



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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

Two fake nativities of Jesus for an 'immaculate conception'

Prologue

Just after ascending the papal throne in 1978 Pope Karol Wojtyla, beatified as "John Paul II the Great", carried out a modern form of cutting-edge "apostolate" by having believers of proven faith become compères in the principal television networks; this was an attempt (which will later prove to be illusory) to have the Christian religion regain credibility after being driven into a corner by the student protests of the 1960s and 70s.

A "high tech" method of indoctrination was favoured; it made use of crying Madonnas, stained with "painful tears of blood"; or of another "Virgin Mary" seen only by six visionaries from Medjugorje; or of the ambiguous "third secret of Fatima", according to which another Madonna deviated the bullet pointed at the heart of Karol the Great by the Turkish assailant Ali Agca, the latest self-proclaimed "Messiah"; in addition to the beatification of over 1300 new Saints and, last but not least, the creation of the latest divinity, made flesh through "Padre Pio" and to be worshipped by naive believers.

Apart from the scientific "blow" received due to the "Holy Shroud" - which proved to be a resounding fake after a series of radio-carbon tests - within the many Jesuit-Christian sects scattered throughout the world a spirit of revenge developed; its aim was to **propagandize by means of modern media** the image of a successful Catholic Church founded upon a "historical Jesus" who truly existed both as man and as God.

Nonetheless, a serious and unsolved problem remained. This problem - which has been highlighted for ages and is documented in encyclopedias all around the world - is the result of the appointment of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius as **Governor** of Syria, who was conferred the title by Caesar Augustus in **6 A.D.** and assigned the task of conducting the census in this imperial province which had just annexed Judea. As a result the chronology of the birth of Christ differs historically from the dating which is attested in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew by 12 years, as according to Matthew the new-born Saviour survived the "*Slaughter of the Innocents*" ordered by Herod the Great (a couple of years before his death in 4 B.C.) exactly twelve years **before** Quirinius became **Governor** of Syria and, as such, is mentioned in the Gospel of Luke along with the historical reference to the census in order "to offer evidence" of a second "Advent" of Christ **lacking** the "Slaughter of the Innocents": history recanted the birth of the Divine Redeemer.

We are in the 1990s, the "third Christian millenium" is approaching and with it the "Grand Jubilee" to be propagandized in all Nations. Time is ripe for the last "thorn" remaining in the "sorrowful rib of Christian faith" to be removed ... even at the risk of knocking down history: **the Marian cult - founded upon the only two contrasting Evangelical depositions** of the Blessed Virgin Mary and so exalted and divulged by Karol Wojtyla the Great - **had to be "substantiated"**.

After a first unsuccessful attempt made by the genuflexion experts belonging primarily to the "Spanish school" - based on a grammatically incorrect and ludicrous straining of the interpretation of the Greek word "prote" which can be found in the Gospel of Luke and means "first", but is changed to "previous" (in reference to the census) - the initiative is undertaken by the "prince" of the Vatican Exegetes: now Cardinal Gian Franco Ravasi. In an interview published in Corriere Della Sera on 29.5.1996 he reveals the "discovery" made by the "inspired" Giulio Firpo (university professor of Roman history) regarding a census which the Governor of Syria, Gaius Sentius Saturninus (appointed by Augustus and in office from 9 to 6 B.C.) was unable to carry out and which conducted in his stead by Quirinius in 7 B.C.

The theory - based on conditionals such as "might", "maybe", "seems", "leads us to believe" etc. and mentioned a number of times by Ravasi himself even on Italian public television - was drawn on and endorsed in unison as if it were litany in order to strengthen its credibility. Many of the most important Italian and foreign Christian scholars - including Marta Sordi who held the chair of History at the Università Cattolica - were involved and their contributions were publicized through all the existing means of mass communication, including Wikipedia.

This theory can be summarized in just a few lines on the basis of what was expounded by Ravasi.

The spiritualist historians who conceived the theory and their many followers - basing themselves on what was attested at the beginning of the III century A.D. by the Apologetic Father Tertullianus in "**Adversus Marcionem**" (IV 19) - have convinced themselves that the census was **begun** by the Governor of Syria Sentius Saturninus ... but here is the "discovery"; Saturninus, "*probably involved*" (Ravasi's words) at that time in a war of succession to the throne of Armenia (there is no historical evidence to support his involvement and the attempt to have this war coincide with the census in Judea already represents a straining of history), was unable to carry out the census and was replaced in 7 B.C. by P.S. Quirinius (the historical sources reveal that he had yet to be nominated **Governor** of Syria) after the latter had defeated the Omonadesi tribe from Cilicia, which - like Judea - was annexed to Syria; the documentation mentioning this war does not indicate when it took place (cfr Tacitus Ann. III 48; Strabone Geo. XII 6,5).

Aware that the formulated hypothesis not only is contrived but also proves nothing (we are about to highlight the contradictions), the Christian historians attempt to strengthen it by interpreting, through the distorting lense of their catechesis, several outdated epigraphs from the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL). Of these the only one worthy of consideration is the "**Lapis Venetus**" memorial tablet, found in 1674 and preserved in the city's archeological museum and classified under **CIL III 6687**. On the tablet we can read the memorial of the event carved onto stone by Prefect Quintus Emilius:

"...by order of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, I conducted a census of the 117,000 men, citizens of the city of Apamena (in Syria)".

This archeological find clearly demonstrates the correctness of the chronicle regarding the census **in Syria** and in the territories annexed to this Province (Judea), as reported by the Jewish historian Josephus; his work - which states precisely that the Imperial Legate of Syria went to Jerusalem to repress a popular uprising against the imposition of a tax census - **was submitted to Roman historians for approval under Vespasian before being deposited in the Imperial Archives**.

Another Latin epigraph, found in Tivoli (Italy) in 1764, does not mention a census nor does it contain any reference to Quirinius or information which reveals its dating; the illegible parts of this epigraph have been interpolated - through the use of square brackets - by historians of proven faith thanks to whom the name P.S. Quirinius "miraculously" appears.

These catechetical theories - which have been raised to the status of "**lessons**" and endorsed by a minority of experts undergoing a mystical fit - are in reality **falsifications of history**: no one must dare to insert names into archeological finds haphazardly in the attempt to justify the mistakes made by Christian scribes who decided to substantiate the virginal birth of a divinity. At the same time these scholars hide from followers the many contradictions contained in the two evangelical testimonies; in compliance with professional ethics, these contradictions must be taken into consideration along with the writings of the early Fathers of the Church who (from the very moment in which the doctrine was first formulated) also described this extraordinary divine Event.

These initial references offer evidence of the conflict of interest between history and the genuflexion scholars resulting from the latters' inborn "original sin": these experts read about the events of the past with the sole purpose of demonstrating the truthfulness of the New Testament writings which they use to "spread the word" after having "moulded" them to suit their needs. These experts do not realize that through the formulation of a series of hypotheses it is possible to direct the study in a certain direction in order to arrive at the desired conclusion; they also do not understand that it is "faith" itself which prevents them from carrying out a critical comparative analysis of the two Gospels that report the "Nativity", and go as far as to focus the attention of believers solely on the asynchrony of the dating in order to head off the many contradictions contained in the Gospels and in the patristic testimonies. It is important to make use of all the sources of the period, including the writings of the "Fathers" of Christianity, the first to deal with, study and resolve the serious evangelical contradictions. It is important to remember (as we are about to highlight) that it is mainly historiography that provides us, in a clear, logical and incontrovertible manner, all the data which recants the complicated theory according to which two censuses were carried out in Judea by the Governor of Syria, Legatus of Caesar Augustus, Publius Sulpicius Quirinius. Believers claim that the Proconsul was the only Governor in Imperial Rome to have held the office twice in this Province; **such a special honour should have been highlighted by all the historians of the period**, especially by Tacitus and Josephus: they both report the deeds of the famous Roman commander but make no mention of this circumstance.

After examining the testimonies of the "Fathers", the theory of the "two censuses of Quirinius" lacks validity from the very beginning because **Tertullianus cannot have written that Sentius Saturninus carried out a census while governing Syria**. In such a case, the "Fathers" of Christianity would have been forced to report such important news, starting from Origen, his contemporary, who does even mention that Tertullianus* existed yet describes the "Nativity of Jesus" through a specific analysis. Even the Pope Hippolyte of Rome who was Tertullianus's contemporary did not know the latter. No Bishop, Pope or Father knows Tertullianus before the time of Eusebius of Caesarea (the first to mention him) and Saint Jerome; yet Eusebius and Jerome know nothing about Saturninus's census. From this moment onwards the series of Christian chroniclers who followed one upon the other through the centuries make reference to Tertullianus in their manuscripts, apart from the four men mentioned in the footnote. See Orosius, Sulpicius Severus, Saint Augustine, etc., etc., in particular **Dionysius the Little** (to whom the dating of the birth of Jesus is attributed) and, through the centuries, up until when, in the ninth century, scribes began to write the first works of Tertullianus and over time built up a huge but unlikely "manuscript tradition" attributed to the latter; this work was then "collated" and selected in the sixteenth century in order to identify an "archetype" to be assigned to the "Father", by means of an "editio princeps opera omnia" among "families" of **conflicting codexes**. This proves that the codexes were not drawn up by Tertullianus (the authentic original author would have never provided conflicting testimonies) ... in addition to many other works which have disappeared through the centuries.

* These testimonies regarding Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus are very contradictory, to the point that they make his very existence unacceptable. He is mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea, Saint Jerome, Lactantius, Saint Vincent of Lerins, Saint Gelasius and Isidore of Seville in non-original ecclesiastical **manuscripts elaborated by other authors between the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance**, none of which point out the deposition - today considered to be fundamental by mystical theorists - regarding the census attributed to Sentius Saturninus. The contradictions were due to the lack of coordination, which was the result of the vast Apologetic work drawn up by various scribes and later assembled; this "assembly" would have required an impossible comparative reading of all the manuscripts spread throughout the many European and Byzantine Christian communities, which by this time were divided by quarrelsome schisms and mutual curses motivated by subtle doctrinal exigencies and, above all, by ambitions of supremacy.

It is hard to believe that between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century Tertullianus - a Carthaginian pagan until adulthood (40 years of age) and son of a centurion - after converting to Christianity and learning Greek and Latin, had the time and economic means to write a vast and in-depth work made up of over thirty treatises on the knowledge of the classical, historical, philosophical, juridical and religious world; it is also incredible to think that at the same time he managed to adopt a publicly documented vehement ideological stance against imperial Proconsuls who would have "martyrized" him immediately instead of allowing him to grow old peacefully, as is reported by Saint Jerome in a non-original document copied and corrected in the late Middle Ages: the Codex MS 2 Q Neoeboracensis. These literary writings are numerically superior to those of the vast work written by Josephus, who over a period of twenty-five years benefited from the generous financing given to him by two Flavian Emperors and a wealthy patron in addition to having access to the Imperial Archives. Tertullianus's work is as vast as that of Cassius Dio ("Roman History"); the latter spent twenty-two years on his work, had no organizational or financial problems and was able to consult the Senate Acts and the Imperial Archives of his friend Emperor Alexander Severus.

In conclusion, we are dealing with a work focused on Christianity yet unknown (along with its alleged author) to all Bishops, Popes and Christian Fathers who followed one upon the other in the administration of the Church up until the time of Eusebius of Caesarea: its inventor.

Yet the fact that the great Apologetic Father Origen (his contemporary) **knew nothing about the great Apologetic Father Tertullianus is enough to prove that the latter never existed**; two years after his imaginary death (230 A.D.), Origen left the school of theology in Alexandria and founded a new school in Caesarea in 232 A.D. The aim of this institute, which had a **rich library** containing holy and scientific texts, was to conduct in-depth philological, historical and theological research on Christianity ... with no awareness whatsoever of the existence of the tertullian "Opera Omnia".

As already seen, the passage concerning Sentius Saturninus can be found in "Adversus Marcionem" (IV 19), which was also "collated" and chosen among many **codexes drawn up between the ninth and fifteenth centuries**; these codexes are so conflicting and "contaminated" that it is impossible to conjecture an archetype.

A Christian scribe invented the "testimony" of Tertullianus in order to naively justify (as we are about to demonstrate) the chronological contradiction contained in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew and highlighted in the historical research conducted by Dionysius the Little; but the Christian scribe was unable to "foresee" that a couple of centuries later another scribe would have interpolated Tacitus's work "Annales" and reported the false and spectacular martyrdom of Jesuit Christians (attributed to Nero) in the Codex Laurentianus Mediceus, manuscript M II. This scribe contradicted Tertullianus's "Apologeticum XVI" (see twelfth study) ... because he had not read it. The real "lesson" that the inspired mystical historians do not wish to learn is that it is important to keep to history without falsifying it.

Starting in 2004 every year at Christmas time RAI TV (Italian State Television Network) broadcasted and repeated on all its channels the program "Inquiry on Jesus" conducted by Dr. Giovanni Minoli and the "Vaticanist" Andrea Tornielli. It was an awkward "historic reconstruction" passed off as "scientific", and at the end of the program historians were asked to try to prove that Jesus never existed. On 15 November 2008 Dr. Giancarlo Tranfo and I decided to honour the RAI TV request. We sent the TV network a letter in which we stated that we were willing to take part in a public debate with two famous and scholarly exegetes of the Catholic Church, the priest Gian Franco Ravasi and the scholar Vittorio Messori, both of whom are well-known for being willing to take part enthusiastically in public television debates in which they defend historicity of Jesus; I publicized the letter on the web, which can also be found on this website. RAI TV did not reply to our letter ... and the program quietly "went off the air" the same year.

It is a strategy, but in order to sort out the contradictions and falsifications reported in the "holy texts" the Church and spiritualist historians are now forced to work on religious private TV channels and websites, and they comfort believers by telling them that in a public debate their "hypotheses" would be immediately contradicted as history is very clear and unambiguous. A series of suppositions which are indispensable to the various Christian parties all around the world as their Leaders, "Ministers of God", are well-aware of the fact that a "Creed" cannot be recanted by a "hypothesis"; but to their misfortune, the time has fatally run out for these convenient theories: history throws them into the rubbish bin.

In December of the same year I published an analysis (which will follow) on the "Primitive Christian" forum, a clerical website full of conceited, arrogant "spiritual" exegetes who were left speechless by my analysis; as a result, I addressed the faithful believers to urge them to convince a famous expert of History of Christianity (better if holding the chair of History of Christianity at the Università Cattolica) to declare - in order to open a debate on the matter - that Publius Sulpicius Quirinius carried out a census in Judea **before** the death of Herod the Great: absolute silence! The clerical exegetes, with or without a frock, stay away from anyone who intends to confute the "Nativity" through the presentation of facts which prove that it is false.

I then challenged these exegetes in other forums, but not even the members of the "Communion and Liberation" Party - famous for their arrogance - have attempted to come to terms with historical reality: the silence of exegete believers after this historical reference is enough to demonstrate that the births of Jesus narrated by the evangelists Luke and Matthew cannot be truthful, thus contradicting those who wish to pass the event off as something which truly occurred. I am still willing to have an open historical debate with anyone, even with the profoundly inspired English-speaking exegete Christians.

Emilio Salsi

From the dawn of Christianity the Church has strived to make the two "Nativities" of the Christ (which were entirely made up by imaginative evangelists) compatible; births complicated by the interventions of the Apologetic Fathers who, from the third century onwards, awkwardly attempted to reconcile the contradictions and, instead, achieved the exact opposite.

In light of all the previous considerations, let's verify the true chronicles of historiography and compare them to the evangelical truths in order to give the lie to both the early creators of the "Nativity" of Christ and the abstruse present-date theories devised by incompetent genuflexion historians forced to patch up the bad mistakes present in these theories.

The "immaculate conceptions"

Part I

Through the present study we intend to demonstrate that the "Nativity" of the Messiah was not present in the primitive Gospels; it was invented later on during the evolutionary process which transformed the original Messianic gnostic doctrine belonging to the Essene Jews. The same goes for the consecrated "**Hostia**" which guarantees the resurrection of the faithful after their death; in fact, this pagan theophagical Eucharistic sacrifice was "grafted" onto the transcendental Jewish Messiah long after the primitive Gospels were written.

The eastern gentile cults - these were only open to their followers and thus called "Cults of the Mysteries" - which existed prior to Christianity adored the Semi-gods "Sotères" Σωτήρες (Saviours), begotten by a Divinity who coupled with a young virgin. They were half-man and half-God; as is true for all men, they died, but at the same time they were also Gods who resurrected after spending three days in the "**Hades**": Deities who protected the wellbeing of their believers when alive and in the afterlife.

The virginity of a girl was indispensable as it was a "warrant of purity" during the coupling with the God: in order to make sure that a bastard was not born ... an "**immaculate conception**" was necessary.

These myths formed the basis of the "Nativity", which was "christianized" in **381 A.D.** at the **Council of Constantinople** where the following **Catholic dogma** (still in effect today) was decreed:

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

It was an "ideological wrapping" for the Jewish divine Messiah and, to this aim, the Christian scribes added the "Nativity" to two canonical Gospels but ... the founding Fathers made much too much confusion: they were certain to be able to pass it off from the very beginning as "history", as the "true" birth of a man; yet the virginal birth was proven wrong by the contradictions contained in the "holy texts".

Saint Joseph (Jesus's putative father), the Blessed Virgin Mary and the entire "holy family" became the protagonists of absurd events which were ridiculous and at times offensive to the Pagans and to the Jews themselves ...

On the basis of the descriptions of the events made by the evangelists Luke and Matthew - the only ones who make reference to the "Nativity" - the birth of Christ is completely different, apart from the names of the theological protagonists. If we removed these names, we would find ourselves with two events which are so different and incompatible to the point that the testimony of the Advent of Christ loses all of its credibility; or rather, instead of attesting the "Divine Revelation", it demonstrates that the Advent was merely invented by man. The Apologetic Fathers of the Church were perfectly aware of this from the very beginning, and their attempt to justify the incurable contrasts contained in the two Gospels boomeranged; this can be seen in the words of Celsus - a Greek philosopher who lived at the same time as the Apologists (between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century A.D.) - who stated in his work **"The True Word"** (an attack on Christians), written about by Origen (**"Contra Celsum"** I 62):

"It is known to all that what you have written is the result of continuous alterations made as a reaction to the criticism that you received".

In fact Luke, who places Jesus's birth around **6 A.D.** - year in which Publius Sulpicius Quirinius carried out the census in Syria and Judea - in other words, ten years after the death of Herod the Great ... condemned the Madonna to a **twelve-year** pregnancy, in contrast with what is reported by Matthew, according to whom Jesus was born in **6 B.C.**, two years before the death of the King himself ... provided that the two Evangelists were referring to the same woman, to the same pregnancy and to the same "Son" of God.

*"Now it happened that at this time Caesar Augustus issued a decree that a **census** should be made of the whole inhabited world. This census - the first - took place while Quirinius was **governor** of Syria" (Luke 2,1-2).*

A census ordered by Augustus throughout the Empire would have become known far and wide; thus, it could not have been ignored by any historian of the period, including the Emperor himself who, in his work **"Res Gestae"** (VIII 2,4), reports three censuses which he carried out on the inhabitants possessing Roman citizenship (cfr. Tacitus Ann. I 11). The census called by Caesar Augustus had two aims: introduce taxation as a means of support for the state and keep up-to-date the list of all the citizens of the Empire who had been issued a diploma of citizenship; the latter being a fundamental premise of a political, military and economic career (like the enlargement of the large landed estates), therefore a prerogative which was a source of power. As a result, Roman law provided for the death penalty, through decapitation, for those subjects which passed themselves off as Roman citizens.

There is no trace of a census having been carried out by the Imperial Legates "in two different phases", as hypothesized by Pope Benedict XVI (who attempts to preserve the evangelical contradictions) in his work "Jesus of Nazareth" (vol. 3): a statement with no historical quotations, therefore lacking verification ... and logic. The Pope went as far as to ignore the specific depositions (by not revealing them to believers) concerning the birth of Christ made by the Fathers of the Church, none of whom dared hypothesize a census "in two different phases"; and, above all, after glorifying in the General Audience of 13 June 2007 the Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, *"the most preeminent historian of the Christian tradition"*, the Pope describes him as "the most qualified representative of the culture of his time". As we will soon see, Eusebius wrote about Quirinius's census by referring to the Gospel of Luke and clearly placed the event in **6 A.D.**: the omission of such basic information is a "mortal sin" for any exegete ... even worse if he is a Pope.

Having taken into consideration these obvious motives, Imperial Rome's most important statesman, **Caesar Augustus, never carried out a census of the Empire aimed at discovering what ethnic group its citizens belonged to.** The theory regarding the "ethnic census" ordered by Caesar Augustus is the latest silliness thought up by the spiritual historians in the attempt to disentangle the skein of evangelical contradictions created by scribes when describing the "Nativity": an offense to the intelligence of all those who dedicate themselves to a correct reading of history, by keeping to it and not setting themselves the objective of "evangelizing" it.

According to the manuscripts dated between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries, the first to realize that there was a serious contradiction was **Tertullianus**, in whose name **the scribe** - who does not point out that the Gospel absurdly mentions a *"census of the whole inhabited world"* in order to "eliminate" the chronological problem of the "Nativity of Christ Our Lord" - goes as far as to **contradict Luke and eliminate "Quirinius"**, who is replaced by the Legate "Sentius Saturninus", appointed Governor of Syria by the Emperor during the final years of Herod the Great's life:

"There are reports of censuses carried out under Augustus, in Judea, by Sentius Saturninus, through which His origin (of Christ) may have been identified" (Adversus Marcionem IV 19,10).

The hesitant "testimony" falsely attributed to **Tertullianus** (who has Quirinius disappear) proves the "Nativity" of Luke wrong without resolving the problem ... on the contrary: **the Christian scribe demonstrated that the Gospels, "dictated by God", were not coherent with historiography.** To further complicate the problem regarding Jesus's birth, in the third century **Origen**, the most important "Father" - who lived in the third century and therefore could not have known Tertullianus (invented by Eusebius in the fourth century) nor his great work (written long after) - affirmed:

*"During the days of the **census**, when Jesus was probably born, a certain **Judas the Galilean** won as followers a great number of Jews..." (Contra Celsum I 57).*

For Origen **the census, the birth of Christ and Judas the Galilean's revolt happened at the same time** (and the same goes for Saint Luke), in **6 A.D.**; and he immediately confirms the date and tries, in any case, to "coordinate" Luke and Matthew, but ...:

"Herod the Tetrarch sent his men to kill all the babies born in the same period, with the intention to also eliminate Jesus who he feared could occupy the kingdom" (ibid I 58).

Origen - who could know nothing about "Tertullianus" (as just mentioned) and assumed that Jesus's birth took place in 6 A.D. - deduced (in contrast with the "Nativity" of Matthew) that at this date only Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, could have carried out the "*Massacre of the Innocents*"; Origen knew that Herod the Great died in 4 B.C. and, being that his son Herod Archelaos was exiled by Caesar Augustus in 6 A.D., **in Judea there was no King governing but only Coponius**, a Roman Prefect. Although Herod the Great and his descendants were perfectly aware that only the Emperor had the power to decide whether or not they could continue to reign, in this case the King had no choice but to obey as the Legate of Syria was stationed in Antioch; the latter acted as Proconsul who commanded over the Roman legions and was ready to ensure the respect of imperial decrees.

According to Matthew the new-born "baby Jesus" was the reason why the "*Massacre*" was carried out; he was Herod's objective and the latter's decision to carry out the "*Massacre*" provoked "*the flight into Egypt*" - propitiated by the conspiracy of silence of the "*Wisemen*" (unknown to Luke) who came to adore the "King of Kings" - which was a dramatic event for the "Holy Family". Their exile in this land lasted until the death of the King, described as a criminal only by the evangelist Matthew (and not by Luke). This tragedy comes to an end in "heavenly" Nazareth, the only calm city in Galilee, where the Madonna and Saint Joseph are able to look after "baby Jesus", unaware (like Mathew) of the bloodshed taking place in their land, put to fire and sword by the Roman legions led by the son of Quintilius Varus (Legate of Syria chosen by Caesar Augustus). He was sent in to crush the Jewish rebellions, including the one led by Judas the Galilean, King "pro-tempore" of Galilee; there were thousands of crucifixions, tens of thousands of deaths on the battlefield and many people were enslaved.

The simple-minded ignorance shown by the fake Jew "Matthew" with regard to the events which threw Galilee into chaos after the death of Herod the Great demonstrates the falseness of his Gospel, in which he describes their return home after their "flight into Egypt". The "Holy Family" returns to Nazareth, which was very close to (5 Km) the capital Sepphoris, city razed to the ground and whose inhabitants were either killed or deported as slaves along with all the captured Galilean rebels.

Saint Luke, on the contrary, is unaware of the risk that "baby Jesus" is running; for this evangelist "King Herod" is not a criminal: he is another "Herod", not "the Great" ... and the "Holy Family" simply focuses on their quiet family life and does not worry about avoiding certain dangers.

As the evangelists Luke, Mark and John make no mention of the danger hanging over "baby Jesus" and of the "flight into Egypt" to escape from the "*Massacre*", this means that it is a mere invention ... and the "Christmas", celebrated by hundreds of millions of believers all around the world, is nothing but a deceitful ballyhoo thought up by the "Fathers" of Christianity in order to replace two festivals: the annual pagan festival of the Sun God - Dies Natalis Solis Invicti - which Emperor Aurelianus officialized as a legal holiday throughout on 25 December 274 A.D., and that of the Mithra God, the "Saviour" with the highest number of followers before the arrival of the new "Saviour" Jesus ... both of whom, like the Sun God, were born on the same day of the year.

Said to have miraculous prophetic and thaumaturgic powers (almost as many as the Apostles), the "Wise Men" were the priests of the cult of the Mithra God, which originated in Ancient Persia, and spread to the Roman Empire where it evolved. This God was also born in a cave (mitreus); the cave, the ox and the ass do not appear in the canonical Gospels, and the "cave" was a cultural symbol in many eastern religions existing prior to Christianity; these religions provided for a fleeing virgin who gives birth to a divinity inside a cave, a divinity which the forces of evil attempt to track down in order to prevent the forces of good from outliving and defeating them.

The Evangelist Matthew (Mt 2,9) very imaginatively had the Wise Men from the faraway East come to Bethlehem, where the "holy family" resided (while according to Luke they lived in Nazareth). They were guided by a star (also unknown to Luke) which **slowly** preceded them and stopped (seen only by the Wise Men but not by Herod and his militiamen, who all became near-sighted) over the house where "baby Jesus" was born in order to submit to the new "King of Kings" (which was the title attributed to the Parthian Emperors), to whom they gave gifts symbolizing kingly power (gold), spiritual power (incense) and eternal life (myrrh). Of course in Jesus's home (and in the Gospels) there was no ox or ass.

*"And suddenly **the star** they had seen rising **went forward and halted** over the place where the child was ... and going into the **house** ... they did him homage"* (Mt 2,9/11).

The contradictions contained in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew make it impossible to give a precise date to the birth of a "man", and at the beginning of the sixth century the Church gave a learned monk, Dionysius the Little, the task of resolving the problem through the adoption a new system of numbering the years of history. Rather than a calendar based on the founding of Rome (in force up to this time), all of the narrated events had to base themselves upon the birth of "Our Lord": Anno Domini ... which corresponds to the 753rd anniversary of the founding of Rome. Dionysius made a precise calculation, but due to the discrepancies in Luke and Matthew he "diplomatically" placed the Advent of Jesus halfway between the two dates of birth indicated by the two Evangelists (thus proving wrong both evangelists). He was forced to do so as Luke (Lk 3,1) in his Gospel attests that "*In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar's reign ...*" (29 A.D.) "John the Baptist begins his preaching **before** the "Ministry of Jesus". **Afterwards**, Luke says that "*When he began, Jesus was about **thirty years old***" (Lk 3,23), confirmed by the Christian Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea (HEC. I 10,1):

*"It was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (29 A.D.), according to the evangelist (Luke), and in the fourth year of the governorship of Pontius Pilate, while Herod and Lysanias and Philip were ruling the rest of Judea, that our Saviour and Lord, **Jesus the Christ** of God, being about **thirty years of age**, came to John for baptism and began the promulgation of the Gospel"* ...

therefore the precise historical information regarding Tiberius (contained in the Gospel of Luke) forced Dionysius to set the date of Jesus's birth in Anno Domini 1 (which today is still the date given in the Bible). In spite of this, Benedict XVI **is forced to contradict** Dionysius because he is well-aware that the information provided by Luke recants Matthew's testimony. It is a historic comparison which on its own is enough to prove that "*In the days of King Herod of Judaea ...*" (Lk 1,5) this "Herod" could not have been "**Herod the Great**" because he **had already been dead for over four years**, as we will be examined more closely later on.

Pope John I, who assigned Dionysius the task of identifying Jesus's date of birth, immediately understood yet did not reveal the anachronism to the masses of believers; therefore, he did not adopt the new calendar, which nonetheless spread spontaneously throughout the Christian communities during the centuries thereafter ... even if at that time the clerical exegetes were already aware that Anno Domini had "cut out" both the "*Massacre of the Innocents*" - carried out by Herod the Great (according to Matthew) **6 years before** Anno Domini 1 - and "*the census of Quirinius*", which according to Luke took place **6 years after**. This was the reason why the scribes had Tertullianus "witness" the census of Sentius Saturninus ... but they make a gross mistake in contrast with history, as we are about to see. Moreover,

throughout the Middle Ages the mystical inventors did all that was in their power to enrich the fable by stating that there were "three" "Wise Men", who have precise names and bring precise gifts: all this is not mentioned in the Gospels.

As a result of these inconsistencies, today's "inspired mystical" exegetes are performing "miracles" which aim at falsifying history by attempting to attribute another inexistent census to Quirinius; this is being done on the basis of impossible hypotheses and thanks to the "silence" of the media and of the educational system. They know that history proves that Jesus did not exist and, as a result, they are forced to modify historical reality by omitting important details in order to "preserve" their doctrine. Therefore, once they have adopted and officialized the "theory" of the "two censuses" of Quirinius, they are forced to behave consistently despite the fact that their theory is based on meaningless sophistry. Prof. Giulio Firpo, who holds the chair of History of Christianity at the University of Chieti Pescara (Italy), has taken the liberty of "catechizing" the History of Rome as he knows that he can count on a large flock of spiritual exegetes ... or, at least, he and others have tried ... but have failed. Let's see why.

Cassius Dio ("**Roman History**" LV 27,6) places Archelaus's exile (ordered by Augustus) in 6 A.D, at the time of the Consulate of Emilius Lepidus and Lucius Arruntius. As a logical consequence of this decision, that same year the Emperor decrees Judea as a Province annexed to Syria under direct Roman administration and orders a census in both territories. Without explicitly naming Archelaus, Strabone (Geo. XVI 2,46) writes that a son of Herod was exiled to Vienne (south of Lyons) by Augustus. All historians (except those belonging to the mystical group filled with profound faith) - on the basis of documented events and their related motives, archeology and simple logic - recognize only the census carried out by Quirinius in 6 A.D., when for the one and only time he was sent in by Caesar Augustus as Legate of Syria to oversee the count.

Rome deliberated the measure which aimed at introducing, by means of an administrative act, direct tax collection in the newly-constituted Province (annexed to Syria), made up of the territories formerly governed by the Ethnarch Herod Archelaus, who had just been deposed by Emperor Augustus and exiled to Gaul for his ineptness (Ant. XVII 344).

The regencies of Herod the Great's two sons, Herod Archelaus and Herod Antipas, were characterized by numerous uprisings led by Jewish rebels who proclaimed themselves "King"; they did not recognize the Herodians as having the right to sit on the throne of the Jews (Ant. XVII 271/285). It was thanks only to the constant intervention of Roman legions in Syria that these rebels were eliminated (**except Judas the Galilean**) and order was restored; this went on for ten years until Augustus, realizing that Archelaus was unable to govern, decided to take matters into his own hands and to subject Judea to the direct hegemony of Rome.

*"The region subject to Archelaus was annexed to Syria and Quirinius, a consular agent, was sent by Caesar to carry out an estimate of the properties in Syria and sell Archelaus's assets" (Ant. XVII 355). "Quirinius sold Archelaus's estate, and at the same time the recordings of the properties took place in the **thirty-seventh** year of the defeat in Actium, inflicted on Antonius by Caesar" (Ant. XVIII 26).*

The battle of Actium took place in 31 B.C., therefore: 37 minus 31 years equals **6**.

The territories of the former Ethnarchy, comprising Judea, Idumea and Samaria, were registered as a Roman possession and in **6 A.D.** were assigned with *"full powers"* to Prefect Coponius of equestrian order; he was stationed in Maritime Caesarea, with military garrisons located also in Jerusalem and in Sebaste, capital of Samaria (Ant. XIX 365).

In these territories the hegemony of the Prefect was subordinate only to that of the Legate of Syria and of the Emperor; this hegemony provided for "ius gladii", the right to try, torture and condemn to death whoever rebelled against the authority of a Roman official.

These were the events which from this date prompted the Jews to rebel against Rome once again; they were led by the Rabbi and Pharisean Zealot Judas "the Galilean"...

As pointed out above, primitive Jesuit Christianity (Messianism) - which was the result of the grafting of the pagan eucharistic theophagic ritual on to Messianic Judaism - adopted the "doctrine of salvation" (or "soteriology") which provided for the redemption of sins and human destiny after death.

This doctrine - present in many Mystery religions which existed in the pre-Christian classical world - also provided for the "Immaculate Conception" of human Virgins, fecundated by the variegated eastern pagan divinities, in order to generate a "Semi-God Son", who in Greek is called "Sotère", in English "Saviour", in Aramaic "Jeshua"... at that time **the Fathers, creators of the new religious "union", were so pig-headed that they thought themselves capable of transforming Christian "myth" into "history"** but, rather than history ... they caused damage ...

The nativities

Part II

The Ministry of Christ began in Galilee where the majority of the taxes collected by the Tetrarch Herod Antipas had to be sent to Caesar after being converted into talents of gold (as was done by Antipas's father Herod the Great).

The sole aim of the Christian scribe who introduced the tax collector "Matthew the Publican" among the Apostles of Christ was that of averting all suspicions of Zealotism with regard to "Jesus" and his disciples as the Zealots were fighting against Roman taxation; but it was an exaggerated precaution ... therefore naive. As a "tax collector", the evangelist and Apostle Matthew (unknown to the evangelist and Apostle John) would have been a tax specialist and, as such, would have known that the Empire began to impose direct taxation upon the Jews in **6 A.D.**

This decision provoked guerrilla warfare, fomented by the nationalist "fourth philosophy" of Judas the Galilean; this went on for years, and the Roman and Jewish authorities (Sanhedrin) finally asked Rome **to reduce taxation in 17 A.D.**, under Tiberius, because, as is reported by Tacitus, *"the population was oppressed by heavy taxation"* (Ann. II 42), but the request was denied by the Senate. In the meanwhile, according to the Church, **on this date "Jesus Christ" was already an adult.**

As we are about to document, the Publican **tax collector**, evangelist and Apostle "**Matthew**" - **eyewitness to the life of "Jesus" ... and of his mother** - according to what was written by the scribe who invented him, **did not know** (the scribe) **that the census** decreed by Augustus in order to tax the Jews **was the reason behind the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem made by Saint Joseph and the pregnant Virgin Mary**, which instead is described by the other scribe who wrote under the pseudonym "Luke".

This means that **there was no census whatsoever when Herod the Great was still alive, otherwise the Publican tax collector Matthew (and not Luke) would have reported why they needed to make this journey.**

"Gaius Sentius Saturninus" and "Publius Sulpicius Quirinius" became Consuls under Augustus years earlier: the first in 19 B.C. and the second in 12 B.C. Both were sent by the Emperor to govern the Province of Syria, as Lieutenants.

This military appointment took into account seniority. In order to obtain the rank of Governor, they first had to carry out the role of Consul. Saturninus and Quirinius were appointed Governor, respectively, in 9 **B.C.** and 6 **A.D.**

The latter (who commanded over several legions), with the title of excellency pertaining to the dangerous task of carrying out for the first time a census in Syria and in the Palestinian territories which it had annexed: Judea, Idumea and Samaria (Ant. XVIII 1,2).

The Jewish historian gives an in-depth description **of all the events which took place in his land** (he and his ancestors were from Jerusalem) **prior to 6 A.D.**, especially those involving the **powerful Legates of Syria** (whose military and juridical authority was superior to that of the Palestinian Kings themselves), all of whom he cites; yet there is no mention of Publius Sulpicius Quirinius being Legate of Syria prior to 6 A.D, of him having a similar mandate or of him having carried out a census at an earlier date; and there is no trace of this in the writings of other imperial historians: things which did not occur cannot be written by history.

Herod's ability to look after Palestine's revenues prompted Caesar Augustus (after enlarging his kingdom through the granting of new regions) to assign him the administration of territories which were located well beyond the borders of his realm (Bellum I 396/404).

Herod the Great was the only Jewish King to be awarded this status or highest office within the administrative hierarchy of imperial Rome.

"He was Procurator of all Syria and thus no other Procurator could act without his consent" (Bellum I 399 and Ant. XV 360) **"with the obligation to collect taxes in all the regions of this Province"** (Bellum I 428).

Despite being both juridically and militarily subordinate to the Emperor's Legate of Syria, Herod the Great was never subjected, administratively, to the same; and the tax revenues, in virtue of his role, forced him to build, in the name of Caesar Augustus and his relatives, magnificent works, including Pagan temples, even in cities outside his Kingdom (Bellum I 422/425).

For as long as Herod the Great was alive, it was not necessary for Rome to carry out any census whatsoever in Syria or in Judea as he was the **"Procurator of all Syria"**: it was he who, as fiduciary of Augustus, was in charge of tax collection and handled the revenues of the Emperor. It is important to point out that chronicles reported in **"The Jewish War"** **had to be checked and approved by Vespasian's historians** and that this document, deposited in the Imperial Archives, was also consulted by **Suetonius** half a century later (Vespasian 4-5). Unlike the inspired mystical exegetes, here we are following the history of Rome and not the "catechism of Jesus".

For the Emperor there was no one better than Herod capable of administering and looking after his affairs, his property and his revenues in Syria and Palestine and, **no Governor could have done this without a specific imperial mandate**. The revenues were calculated in talents of gold and at the death of Herod the Great the revenues in these territories were equal to almost one thousand talents of gold a year (Ant. XVII 317/323).

Upon the death of the King, Caesar Augustus immediately sent **Sabinus to Judea** as the **"New Roman Procurator for Syria"**; the latter took over the function carried out by the monarch effectively, **"in order to look after the property of Herod"**. In other words he had the task of administering Herod's whole Kingdom, which however was militarily and juridically subject to the Legate of Syria, Quintilius Varus (Ant. XVII 221-222).

"Sabinus, the Procurator of Syria, went to Judea to subject to precautionary seizure the property of Herod" (Bellum II 16), due to the fact that Herod had been "Procurator of all Syria" on behalf of Rome. **Sabinus's appointment** to this office **demonstrates the continuity of the "management" of the revenues generated by his property** (made up of territories subject to the Empire of Caesar Augustus); this task contemplated the collection of taxes, which had been carried out by Herod the Great in all of Syria (including the Kingdom of Palestine) until his death in 4 B.C.

Joseph reports all of the initiatives undertaken by Legate Sentius Saturninus who, despite being juridically and militarily stronger than Herod the Great, could not interfere in the latter's administration without a specific mandate from Caesar Augustus; this occurred in 6 A.D., when Publius Sulpicius Quirinius received a special imperial mandate, more important than the one previously given to Legate Saturninus. We can read about all of the latter's interventions (Antiquities XVI 277/283-344-368-369; XVII 7-25-57-89; and Bellum I 538/554), yet **there is no record of him carrying out a census**; nor could others have carried out the administrative act **without being noticed by the Jewish historian**, as such a measure would have provoked a dangerous reaction within the Jewish population.

Herod the Great - in addition to being a faithful ally as he was a sworn enemy of the menacing Parthians - proved to be "the goose that lays the golden egg" for the Empire; finally, the fact that **Quirinius's census in Judea did not take place** (as long as the King was still alive) **is confirmed in the Gospel of Matthew**, in which (as we have just stated) the evangelist, despite being a Publican tax collector, does not dream of mentioning it; but he should have done so if, as is stated by Luke, it was the reason behind Mary and Saint Joseph's trip from Nazareth to Bethlehem for the census.

"Quirinius, Roman senator who had experience in all of the magistracies before arriving at the office of consulate, was an extremely distinguished person from all angles, sent in by Caesar (6 A.D.) he visited Judea to estimate the value of the properties of the Jews and liquidate the assets of Archelaus (Judea, Idumea and Samaria became possessions of Rome) **and at the same time the registering of the properties took place in the thirty-seventh anniversary of the defeat of Actium (31 B.C.) inflicted upon Antonius by Caesar"** (Ant. XVIII 2 and 26).

Such a detailed description of the census (repeated many times by the Pharisean historian) is a demonstration of the economic, social and religious unrest caused by this act which violated the Ancient Law prohibiting the subjugation of the people of Israel, the Holy Land and their God (Yahweh) to the pagan invader.

Under Constantine (fourth century) the Christian Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea wrote the following in **"Historia Ecclesiastica"**:

"At the time of the first census, while Quirinius was Governor of Syria, our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem. Even Flavius Josephus remembers this census, under Quirinius, when he speaks about the revolt of the Galileans which occurred at the same time and which is also mentioned by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles" (HEc. I 5,2-3).

Eusebius clearly attests the contemporaneity of the birth of Jesus Christ, the census of Quirinius (cited by Josephus) **and the 6 A.D. Jewish revolt led by Judas the Galilean**; he points out that all these **events are mentioned by Luke** in "Acts of the Apostles" and his Gospel.

History does not report other imperial administrative acts in Judea before the time of this census; if the spiritualist teachers affirm the contrary, they must offer valid proof and allow us to read what the historians of the time wrote; they must not express personal sophistry, which today is written and fed to young students who are led to believe their teachings. The latter are unaware of being victims of a religious indoctrination aimed at masking two contrasting

evangelical "Births", which were clearly invented and craftily made consistent.

Saint Luke (in order to spite the overly-devout exegetes) **mentions Quirinius's census two times**: first, in his Gospel when referring to the "birth of Christ" (Lk 2,1-2), and then in the speech of Gamaliel (Acts 5,34/39), as already stated in the first study. If the evangelist wanted to cite two different censuses carried out by Publius Sulpicius Quirinius on different dates, being that one referred to the virginal birth of the "Son of God", he would have pointed this out in his works; and to distinguish between these two censuses, in "Acts of the Apostles" Luke would have specified that the one which makes reference to Judas the Galilean (6 A.D.) was the "**second**", aware of the misunderstanding that this could have caused.

But if Luke did not do so, the reason is obvious: the census was in reality the first to be carried out by Rome in this Province and for him Jesus Christ was born in 6 A.D.; however it is important to realize that historians undergoing a profound mystical crisis would prefer ... to go hell rather than admit that the Madonna was pregnant for twelve years. And yet a solution was within reach: after all, a "Virgin" would have required a longer gestation period to give birth to a God "*conceived by a Holy Spirit*" and no "believer" would have had any objection.

On the other hand the census was being carried out by the Romans where the people worked and produced, in other words the tax collectors (Publicans) would have collected taxes from **male citizens** where the latter had residency (we have read this in the epigraph of the Lapis Venetus); but the place of work of the carpenter Saint Joseph, head of the "Holy Family", was in **Nazareth, located in Galilee** (according to Luke), **not in Bethlehem, located in Judea**. **As the census was carried out in Judea, Idumea and Samaria ... not in Galilee**, this means that **the reason behind this journey is not justified by history**.

In fact the inhabitants of Nazareth had to pay their taxes to the Tetrarch of Galilee, Herod Antipas; as a vassal who administered a Protectorate of Rome, he would have then sent Caesar Augustus his rightful portion. As explained above, the "flight into Egypt" is nonsense: the two journeys of the "Holy Family" are naive strainings of the truth which are proof of the machination of the stories told by the Christian scribes; these amanuenses lack knowledge of the true events of the Jews and are incapable of expressing historical rationalism. What is more, Mary was not obliged to travel as she did not produce income.

Once in Egypt the Holy Family ...

"Being warned in a dream by an angel, he (Saint Joseph) withdrew to the region of Galilee. There he settled in a town called Nazareth. In this way the words spoken to the prophets were to be fulfilled: He will be called a Nazarene" (Mt 2,22-23).

The Christian scribe who passed himself off as the "Publican Evangelist Matthew" not only knew nothing about Jewish history, but did not even have the slightest knowledge of the Old Testament because the vaticination attributed to the "Prophets" does not exist in Jewish mythology. As he was a true former Jew and Apostle, his narration would not have been unaware of the vaticination of the advent of the Messiah "davidic dominator", prophesized centuries earlier by Micah:

But you, Bethlehem-Ephrathah too small to be among the clans of Judah. From you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel ... He shall stand firm and shepherd his flock by the strength of the Lord, in the majestic name of the Lord, his God ..." (Mi 5, 1-3).

Another piece of contrasting information which is not revealed to believers refers to the name of Jesus's grandfather (Saint Joseph's father), which according to Luke is "**Eli**" and according to Matthew is "**Jacob**" (Lk 3,23; Mt 1,16). The anagraphical, chronological, genetical and geographical contradictions regarding the "Births" contained in the "holy documents" demonstrate that they were added at a later date to texts which were originally different; therefore "Jesus", "Saint Joseph" and the "Madonna" never existed. In fact the evangelists "John also called **Mark**" and "**John**" know nothing about the birth of Jesus nor the serious risk run by the latter as a result of the "*Slaughter of the Innocents*". In actuality the primitive Gospels do not go beyond the mainly Jewish concept of the "Messiah Saviour": this did not contemplate the virginal birth in the cave - adopted at a later date (it is Origen who mentions the "cave" in the third century) - which provided for the "Soter" (Saviour) and the relative theophagic sacrifice taken from the pagan rites.

The Gospel of Luke's opening phrase, which refers to a generic "Herod", even deceives certain secular scholars who mistakenly identified him as "Herod the Great":

"In the days of King Herod of Judaea..." (Lk 1,5); *"But when he learnt that Archelaus had succeeded his father Herod as ruler of Judaea"* (Mt 2,22); passage 14,1-9 of Matthew regarding the decapitation of the Baptist, creates more confusion - among the many unspecified evangelical "*Herods*" present in the Bible - by calling Herod Antipas "King". In fact, *"At that time Herod the tetrarch ... The King (Herod the tetrarch) was distressed"* (Mt 14,1-9).

As pointed out, the Evangelists themselves declare that **Herod Archelaus was King of Judea**.

Even the Jewish historian states that Archelaus - by abusing the "Ethnarch" powers which Caesar Augustus had granted him after the death of his father - *"had convinced some to crown him and he had ascended the throne and acted with the powers of King"* (Bellum II 27). The Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, after consulting the Imperial Archives", wrote:

"Herod was chosen as King of the Jews by Antonius and by Augustus through a senatus consultum. His children were Herod and the others Tetrarchs" (HEC. I 7,12);

"Gaius (Caligula) successor of Tiberius, condemns Herod Antipas to perpetual exile and appoints Agrippa King of the Jews" (HEC. II 4);

"Agrippa, also called Herod, as he had persecuted the Apostles" (HEC. II 10).

Herod's appointment to King of the Jews, which is mentioned by Eusebius, took place in 40 A.D. The decision to expand his Kingdom by awarding him all of Palestine was decreed by Octavian Augustus at a later date as a reward for his effective economic and tax management; but it is important to point out that the Christian Bishop (just like Luke) cites "**Herod**" Archelaus and distinguishes him from the "**Tetrarchs**" Antipas and "Philip", who are both called "Herod" by Josephus (Ant. XVIII 109). Therefore when these three sons - potential heirs to the throne of Palestine - were born they were given their father's name (as their first name) in honour of the Great King.

Herod Archelaus proclaimed himself **King of Judea**, unlike his father Herod the Great, who at the time of the Matthew's account **was the King of all Palestine** (and Judea was just a part of this Kingdom). Only Herod the Great's grandson, King Herod Agrippa I the Great, also reigned over all of Palestine (starting in 41 A.D.) until his death, thanks to the authorization granted by Emperor Claudius; the Jewish historian Josephus calls him King "Agrippa" or "Agrippa the Great", while in "Acts of the Apostles" he is generically and imprecisely referred to as "**King Herod**" (*"At that time King Herod ..."* Acts 12,1) and his sister as "Herodiade". Therefore, just as the narrated events in "Acts of the Apostles" allow us to understand that we are dealing with **Herod Agrippa I**, even the narrated events in the Gospel of the same

evangelist make reference to **Herod Archelaus, King of the Jews**; not to Herod the Great, **King of Palestine**.

The historians with faith pretend to be unaware that **"In the days of King Herod of Judaea ..."** (Lk 1,5); this passage in Luke's account **does not refer to the birth of Jesus** but to the period of the conception of John the Baptist and, **after six months** (Lk 1,26) describes the divine "fecundation" of Jesus. If we add nine months to this number this means that a total of fifteen months have passed since **"that time"** (conception of the Baptist); the Saviour was born **afterwards** but, in the meanwhile, Caesar Augustus had exiled Herod Archelaus for his incompetence and had raised Judea's status to that of Province of Rome annexed to Syria and governed by a Prefect. Luke (3,1) also attests that: **"In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar's reign (29 A.D.) ..."** John the Baptist's preaching begins, **before** the "Ministry of Jesus"; and immediately **thereafter** the same evangelist adds (Lk 3,23): **"When he began his ministry, Jesus was about thirty years old"**. This is why no one today can take the liberty of affirming that **"At the time of Herod ..."** Luke was referring to Herod the Great: being that Jesus was born almost thirty years before 29 A.D., **Herod the Great had already been dead for four years ...** therefore before the Lucan "Nativity".

In fact, the birth of Jesus "conceived" by Luke, with regard to the **"Massacre of the Innocents"**, proves him right: he surely had read the approximately one hundred pages (they were handwritten scrolls) which Josephus dedicated to Herod the Great, without finding trace of this very serious piece of information invented by "Matthew"; this explains why **the Herod who he mentions - "In the days of King Herod of Judaea ..."** (Lk 1,5) - could not have been the "massacrer of children" **"Herod the Great of Palestine"**. The evangelist instead was wrong when - after passing himself off as a "doctor" through a letter attributed to Saint Paul Saul (Colossians 4,14) - he decided, **unlike Matthew**, to have the Madonna, who was about to give birth, travel over 200 km by donkey from Nazareth to Bethlehem (the journey was rough and winding) to take part in the census and "fulfil" the Messianic prophecy from Micah 5,1: **"But you (Bethlehem) Ephrathah ... from you will come for me a future ruler of Israel"**.

On the basis of Paul's testimony, contained in his letters, the evangelist Luke was a physician, as we can see in Col 4,14: **"Luke the beloved physician sends greetings, as does Demas"** ; Ph 23-24: **"Epaphras ... greets you, as well as Mark, Demas, and Luke, my co-workers"**; 2 Tm 4,11: **"Luke is the only one with me"**.

It is clear that the "beloved physician", just like the chaste and modest impostor who invented him, throughout his life had never seen the nude belly of a woman who was about to give birth. We are certain that this detail of the "long journey" to Egypt - which forces a woman who has just given birth to travel another 200 km (on the back of a donkey according to the scribe who wrote Matthew) for a total of over 400 km one-way - today is still not known to mothers kneeling down to pray in front of a statue of the Madonna or of "baby Jesus".

Women who are conveniently kept oblivious of the "apocryphal" (hidden) details in order to prevent them from reflecting upon such an absurdity.

We have demonstrated the false births in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, which place, respectively, the Advent of Jesus in **6 A.D.** and in **6 B.C.** (two years before the death of Herod the Great). But the Gospel of John reports a detail regarding the age of the "Messiah" which is dutiful to mention as it highlights the "confusion" made by the evangelists when creating the theological shell of the Divinity (Jh 8,57):

"The Jews then said: You are not fifty yet, and you have already seen Abraham!" ...

To all the readers who have faith and to their "Ministers of God" , in particular to all the spiritualists belonging to the "Comunione e Liberazione" Party (Communion and Liberation), we will grant the time to ... meditate **"with one heart all these joined constantly in prayer"**; at the same time, after Karol Wojtyla the Great, Benedict XVI, Francis I and their successors will be forced to continue to control all means of mass communication in order to contain the propagation of the historical truth on the origin of the myth of "Jesus Christ", despite being aware that in the long run they will not be able to stop the spreading of knowledge among men, which ultimately bring about the end of a doctrine upon which the centuries-old power of the Church and of its leaders was founded.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]