



GOSPELS and HISTORY

IT WAS AN UNYIELDING STRUGGLE AGAINST ROME LED BY A LINE OF NOBLE JEWS DESCENDANTS OF THE HASMONEANS AND PRETENDERS TO THE THRONE OF THE JEWS USURPED BY HEROD AND HIS HEIRS WHICH GAVE BIRTH TO FIRST CENTURY "MESSIANISM". IN GREEK "CHRISTIANITY"

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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

Yeshua Johannes and the Zealots of Gamala redeemed by the Christianity of the Gentiles

Through the studies carried out thusfar we have demonstrated that the "Apostles", one after another, are eliminated thanks to a critical historiological verification. The analyses have allowed us to uncover spurious passages and simulations added to the holy and historical texts by Christian scribes during the century-old evolution of the doctrine. These tamperings are still underway and their objective is to prevent the recognition of the true protagonists, who were the leaders of the Zealot movement for Jewish national liberation; these men were hidden behind an "Apostolic" guise which depicts them as myths such as lambs and preachers of peace and justice on Earth who bestowed the promise of eternal life.

The bloody revolutionaries of the **"fourth Zealot philosophy, a novelty unknown up to that time"** (as defined by Josephus), founded by Judas the Galilean in 6 A.D., had to disappear. Their doctrine postulated the overturning of Jewish society through the elimination of slavery, the corrupt priestly nobility and the privileged pro-Romans, and the establishment of a new economic system based on the redistribution of wealth on a more equalitarian basis for the benefit of the under-privileged classes: "the Ebionites" (from the Aramaic "Ebionim"), who were the poor. These revolutionaries were Zealot Pharisean **leaders**, **"Doctors of the Law (Rabbis) of great power ... fanatical nationalists"** devoted to martyrdom.

The Jewish historian Josephus - a noble Pharisean conservative belonging to an opposing wealthy and opportunistic priestly class - expressed hatred towards them in "Jewish Antiquities" and "The Jewish War":

"The zeal which Judas (the Galilean) and Saddoc (the Pharisean) inspired in the youth was an element of ruination for our cause. The people saw the tenacity of their determination and the indifference with which they accepted the lacerating suffering of the punishments" (Antiquities XVIII verses 10-24). **"False and deceitful individuals, pretending to be inspired by God (Prophets), who plot disorders and revolutions and push the people towards religious fanaticism. Charlatans (Preachers) and bandits incited many to rebellion and incited them to freedom by threatening to kill whoever submitted to the domination of the Romans"** (Bellum II verses 259-264). **Zealots, in fact, was the name that they had given themselves, as if they were zealots of good deeds"** : Bellum IV verse 161).

They carried out an uneven struggle in order to "save" their land from Roman pagan domination and rebuild, thanks to the advent of a Messiah chosen by Yahweh, an eternal kingdom ... which, after the "universal" Catholic reform, was called "Kingdom of Heaven".

But the motives of the Jews were very different. The Old Testament tradition imposed uncompromising radical decisions which were in contrast with those of the moderate priestly aristocracy, wealthy merchants and big landowners. The certainty that God would help the Israelites to get rid of **the pagan invaders** was written in the Law: the **"Kittim"** (pagan invaders) would have been defeated and humiliated by the divine Messiah, a nationalistic King who triumphs thanks to the intervention of the heavenly forces sent in by Yahweh to help the "chosen people".

Upon the death of Herod the Great, Judas the Galilean creator of the "fourth philosophy" - after attacking the royal palace of Sepphoris, capital of Galilee, and forcing the son and successor of Herod, Antipas, to flee - took over as King of the Jews.

The intervention of the Roman legions of the Legate of Syria, son of P. Quintilius Varus, reestablished the Augustan system in Galilee after destroying Sepphoris and crucifying two thousand Jews in public.

Five brothers - descendants of a royal blood line (the Hasmoneans) which survived (through their mother's side) the systematic elimination carried out by Herod the Great - fought against Herod's heirs who they did not recognize as having the right (conferred by Rome) to reign and govern over the Jews. It was their **Messianic right** and they claimed it through the use of force; in reality this struggle was begun by Ezechias (their grandfather and father of Judas the Galilean) who was executed by Herod before being crowned (40 B.C.) as King by the Triumvirates Marcus Antonius and Gaius Julius Octavianus.

The high-risk social tension which characterized the bloodshed provoked by the nationalist integralism inevitably penetrated into families and was the cause of serious controversies and disagreements between impetuous young people and their elders.

The continuous, endemic state of civil war - which began at the time of Quirinius's census (6 A.D.) - lasted until the outbreak of the war against Rome in 66 A.D., with a pause during the reign of Herod Agrippa the Great (41- 44 A.D.). The serious denouncement of the Zealot unrest within the theocratic society of the Jews during that time inevitably had repercussions within families and of course involved the Messiah chosen by God to lead the people of Israel; this denouncement also "oozes" from the evangelical testimonies by mouth of "Jesus" himself:

"I have come to bring fire to the earth, and how I wish it were blazing already! ... Do you suppose that I am here to bring peace on earth? No. I tell you, but rather division. For from now on a household of five will be divided: three against two and two against three; father opposed to son, son to father" (Lk 12,49-53).

The names of these five brothers dictated by the strict Jewish tradition are still present in the Gospels and **correspond to the names of the five brothers of "Jesus": John, Judas, Simon, James and Joseph.** The names which are also attributed to the children of the various "Marys", wives of Alphaeus, Zebedee, Cleophas and Clopas. **These wives-sisters or relatives who have the name "Mary", like the mother of Jesus, all have children with the same names as the brothers of Christ.** The presence of many "Marys" in the New Testament documents is not truthful (there are a total of six) to the point that one of them - according to these documents - turns out to be the sister of the Mother of the "Redeemer Son of God":

"Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother (Mary) and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas ..." (Jhn 19,25).

How could have parents given their own children the same names? Since ancient times the Church has been aware of the contradictions contained in the evangelical "revelations", and has attempted to "compress" the six "Marys" into "three Marys" through analyses which have been proven to be incorrect, as is reported in a later study regarding "the six Marys". One of these - passed off as **wife of Alphaeus, father of the Apostle Levi**, that is to say Matthew the Publican - proves to be absolutely false once **verified that "Matthew" never existed** (see first study and the study regarding the "Nativity"):

"As he (Jesus) was walking along he saw Levi the son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax office, and he said to him: «Follow me». And he got up and followed him" (Mk 2,14).

As demonstrated in the first study and in the study regarding the "Nativity", it is clear that **the inexistence of Levi Matthew unequivocally disavows the existence of his father, Alphaeus, and Mary, wife of Alphaeus**, with whom Alphaeus (according to the Gospels) conceived the future Apostle, "tax collector" on behalf of Caesar. Of these six "Marys", only one did not have children: Mary Magdalene. We believe that the relationship between this Mary and the "historical" Jesus would not have played an important role in the political situation of this period, very dangerous for the people of Israel who did not want to be subject to the domination of Rome. Another four "Marys" were cloned from only one and awkwardly **"divided" in order to separate the brothers of Jesus**, all of whom were sons of the one and only Mary mother of Jesus (Mt 13,55 and Mk 6,3); this was done in order to prevent researchers from tracking down (in history) the true protagonists of the events narrated in the Gospels and from identifying them in the last heirs of the **only dynasty** which, over a period of three generations, had distinguished itself for having guided the Jews in their struggle against the Roman "kittim".

The real Mary, mother of five sons and of two or more daughters, was a noble descendent of the Hasmoneans and wife of Judas the Galilean, *"Doctor of the Law of great power"*, father of John, his eldest son. They therefore belonged to a royal bloodline who had the right to the throne of the Jews occupied by the Herodians, semi-Jews of Arab extraction sworn in by the Emperors of Rome. The five brothers belonged to a theocratic society and advocated an armed struggle based on religious and political principles contained in the holy Ancestral Law, on the basis of which the only regality permitted was that of the will of God: a **Messianic regality**. They were Zealots and guardians of a nationalist integralism which was more extreme than that of the other three Jewish religious factions of the period, that is to say the Pharisees, Essenes and Sadduceans. In 6 A.D. ...

"Judas the Galilean placed himself at the head of the fourth philosophy, a novelty unknown up until that time, which agrees with all the opinions of the Pharisees apart from the fact that they have a burning love for freedom" (the Zealots were Pharisean irredentist revolutionaries who were against slavery) convinced that only God is their guide and Owner; they were more than ready to face up to an agonizing death ..." (Ant. XVIII 1,23).

A generation thereafter (in 35 A.D.) his son John manages to conquer Jerusalem after freeing the Holy City from Roman occupation; he obtains the recognition of the people as "Saviour" (Jeshùa) and King of the Jews ... until the year 36 A.D., when he is dethroned and crucified by the Romans. For the Jews the true divine Messiah could not be defeated by the Pagans, so John was repudiated and forgotten. After the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple - carried out by Titus in 70 A.D. along with the ethnic massacre of Jews in the eastern cities of the Empire - a religious identity crisis involving the entire Jewish world began.

Until the time of the Holocaust, the Essenes were the most active among the prophets who had announced the Advent of the Messiah of Israel who would have united all the Jews in a renewed Alliance consecrated by God and massacred the pagan kittims. After the exceptional catastrophe, a Jewish reformist faction of the Diaspora - led by Essene priests residing in Egypt and inspired by the abstract "Logos" of the Semitic philosopher Philo of Alexandria - developed a new "Saviour Messiah" figure as an alternative to the *"Dominant of the World"* mentioned by Josephus (Bellum VI 310-315). A divine Messiah, no longer a bellicose commander of the people of Israel but as docile as a lamb, thus acceptable to imperial Roman power and less dangerous for the families of the diaspora. Yet still a Messiah observant of the Ancestral Law prophesized by Isaiah:

"Ill, treated and afflicted, he (the Messiah) never opened his mouth, like a lamb led to the slaughter-house, like a sheep dumb before its shearers he never opened his mouth" (Isaiah 53,7);
"Look, there is the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world!" (Jhn 1,29).

The Essenes, rather than admit the failure of their prophecy regarding the intervention of the Davidic "Saviour", blamed the disaster and the deaths suffered by the Jews on their refusal to recognize the Advent: the Messiah, awaited with longing faith by the Jews during the first century; **the Anointed** - chosen by Yahweh and who would have led them against the pagan invaders of Promise Land - **had already come, but was not recognized as such by His people.** In the Jewish history of the time which saw as royal protagonist the noble John and his agonizing death, this was the only suitable episode in which he could be mythicized as "Lamb of God" and "Saviour of the World" rather than "Dominant of the World".

A "Saviour" which the Essene monks - thanks to their "Gnosis" (knowledge of God) - began to represent in their writings, preaching him as the Therapeutic Demiurge, Son of God, with extraordinary powers. They had **already prophesized** him in the fragment of scroll number 4Q246 found in Qumran which gives evidence of the Zealot nationalist "pathos", which was in conformity with the ethics of a theocratic society like that of the Jews and in line with the **Messianic royal figure**:

"He will be called the Son of God: they will call him the Son of the Most High. His reign will be eternal ... the people of God will rise and stop all with the sword".

The traces of this Messiah still exist today in the Gospels. Luke said:

"He will be great and will be called the son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his ancestor David ... And so the child will be holy and will be called Son of God" (Lk 1,32-35).

Matthew said: *"Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth: it is not peace I have come to bring, but a sword" (Mt 10,34).*

Of all the protagonists of the "Christianized" Gospels, John - unlike in the original Gospels - is the least striking character (despite being heavily reworked). According to the canonical tradition, John was first referred to as *"the disciple who Jesus loved"* called in as eyewitness to the life of Christ (as narrated in his own Gospel) and was later chosen as guardian of His "Revelation" (Apocalypse) and of His return (Parousia), no longer as "Saviour" but in the role of a terrifying "Executioner" who would have provoked the end of the world through a cosmic catastrophe marking the beginning of the "Kingdom of God".

In reality this nameless "disciple" did not exist (as demonstrated in the previous study) and therefore did not write any Gospel, Apocalypse or "letters".

Few people know that there are two Gospels **attributed** to "John": that of "John also called Mark" and that of "John". In order to distinguish between the two and justify the differences, incompatible as unequivocal evidence, due to the huge differences regarding the narrated events (all we need to do is check the "Chart of the Apostles and their Qualifications" in the first study); *"also called Mark"* is added to *"John"* in "Acts of the Apostles" (12,12), where "the favourite Apostle" suddenly emerges shortly before the death of Herod Agrippa I in **44 A.D.** and turns out to be *"son of Mary" residing "in his mother's house" in Jerusalem* (not in the house of Zebedee, his father, **as stated in the synoptic Gospels**).

Instead, in no Gospel do they mention an Apostle named "John also called Mark" despite being "officialized" by the "tradition" from Eusebius onwards; the latter very superficially referred to him as "Mark".

In the Gospel of "John also called **Mark**" we met a "John" son of Zebedee, an **integralist Zealot** like his brother James; both were qualified as *"Boanergés" **, **sons of the "Wrath of Yahweh"** adverse to the Roman domination of the Land of Israel. Therefore John was an adult rebel and fanatic nationalist who sided against the established authority, and who, ideologically, would never have accepted a second "Trastevere" (renowned neighbourhood of modern-day Rome) name: Mark. In the Gospel of Luke (Lk 9,53), John turns out to be a **Zealot** ready to set fire to Samaritan villages (the Samaritans were enemies of the Jews) along with his other brother: James (the Greater).

* See explanation of the term "Boanergés" in the first study.

A prohibition regarding the use of aristocratic names (even more rigid than that of the Jews) **was imposed by Roman Law** (the only law which really counted in the Empire), which the editors of "Acts of the Apostles" foolishly fail to mention; a similar error (see study) was made with regard to the "citizenship" of Saint Paul, thus demonstrating that this document, considered holy by believers, was created after 212 A.D.

In that year Emperor Marcus Aurelius Caracalla decreed the extension of Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire in order to level their privileges and thus render useless the Diplomas of Roman Citizenship.

Before this date (even at the time of the Republic) only foreigners who were conferred a **Diploma of Citizenship** were granted the **right to give themselves Roman names, while for all others it was prohibited**.

Caesar Augustus - who gave great importance to **Roman citizenship** - **ordered three censuses** in order to verify which inhabitants of the Empire had the right to this citizenship. The title was registered in the Acts of the Senate, and a **Diploma** was issued as proof of this title. This Diploma (like the Military Diploma) contained a certificate of merit issued by the imperial authorities and which was to be shown upon request of any Roman official.

Suetonius said (**Claudius** 25):

"People of foreign citizenship were prohibited from taking on Roman names, let alone aristocratic names. Those who usurped the right to Roman citizenship were beheaded on the Esquiline field".

The Jews were persecuted by all Roman Emperors and Commanders, with the exception of Julius Caesar and Nerva (the latter, who was elderly, was in office for less than two years). Therefore the equestrian Military Tribune adorned with laticlaves - an imperial official in Jerusalem during the principate of **Claudius**, obliged to ensure the respect of Roman Law - would have inflicted grave punishment on any Jew who had given himself a Roman name such as Mark (a typical aristocratic name) if not in possession of a Diploma of Citizenship.

Therefore, "Mark" is a pseudonym chosen by Christian scribes after the Edict of Caracalla, unaware of an old and obsolete imperial law and lacking knowledge of the strict Jewish customs. In the Roman Empire of the first century an aristocratic name such as "Mark" "fastened" upon a Jewish subject **lacking Roman citizenship** violated laws and customs of both Rome and Judea.

On the contrary, the "John" described by the "tradition of Saint John" is not an adult rebel fighter and integralist; the role is given to an unnamed, unknown boy called *"the disciple who Jesus loved"*, who appeared out of nowhere during the last supper in which the first Eucharistic Sacrifice was celebrated. Apart from the reference to the Baptist, the name "John" is unknown to the evangelist himself and never appears in his "own" Gospel; not even when the Jesus "calls" the Disciples to follow Him in the mission assigned to him by God the Father. We know of the existence of *"the sons of Zebedee"* (Jhn 21,2), after the death and resurrection of Christ, in the twenty-first and final chapter. Studies conducted by experts have discovered that "John" was added at a later date in order to reduce the number of contrasts with the other Gospels with regard to the number and names of the Apostles (see chart in the first study and relative footnote).

The "John" of the fourth Gospel was depicted as an adolescent tied to the "Saviour" by a strong sentimental relationship (as in the case of relatives), to the point that during the Last Supper he *"lean[s] back close to Jesus' chest"* (Jhn 13,25). This aspect of the favourite Apostle, who languidly abandoned himself on the body of Christ, is not reported by the other evangelists. Also, why would a God have created a very young Disciple-Apostle who Jesus preferred to the other Apostles?

We can find the answer in the final eschatological passage of the Gospel itself, at the time of the Crucifixion, in which a scene with the "three Marys" grasping the foot of the cross along with a boy is described.

This in reality would have been impossible as **the Law of Rome did not allow anyone to go near a public torture** (which was guarded by a cordon of armed militiamen): especially relatives, friends and disciples ... **No one, Apostles included, could stay in the vicinity of the cross.**

"Seeing his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing near her, Jesus said to his mother, «Woman, this is your son». Then to the disciple he said, «This is your mother». And from that hour the disciple took her into his home"

(Jhn 19,26/27).

But in whose house? In his father Zebedee's house according to the the Synoptic Gospels? Certainly not, as in "Acts of the Apostles" we have already seen that "John also called Mark" lived at **Mary's** (his mother) **house in Jerusalem**. And how can we believe that a boy could have looked after an old woman? This is a "Saint John scenario", totally different from that of the other evangelists, prepared with aim to "represent" the human sacrifice of the new transcendental "Entity" which would have "saved" humanity from going through hell. But the Christian scribe, when copying this from an original manuscript, gave little weight to the "details" of this Gospel, "stratified" remains of a form of primitive Messianism which have provoked serious problems which continue today to remain unsolved.

The scribe, first of all, carefully avoided writing the name "John" used in reference to the Messiah in the original Essenic Gospel entitled "Gospel **of** John", as it described the deeds of the divine Jewish protagonist, thus justifying the title by having it appear to have been written **by** "John". But the copyist, by removing this name inevitably eliminated a protagonist and, as a result, **the evangelist John does not know himself**. Finally, so as to make it impossible to identify "John" as the crucified Messiah, he places under the cross a younger brother having the same name:

"John", afterwards awarding him the honour of looking after his elderly mother.

So much so, in the Gospel verse we have just read that **Mary, who was the mother of Jesus, was also the mother of the "disciple who Jesus loved"**. That is to say, a brother of Jesus or "**He**" himself (in the first study, after the Apostles' chart, we have listed the ancient Codexes, later "discarded", and according to which in Matthew 13,55 **John is also included among the sons of Mary**). Yet as the "favourite Apostle" was called John and **beneath the cross there could be no one because in violation of Roman Law, it is evident that He, "Jesus", was John ... on the cross**. Without any disciple under or near the cross ... and confirmed by the canonical Gospels:

"Then all the disciples deserted him and ran away" (Mt 26,56).

So, the unnamed "**disciple who Jesus loved**" is the "avatar" of **John**; this name **does not appear** in the Gospel of John **as one of the Apostles called in by Christ as one of His followers** because it is Him: "Jesus".

This is how the "Gospel of John" begins:

**"A man came, sent by God. His name was John ...
He was in the world that had come into being through him
and the world did not recognize him.
He came to his own and his own people did not accept him"**
(Jh 1,6-11)

"**John**" is the **only appellative** indicated in the prologue of this copy of the Gospel (no longer the original), in which in spite of the reference to God the creator, the name "Jesus Christ" does not appear; it will be added at a later date, after citing "John the Baptist", in order to hide the true "John" of the preamble. The reference in the prologue cannot concern the Baptist, as will soon be verified. In fact, as proof of what we have just stated, we then read: **"Who are you? He declared, he did not deny but declared «I am not the Christ»"** (Jhn 1,19-20).

Tricky **words** which were **clearly tampered with** in order to contradict the true John who, in the original Gospel, said **"I am the Messiah"**, confirmed in the text itself (as we are about to read), where Jesus is accused of having proclaimed himself King ... but we of course know that a true Jewish monarch underwent the unction ritual, from which the term **"Anointed"** (in Hebrew **"Mashiah"**) derives. With regard to the Messianic expectancy of the Jews, Luke goes so far as to say that:

"A feeling of expectancy had grown among the people, who were beginning to wonder whether John might be Christ" (Lk 23,1).

A purely Christian concept which, as in many other cases, misinterprets Jewish Law: the people of Israel awaited the divine Messiah, but their hope could not go so far as to mention useless names, because they were aware that only Yahweh would have chosen the true Messiah ...

"The whole assembly then rose, and they brought him (Jesus) before Pilate. They began their accusation by saying, «We found this man inciting our people to revolt, opposing payment of the tribute to Caesar, and claiming to be Christ, a King»" (Lk 23,1).

"If you (Pilate) set him (Jesus) free you are no friend of Caesar's; anyone who makes himself king is defying Caesar" (Jh 19,12).

The comparison of the evidence provided by the two Gospels highlights the accusation directed towards "this man" without specifying his name, guilty of inciting the people not to pay their taxes to the Emperor of Rome and of proclaiming himself King of the Jews (through the holy unction) and Messiah.

It is important to point out that the description of the event, narrated by ignorant scribes, does not conform to Roman power and law which obliged an imperial Prefect **to eliminate whoever proclaimed himself King in a territory owned by Caesar and had subversive intentions with regard to the payment of taxes to Rome**; no one would have dared to remind the Prefect of his duty (ius gladii), as instead is evident in the passage we have just read. Instead, in spite of the precise accusations made by the assembly against the "Messiah King", who had ascended the throne of Jerusalem without an imperial decree issued by Tiberius, according to the phony trial drawn up by incompetent Christian scribes ... a Roman magistrate, Governor of Judea, rather than ask, **first of all**, for confirmation of the event from his vice, the **Imperial Tribune**, commander of the military garrison stationed in Antonia Fortress, is said to have asked this idiotic question: **"«Are you the King of the Jews? He replied, It is you who say it»"**. Then Pontius Pilate is described as a puppet who, indifferent to the fact of having been deprived of his powers-duties linked to his position of "Governor of the Jews", rules: **"«I find no case against this man»"** (Lk 23). Whoever has minimum knowledge of the Law in effect at the time of the Roman Empire must consider this "trial against Jesus" as buffoonery, starting with the insignificant "this man" (as mentioned above), expression used to identify the self-proclaimed "King of the Jews". In reality "this man" was **John**, awkwardly **disguised as "John called the Baptist"**; from the very beginning the Church led us to believe this in order to hide the names of the authentic Zealot protagonists of the primitive Gospels, by often having recourse to the stratagem of overlapping their names and deeds in the current Gospels copied from the originals:

"At that time Herod the tetrarch heard about the reputation of Jesus and said to his court «this is John the Baptist himself; he has risen from the dead, and that is why miraculous powers are at work in him»" (Mt 14, 1-2).

The true John, in reality, was a "boanergès" Zealot whose nationalist doctrine - **the fourth Jewish philosophy** - **incited the people not to pay their taxes to Rome**. A "John" who was disguised behind the name "**Baptist**", who, in turn, was even passed off by Luke as the **cousin of "Jesus Christ"**. **An absurd blood relationship which is not mentioned in the Gospel of "John"**, thus demonstrating the intricacy of the ecclesiastic scribes when choosing to have the two protagonists interact.

A naivety which becomes even more evident when Eusebius of Caesarea invented the "Testimonium Flavianum" and attributed it to Josephus; the former makes Jesus Christ appear to be famous, but fails to mention the blood relationship between the Baptist and the more important "Christ", "Man-God", who **resurrected three days after His death** (cfr HEC I 11,7 and Antiquities XVIII 63).

"John" could not have been the Baptist as history is clear and teaches that the latter had only one enemy: Herod Antipas the Tetrarch *. It was he who killed him because - unlike the Gospel passage (John 1,11) we have just read which says that **"He came to his own and his own people did not accept them"** - **his people had received him with too much favour**:

*"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).

* Herod Antipas married Herodiade despite having another princess as his wife: the daughter of Aretas IV, King of the Nabataean Arabs. Antipas the Tetrarch counted on being chosen as King by Tiberius, but only one of the two princesses could have become Queen. Herodiade laid down this condition, which Herod secretly accepted, but the daughter of Aretas found out and informed her father who declared war on the Tetrarch, in the meantime claiming territories bordering on Perea which were administered by the Herodian half-Jew. Territories which, however, were Roman "protectorates".

The Gospels deliberately confuse John the Baptist and "Jesus", and use the former as the "double" of the latter, overlapping the two ideological characters to the point that Saint Luke begins his tale with the "Nativity" of:

"John ... he will be great in the sight of the Lord; he must drink no wine, no strong drink" (Lk 1, 13/15).

Who could not drink wine was a "Nazirene" (Jews who had taken the holy vow called "Nazir"), but according to history **John the Baptist was not a Nazirene nor a Messiah**. Josephus was a Jew and was totally aware of what the "Messiah" represented for the Jews; he also had known the Nazirenes very well and describes them and praises them for their importance, as he does with Samuel and Samson who are consecrated to God of this vow; and therefore, if the Baptist had been a Nazirene like Samuel and Samson, Josephus would have specified the fact in the long passage dedicated to him; likewise - as a chronicler and, in particular, as a Pharisean priest - he would have felt obliged to inform the entire Jewish world that John the Baptist was the precursor and prophet of the imminent advent of a divine Messiah and guardian of a doctrine which was completely different from Jewish doctrine. This is what the Gospels say. Josephus also mentioned the blood relationship with the even more famous Messiah - "Jesus" - thus confirming the evangelical news which attests him as the Baptist's cousin. All the more so - due to the exceptionality of the Messianic event which the Jews awaited - the historian would have informed his readers that the people had mistaken the Baptist for the Messiah, as written superficially by Luke. The information (as a whole) highlighted in the evangelical writings is totally pertinent to the Jewish creed; so if Josephus did not make reference to this information in the detailed historical event regarding John the Baptist, this means that it was not true, and that the scribes lied ... but with a precise aim, which we are about to reveal.

First of all, "Nazirene" was the appellation of the Jewish believer who dedicated himself to God, promising for the entire duration of the vow not to drink alcohol and to keep his hair uncut and his beard unshaven. The followers became part of the sect of the Nazirenes directly linked to "Yeshua" John, **unlike the Baptist**.

After the prophecy written about John the Nazirene, Luke continues his narration by **first describing the "Nativity" of "John", then that of "Jesus"** ... as if the Nativity of Christ had been added later; furthermore, in his description of the event he even "depicts" an intermaternal relationship of a fetus.

*"She went into Zechariah's house and greeted Elizabeth. Now it happened that as soon as Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, **the child leapt in her womb**"* (Luke 1,40-41).

The Christian scribe says that "John" - while still in the womb of his hypothetical mother Elizabeth - "recognizes or perceives" Mary as his true mother; but ... being physically impossible in 6 B.C. (according to the modern dating of Church) for Luke to have placed his ear on Elizabeth's womb, we have tried to imagine God the Father, who "from the high heaven" bent down to whisper in the ear of the evangelical Saint (to him only) this detail regarding the "jolt" of the fetus inside the maternal womb and pass it on to future believers - **"the blessed are the poor in spirit"** - to whom priests hide the fact that the evangelist (according to "tradition") was born in 10 A.D.

In the **"Protoevangelium of James"** we read:

*"Elizabeth, hearing that they were searching for **John**, took him and went **on the mountain**"* (op. cit. 22,3). *Herod was searching for **John** ... and told them: «**John is he who will reign over Israel**»"* (op. cit. 23,1-2).

In this Gospel - a manuscript which is older than the Vatican and Sinaitic Codexes - why would have Herod persecuted "John" if he was not destined to become "King of the Jews"? ... right which belonged to the Hasmonean line? And what "mountain" was it, if not that of Gamala? ... the native land of Judas the Galilean and his sons: John, Simon, James, Judas, and Joseph.

By carrying on with the research we will be able to establish that the primitive "Gospels of John" (written by the Essenes) were not manuscripts written **by** "John", but were manuscripts which spoke **about** "John the Messiah and Saviour".

In the previous study we verified the inexistence of the Apostle Saint John, "the favourite of the Lord". In order to do so, we inevitably - due to the long life and venerable age attributed to **"the disciple who Jesus loved"** - made use of the testimonies of the **"successors of the Apostles"**, the first of whom was Simon, passed off as the **second** Bishop of Jerusalem after James the Minor.

"Successors" mentioned by the "Ecclesiastical tradition" which has reached us through ancient manuscripts which we will continue to compare; the aim of this task is to verify what the Christian "Fathers" managed to invent in order to provide

"evidence" of the existence of Saint John. They were obliged to do so because they understood that "the disciple who Jesus loved" was "John Jesus", but - on the basis of their design - **if John got old no one would have suspected that he was Jesus "on the cross"**.

Having identified all four brothers of Jesus, including the youngest, Joseph ... in history we must not search for an in-existent "Jesus Christ resurrected", but for "John": a common mortal. He is a character of utmost importance, and among the Jews is even more important than his "brothers". His appellation was intentionally discarded in those versions of the Gospel of Matthew in which he is described **along with all the sons of Mary**; instead, as we have seen in the first study, the exegetes of the Church chose only the manuscripts in which **John and his brothers are never mentioned simultaneously because John was the true "subject"**, referred to as "this man" in order to fill the "void" left by this name.

John and his brothers were the promoters of risky undertakings (which even included the possibility of martyrdom), undertakings of integralist guerrilla **leaders**, of "Apostle Prophet agitators", of "nationalist fanatics", of ... **Zealots**. And this **John, identical to "Jesus" - they even had the same "fingerprints"** left by the *"prohibited foods and He had abandoned the traditional rules of purity"* (Bellum VII), foods eaten without carrying out the ritual ablution before the meal, in the same way as Christ - **is returned to us by history through a distant memory recalled by the Jewish historian Josephus at the end of the war**, after the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple by Titus: an entire chapter made up of twenty-two paragraphs. For the Law Jews who ate prohibited food were sinners. The Gospels say the following:

"Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?" (Mk 2,16);

"Look, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Lk 7,34);

"The Pharisee saw this and was surprised that he had not first washed before the meal" (Lk 11,38).

Apart from the false "Testimonium Flavianum" and the fake "James, brother of Jesus Christ", the search for authentic traces of "Jesus Christ" in the works of Josephus is a vain undertaking, as the historian was Jewish and so remained until his death. In the thirteenth study, in fact, we demonstrate that "Jesus", "Christ" and "Nazirene" were not names but divine titles.

The Jewish historian, a conservative Pharisee, scion of the highest priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem and descendent of the Hasmoneans ... was born in 37 A.D., a few years after (according to the Gospels) a "King of the Jews" was crucified by the Romans in compliance with a decision of the Sanhedrin, and, **incredibly, backed by the same people who had acclaimed him ... a "trial" which was a farse and created to suit the needs of a doctrine in contrast with the Law of Rome**, functional to the preservation of its domination exercised by means of capable army leaders. In reality a Roman military garrison (stationed in the Antonia Fortress) would have never submitted itself to the orders of Judas "the traitor", rather than to the Imperial Tribune of Jerusalem, in order to arrest Jesus (Jh 18,3), the proclaimed "King of the Jews", while Judea was governed by Prefect Pontius Pilate by will of Emperor Tiberius.

True Roman Law, in conformity with imperial power (the only one which possessed authority), obliged the *"Legatus Augusti pro Praetore"*, provincial governor, to eliminate whoever illegally ascended the throne of a territory belonging to Rome.

The parents of the Pharisean historian (and who resided in Jerusalem) attended the execution of "John", who was sentenced to death for leading a revolt during which the High Priests were killed and for **"breaking up whatever was left of the political systems"** (Bellum VII Chap. 8). The political system of Judaea was made up of prefectorial government headed by Pontius Pilate; he was stationed in Caesarea Maritima, the imperial capital of this Province, while in Jerusalem the supreme Roman authority was represented by the equestrian Military Tribune, who led a cohort of 500 men and one or more cavalry wings stationed in the Antonia Fortress.

It is a long, solely historical analysis through which it is possible to highlight and then fill a "void" created by cuts in the historical sequence of Book XVIII of "Jewish Antiquities": the period of "Jesus". Censorship practiced with the aim of preventing the recognition of the deeds the "boanergès" Zealots and highlighted by other historical sources.

The death of John and of the Zealot leaders, reported in the written record of the Jew, **is described as such**:

"They all encountered the death which they deserved, as God gave each of them a just punishment; in fact all of the scourges which could hit a man befell them until their last moment of life, and they died as a result of atrocious torments of all kinds" (Bellum VII Chap. 8 verse 272).

The writer of the "Jewish War" - at the end of a war which had brought about the ethnic holocaust of the Jews and the destruction of the Temple and of Jerusalem - recalls "John" in a long recollection focusing on the actions of the Zealots promoted by Judas the Galilean in 6 A.D., along with the census of Quirinius. As the description of the deeds and death of this "John" corresponds to the Zealot "John" of the Gospels, the false scribes intervened to prevent the identification of the historical character with the evangelical figure. In this case "the protagonist" is "moved forward" a generation and "covered" - in an "explanatory" footnote - by another truthfull double: John of Giscala. But, like in other similar circumstances, the Christian editors of the translations were not (and are not) capable of carrying out comparative readings of the consulted manuscripts and history. If they had done so, they would have realized that John of Giscala, a rebel leader of the Jewish War, was captured in 70 A.D. by Titus and placed **in prison for life** rather than being eliminated through torture.

As "The Jewish War" was written by Josephus at the time of Vespasian (between 75 and 79 A.D.), **while the historian was reporting this account John of Giscala, his bitter enemy, was still alive**.

The Jew Josephus knew John of Giscala personally and dedicated a large part of **"Autobiography"** - a handwritten scroll - to his enemy and described him as being a social climber who unsuccessfully attempted to discredit him in front of the Sanhedrin in order to replace him as Governor of Galilee.

After verifying (through the previous analysis) that the city of "Jesus" described in the Gospels does not correspond to the present-day "Nazareth" but to Gamala, the city of Judas the Galilean and his children, who had the same names as the brothers of the "Lord" ... we have discovered that "Nazareth" is needed in order to justify the title of "Nazarene", which is a literary modification of "Nazireo", that is to say the consecrated to God through the vow of "Nazir": a promise which obliged the followers not to drink wine and cut their hair.

In the Gospels the vow was falsely attributed to John "the Baptist" because Nazarism was incompatible with the new Christian doctrine: it was in contrast with the Eucharistic rite of the transformation of the wine into blood.

A "Nazireo", tied to the vow of "Nazir", **could not have drunk wine during the last supper and then transform it into blood** to be drunk by other Jewish "Apostles", who were also his brothers.

This need of the new theology forced the founding Fathers of the Christian doctrine of the salvation (as mentioned in the Gospel of John) to superimpose (having both the same name) **the false Nazireo John the Baptist and the true one,**

John, the eldest of the brothers, sons of Judas the Galilean.

According to the Law of the Ancient Fathers, the Jews did not await "Yahweh's Anointed" in order to crucify him and eat him as "Hostia" (host) and drink his blood; their Messiah had to be a warrior King: a Saviour (Jeshù'a) who would free the land of Israel from pagan domination.

The theophagical Eucharistic rite, which called for the drinking of the blood of the **"sacrificed victim of the Gods"** (Hostia), was adopted by the pagan doctrines and grafted on to Jewish religion; it was adopted by the first Jesuit Christians during the second half of the second century, after the second destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 135 A.D.; **the first Jesuit Christians maintained the liturgy of the "breaking of bread" practiced by the Essene Jews** (as documented in their "rule" described in the scrolls of Qumran).

From the very beginning monks and high clergy knew that they descended from the Therapeutic Essenes of Alexandria, as mentioned in the fourth century by the Bishops Epiphanius and Eusebius of Caesarea (HEC. II 16,1-2). As the Gospels do not contain the description of the appearance of the "Saviour", in later centuries artists imagined him as wearing a simple white alb like that used by the followers of the sect (Bellum II verse 123) and as having **long hair and a long beard, which were obligatory for a "Nazireo"**; he was also imagined as wearing a long purple mantle fit for a king ... because, in reality, in 35 A.D. **John managed to become King of the Jews** and was recognized as their "Yeshù'a".

In order not to make him appear to be a "Nazireo" - a detail which would have jeopardized "the doctrine of the salvation" - the founding Fathers wanted to demonstrate that he did not belong to this sect, but they went overboard ... and a "God" who descended on Earth to save humanity first was said to have transformed water into wine then, without qualms whatsoever, was passed off as a **"drunkard"** and **"glutton"** along with "sinners" (for the Jews those who ate prohibited foods were sinners) and **"tax collectors"** (those who collected the taxes to be paid by the Jews to "Caesar"). In order to prevent the Zealots who fought against these taxes from being identified, the deceitful ideologists vulgarly preferred to pass Jesus off as a "middling scab" Jew who, along with his "disciples" - **before being acclaimed by the people of Jerusalem as Christ King** - sided with the Romans rather than with his fellow countrymen, and even chose a tax collector, Matthew, as his "Apostle".

*"When he went out after this, he noticed a tax collector, Levi by name, sitting at the tax office, and said to him: «Follow me». And leaving everything Levi got up and followed him. In his honour Levi held a great reception in his house, and with them at the table was a large gathering of tax collectors and others. The Pharisees and their scribes complained to his disciples and said, «Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?»" (Lk 5,27-30).
"«Is it permissible for us to pay taxes to Caesar or not?» ... He says to them, «Well then, pay Caesar what belongs to Caesar - and God what belongs to God.»" (Lk 20,22/25) ...*

A precise answer which means: pay your taxes to the Emperor and then pray. In contempt of the nationalist Creed pervading Jewish society, which called for young people - resentful, unruly and impatient towards pagan Roman domination over the "land" which Yahweh "promised" to the chosen people - to mobilize.

The founding fathers of Christianity - due to the political changes resulting from the bloody wars which the Jews had lost - realized that the narrated events originated from the real vicissitudes of irredentist martyrs from Judea. Mythicized heroes with revolutionary ideals who over time came into contrast with the new doctrine, and who were not as docile as "lambs of God" whatsoever.

Changes had to be made in order to make the **sacrifice of a Saviour** incarnated as a real man more credible, unlike the pagan religions which were solely based on myths; **a theophagic sacrifice which aimed at guaranteeing eternal life** which, along with the hope of miraculous healings, had become the strong point of Jesuit Christianity.

*"I am the living bread which has come down from the heaven. Anyone who eats this bread will live forever; and that bread that I shall give is my flesh" (Jh 6,51).
"Anyone who does eat my flesh and drink my blood has eternal life and I shall raise that person up" (Jh 6,54).*

This was the new doctrine which intrigued masses of new proselytes: **the grafting of the sacrifice of the pagan "Soter" onto the Jewish religion by means of the "Messiah", Jeshù'a of the Jews**. Messiah who no longer **"descended from heaven"**, as initially postulated by the mystic creators of the primitive Gospels and prophesized by the Essenes in a fragment of the manuscript of Qumran (4Q286/7) **"... the Holy Spirit will descend on his Messiah..."** - **taken word for word by the Gospel of Luke** (Lk 3,22) - who was born in a grotto from a "virgin" mother.

This is how the virginal birth is reported by Origen and it is similar to births in other Creeds, especially that of God Mithras, with targeted syncretism. Mithraism is defeated and **the "grotto" (mithraeum) later disappears from the Gospels** in order to sever one of the pagan ideological roots ... but it has remained through the centuries in the memory of people, thus contradicting the canonical Gospels themselves.

It was no longer necessary to kill animals and drink their blood, ritual reserved for well-off pagan Neophytes (followers of the Mystery Cults) and too expensive for the plebians. In order to achieve eternal life, all one had to do is follow a liturgy in which the breaking up of **"consecrated live bread"** took place. The same liturgy, but lacking theophagical rite, is described by the Essenes in the **"Rule of the Community"** of Qumran.

An original manuscript of the **"Gospel of Judah"** - which survived the devastating ecclesiastic censorships - was discovered recently and is dated 275 A.D.; the verification of the dating was carried out by means of mass spectrometry and depicts a "Jesus" and a God creator different from those described by the Church. The Gospel does not mention Pilate, nor the **theophagic eucharistic rite** which occurred in the "Last Supper" or the **"Resurrection"**.

He is a "Saviour" who is still partly Jewish, but not the leader of a nation fighting to free its land from pagan invasion. The same goes for the other Gospels found in Nag Hammadi (Egypt) in 1945; differences found even in the papyri in Ossirinco (Egypt). This is proof of the theological differences among the "embryonic doctrines" followed by the early "Christians" and which forced the "Church" - from the **authentic "Fathers" of the fourth century A.D.** onwards - to select and unite different Jesuit-Christian "creeds" and destroy their respective Gospels.

Even before the victory of Constantine over the pagan Massentius in 312 A.D., various Christian theological currents began to wage war among themselves. The conflict continued for more than a century, and each of the factions involved was convinced to be the guardian of the true **"Revelation"** regarding the **"Truth of the Salvation"**, of the true **"Substance of the Saviour"**, of the **"gnosis"** of the **"Son shaped like the Father"**, of how many **"Powers and Substances"** had to make up **"The Verb"** or the **"Logos"**, if by an **"Unknown Father, Infinite and Shapeless"** or if by God, through an **"Enlightening Baptism"** creating **"His son as Humanization of the Spirit"**, or if by **"the Holy Spirit which, through a perfect hypostasis with the Father and Son, generates a Virgin, according to the flesh, the Verb made flesh"** ... **"in a consubstantial and coeternal Trinity"** ... Until the definitive **"Verb"** was coined and described in detail in encyclopedias and dictionaries all over the world: **"Transubstantiation"**. Or rather

*"The ritual through which **the real presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus** in the Eucharist takes shape, by means of the **transformation of the substance: wine into Blood** and bread **into the Body of Jesus Christ ... with the bread and wine which only appear to remain unaltered**".*

And all this, thanks to a universal brainwashing, was introduced into a "host". *"Hostia": "Sacrificial victim that the pagans offered to the Gods" on an "Altar": "a slab of stone raised above ground where sacrifices were carried out".*

Bishops, Patriarchs and "Pontifices Maximi" Emperors all declared themselves to be *"Venerables and Saints"*, and through tall tales created divinities to be adored by man. Divinities which ideologically contradicted one another, thus generating tensions and wars; conflicts which were so violent that one Council after another had to be summoned in order to try and "conciliate" schismatic doctrines whose followers preferred to massacre one another and mutually accuse one another of being *"heretics"*, *"apostates"* and *"crazy"*. Doctrines against Doctrines ... Saints against Saints ... men against men ... persecutions and martyrdoms of Christians against Christians, **followers of different Christs** ... power against power ... death against death ... **for eternal life**.

"We have withstood the persecutions carried out by the heretic Christians, the sufferings they inflicted, their threats to the faith ... Every heresy must be anathematized, especially that of the Eunomians or Amoneans, the Arians or Eudosians, the Serniarians and Pneumatomachians, the Sebellians, the Marcellians, the Photians and the Apollinarists" ... Basilidians, Docetists, Carpocratians, Cleobians, Cerinthians, Modalists, Adoptionists, Dositheans, Marcionians, Masbotheans, Montanians, Novations, Simonites, Donatites, Priscillians, Menandrianists, Pelagians, Monophists (Coptics), Nestorians, Abellians, Valentinians, Saturnillians etc..."

And the massacre among the "Christians" continued throughout the fourth and fifth centuries, until all of the Christian doctrines declared "heretical" were eliminated, along with their respective Gospels, by the victorious doctrine which had survived the struggle ... like a sort of "survival of the fittest religious species": **present-day Christianity**. The conception of a new theological figure - the "Messiah Saviour" - was not, from the very beginning, easy for the Essene sects scattered throughout the Eastern Empire ... in consideration of the fact that, to date, each of us (apart from atheists) imagines his "God" to suit their own "needs" or imagination.

The hatred of the aspiring Leaders of the Catholic world is described as such by **Ammianus Marcellinus**, the most important imperial historian of the fourth century, in his *"Res Gestae"* (XXII 5,3-4) completed by the year 378 A.D:

"No ferocious beast is hostile to towards men like the majority of Christians amongst themselves".

The new Fathers of the Church study the available manuscripts, eliminate the ridiculous trash and declare the abstract doctrine founded upon a "gnosis" (knowledge of God) to be heretical as it is more suitable for ascetics who have a tendency towards mystical exaltation, which is not very requested or practiced as it is not understood by a "people" in need "of eternity" and of "therapeutic" miracles.

They destroy many Gospels along with their respective "Jesuses", which were different and in contrast with one another; these Gospels are clear evidence of the many attempts to "construct" a new religion. These Gospels are "apocryphal", which means "hidden" ... an expression which is as hypocritical like those who use the term imprecisely. They write the "Acts of the Apostles" to offer "testimony" and "historically demonstrate" the new doctrine which evolved from the primitive Essenic Jewish Gospels and was adapted to suit the "universal" needs of the new "Creed"; but **they are forced to manipulate the compromising identity of the "brothers of Jesus", by transforming them into "Apostles" who are cloned and given the task of preaching and spreading the "True Faith wanted by God"**.

As a result of the "adaptive" theological evolution of the manuscripts over time, in today's Ancient Greek and Latin Gospels we can still find terms and authentic words (not understood in the past) which give evidence of **the anti-Roman Zealot origin of a pro-Jewish doctrine** ... which is later "redeemed" by Pauline Christianity.

The historical sources, the Gospels and the patristic texts have been corrected in order to prevent the recognition of the true protagonists and the political context which forced John, leader of the Zealots and eldest son of Judas the Galilean, to attack a Roman garrison stationed in Jerusalem and free the Holy City from imperial dominion while Rome was at war with the Parthian Empire. At the same time, in Judea, a very serious famine was killing off many poverty-stricken people to the point that *"... **the famine made the Zealots devastatingly wild** ..."*. There was so little food that the Jewish population under the leadership of the Zealots was persuaded to rebel against the authorities and destroy the political system in force.

A detailed analysis of the events of the period, which are compared to the accounts of the Christian historians, highlights the very coarse alterations which will allow us to verify the true course of the events. This will be done in the next study.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]