaum and, after "baptizing" it as the "house of Saint Peter" **for the first time**, upon it had an octagonal Christian **church (unknown by the Gospels)** built. Instead the synagogue of Capernaum, being that Jesus himself "decontaminated" it from the presence of the demon, was considered a holy place for the entire Christian world. As of the fifth century, until the Byzantines maintained power over the Holy Land, the synagogue of Capernaum was frequented by believers (without compiling detailed diaries) and was carefully looked after thanks to the donations of the wealthy and in conformity with previous Jewish customs, as demonstrated by the numerous coins found in two hidden storage rooms built within the foundation.

Then in the twelfth century, after centuries of bloody struggles between Christians and Muslims for the control over the Holy land, in Capernaum, next to the ruins of the Byzantine "house-church" (of Saint Peter) there were still the vestiges of the stupendous Jewish synagogue; both were described by the monk Pietro Diacono, convinced by the Gospel that they dated back to the time of Jesus. Now let's go back to:

The Synagogue of Capernaum, where Jesus drove away the demon

We have observed that the grave problem concerning the dating of the synagogue cannot be resolved by a pilgrim who never existed; if anything, for the Church, the undertaking is complicated by **further archeological findings**. Lacking real probative arguments, today's Clergy has ordered about fifty studies (click = The Pilgrim Egeria: A Select Biography) in many languages. This research, aimed at **making an invented pilgrim plausible**, demonstrates the importance, for Christian doctrine, of the testimony of Egeria with regard to the synagogue of Capernaum at the time of Jesus.

Fundamental archeological data which, in addition to the historical information analyzed above, the prone mystical researchers, who are all well-coordinated, deliberately **do not reveal so as not to unveil** the motive that forces them to defend such stupidity.

On the basis of what is written above, **very important appellatives** are carved on a column of white limestone inside the synagogue of Capernaum but which all friars and contemplative analysts carefully avoid mentioning, as if they had

never read them, or rather, **as if they did not exist** ... despite having pushed their "analyses" beyond any logical limit in order to find impossible proof of the existence of the synagogue of Capernaum during the ministry of Jesus (as of the first century).

We have seen that the Aramaic writing carved on a marble column contains the name of the donor: **"Halfu son of Zebida, son of Yohanan"**. We are dealing with strictly Jewish epithets (used by the Jews to identify family lineage) which, copied into Greek (anglicized) become: **"Alphaeus, son of Zebedee, son of John"**. This is a "detail" which, **absolutely**, forces the subtle minds of the indoctrinators to "push" the reconstruction (which they hypothesized) of the "striking synagogue" **into the fifth century**. In fact, having the the missionary archeologists autonomously adopted "obtorlo collo" the theory of the reconstruction of the Jewish place of worship ... what difference would it have made if it had taken place in the second or third century? This would have been of no importance to the monks as the first century synagogue of Jesus, according to what they themselves affirm, was beneath the foundation of the one rebuilt above it. So why did the sly exegetes "push" the dating into the fifth century?

All you need to do is reflect in order to understand the thing that the grey eminences of Faith have always known. According to the Gospels, **John** was the son of **Zebedee** and, like his brother James, was one of the twelve Apostles, and also the "favourite of the Lord": **"James of Zebedee and John his brother"** (Mk 4,21). To these names must also be added **"Alpheus"**, another protagonist of Jesus's time who the evangelists refer to as **father of two Apostles, "James (the Minor)"** and his brother **"Judas"**: **"James, son of Alphaeus ... Judas, brother of James"** (Codex Sinaiticus: Lk 6,15-16). And, through abstruse variants, the evangelists also call the wife of Alpheus "Mary of Cleophas", thus confusing the two husbands "Alphaeus" and "Cleophas". In addition, "Mary wife of Cleophas" (that is to say "Alphaeus") was also the sister of the "Virgin Mary" ... but, at this point, the **impossibility of there being two sisters with the same name** arouses suspicion:

"But there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother (Mary) and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary Magdalene" (Codex Sinaiticus: Jh 19,25).

Things then get very complicated in the fourth Gospel (of John), where we read that "the disciple who John loved", that is to say **John** himself, was the **son of Mary**:

"Seeing his mother and the disciple whom he loved (John) standing near her, Jesus said to his mother: «Woman, this is your son». Then to the disciple he said: **«this is your mother»...**" (Jh 19,26).

Let's try to understand better by reading the other Gospels:

"Is not this the son of the carpenter? Isn't his mother called Mary, and his brothers, James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" (Mt 13,55);

"Isn't this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James and Joses (Joseph) and Judah and Simon? Aren't his sisters here with us? And They were offended at him" (Mk 6,3).

In addition to the evidence that it was not an absurd Roman centurion who built the synagogue, among the archeological remains we also discover that the names of a Jewish family (one of the sponsors of the building) corresponded to those which can be found in the current Gospels. As already seen, the name of one member, "Alpheus" (Cleophas), in certain evangelical excerpts **involves four Apostles who have the same names as four of Jesus's brothers, therefore sons of Mary: James, Judas, John and Simon**. Within this circle of the Apostles there is no trace of her son **Joseph** who, in turn, was son of **"Mary who was the mother of James the younger and Joses"** (Mk 15,40), and therefore also "Joseph" son of Alphaeus.

So, according to the evangelical texts of Matthew and Mark, Mary had several children, but, now, the question which we must ask ourselves is: when was Mary recognized as the mother of an only child by the name of Jesus?

At the Council of Constantinople held in **381 A.D.** the Bishops of the Roman Empire established a new **Constantinopolitan Creed**, still recognized today by the Christians (**different** from the **Nicean Creed** of 325 A.D.), in which, **for the first time, there is evidence of the Virgin Mary**, mother of the universal Saviour, and **Pontius Pilate**, under whom Christ carried out his ministry:

"We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds ... who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; he was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried".

A precise dogma which forced the Catholic scribes to revise the Gospels - officialized earlier under Constantine the Great - to which were added the "nativities" of Luke and Matthew along with the "Teothòkos", mother of the "only begotten" Jesus: the **Virgin Mary could not have generated other children apart from Christ**. And He ... "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost". This is what the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Empire decreed.

Aware that the drawing up of the current official Gospels, contained in the **"Sinaiticus"** and **"Vaticanus"** Codexes, dates back to the fourth century, it was the compromising correspondence between the names found in the synagogue of Capernaum and those of the evangelical protagonists which forced the monks specialized in archeology to bring forward the reconstruction of the synagogue to the fifth century, after the **381 A.D.** Creed of Constantinople. Through this chronological expedient the friars attempted to prevent the historians of Christianity from understanding **the motive**, resulting from the new Marian theology, **which forced** the evangelists to **attribute other "fathers"** and other mothers to the children of the Virgin Mary, mother of the **only begotten** Jesus. In fact, according to the reasoning of the mystical archeologists, if their theory concerning the fifth century reconstruction of the synagogue - that is to say **after the Constantinopolitan Creed** of **381 A.D.** - were accepted, **the correspondence between the names carved in the fifth century upon the buildings and those mentioned in the Gospels drawn up prior to the reconstruction would be considered a mere coincidence**.

On the contrary, if the reconstruction of the synagogue had been carried out before the 381 Catholic Creed, **the correspondence between the Galilean appellatives and the evangelical appellatives "Zebedee" and "Alpheus"** (fathers of children having the same names as Mary's offspring) **could no longer be considered a mere coincidence, as the dogmatic motive of the new doctrine** (decreed in 381 A.D.) **would be evident, doctrine which forced the scribes to give Mary's children different parents**, while her name was assigned (absurdly) to one of her sisters, specially invented for the circumstance.

Ultimately, the monks (and the Church) realize that the names "Alpheus" and "Zebedee" were assigned by the evangelists to the "dads" of the five sons of the "Virgin Mary"; fathers who, inevitably, were married to other "Marys". And for the "dad" of the universal Saviour? Better to rely on a decrepit Saint Joseph ... assisted by the Holy Spirit in his heterological insemination.

The grey Christian eminences are aware that the synagogue of Capernaum constitutes the archeological proof that **Mary was not a Virgin**, despite being the mother of the universal Saviour. The "Mother of Jesus Christ" was deliberately created by the Catholics, at the end of the fourth century, as a "super Goddess" in order to strengthen their doctrine which was in competition with other pagan divinities, all of which had a "Mater Magna", like the famous Artemis. But the famous, new Christian Goddess, Mary the Virgin, was unknown to Paul of Tarsus: the Apostle of the Gentiles is

unaware of the existence of the "Mother of God" and, in his "Letter to the Ephesians", does not know that the "Mater Dei" went to live in Ephesus along with John, the Apostle who was "the Lord's favourite". In addition, even the evangelists can have no knowledge of the fact that Mary the Virgin resided in Ephesus as the mother of Jesus was declared to be the "Mother of God" at the "Council of Ephesus", convened in 431 A.D. for this reason. It was at this time that the Bishops decreed the "Mater Dei" dogma, thus modifying the previous "Mother of Jesus Christ" dogma; it was in Ephesus that her residence was established and, at the same time, the Bishops suppressed the popular creed of the Goddess Artemis (Mater Magna), who had a grand Temple dedicated to her in this city. The Gospels in Greek and the Vulgate Bible written in Latin by Jerome had by this time been spread by the clericalists at the expense of the State within the territories of an Empire on the brink of dissolution.

Paul's grave lack of awareness of the Virgin Mary, mother of Jesus Christ, can be explained quite simply: the "**Letters of Paul**" had been spread throughout the Provinces, at the beginning of the fourth century, separate from the Gospels. The aim was to propagandize Christianity, on the basis of Paul's teachings, as a religion subservient to the Empire, therefore in favour of slavery and hostile towards the original Jewish religion, which was fundamentally anti-Roman.

The divulgation of the Pauline Christian doctrine made it impossible to track down, eliminate and/or correct the manuscripts dedicated to the "Letters of Paul"; as a result, at the end of the fourth century the latter were not modified by the scribes, who relied on the fact that the "Nativities" of Luke and Matthew offered evidence of the "Madonna".

All the Christian Churches date the current Gospels as if they had been written in the first or second century but, we would like to highlight once again that, **apart from** the Greek texts constituted by the "**Sinaiticus**" and "**Vaticanus**" Codexes - drawn up at the end of the fourth century, **after** the Council of Constantinople - **there is no other previous and complete documentation**; as a result, insignificant fragments are passed off as archetypes. Therefore whoever attempts to date the Latin Codexes - "Vercellensis", "Veronensis" and "Corbeiensis" - to the second or third century acts in bad faith. In order to safeguard the virginity of the Madonna, the Church passes Jesus's brothers and sisters off as His cousins or relatives; in addition, it attempts to make it appear that the "Nativities" were written prior to the 381 A.D. Council of Constantinople so as to hide the motive behind their creation. By dating the above-mentioned "vetus latini" manuscripts prior to 381 A.D., the grey eminences of the Clergy wish to hide the reason why the Church was forced to draw up the "Nativity".

But this deceitful intention is disavowed by the fact that the previous Gospels contained different information; these writings not only lacked the "Nativity" - as attested in a Gospel of Matthew in Aramaic - but also mentioned different deeds and Apostles with different names. Evidence of this can be found at the end of the study concerning the "Testimonium Flavianum".

It must also be highlighted that there are no ecclesiastical Codexes written by apostolic and apologetical Fathers or by historians and Doctors of the Church dating back prior to the seventh century and, most important of all, **no document, starting with the Gospels, has been dated through mass spectrometry radiocarbon testing**: a non-invasive analysis which can verify the coarse paleographical datings filled with insipid theories ... beloved to the scholars of Christian faith.

The fact that the Church always avoids the use of mass spectrometry for the datings in the grand New Testament "Opera Omnia" - compiled in Convents and **only dated paleographically** from the fourth century to the Renaissance - demonstrates that the "grey eminences" of the Clergy are well aware of how risky it is for their doctrine to extrapolate a precise chronology that reveals the "assembly" of the myth of Jesus Christ and his theological successors ... starting with the "Nativities" of Luke and Matthew, written into the Gospels only after the Bishops of the Empire established the definitive Catholic Creed at the council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.

A few years ago the paleographers of the "Gospel of Judas", rightly, had the manuscript undergo C14 testing that dated the work between 220 and 340 A.D., thus dating the manuscript to 275 A.D. with a margin of error of 50 years ... But when will the "enlightened exegetes" of Christ offer concrete proof of writings containing the "Teotōkos" (Generator of God) from the Gospel of Luke, writings which have undergone C14 testing and have established, without a shadow of a doubt, that their compilation took place prior to the fourth century?

Nevertheless, the manuscripts concerning the "Historiae Ecclesiasticae" of Christian authors, though paleographically dated to the seventh century onwards, attest different evangelical protagonists (their number and their deeds vary), starting with the Apostles. This means that the pre-existing Gospels were different from the ones that have reached us.

After the 381 A.D. Council of Constantinople, the calligraphers of God forced themselves to copy the Gospels into new codexes so that the **five sons of Mary** (including Jesus), already mentioned in the previous Gospels, **would appear to be sons of other "Marys"**, in turn **wives of different Jewish fathers**; and to be certain not to invent strange Jewish appellatives, they relied on names found inside the synagogue of Capernaum: the most spectacular Israelite monument in all of Palestine after the Temple of Jerusalem which had by this time been destroyed. And finally, to demonstrate that Christian dogma was superior to Old Testament doctrine, the scribes had the universal Saviour drive away the demon present in the synagogue itself.

It is also important to remember that the current Gospels, drawn up at the end of the fourth century, make no mention of the presence of a house-church of Saint Peter as it was built by the Byzantines a century later. The proclamation of Mary as the "Mother of the Only Begotten Son Jesus Christ" at the 381 A.D. Council of Constantinople was in grave contrast with the "canonical" texts drawn up prior to the 325 A.D. Council of Nicea and according to which Mary had other children. Problems even more serious than those which, as a result of the new 381 A.D. Creed, forced the evangelists to invent a Jew by the name of "Joseph of Arimathea" (unknown to the earlier Christian historian Eusebius of Caesarea who died in 340 A.D.) so as to prevent the super Virgin from asking Pontius Pilate for the body of the "King of the Jews", thus freeing her of the burden of replying, when asked this mandatory question by an imperial Prefect, that the Father of the Messiah King was the Holy Spirit: logically inadmissible in a true Roman trial.

Conclusion

The Apostles and the evangelists of God were not converted Jews, nor did they ever visit the Palestinian localities in which they had the heroes of eternal salvation operate; nonetheless the Christian scribes went as far as to invent a synagogue, which no one had ever seen, in a "city of Nazareth" which did not exist in the first centuries A.D., and sent to this locality the "Saviour" to preach to the Jews.

The lack of knowledge regarding the places located in the homeland of Christ can also be found in the superficiality with which the scribes relate the customs of the Jews and their Sanhedrin. The same goes for the description of the behaviour of the Roman high officials charged with the task of governing a territory populated by men who were against Roman domination. This all goes to show that the scribes acted with unjustifiable thoughtlessness, and they go as far as to offer an unreal description of the behaviour of Pilate who, after putting on trial a "King of the Jews" - not wanted by Tiberius and accused of fomenting a rebellion against the payment of taxes (Lk 23,1) - does all he can to avoid eliminating him: senseless! All the more so as, according to the Gospels, the imperial Prefect ended up imposing upon an "innocent" man an agonizing crucifixion after a long "via crucis", in contrast with Roman practice and logic, while he could have simply availed himself of a normal decapitation.

We must take into consideration the fact that legions of Rome, as a result of three wars fought over a period of two

generations (from 70 to 135 A.D.), caused the death of 1.2 million Jews because this people refused to submit to the will of the Empire; this figure does not take into account those reduced to slavery and all the cities and important villages destroyed.

So the evangelists, like the pious confraternity of present-day exegetical believers, should have studied history better before inventing such fairy tales.

After the Jewish holocaust carried out by the Romans, the Essenic Jews, self-proclaimed guardians of a divine "gnosis", elaborated a "revelation" based on the appearance of a new representation of the "Messiah" ... not the awaited, until this time, "Dominator of the World" but "the Saviour of the World", "Son of God" and "Wonder-Worker", capable of resurrecting the "chosen". The widespread success obtained by the Jewish myth of salvation in the third century A.D. prompted ambitious, opportunistic churchmen to "infiltrate" into the new sect; over time these men prevailed over the original priests and once in power adapted the original myth to Western thought by grafting the theophagical pagan rite of the Eucharist onto the Jewish Messiah, going as far as to document the Advent of the "Saviour" thanks to the data collected in the imperial archives. But, in the attempt to substantiate the divine saga dating back three centuries, the Christian scribes, who by this time had succeeded the primitive Essenic writers, ran into grave contradictions and oversights; a lot of the information linked to Jewish localities and traditions was imprecise, thus also demonstrating that these men had scarce command of the Semitic language.

But how is it possible to justify the superficiality of the manipulators of fundamental events concerning a Faith, passed off as being historically true? The answer to this question is that the scribes of God belonged to a powerful religious group which supported the "doctrine of Salvation": a Creed capable of convincing masses of new proselytes that it was possible to resurrect after death. The subtle minds of the High Clergy that knew no one would have ever been able to consult the Gospels and then compare them to the volumes (handwritten scrolls) of first century historians; the High Clergy, of course, got a hold of these scrolls, which are preserved in Abbacies and are not to be read by anyone.

The illusion of Eternal Salvation was propagandized by religious congregations which, from the end of the third century, gradually became more and more numerous and organized; a sole and widespread organization was established in the territorial districts assigned to the organization itself by the Dominus who led the Empire, thanks to the political weight acquired. A High Clergy in charge of Convents and maintained mainly by poor plebians, humble serfs with no hope of liberation, spread throughout an immense territory in an advanced stage of economic and military decomposition. The monopolization of knowledge was the only stratagem capable of preventing people from disproving the divine "Good News": an absolute monotheistic doctrine, spread throughout a dying theocratic Empire, and created for the sustainment of "venerable ministers of God" gathered in the largest and most parasitical system ever created by mankind. A "holy" macrostructure founded by men for the exploitation of other men ... in return for the promise of resurrection. Ultimately, underestimating the effectiveness of historical rationalism, corroborated by archeological remains, was the original sin of the scribes of God: an unforgivable mistake which today is proving to be the most serious of mortal sins ... and no "mea culpa" will be able to offer absolution.

With the passage of time, believers are slowly yet steadily becoming more aware of the deceitfulness contained in the Holy Texts and this will bring about the extinction of the most worst obscurantist superstition that humanity has ever experienced and the most hypocritical absolute among the monotheistic religions: Christianity ... or "Salvation for eternal life".

Emilio Salsi

Now let's carry on with our study on how the messianic myth was born and how it evolved.

[go back]