



HOME PAGE | PROEMIUM TO THE STUDY | PROFILE AND CONTACTS

LANGUAGES  

A grave famine convinced Yeshùà to proclaim himself King of the Jews

Incipit

Acts of the Apostles:

"And one of the Prophets whose name was Agabus, seized by the Spirit, stood up and predicted that a severe and universal famine was going to happen. This in fact happened while Claudius was Emperor" (Acts 11,28).

As of the fourth century, period in which the "Acts of the Apostles" were drawn up in their respective biblical codexes (which still exist today, like the "Codex Sinaiticus" and the "Codex Vaticanus"), the historians of the Christians who had come to power, having read the first century scrolls containing the works of Josephus and preserved in the imperial library, were aware of the serious famine which had hit Judea between 34 and 36 A.D., during the Principate of **Tiberius not under Claudius**. The gravity of this misfortune exasperated the Jews so much that in 35 A.D., during the "Feast of Tabernacles" (late summer early autumn), the people of Jerusalem, led by the Zealots, rose up against the Roman Prefect "Pontius Pilate" (who in this moment was in Caesarea Maritima) and the Sanhedrin of the Holy City. The latter was a religious institution made up of seventy-three people, and which for the Jews was the most authoritative in interpreting the Mosaic Law; its members came mainly from the wealthy pro-Roman priestly class and was presided over by a High Priest of the Temple.

The rebellion took place at the same time as the **war declared against Rome in 34 A.D.** by the supreme King of the Parthians **Artabanus III**, who belonged to the Arcaside Dynasty. The destruction of the Roman military garrison stationed in Jerusalem, allowed the Zealots to place a descendant of the Hasmoneans on the throne which had belonged to David: **John**, son of Judas the Galilean, who was acclaimed by the people as "Yeshùà" (Saviour) and King of the Jews".

This change in political power, which John and the powerful King of the Parthians had already agreed upon, entailed the investiture as King and "High Priest" of the Temple through the ancestral rite of anointing. Just like his ancestor **Antigonus II**, son of Aristobulus who, in 40 B.C., after allying himself with the King of the Parthians, Barzaphranes, also managed to become "King of the Jews" and High Priest. This is how, during the 35 A.D. "Feast of Tabernacles" in Jerusalem, an absolute monarch, a Doctor of the Law (Rabbi), ascended the throne and whose name was **John**".

In the eleventh century, the scribes of "**Codex Ambrosianus F 128**", when copying the text of "Jewish Antiquities", modified the chronicles of the Israelite people described in the third book of this work where the Jewish historian, Josephus, a thousand years earlier, had reported the events of his era. The aim of the scribes was to mislead researchers as to the precise dating of the grave famine which afflicted the Jews and brought about a popular revolt resulting in the acclamation of John as **"King of the Jews"** and **"Saviour"** (Yeshùà); until the Romans, after after defeating Artabanus, crucified him at Easter in 36 A.D. This event was idealized over a century later by the Jewish sect of the Essenic Jews through the creation of a new myth: the "Messiah, Universal Saviour and Son of God", with power to raise the dead and give them eternal life.

This is how the falsifiers dealt with the historical reference, drawn on by Josephus as an example of the Jewish priests' total respect of fasting (provided for in the Mosaic Law), even in cases of extreme difficulty.

"**Jewish Antiquities**", Book III 320: *"This legislation arriving from God ensured that this hero (Moses) be raised to a level higher than that of his nature; in addition, but just before our current war, under Roman Emperor Claudius, and our High Priest Ismael,* was our region was undergoing a famine of such a gravity that an assaron was worth four drachmas, and when for the the feast of the Azymes no fewer than seventy cori of flour were transported, the equivalent of thirty-one Sicilian medimni and forty-one attics, none of the priests dared to eat even a loaf, despite the great famine devastating the earth, for they feared the law and the wrath with which God always punishes crimes, even if hidden. We therefore should not be surprised by what took place at the time, having verified that to this day the writings left by Moses are so authoritative that even our enemies recognize that our constitution was promulgated by God through him and his merits".*

* Here are the oversights carried out by the exegetes of God when they modified the passage we have just read.

1° - This **"Ismael"** lacks the patronymic "son of (bar) **Fabi**": an omission which Josephus never committed when, in first citation, the historian mentioned each High Priest of the Temple. Now let's verify the specific passages contained in "Antiquities" (XX 179 and foll.), which attests the investiture, decided by King Agrippa II, of the young **"Ismael son of Fabi"** as High Priest - **under Nero, not under Claudius** - from **56 to 61 A.D.**, date in which he was replaced by the High Priest "Joseph called Kabi" son of Simon. **During Ismael's five years as High Priest it has been verified that no famine took place.**

2° - On the contrary, during the feast mentioned in "Acts of the Apostles" and which took place **under Claudius in 47 A.D.** (cfr. Tacitus, Annales XI 4) in the faraway province of Judea, the High Priest of the Temple **was not "Ismael" but**

"Joseph son of Kamei".

The latter was appointed by "Herod brother of Agrippa" to replace "Simon called Kanthera, son of Boethus" (Ant. XX 16). The following year, under the newly-elected Procurator "Ventidius Cumanus" (in office as of 48 A.D.), a new High Priest was appointed and his name was "**Ananias son of Nebedee**", who in 52 A.D. was arrested by the Legate of Syria "Ummidius Durmius Quadratus and **never re-elected by the Romans**. It is important to remember that the scribes of God made a blunder when they had Saint Paul argue with "Ananias" in 58 A.D. (see second study), describing it as unacceptable High Priest of the Temple.

The chronology of the High Priests of the Temple is completed by the accounts of their detailed actions, accurately described by the Jewish historian **Josephus** who was **also an eyewitness and scribe of the Sanhedrin of "Ismael son of Fabi"** in Jerusalem.

Being it impossible for Josephus to have described in two contrasting events the same High Priest "**Ismael**" who presided over the Sanhedrin to which they both belonged, it is evident that the quotation highlighted above in yellow is **a spurious interpolation** inserted, for the first time, in "Jewish Antiquities" by the editors of "Codex Ambrosianus F 128" so as to as to make the dating of the famine questionable. In this passage, in addition to making the High Priest "Ismael" a contemporary of Emperor Claudius, something which is impossible, the eleventh century Christian calligraphers also make the mistake (allowing us to discover the blunder) of quoting the same phrase from "Acts of the Apostles": "**the grave famine which devastated the earth**". We will soon understand why the copyists forced the tragic famine to spread throughout the world in addition to Judea.

At this point it is sufficient to eliminate the extemporaneous interpolation highlighted in yellow in order to verify that the abstinence from food, contained in the Mosaic Law, was respected (as documented by Josephus) by all the priests even during the lethal famine which hit the Jewish people, reaching its peak in 35 and 36 A.D.

Having said this, now let's analyze the famine in-depth so as to **demonstrate the cause** which drove Christian historians to **falsify the dating** during the fifth and sixth centuries, first in "Acts of the Apostles", then in "Jewish Antiquities" and, inevitably, in "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Eusebius of Caesarea.

The famine

Through a reading of the "Acts of the Apostles" we have also proven the inexistence of Saint Paul and the other evangelical protagonists, all of whom possessed supernatural powers given to them by the "Holy Spirit"; the description of these powers is so puerile and silly that the learned ecclesiastical exegetes, starting from the Pope himself, are ashamed to report these details to believers in order to prevent these "actor saints" ... and they themselves, from being ridiculed.

Nonetheless, one must admit that it would have been fascinating to meet men in the street with long beards looking up towards the sky, with a priestly appearance and "*tongues of fire [which] came to rest on the head of each of them ... They were all filled with the Holy Spirit*" (Acts 2,3/4) which accompanied them in their solemn advance ...

We are about to discover another of these extraordinary characters invented by Luke: **the Prophet Agabus**. He, thanks to the prophecy revealed by the Holy Spirit, convinced Saul Paul to go to Judea to help the "brothers" who are starving due to the famine.

So let's follow the true historical events and verify the deeds of the "fictitious super Apostle of the Gentiles".

In Acts (Acts 21, 8/11), "*at the house of Phillip, one of the seven*", Agabus predicts the following to Saint Paul : "*This is what the Holy Spirit says*" ... informing the Saint of his imminent capture by the pagans (Antonius Felix and Porcius Festus); but, thanks to the study on Paul of Tarsus, we know that the events and all of the characters, including Phillip, were invented by deceitful Christian scribes who wrote under the pseudonym of "Luke". The mystification which we are about to verify (as in the case of those verified previously) had a precise objective, vital to the new doctrine: hide, in this case, **the precise date and relative historical context which allowed "Jesus"** and his brothers, leaders of the Zealot national liberation movement, **to take power in Jerusalem in 35 A.D.** In this year **Johannes** (John) **managed to crown himself King of the Jews** in the Holy City, where he was executed by the Romans the following year during Passover.

We continue, therefore, to compare New Testament writings and history.

Even if it may seem impossible at first, we manage to bring out the historical truth from the "holy texts"; we demonstrate that the true events linked to "Jesus Christ" have to do with a simple war, among the many fought by the Roman Empire to maintain Roman domination over a land whose inhabitants, the Israelites, considered "Holy" and inviolable because assigned to them by God; thus, they could not accept pagan domination of their territory.

Josephus in "Jewish Antiquities" (Book XX 101) states:

*"It was under the administration of **Tiberius Alexander** (from 46 to 48 A.D.) that in Judea a grave famine took place, and during which Queen Helen spent a huge sum of money to buy grain from Egypt and distributed it to the needy, as I said above*".

A reader who gradually reads the work of Josephus at this point realizes that there is a very reduced repetition of a serious event which had just been reported in detail by the historian ... and they must ask themselves why. What is striking is the prominence given to the dating, true aim of the spurious introduction of this passage: under the administration of Procurator Tiberius Julius Alexander (46-48 A.D.), therefore **under the reign of Claudius**.

In effect, what had the Jewish historian "*said above*" about Queen Helen?

*"Her arrival had been very useful to the people of Jerusalem, because at that time the city was saddened by the famine and **many people died** because they lacked the money to buy what they needed. Queen Helen sent her attendants to Alexandria to buy huge quantities of grain, and others to Cyprus to buy loads of dried figs. When **Izates**, her son, was informed of the famine, he also sent huge sums of money **to the leaders of Jerusalem**. The distribution of these sums to the needy allowed him to overcome the hardships caused by the famine. I will to later **the description of the good deeds** carried out by this royal couple **for our city**"* (Antiquities XX 51/53).

Let's highlight the first detail which makes the two pieces of information incompatible: the one we have just read, much more circumstantial, speaks about "**leaders of Jerusalem**", while the previous is laconic and tells us that there was **only one** "leader", obviously Rome: the Procurator Tiberius Alexander.

Aware of the fact that between 6 and 48 A.D. the Governors of Judea who followed one another in this Province were all Roman imperial legates, with the exception of the Jewish King Herod Agrippa (from 41 to 44 A.D.), let's carry on with our investigation in order to clear up this point.

Helen and her son Izates were respectively Queen and King, Jews from Adiabene, a region south of Armenia and east of the upper Euphrates river, which marked the border agreed upon by the Roman Empire and Parthia. Just before this event we read that Izates, who had just been chosen as King:

*"When Izates arrived in Adiabene to take possession of his Kingdom and saw his brothers, considering it cruel to execute them and bearing in mind the affronts received, sent some of them to **Caesar Claudius in Rome** as hostages along with their children; and with the same pretext sent others (brothers) to **Artabanus King of the Parthians**" (Antiquities XX 36-37).*

The chronological matching of the two great Emperors with regard to this event is a serious historical error which Josephus could not have made: he was well-aware that **Artabanus died in 38 A.D.**, as he mentions later on. This information is given **after the historian describes the famine and the war conducted by the great Parthian against Tiberius**; therefore, Josephus was aware that **Claudius was proclaimed Emperor in 41 A.D.** (as is described in the chronicle).

It is important to point out that the manuscripts written by the Jewish chronicler in the first century were checked by Roman historians before being approved and deposited in the Imperial Archives ... and this is history of Rome.

Therefore, **being that Artabanus was alive, the only Emperor who interacted with him was Tiberius and no one else.**

The fact that we are dealing with Emperor Tiberius is unequivocally confirmed once again by history; in fact, in Antiquities XX 92 Josephus writes: *"Izates died, at fifty-two years of age and after a reign of twenty-four years"* (he became King at the age of 28).

Thanks to Tacitus (Annales XII 13-14) we know that Izates was still alive in 49 A.D., allowing us draw the conclusion that he became King before 30 A.D.; having read that just after ascending the throne he sent his brothers as hostages to the Emperor of Rome, **the latter had to have been Tiberius.**

Let's carry on with the reading of Antiquities. **After** Izates's relatives were sent to Rome as hostages, we - aware of the fact that we are **at the time of Tiberius** - observe the presence of Queen Helen in Jerusalem and her providential help to the starving people, as described above. **Later**, in Antiquities XX (from par. 54 to par. 68) Josephus describes **the political crisis of Artabanus III**, supreme King of the Parthians, which, as confirmed by the history of Tacitus, we know **occurred during the second half of the year 35 A.D. and was provoked by imperial Legate Lucius Vitellius, Roman commander of all the legions of the Eastern Empire** (Annales VI 31/38).

On the basis of what is clearly stated above, **the famine** described from par. 51 to 53 without a doubt hit Judea **before the crisis of Artabanus dating back to the latter part of 35 A.D.**; this crisis is described from par 54 to 68. In fact, this famine was alleviated (with benefits that are impossible to calculate) mainly by the Jewish royal family who offered direct aid, then by the imperial Legate Lucius Vitellius who, during Easter of 36 A.D. (Ant. XVIII), lifted taxes on foodstuffs and reduced prices and social tension as a result of the events described above.

It is important to highlight the chronological sequence of the events, which can be read in "Jewish Antiquities"; this sequence is utterly absurd as **first** Emperor Claudius (elected in 41) - to whom Izates sends his relatives as hostages - is mentioned, **then** the famine. According to the "Acts" of Luke (which we are about to read) and par. 101 of Book XX of "Antiquities" (reported above), the famine is dated **after 46**, while the **35 A.D. crisis of Artabanus took place before his death in 38 A.D.** (thus causing a contradiction in the chronology of the events).

This erroneous dating is corrected by simply rectifying "the error regarding the name of the Emperor": **it was Tiberius and not Claudius.**

The political crisis of Artabanus, which took place at the end of 35, was caused by the intervention of the Roman legions and by Vitellius's corruption of the Satrapes Dignitaries (relatives and friends of the old King). The Proconsul operated thanks to the mandate and capital given by Tiberius, and retook Armenia which had been conquered by Artabanus the previous year (34 A.D.).

The grave problems facing the Leader of Parthia were overcome thanks to the intervention of Izates (36 A.D.), who convinced the great Satrapes to recognize once again the King of Arsacid blood as their "King of Kings".

At the beginning of 37 A.D. Artabanus and Vitellius met on the Euphrates River, which marked the border between the two Empires, and signed a Treaty which reestablished Roman rule over Armenia:

"Having terminated the negotiations, the Tetrarch Herod (Antipas) held a feast under a tent which he raised at the middle of the bridge at great expense" (Antiquities XVIII 101-102).

Tiberius had just enough time to receive the important news and rejoice because on 16 March of 37 A.D. he went on to a better life. But also...

*"Shortly thereafter **Artabanus died** and left his kingdom to his son Vardanes" (Antiquities XX 69). It was the year **38 A.D.***

The substitution of the name Emperor Tiberius with that of Emperor Claudius was carried out by Christian scribes to lead us to believe that the famine took place under Claudius, exactly as is reported in **"Acts of the Apostles"** (11,28-30), thus enriching the "historical bait" of the famine with the usual disguise of the divine "Prophesy":

*"And **one of the Prophets whose name was Agabus**, seized by the **Spirit**, stood up and predicted that **a severe and universal famine** was going to happen. This in fact happened while **Claudius was Emperor**. The disciples decided to send relief, each to contribute what he could afford, to the brothers living in Judaea. They did this and delivered their contributions to the elders through the agency of Barnabas and Saul (Paul)".*

It is important to highlight that the writers of "Acts of the Apostles" and the "Letters of Paul", after giving us this information, forgot to mention the conclusion of the "mission" of Saint Paul in Judea, which was however motivated by the gravity of the calamity that hit the entire region and provoked many deaths.

The scribes wanted the famine to appear to have occurred under Claudius, therefore ... why waste other precious papyrus and ink? And run the risk of historical oversight.

The reference to Claudius in fact was not accidental but deliberate. "Luke", while sifting through the events in order to find an alibi able to divert the attention of experts, ruled out a famine which occurred under Tiberius in 32 A.D. (Annales VI 13) because too close to the time of the evangelical "Jesus", and chose a famine reported by Suetonius and **Tacitus** which hit Rome during the reign of Claudius:

*"...the charges made against one of the two were to have seen, **in a dream**, Claudius wearing a crown made of ears of wheat turned backwards, with consequent **prediction of a famine**" (Annales XI 4).*

This "prophetic dream" allowed "Luke" to have "God dictate to him" the prophecy of the Prophet Agabus and chronologically sidetrack the true and much more serious famine which took place in Judea and reached its climax between 35 and 36 A.D.; but as the two territories were too far from each other, Luke made the Prophet declare that *"a severe and universal famine was going to happen"*: a very dramatic event to be mentioned by all writers of the time. This event did not occur because what did hit Rome was not a true famine but simply a brief food shortage during which no one died of hunger.

The exceptional scarcity of food was fatal for many Jews and this was one of the reasons which triggered "Jeshua's" decision to take power in Jerusalem and have himself proclaimed King of the Jews. The pilgrims belonging to the Jewish world - mainly the inhabitants of Galilee, Idumea, Judea and those of Jerusalem exasperated by the famine - took part in the revolt against imperial power and the pro-Roman religious aristocracy. In order to prevent this calamity and the military events which took place between 34 and 36 A.D. from being recalled by historians, forcing them to investigate and thus discover that the year 36 was the year of the death of "Jesus Christ"; as such an investigation (and this would have been even worse) would have allowed them to come to the rightful conclusion that the man who truly existed was not ideologically compatible with the prodigious, supernatural being created upon a myth long after the true events occurred, the Lucan Christian scribes brought the famine forward ten years: **under Claudius rather than under Tiberius**.

The eminent Bishop, Eusebius of Caesarea, thanks to his position at the court of Emperor Constantine, was the first Christian to have access to the state archives in order to consult the scrolls and falsify them where necessary. When the Bishop invented "Historia Ecclesiastica", he mentioned this famine in detail and, in order to make it seem more credible, he was forced (and we must thank him!) to connect the "testimony" of Josephus to that of "Acts of the Apostles", where the prophecy of Agabus is reported; Eusebius also mentions the intervention of Queen Helen. According to him, all of these events occurred under Claudius (HEc. 12,1/3). Eusebius - through his testimony - wanted to "guarantee" the lies of "Saint Luke" in "Acts" by tampering with the Jewish historian's work in the above-mentioned points in order to hide the true identity of the protagonists of the events and their dating. But he made the mistake of specifying that it was *"the famine of Queen Helen"*, the same famine (as already seen) which took place - as demonstrated by history - under Tiberius and not under Claudius. In "Historia Ecclesiastica" Eusebius falsified the contents the handwritten scroll reporting the chronicle; it originally contained his true name and patronymic - the Prophet Theudas whose real name was Judas, one of the brothers of "Jesus"; **he was even forced to eliminate the information** (mentioned above by the Jewish historian) **regarding further donations for the benefit of Jerusalem**, which we would have certainly read about in "Antiquities":

"I shall leave to a later time the description of the good deeds carried out by the royal couple for our city" (ibid).

Saint Paul Saul - "the Secretary of State" without an executive-jet - took a "collection" to raise money for to help those hit by the famine. We can be certain the Jews finally, even if ten years later, gorged themselves and today's contemplative mystical historians, astounded by the above-said prophecy, swallow the bait stuck onto the hook of the "Prophet", almost as if it were a consecrated host; they all work to "interpolate" with footnotes hinting to the famine under Claudius and to the "Acts of the Apostles", didactic texts and "Jewish Antiquities", in order to indoctrinate young people in deference to the historical truthfulness of a pseudonym: "Saint Luke the Evangelist" ... the impostor.

But why was this lie - reported in "Acts" and taken up again in "Historia Ecclesiastica" - considered so relevant to the point of tampering with the principal source: the writings of Josephus? The Jewish historian already speaks about the fatal famine in "Jewish Antiquities" at the start of Book XVIII par. 8, in the preamble which makes reference to the Zealots. It introduces:

*"They were to blame for the seething seditions and there was much civilian bloodshed, due to the massacres carried out by the nationalist fanatics and to the butchery which they afflicted upon their enemies. **Then came the famine which made them devastatingly uncontrollable...**"*.

If "Acts of the Apostles" and Eusebius of Caesarea found it necessary to lie about the dating of this calamity, it means that such dating was vital for Christian doctrine and had to be sidetracked in order to prevent the reconstruction of the events involving the true protagonists, who would have run the risk of being identified as "Jesus Christ" and his brothers.

Between 34 and 37 A.D. there was a conflict between Rome and the Kingdom of the Parthians as Artabanus III, their King of Kings - as mentioned by Tacitus in Annales VI 31 - *"Took control of Armenia and threatened to invade the lands formerly owned by Cyrus and Alexander"*, including Palestine. In order to prevent this, in the spring of 35, Tiberius sent to Antioch his Lieutenant, the Proconsul Lucius Vitellius, who had **full powers over the Orient**; during the war, which lasted until the beginning of 37 A.D., he found the time to go to Jerusalem (600 km further south) at the head of his legions in 36 A.D. during Passover:

*"In the meantime Vitellius arrived in Judea and went up to Jerusalem where the Jews were celebrating their feast called Passover and was welcomed with many honours, **granted forever to the inhabitants all of the taxes deriving from the sale of agricultural products** and ordered that **the sacred gown of the High Priest**, along with its ornaments, be kept by the priests in the Temple" (Antiquities XVIII 90).*

This event has a prologue: in Book XV of "Jewish Antiquities" the writer explains that **the "Sacred Gown", which had belonged to Kings and High Priests of Hasmonean blood**, was taken away from the Jews upon the death of King Herod the Great.

From that time on, the Romans kept it in the Antonia Fortress and allowed the High Priests to use it only for Jewish festivities (Antiquities XV 403/409). The great symbolical value and power represented by the this sacred cloak for the Jewish people is clearly evident ... and the Romans were aware of this.

This went on until the Passover of 36 A.D. when Vitellius gave the sacred gown back to the religious authorities, after choosing a new pro-Roman High Priest. The historian ends the prologue by stating that: *"This digression was caused by the sad experience which took place afterwards"* (ibid). But what *"sad experience took place afterwards"*? And why did the "digression" provoke the deviation and break with the described practice?

In "Antiquities" we do not find the explanation for the important preamble - which should have been mentioned in Book XVIII just before the passage regarding the tax amnesty on behalf the Jews - as even this is censored.

During a war between the Empire of the Parthians (a huge eastern State, which had always been a rival to Rome, governed by a "King of Kings") it is not credible that the most powerful man in the Roman Empire after Tiberius - by virtue of the mandate conferred to him - could have gone as far south as Jerusalem only to lift taxes on the agricultural goods produced by Jews dying of hunger due to the famine. Why would Vitellius - Lieutenant of Tiberius and

Commander of all the Roman forces in the Orient - have needed to go personally to Judea during a difficult and risky wartime period and leave Antioch, seat of the most important anti-parthian military garrison? It would have simply been necessary to send couriers to Prefect Pontius Pilate (his subordinate) with an order to lift taxes on the Jews. **It would have been necessary to use force to impose taxes ... but not to abolish them.**

If a Roman General and Chief of the Army General Staff who commanded many legions moved at such a difficult and dangerous time, it meant that something serious had occurred and, for the Roman Empire, "serious" meant "war". Taking advantage of the favourable international political situation, in 35 A.D. **the Zealot Jews** - while Vitellius was struggling against Artabanus III, King of the Parthians - **seized the opportunity offered by the conflict between Rome and Parthia and set off a rebellion** in order to liberate Holy Jerusalem from pagan domination...

"Then came the famine which made them devastatingly uncontrollable"

A serious famine was underway and the starving people *"oppressed by the taxes owed to Rome"* - incited by the Zealot prophets' vehement preaching in favour of the re-establishment of the Law of Yahweh - rebelled against the Roman garrison stationed in the Holy City and massacred its soldiers *"... and shattered all that was left of the political systems"* (Bellum VII chap. 8). This mention made by the historian refers to a distant memorial family of the subversive feats of the Zealot John, which brought about the suppression of the "political systems" founded by the Roman government and by the opportunistic priests of the Jewish Sanhedrin in collusion with imperial power.

The influential Jewish Rabbi of Gāmala John (called the Nazorean)* - eldest son of the Doctor of Law Judas the Galilean (who according to the historian was *"of great power"*) and descendant of the Hasmonean royal line on his mother's side - a few days prior to the the Feast of the Tabernacles in 35 A.D. (early autumn), became leader of the revolt and managed to have himself proclaimed King of the Jews and High Priest of the Temple, thereby re-establishing the practice of his monarchic Hasmonean ancestors who held both sacred positions.

* As explained in more detail in the previous study, we can identify him through the analysis of a distant memory of relatives mentioned by Josephus at the end of the "Jewish War", Book VII chap. 8.

For the Jews of that time John was the "Jeshua" (Saviour) of the Holy Land, and after being consecrated as "Messiah" (Christ) through the ritual of the anointment described by the Ancestral Law, he founded a new Kingdom without slaves in which *"only God was Owner"*, thereby fulfilling the precepts of the *"fourth philosophy, a novelty unknown until this time"* created by his father Judas of Gamala.

But the "Saviour" did not last long. By the end of the year 35 A.D., Vitellius managed to undermine Artabanus and forced him to flee. After subjugating Armenia once again to Roman rule, the General Commander pushed forward and crossed the Euphrates River, where *"he had arrived thanks to the strength of his Roman legions and his allies"*, and invaded the Kingdom of the Parthians; he *"considered it sufficient to have made a show of Roman force to the Great Parthian Dignitaries, and returned to Antioch in Syria with his legions"* (Tacitus, Annales VI 37).

When the Roman leader arrived at the garrison (between the end of 35 and the beginning of 36 A.D.), he was informed of the events which had taken place in Judea, and after having given a rest to his army in the winter quarters, led his legions on a march to retake Jerusalem and execute the monarch who had illegitimately proclaimed himself King of the Jews.

In the meantime he had already sent Prefect Marcellus to **Caesarea Maritima** to remove Pontius Pilate from office. The imperial Legate considered Prefect Pontius Pilate, who was of equestrian order, to be responsible for not being able to prevent the revolt and for losing Jerusalem. Pilate should have strengthened the Roman military reserve contingent before all Jewish feasts, in compliance with precise written military orders.

A few days before Easter in 36 A.D., Lucius Vitellius - after laying siege and sending an ultimatum to the Holy City, unable to put forth further resistance without supplies of food (the help given by Helen could not last long and feed an entire population) - obtained the surrender of Jerusalem and was handed over the illegitimate King.

The Sanhedrin, which was convened by the High Priest of the Temple John in a moment of dramatic crisis, decreed the end of the King's brief reign. This is how Caifa, at the meeting of the elders, explained Vitellius's order for the surrender of Jerusalem:

"You fail to see that it is to your advantage that one man should die for the people, rather than that the whole nation should perish" (Jhn 11,50).

This testimony, which has survived the ecclesiastical censorships which the "Gospel of John" has undergone, is alone enough to demonstrate that **the danger for the entire Jewish nation was not constituted by simple military reserves recruited by a Prefect** identified in the Gospels as Pontius Pilate. Only a Proconsul *"Legatus Augusti"* like Lucius Vitellius - Roman Chief of Staff stationed in Antioch (Syria) and assigned by Tiberius full powers over the military contingent in the Eastern theatre - could have destroyed a possible revolt of the Jews united in a "Holy Alliance".

For John, the "Saviour" King of the Jews, there was no way out and he accepted his destiny: the crucifixion. He was arrested and brought to Fortress Antonia in chains and kept watch on. The Holy Gown was brought to the Temple and put under the protection of High Priest Jonathan, who had just been chosen by Vitellius and son of the Sadducean conservative High Priest Ananus ("Anne" of the Gospels); while the Tribune (Commander of the Roman garrison) reacquired guardianship over the Diadema (Sacred Crown), which remained in the fortress until being placed on the head of the King of the Jews Herod Agrippa the Great by order of Claudius Caesar.

The following day, after a long, useless interrogation carried out under torture to make him confess the names of his accomplices and the details regarding the revolutionary organization, John the Nazorean son of Judas was crucified in public as a warning to the Jews and to highlight their subjugation to the Roman Empire.

John was the head of the Pharisean Zealots sect, founded by his father and the most popular among Jews for its philosophical principles and goals. And the Zealots, just like the Essenes, were devoted to martyrdom in order to "save" the land promised by God to the people of Israel. Being Zealot leaders, the execution of the sons of Judas the Galilean had to be public as a warning to the Jews. Nine years after John, in 45 A.D., his brother Judas was also executed. Even if the latter was executed by Cuspius Fadus far from Jerusalem, his head was brought to the Holy City and shown in public: another significant warning. James and Simon's turn came in 47 A.D.; they were crucified in public after being captured and put on trial by Procurator Tiberius Julius Alexander.

The fifth and youngest brother John (called Menahem) met a different death; in 66 A.D. the Zealot leader - after destroying the Roman garrison in Jerusalem - was killed by the Guardians of the Temple who answered to the priestly aristocracy which he had overthrown.

Zealots, Essenes, Pharisees, Sadduceans and all the people, kept behind a cordon guarded by Roman militiamen, powerlessly and in silence witnessed the death of John, *"who was tortured to death"* through a long agony (Bellum VII chap. 8, 272); they were well-aware of the meaning of such a death ... while Roman legions were camped outside Jerusalem. According to Roman Law, the person's name and the motivation for capital punishment had to be written on a sign which was then hung around the victim's neck.

I N R I : IOHANNES NAZIREVS REX IVDAEORVM

For ideological reasons the future Christian iconography represented the suffering of its God stuck up on a cross, stylized and yet unreal due to the complex carpentry characterized by elaborate "crux" joints and footrests; the presence of the latter demonstrates that to this day we continue to not know how the Romans pierced the feet of the crucified ... if they truly pierced them. A torture ritualized in an unreal manner, which to this day continues to depict the condemned Jesus along an imaginary "via crucis", despite there being no evidence of this in classical literature. Lucius Annaeus Seneca (3 B.C. - 65 A.D.) - a famous philosopher and contemporary of Jesus - in "De Consolatione Ad Marciam" (XX 3) states that crosses (or gallows) for the torturing of the condemned were made in different ways. Like Seneca, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Maccius Plautus and Plinius the Elder also mention the crucifixions, yet they make no reference to the "via crucis": a ridiculous complication which would have forced security to move the cordon of militiamen surrounding the condemned and follow them. A macabre scene of copious bloodshed symbolizing the universal Eucharistic sacrifice had to be paraded ... but the letters "I N R I" could not hide the "Sacred Heart of Jesus", so the upper part of the "crux" was deliberately extended as if it were a "playbill" in order to accommodate the most famous manifesto of indoctrinated humanity.

Yahweh had abandoned John to his destiny and for the Jews this meant that he was not the Messiah chosen by Him. According to the Jewish prophets, the intervention of Yahweh would have lined up the heavenly powers and His wrath and would have annihilated the supremacy of the "Kittim" pagan invaders through a great massacre; this would have allowed the Chosen people to set up a *"Kingdom which would have lasted for eternity"* (Scrolls of Qumran: fragment 4Q 246).

The true Messiah would have been a *"Dominator of the World"*; His advent was known for certain by the Prophets, thus driving the Jews towards a war against Rome, as explained by Josephus in "The Jewish War" (Bellum VI 317). But the Jewish historian could not foresee that after his death that a new Messianic doctrine would have been founded, a doctrine deriving from the *"fourth philosophy, a novelty unknown until this time"* and which would have transformed the Jewish "Messiah" ("Christ" in Greek) into a "Saviour of the World".

John **was on the cross and not under** the cross, as instead is reported in the Gospel, where he is surrounded by various "Marys", mothers of sons who had Jewish names which were the same as those of the brothers of "Jesus"; these "Marys" were invented to cause confusion and prevent believers from understanding the connection between the sons of the only true Mary and the sons of Judas the Galilean through the matching of the identical appellatives. But no one was allowed to go near the condemned, especially not the relatives. Eschatological exigencies forced the Christian scribes responsible for this Evangelical representation to create a scene which was incompatible with historical reality:

"Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas (sic! two sisters with the same name), and Mary of Magdala. Seeing his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing near her, Jesus said to his mother, «Woman, this is your son»" (Jhn 19,25-26).

The poorly specified *"disciple who Jesus loved"* (who the Catholic Church identifies as "John") would have also been crucified if he had dared go near someone condemned to death, publicly and atrociously tortured as an exemplary warning to the Jews to discourage them from imitating his deeds. According to Roman Law John the Nazirean could only be placed on the cross: the armed militiamen made sure that everyone else kept their distance.

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

In the Gospel according to Matthew the Law of Rome is respected (at least with regard to this detail). The brothers of Jesus and the most well-known Zealots knew that they could have been identified and reported by informers of the conservative party, which was against the social changes that had abolished the privileges it had acquired before the brief reign of "Jeshua". Social advantages and wealth fought against by the ideology of the *"fourth philosophy, a novelty unknown until this time"*, created by the father of **Johannes bar Yehudas** in 6 A.D.

John was the name of one of the sons of Mary ("mother of Jesus"); he was listed along with his other brothers, as mentioned in many handwritten codexes of the Gospel of Matthew listed in the first study "The Apostles did not exist".

There was no trial to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused person, there was no need to do so: he had been caught in the act. John, a subject of the Empire, took advantage of the war against the Parthians to sit himself through the use of force on the throne of a territory belonging to Tiberius: a rebel without Roman citizenship who became an enemy of Rome and, as such, was eliminated.

The "Trial" was made up in order to place the blame for the execution of the "Saviour" upon the Jews. In fact, for the new doctrine Jesus Christ "Our Lord" it could not emerge that He had been executed by the imperial plenipotentiary; this would have demonstrated that he was a Zealot Jewish King and warrior, which was in contrast with the new, docile figure of the *"Agnus Dei"*, divine victim sacrificed for the good of humanity. A "Lamb of God" with warlike intentions, according to His words:

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

"As for my enemies who did not want me for their King, bring them here and execute them in my presence" (Lk 19,27);

"Whoever has no sword must sell his coat and buy one...the apostles said: «Lord, here are two swords»" (Lk 22,36/38).

We all know that the Gospels narrate that Pontius Pilate (and not Lucius Vitellius) was **forced by the Jews** to execute Jesus. There are also two non-Christian writings by Josephus (Testimonium Flavianum) and Cornelius Tacitus (Annales XV, chap. 44) that have reached us thanks to Christian scribes and they state that Jesus was executed by Pontius Pilate. Evidence of this can also be found in the "Creed" in which masses of believers recite aloud - as a symbol of Apostolic faith - *"he suffered under Pontius Pilate..."*, in a puerile singsong repeated an infinite number of times during the liturgy of the Sunday Mass. An outright brainwashing carried out in order to prevent the historical truth from being known; this was done by moving the dating of the execution of "Jesus", which in reality had taken place a few months after the

destitution of Pilate.

In the comparative study of the chronicles of Cornelius Tacitus and Josephus Flavius contained in the later studies regarding the martyrs of Nero and the "Testimonium Flavianum", we demonstrate that the passages of the two great historians of the first century are spurious interpolations. They were introduced by false scribes who, after copying and censoring the original manuscripts of the two writers, destroyed them in order to eliminate the proof of the tampering. But history even has Pontius Pilate - Roman magistrate who did not want to execute Jesus, but simply submitted to the will of the Sanhedrin and of the Jewish people - disappear from the... "Creed". The name of this Prefect **was introduced** into the "Creed" formulated at the Council of Constantinople convened in **381 A.D.**, which declared: *"... was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the **Virgin Mary**, and was made man; he was crucified for us under **Pontius Pilatus**, and he sacrificed himself, and was buried, and the third day he rose again..."*.

While the original "Creed" formulated in Nicea in 325 A.D. said:

*"... was incarnate and was made man; **He sacrificed himself**, and the third day he rose again..."*.

There is no mention of Pilate and of the "Virgin Mary Mother of God" whose "Immaculate Conception" was adopted by the pagan cults in 431 A.D. at the Council of Ephesus under Emperor Theodosius II. With regard to the **imperial Prefect of Tiberius**, we must mention a very important declaration made by Eusebius of Caesarea in the fourth century:

*"It is therefore demonstrated the falsity of the Acts of the Apostles against our Saviour, **published recently**, these, in fact, place under the **fourth consulate of Tiberius**, which coincides with the seventh year of his reign, the suffering which the Jews dared inflict upon our Savior: **but at that time Pilatus did not govern over Judea**"* (HEC. I 9,3/4).

According to what we just read, Eusebius informs us of the publication of a version of "Acts of the Apostles" (which obviously disappeared) - different from the one which we know today - in which the torture of Jesus is said to have taken place in 21 A.D. (fourth consulate of Tiberius), in other words under Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor; this demonstrates that the alterations were carried out by the evangelical editors to sidetrack the research on who really crucified "Jesus" ... including the dating of the imaginary event.

According to those "Acts" Prefect Valerius Gratus "sacrificed" Jesus.

On the basis of what was written by Eusebius's Christian calligraphers when copying the spurious passage "Testimonium Flavianum" into "Historia Ecclesiastica" (XVIII 63/4) - in which the "testimony" of the historian Josephus and Pilate's decision to sentence Jesus to crucifixion are reported - today we continue to read that naive scribes placed ("stuck") the event before 19 A.D., **under Valerius Gratus**.

As proven in the sixth study, from a brief analysis of "Testimonium Flavianum" - drawn on by the copyists who, in the eleventh century, wrote "**Jewish Antiquities**" (XVIII 63-64) in "**Codex Ambrosianus Gr F 128**" - anyone can understand that the passage is a fake as "Jesus" is said to have been crucified during the same period in which the historian Josephus records Tiberius's decision to expel all the Jews from Rome in **19 A.D.**, confirmed by Tacitus (Annales 2,85) and Suetonius (Tiberius 36).

However, Eusebius's scribes made a second "painful mystical boo-boo" and went as far as to **contradict the Gospels themselves**: the crucifixion of "Jesus" is said to have taken place many years prior to the execution of John the Baptist while the Evangelists attest that he died before Christ. According to history, **the death of the Baptist was ordered by Herod Antipas seventeen years after the "resurrection of Jesus"** reported in "Testimonium Flavianum", that is to say at the end of 35, beginning of **36 A.D.**, year in which Antipas was defeated in the war against his ex-father-in-law Aretas IV (Ant. XVIII 116/9), war declared by the latter in the summer of 36.

Further proof of the dating, which demonstrates that the execution of John the Baptist took place at the end of 35 beginning of 36 A.D., can be found in Eusebius of Caesarea's "**Historia Ecclesiastica**":

*"Herod Tetrarch married Herodias, his brother's wife, after repudiating his first wife who he had married according to the laws (she was the daughter of Aretas, King of Petrea) and after separating Herodias from her husband, who was still alive. **And due to this woman had John executed waged war against Aretas, whose daughter he had dishonoured**"* (op. cit. I 11,1).

It is evident that the **cause and effect** of the war **are immediate**, and from history we have the confirmation that Aretas IV opened the conflict against Herod Antipas in the summer of 36 A.D.; therefore, as the Baptist was already dead at the beginning of 36, **it is clear that the crucifixion of the "Saviour" took place during Easter of 36 A.D.** Unlike what truly occurred in history, the events narrated in the Gospels highlights irreconcilable chronological contradictions with historiography; but all you have to do is move the death of "Jesus" to 36 A.D. and the datings of the events become coherent for both history and the Gospels, thus obtaining an incontrovertible sequence of dates: death of John the Baptist, end of 35 beginning of 36 A.D.; the ousting of Pilate as Governor of Judea at the beginning of 36 A.D.; the intervention of Lucius Vitellius during Easter of 36 A.D.

Eusebius himself - in order to "guarantee" the evangelical presence of Pilate as judge at Christ's trial - went as far as to say that the Roman Governor (HEC. I 9,2) *"Pontius Pilate obtained the procuratio of Judea and remained in office for ten years until the death of Tiberius"* (Historia Ecclesiastica by Eusebius of Caesarea. Città Nuova Editrice, second edition Sept. 2005, edited by Franco Migliore and Salvatore Borzi). Tiberius died in March 37 A.D. but history attests that Pilate was removed from office by Vitellius at the beginning of 36 when the Emperor was still alive. In spite of the continual reelaboration and rearrangement of both the New Testament and patristic documents, with regard to Pontius Pilate there remains the certainty that the Christian scribes never blamed the Roman Prefect for the death of "Jesus", but instead put the blame on the Sanhedrin and on all the Jewish people, as attested by Eusebius (ibid):

"it was the Jews who dared inflict suffering upon our Saviour ...".

There is another important piece of evidence regarding the Governor of Judea Pontius Pilate which, inevitably, also reflects upon Jèshua, the Jewish "Saviour" of humanity: that of the great Jewish scholar and philosopher **Philo of Alexandria** (20 B.C. - 45 A.D.), a contemporary of Jesus the Messiah and Pontius Pilate.

After stating in his treatise "**De Providentia**" (II 107) that Philo frequently went on pilgrimages to the Temple of Jerusalem to offer sacrifices to God (without touching upon the existence of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, let alone their "miracles"), in his work "**De Legatione ad Caium**" (par. 299-303), **Philo claims that he knows Pontius Pilate** and expresses a very negative and lapidary opinion about him:

*"A corrupt tyrant, avid and insensitive to the reasons of justice. Pride, arrogance and insolence were his attributes ... **The country under his rule was abandoned to its destiny and sacked and the people were killed without any***

respect for the law".

The reference to the revolutionary Zealots is clearly evident and there is also clear evidence of the powerlessness of the Prefect, who had the command over a limited military force, unable to contrast the numerous subversive raids that took place everywhere in a Palestine in which the "Nationalist Fanatic" Party had the majority. Philo was a wealthy, privileged Jew and he mentioned this piece of information regarding the recent past after the unfortunate Jewish Legation before Gaius Caligula (Legatio ad Gaium XXX 203) dating back to 40 A.D. But the Jewish philosopher, who had profound knowledge of the Old Testament, knows nothing about the Advent of a Jewish divine "Messiah" (Cristòs) by the name of Jesus who, according to the Gospels, lived in the same land, at the same time, author of extraordinary miracles, **acclaimed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem as King of the Jews** and by them called "*son of David*" ... nor knows anything about the crucifixion ordered by the Jewish Sanhedrin and Prefect Pontius Pilate.

As can be verified in the fourth century, the "historical construction" of the new faith was still evolving and tended to distance itself from the previous pagan religions, especially from that of the last **sacrificed** "Saviour", the God Mithra, in order to distinguish itself from the latter.

In addition to the invention of the new "Mother of God" (which previously did not exist) to be adored by gullible "gentiles", the "*Venerable Holy Bishops*" also invented the "sacrificer" of "Jesus", by digging up a Roman official by the name of Pilate (without blaming him for the crime) - in office prior to Lucius Vitellius - in order to sidetrack the historical research on the entire event.

The coup - an outright act of war against the domination of Rome - forced Vitellius, who was still fighting against the Parthians, to immediately subject the leader to torture and execute him. The Lieutenant of Tiberius - Plenipotentiary and imperial representative for the entire Orient, sole "Leader" of the Province of Syria which included Judea, Idumea, and Samaria - knew that this rebellion aimed at depriving him of his powers and duties, the first of which was to guarantee the supremacy of Rome over the territories under its control.

John the Nazorean dared to proclaim himself King of the Jews, King of a territory owned by the Empire, guilty of having committed the worst crime chargeable to a subject of Caesar. This was an attack against the sovereignty of Rome and the imperial regulations regarding the preservation of the state and, consequently, the safety of everyone.

Emperor Tiberius decided who - when and where - could become King of one of the lands under his jurisdiction as long as the latter remained his faithful "client".

From 63 B.C. - year in which Pompeius Magnus conquered Palestine - all of the Kings and Tetrarchs who ruled over this region were chosen by Rome; and they could not remain in power without the consent of the Emperor, who allowed them to exercise their authority if, and only if, they were believed to be governing in the interest of the Emperor; these leaders were removed from office or exiled if there was the slightest doubt ... and any decision to this regard made by the Emperor was unappealable. This happened to Herod Archelaus in 6 A.D. and to Herod Antipas in 39 A.D.

During the alleged interrogation Vitellius (and the same would have gone for Pilate) did not even think of asking John the Nazorean: "*Are you the King of the Jews?*"; or even worse, while "Jesus" was in front of him, Vitellius (or Pilate) supposedly asked the crowd: "*Do you want me to release for you the king of the Jews?*" (Mark 15,9); or, in reference to the military instructions of an imperial Prefect, let's have a look at what Saint Luke would lead us to believe in his Gospel in order to free Pilate from blame.

"But they kept on shouting at the top of their voices, demanding that they should be crucified. And their shouts kept growing louder. Pilate then gave his verdict: their demand was to be granted. He released the man (Barnabba) they asked for, who had been imprisoned because of rioting and murder, and handed Jesus over to them to deal with as they pleased" (Lk 23,23-25).

A Prefect of Tiberius - who governed a territory controlled by Rome thanks to an imperial mandate - would have given little importance to the execution of a Jew, but he would have never released **the leader of a rebellion** carried out against the authorities ... only an army could have convinced him to release a rebel ... but the army obeyed his orders and the legions obeyed those of his direct superior: Vitellius.

Only minds under the influence of mystical ecstasy and day-dreamers lacking even basic knowledge of all the Empires preceding and following that of Rome could have conceived such foolishness; and despite having understood why it was done, the gross mistake remains nonetheless ... even for those who naively and docilely believe. The evangelist and scribe "Luke" and all those who imitated him did not want to have a powerful Roman official appear to be the one who had subjected "Jesus" the "Saviour" to torture for having carried out a bloody political subversion against the power of Rome.

In the Gospels a false trial was introduced in order to pin the blame for the decision to condemn Jesus on the Jews and on the Sanhedrin. The reasons given were solely religious; the political and revolutionary motives which had provoked bloodshed were not mentioned: "*Agnus Dei*" could not have organized and carried out such a violent and clearly anti-Roman military action.

All of the subjects of the Empire were witnesses to the fact that Rome had never persecuted the followers of any religion, except in extreme, well-motivated cases. Within the Empire there was a melting pot of doctrines, all of which peacefully coexisted; there would have been trouble for Rome if it had persecuted such doctrines: the Empire would have fallen. The authorities worried about a religion only when it became the ideological basis of a popular revolt against the institutions; these situations were violently repressed by Rome, as in the case of the nationalist Jew revolt.

The "Lucan" Christian scribes were fully aware of this and hid the "Saviour" and the other Jewish protagonists surrounding him behind a halo of harmless and reassuring "holiness" ... and even go so far as to depict a "Jesus" who, with impunity, preached to the Jews to "*give the tribute to Caesar*" ... while, in reality, the Jews - for such a provocation - would have stoned Christ even before his "short parable" had come to an end.

The new Christian doctrine - based on the Essenic reform of the Jewish Messiah created after the 66/70 and 132/135 A.D. wars and the resulting holocausts of Jews carried out in many cities in the Eastern Empire - had, opportunely, become ... pro-Roman.

Thusfar in our study we have precisely identified four of Judas the Galilean's sons: John, James, Simon and Judas, who all had the same names as the brothers of "Jesus". And we have partly mentioned the deeds of the fifth and youngest son Joseph, who the Jewish historian Josephus calls "*Menahem son of Judas the Galilean*" and who managed to become King of the Jews in 66 A.D. We would like to point out once again that identifying Joseph as "Menahem" is simple: it is as plain as the nose on our face.

John was the eldest son and had the right to be invested with the title of King of the Jews; this is why several generations after the event he began to be mythicized by Essene Jewish monks as the "Messiah", with the divine Aramaic title of "Jeshùa" - the Saviour.

During the Roman domination the Essenic Jews, who were nationalists like the Zealots, used their "prophecies" - as was

also the case with regard to the "Oracles of Yahweh" - to drive the people towards rebellion. But after the ethnic extermination carried out by the Romans and the persecutions ordered by Vespasian against Jews (relatives included) who did not recognize him as their Lord and Owner, the Essenes - conscious of the overwhelming strength of Rome - revised the description of the "Messiah" commander, who the Jews expected to be like the mythical David. Thus no longer a "Dominator of the World", but a "Saviour of the World" ... as docile as an *"Agnus Dei"*.

They were five brothers belonging to a Jewish dynasty which Josephus repeatedly defined as being *"of great power"*. A "royal bloodline" which claimed the right to sit on the throne of the Jews previously belonging to the Hasmoneans, and which waged a war against the domination of Rome to the point of martyrdom during a period that was very dangerous and difficult for the Jews. The Hasmonean line finally died out in 73 A.D., as a result of the fall of Masada, final stronghold of the Zealots led by the grandson of Judas the Galilean, Eleazar bar Jair (Lazarus). A sad epic which was consistent with the real events of those years, mentioned mainly by Tacitus and Josephus but confirmed by Philo of Alexandria, Suetonius and Cassius Dio through shorter descriptions.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]