



# GOSPELS and HISTORY

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

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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

## 'Jesus' and 'Christ': two divine attributes of the Nazireo

*"The woman said to him, «I know that **Messia** - that is, **Christ** - is coming; and when he comes he will explain everything.» **Jesus said, «That is who I am, I who speak to you.»** (Jn 4, 25-26).*

*"The angel Gabriel was **sent by God** to a virgin and the virgin's name was Mary. He went in and said to her: «You are to conceive in your womb and bear a son, and **you must name him Jesus**»" (Lk 1,26-31).*

*"Mary will give birth to a son and you (Saint Joseph) must name him **Jesus**, because he is the one who is to **save his people from their sins**" (Mt 1,21).*

"Jesus": this name - which has reached us through the Latin "Iesus", transliterated from the Greek "Iesoùs", in turn deriving from the Aramaic "**Yeshùa**", contracted form of the Hebrew "Yehoshùa" - is the biblical name of Joshua, hero of the Old Testament and meaning "**He who saves**" or "**Saviour**". "God saves" is wrong: the Jews never pronounced the word "God". "Jesus" and "Joshua" are purposely made dissimilar in the translations from one language to the other but, initially, the two words were the same.

The original manuscripts in Greek of "Jewish Antiquities" and "The Jewish War" by the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius, recopied by Christian scribes centuries later, also refer to Jesus as the biblical warrior who conquered the land of Canaan. This means that in the original manuscripts of all the works of Josephus - starting with the Old Testament - only one name was present: Joshua.

*"Moses, now on in years, chose **Jesus** as his successor both in the role of prophet and commander-in-chief for any circumstance: **by order of God**, he assigned him the management of all affairs" (Ant. IV 165).*

"Yehoshùa" or "Yeshùa" (contracted) had a dual meaning (as does the "Saviour" for us): it was both a person's name and a "divine title", depending on the context in which it was used.

The title, given by the people of Israel to he who had been a protagonist of deeds "**by order of God**", was "He who saves", "Yehoshùa", just like "Joshua". Therefore the many people named Jesus that we come across in the works of the Jewish writer Josephus all refer to "Joshua", an appellative deliberately modified by Christian scribes in order to distinguish between the two protagonists belonging to different mythologies.

The Jews who adopted this name did so in order to honour the memory of the conqueror of the Promise Land given to the chosen people by God, and this is why we run into many "Jesuses" in the works of Josephus.

The Jews, when mentioning "Jesus", were referring to the successor of Moses who "saved" their fathers and gave them a homeland, and **not** to the new divinity "**Jesus the Messiah**", in Greek "Jesus Christ". Up until the end of the first century A.D., these two famous titles, "Saviour" and "Messiah", were idealized, by the majority of the Jews, into another longed for divine figure who, also chosen by God and thanks to His will, would have refounded and given the people of Israel a New Kingdom after massacring the "kittim" invaders: a "Dominator of the World".

*"What mainly incited them (the Jews) to rebellion (against Rome) was an ambiguous prophecy, found in the Holy Scriptures, according to which, at that time, a person from that country would have become the Dominator of the World ..." (Testimony of Josephus Flavius in "Bellum VI 310-315").*

"**Messiah Saviour**" or "**Mesiah Jeshùa**" in Aramaic, and "**Christòs Iesoùs**" in Greek or "**Iesus Christus**" in Latin, were divine titles for the Christian "Evangelical" authors who, in turn, hid behind pseudonyms.

The "salvation of humanity" doctrine was not supposed to reveal that the true name of "Jesus Christ" was John because the founding Fathers of Jesuit Christianity (the one which has reached us today), a reformed version of the original Essenic Jewish Christianity, knew that they were dealing with a Zealot, eldest son of the founder of the Jewish National Liberation Movement: Judas the Galilean.

His son John, as leader of the Zealots, in 35 A.D. managed to take power in Jerusalem while Rome was waging war against the Parthians and Judea was going through a very serious famine. As descendent of the royal Hasmonean line, he was proclaimed "King of the Jews" and "Messiah, Saviour of the Homeland".

In 36 A.D. Lucius Vitellius, Lieutenant of Tiberius for the entire Eastern Roman Empire at war, after defeating the Parthians, rebrought the Holy City under Roman domination and crucified the illegitimate King.

For the Jews a Messiah defeated by the Pagans could not have been "chosen" by Yahweh, and as a result he was disavowed and forgotten. Two generations after the 70 A.D. destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple carried out by Titus, son of Vespasian, a group of Essenic priests from Egypt used this unlucky Hasmonean descendant to begin to conceive a new "Saviour" (Yeshùa) and Jewish "Messiah", inspired by the abstract "Logos" of the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, who died in 45 A.D. A divine Messiah who no longer was a nationalist fighter, and therefore could be accepted by imperial Rome and less dangerous for the Jews of the diaspora. But this was not so simple...

The primitive gnostic Gospels conceived by the Essenes, one of the four Jewish religious currents of the period, were not written by "John" but described the deeds of "John", the first Jewish Demiurge: the Messiah "**Saviour of the World**". No longer the "**Dominator of the World**" awaited by the Jews, as reported by the Jewish priest Josephus after he, as

commander of the Jewish forces in Galilee, was defeated and imprisoned by the Roman leader Vespasian, future Emperor of Rome.

Two of the current canonical Gospels were written by "John": the first by John **also called Mark**, and the fourth by "John". It is easy to understand that "**also called Mark**" was a naive stratagem adopted at the time of the first drawing up of the Catholic Gospels so as not to make the two "Johns" appear to be "Apostles" and "evangelists" at the same time. The Christian scribes' desire to have "John" disappear as the name of the "Messiah" can be found in the "Gospel of John"; in fact, in this writing the scribe even had the Apostle "John" disappear and, being the latter the evangelist-Apostle himself, never mentioned in his Gospel, this means that "Saint John" does not know himself.

**The divine title of "Saviour"** was drawn on by the Essenes and bestowed on the "Messiah John" because this sect had previously already **prophitized** the advent of the "**Messiah**" as the "**Son of God**" who would come to the aid of the people of Israel subjugated by the Roman Empire, as is evident in the Dead Sea Scrolls:

*"He will be called the **Son of God**: they will call him the **Son of the Highest**. His Kingdom will be an eternal domination ... the people of God will rise and will stop all with the sword".*

We are dealing with an effective Essenic prophecy, found inside a cave and written on "**fragment 4Q246**" hidden along with the other scrolls just prior to the destructive Roman offensive led by General Vespasian in **67 A.D.** As up until this date the Jews had limited themselves to **announcing** the coming of the Messiah "Dominator of the World", a prophecy which did not come true (also documented by the historian Josephus), this means that the Advent of "Jesus Christ" had yet to be conceived ... until the successors of the divine Prophets, finally, established that it would have been much more fruitful to have the "Son of God" land on earth as if he were a "Universal Saviour", capable of resurrecting the "chosen", catechized "blessed who are poor in spirit". As in the Dead Sea Scrolls also Luke says:

*"He will be great and will be called **Son of the Most High**. The Lord God will give him the throne of his ancestor David ... And so the Child will be holy and will be called **Son of God**" (Lk 1,32-35). And the candid Matthew has Jesus say: "**Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth**: it's not peace I have come to bring, **but a sword**" (Mt 10,34).*

As we have verified, the Jewish yearning for the "*eternal kingdom*" of the "Dominator of the World" is today still present in the canonical Gospels.

As said above, in the Gospels the appellative "Jesus" means "Saviour" and thus does correspond to a person's name; further proof of this can be found in "Acts of the Apostles", where the Sadduceans and Pharisees of the Sanhedrin always call him "**this**" (referring to a carpenter) but never "Jesus". The scribe of "Acts", through the pseudonym "Luke", identified "Jesus" as a "divine saviour", but he was aware that the Jews could not recognize him as such as they were (and are) still awaiting the advent of the Messiah.

If "Jesus" had simply been a person's name - and there were many Jews who adopted it in memory of the conqueror of land of Canaan - during the meetings of the Sanhedrin and inside the Synagogues (as reported in "Acts" and in the Gospels) the priests, rather than refer to him as "this", would have called him "Jesus" **along with his patronymic**, which was mandatory for all Jews yet never used in reference to "Jesus". From a reading of the Gospels (as read in the initial passage) it can be observed that although the "Redeemer" presented himself as "Christ and Messiah", **He never called himself or introduced himself to third parties with such a name**, but simply defines himself through the generic and insignificant expression "*son of man*", offensive to the common sense of those waiting for more precise and authentic personal details.

This can be verified (as reported earlier in the third study) in the one and only authentic Act of the Sanhedrin (apart from the addition of the expression "called Christ") - which deals with James, brother of a certain Jesus (son of Damneus) - that has reached us through the works of Josephus Flavius and in which the Jews called him by his name: Jesus. They did not refer to him as "this", in contrast with "Acts of the Apostles", thus demonstrating that we are not dealing with the ambiguous "*Jesus called Christ*", as instead the Church instead has lead us to believe ever since the drawing up of the "Codex Ambrosianus F128" in the eleventh century.

Moreover, when they created the farce regarding "Jesus's trial", the evangelical scribes were very careful to avoid having the Prefect of Judea Pontius Pilate - Roman magistrate whose task it was to decide the fate of defendant - ask him his first name and patronymic; personal details which, obviously, could not be pronounced by the Jewish "Saviour" himself. This detail did not escape the scholar Afanasij Ivanovic Bulgakov, professor of history of religions during the czarist era, and father of Michail Bulgakov, author of the fantastical and critical novel entitled "The Master and Margarita", which describes Pilate's famous interrogation of "Jesus", during which the Prefect asks the latter his first name and patronymic and the defendant admits to being called "Jesus" and affirms that he is a **native of the city of Gamala and son of a "Syrian"** (Gamala was located in the southernmost part of Syria). However the son of Afanasij, Michail Bilgakov, did not report all of his father's account as he was well aware that Christian indoctrination would have been unable to "assimilate" such a revolutionary shock, capable of overturning the common belief in the *Agnus Dei*.

As a result of the contraction of the Hebrew word "Yehoshua" into the Aramaic "Yeshua (which refers to the person today called "Joshua)", name which is the equivalent of the famous "Jesus", the scribes copied unchanged the original Greek lemma "Iesoùs", as reported by Josephus, the Jewish historian who was a native speaker of Aramaic. Being that the Aramaic "Meshiah Yeshua" ("Christòs Iesoùs" in Greek and "Jesus Christus" in Latin) referred to two divine titles meaning "Messiah Saviour", the salvation of humanity doctrine was not supposed to reveal that the true name of "Jesus Christ" was John, the Zealot leader, as the true founding Fathers of Christianity (Messianism), reformed by Jewish Messianism, knew that they were dealing with one of the sons of Judas the Galilean. As a result, all of the names of the evangelists who "eyewitnessed the events" are not real but are pseudonyms: as we have already demonstrated in the eighth study.

For the Essenes the "Meshiah Yeshua" John was still Jewish, without the "immaculate conception" and let alone the "theophagic eucharistic sacrifice": unconceivable for the Law of the Ancestral Fathers "revealed" to the Prophets by Yahweh. The Messiah "Saviour of the World" as the "Son of God" was invented, for the first time, by the Essenes in order to reform the dangerous "Dominator of the World" full of hatred towards Rome; At a later date the initial Essenic doctrine further evolved through the introduction of the theophagic pagan rite of the Eucharist (Lat. victim sacrificed to the divinity) ... followed by the "Nativity" (also pagan), characterized by an "immaculate conception" of a "Son of God" by a "Virgin Mother" and "*being of one substance with the Father from the beginning of the centuries*".

The "historical" testimonies concerning His birth are so contradictory that they represent just one of the many pieces of evidence highlighting the evolution of this myth enriched by New Testament scribes over a period of three centuries.

A comparative reading of the Gospels and historiography allows us to identify and demonstrate a series of falsifications of events created in order to hide the truth, which saw the presence of the Pharisean Rabbi John as leader of the National

Liberation Movement founded by his father. John was one of the five sons of Mary referred to in the Gospels of Mark and John as "this", while the codexes of the biblical critical apparatus which reported his name (mentioned in the first study) were excluded from the "canon" at a later date by the ecclesiastical scribes who had become aware of the true historical event. The exegetes of the Church knew that John was the eldest son of Judas the Galilean and, through his grandfather Hezekiah of Gāmala, was a direct descendant of the Hasmoneans (a Jewish royal line).

This analysis can be found in the seventh study concerning the city of Gāmala.

With the help of his brothers, leaders of nationalist Zealot bands, the Rabbi John, son of Judas - at a time when Rome was involved in a risky war against the Parthians of Artabanus III - took power in Jerusalem in 35 A.D. and managed to have himself recognized as King of the Jews.

The Empire reacted quickly ... and inexorably. In 36 A.D., after temporarily defeating the "King of Kings" Artabanus III, the Commander-in-chief of all operations in the eastern theatre of the Empire, Lucius Vitellius, Lieutenant of Tiberius, drove his legions from Antioch to Jerusalem (which at this time was going through a terrible famine), returned control of the Holy City to the Romans and had the unauthorized King crucified.

Following the destruction of the Temple by Titus the Jew John - a Zealot martyr sacrificed for the Jewish nationalist cause - was recognized by the Essenes, one of the four Jewish religious factions of the period, as the "Saviour" Messiah. The Essenes prophetized him in the scrolls of Qumran with a name which was one of the most popular among Jews up until the end of the first century: **Yeshua**.

But it was mainly the meaning of this word which interested the future Jesuit Christians: "Saviour", equivalent to the "Soter" of the Pagans, especially those who followed the cult of the Mithra God, the most popular cult prior to Christianity. This was the first step of a doctrine which evolved into the Pauline Christianity of the salvation of the Gentiles. The birth and spreading of this doctrine took place after the third great Roman holocaust of Jews perpetrated by Hadrian between 132 and 135 A.D., which cost the lives of 580,000 men (cfr. Cassius Dio) which, if added to the deaths caused by the interventions of Vespasian and Titus 60 years earlier and to those provoked by the ferocious anti-Jewish repression ordered by Trajan in 115 A.D., it can be calculated that the total number of victims was over one million; in addition, the great number of slaves taken during these wars brought about the collapse of slave prices.

Rome's hatred towards this ethnic group was even greater than the hatred which they had for the Carthaginians. Cassius Dio wrote:

*"Hadrian sent in against them the most worthy commanders: the first among them was **Julius Severus**, who from Britannia, where he was Governor, was sent in against the Jews ... five hundred and eighty thousand men were killed in the raids and in the fighting; **incalculable**, instead, is the number of those who **died of hunger, of sickness and in fires, therefore almost all of Judea remained empty**" (Roman History LXIX 13,1-2).*

Although the Jewish religion was never outlawed (up until the 380 A.D. Edict of Thessaloniki issued in order to impose Catholic monotheism), at the time of Emperor Hadrian whoever was pointed out as being a Jew ran the risk of being persecuted: the only way out for these people was the "diaspora" towards faraway lands.

During this period a new doctrine postulating a diverse universal Jewish "Messiah" figure began to spread, no longer was he a Zealot nationalist ... no longer a "Dominator of the World" but a "Saviour of the World".

During the third century there was an economic crisis and the Roman Empire became militarily incapable of defending its borders; as a result people lost confidence in Capitoline (Roman) divinities, thus favouring the spread of many eastern religions, among which shined the the Creed of the "salvation for eternal life": Pauline Christianity.

After reunifying the Empire, Constantine the Great, in the role of Pontifex Maximus, decided to syncretize into a sole Creed and sole "Saviour" the "Soteres" of the most important religions existing in the imperial Provinces. After the death of Constantine, the Church of Rome, seat of the new universal religion, which came out as winner after decades of internal struggles between Christians; and at the end of the fourth century, in order to distinguish itself from the pagan "Soteres", the Church decided to pass the divine title of "Saviour" off as simply a person's name: "Jesus". But the "Jesus our Saviour" of the Christians means "Saviour our Saviour"; all the Christian faiths, however, have been compromised by a useless, repetitive, otherworldly title. Unlike in the discarded codexes, **John**, the true name of the "Messiah", is not mentioned in the codexes officially used and chosen by the editors of the translations of the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 13,55) as they knew (and know) that **he was the protagonist**. "John" is the authentic protagonist of the Gospels in which he is deliberately hidden behind John the Baptist (being that they both have the same name); there is an overlapping of the two ideological figures is such that Saint Luke begins his tale with the "birth" of

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

While **this is how the Gospel of John begins**:

*"A man came sent by God. **His name was John** ... He came to his own and **his own people did not accept him**" (Jh 1,6/11).*

In reality he cannot be John the Baptist, he had only one enemy: Herod Antipas. The Tetrarch executed him because, unlike the passage we have just read which states that *"He went among his people, but they did not welcome him"*, **his people welcomed and followed him with too much favour**:

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

Moreover, it is important to highlight that **John the Baptist was not a Nazireo** (even if the Gospels would like him to appear as such in order to hide the identity of the real John); if he had been a Nazireo, **Josephus Flavius would have been forced to mention this** in his long chapter dedicated to him (ibid). In his Jewish Antiquities (Ant. IV 72) the historian describes the Nazireos and in (Ant. XIX 294), therefore just a few years after the "resurrection of Jesus", he mentions that they were obliged to shave through the proclamation of a decree issued by King Agrippa I in 41 A.D., just after being appointed by Claudius. It is evident that the "Nazireos" were Jews who were considered to be dangerous fanatics by the authorities.

**The true John of Gamala was a Nazireo** and, as such, had to keep his beard and hair uncut; **he also could not drink wine**, but this detail - in grave contrast with the Pauline creed of the "resurrection of the uncorrupted bodies" (I Cor 15,51) - forced the founding fathers of the reformed Christian faith to have him become a "**Nazarene**". This is why.

The true aim, of fundamental importance for "the doctrine of eternal salvation" - which obligated the Christian theologians

to invent a city and call it "Nazareth" - stemmed from the absolute need to disguise the content of the original Essene Gospel which referred to the Saviour as a "**Nazireo**". The myth of the Messiah "Son of God", whose advent was prophesized by the Essenes in the Scrolls of Qumran, was put into effect by the followers of this sect following the Jewish holocaust perpetrated by the Romans during the Jewish Wars. As the initial Jewish creed evolved, the vow of Naziritism became incompatible with the subsequent introduction of the "**theophagic eucharistic sacrifice**", a ritual, as can be seen in the "**Rule of the Community**" of the **Essenes**, which the latter did not and could not observe (they were Jews) when they created the Jewish Saviour "**Yeshuà**"; but, on the contrary, this sacrifice constituted **the acme of Catholic liturgy**.

The contrast originates from two diverse religious views. The first, in observance of Jewish Law, which prohibited any Jew, consecrated to God through the Vow of naziritism, from drinking wine. The second, deriving from the pagan cults, obligated priests to offer the Hostia (lat. "victim sacrificed to the Gods) as sacrifice on the altar after drinking its blood: a religious ceremony like the one adopted by the subsequent Christian reformers belonging to primitive Essene Jewish Messianism. In order to make the illusion of "eternal salvation" sound credible to the Gentiles, the new theologians satisfied them by means of a liturgical syncretism ordered by God; for this purpose they had Jesus himself create the **Eucharist**, the "**theophagic pagan sacrifice**", when **he transformed the wine in his Holy Grail into his own blood** to be drunk by his followers:

*"Anyone who does eat my flesh and drink my blood has eternal life, and I shall raise that person (up on the last day)" (Jh 6,54).*

**Transubstantiation! This was the doctrine which dazzled the growing masses of proselytes!** The grafting of the theophagic eucharistic sacrifice of the "**Σωτήρ**" (Gr. see "Sòter" = "Saviour") pagan onto the Jewish religion through the Messiah of the Jews. But a true "Nazirean" who was also "Doctor of the Law", as "Jesus" was called, could have never had a chalice full of wine at dinner, nor could he have ever turned his wine into a "Holy Grail" filled with his blood ... therefore the Christian ideologists transformed the original Jewish term "**Nazireo**" into "**Nazarene**" and this mutation was justified in the Gospels by having Jesus belong to a new land, deliberately invented: the city of Nazareth, which they purposely located in Galilee in order to also explain the term "Galilean" used to refer to Jesus Christ and Simon Kefaz.

*"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 2,23).*

The Greek word in the Gospel is "**Ναζωραῖος**" (see "Nazoraios") which, unlike the fraudulent ecclesiastical transposition, cannot be interpreted as "Nazarene" as the correct translation is "**Nazoreo**" (no Nazorean); but this lemma, vocalized in this manner, is totally unknown to Josephus. The historian, whose language was Aramaic, was an expert of Greek and capable of copying the Semitic vocalisms into the latter language and reproduce the phonetics of the Aramaic language correctly. With regard to this, the Jew describes Moses's dictation regarding the Jewish "**Nazireos**" as such:

*"All those who **consecrate** themselves in observance of a vow are called **Nazireos**. They are people who let their grow and **abstain from wine**" (Ant. IV 72).*

*"Yahweh spoke to Moses and said: «Speak to the Israelites and say: "If a man or a woman wishes to make a vow, **the nazireos vow, to vow himself to Yahweh, he will abstain from wine and fermented liquor ... As long as he is bound by his vow, no razor will touch his head; until the time for which he has vowed himself to Yahweh is completed, he remains consecrated and will let his hair grow freely ...Throughout the whole of his vow he is a person consecrated to Yahweh»"** (Numbers 6).*

We therefore learn that the "**Nazireos**" belong to a **religious order consecrated to God**; they are **not the inhabitants of a city**. In fact, Christian iconography has always depicted "Jesus" as having long hair and a long beard because the "Venerable Fathers" were aware that **Christ was a "Nazireo"** (no Nazirean), even when he was being crucified.

As a matter of fact, in contrast with the Gospel of Matthew, **the Old Testament makes no mention of the Prophets' reference to "Nazarene"**; instead, as proof of what has just been verified, the **Prophet "Amos"** (2,11), thanks to a revelation, expressed the benevolence of Yahweh towards the Prophets and the Nazireos, who are of equal importance in the Covenant stipulated with Him:

*"I made Prophets rise among your sons and **Nazireos** among your young" (op. cit.).\**

\* We have explained above that the correct translation from Greek is "Nazireos", not "Nazireans". In addition, the term "Nazarite" used in English is inaccurate as it does not respect the Greek origin of the word. This also demonstrates the exegetical Christians' wish to change this word; they are aware that it is in contrast with Eucharistic doctrine.

The deliberately inaccurate transliteration of "Nazireo" into "Nazarene", "inhabitant of "Nazarene" was deliberate as Jesus should have been referred to as a "Nazarethene". As a result, in addition to the many contradictions contained in the manuscripts, we find another: "**a city called Nazareth**" which did not exist in Galilee in the first three centuries A.D., therefore unknown to all ... until the Christians decided to build it for a precise aim. Yet they had no knowledge of the region, and thus unable to understand the importance of geographic coordinates, always mentioned in the Gospels and left unchanged therein; in the holy texts we read about a "Nazareth" located right on the Mount of Gàmalà. As we have demonstrated earlier in this study, when we compared, by using a real map, the descriptions of Jesus's trips back and forth from his homeland narrated in the Gospels.

In Book X of "**Chronography**" the Byzantine Christian historian Iohannes Malalas (491-578) of Antioch reports:

*"At the beginning of Claudius Caesar's reign (41 A.D.) those who had earlier been called **Nazarenes** and **Galileans** took on the name of Christians".*

Malalas reported this information, which substantiates the decree against the Nazireos issued by King Agrippa I in 41 A.D., without being aware (not being a Jew, unlike King Agrippa) the implications deriving from the mentioning of two typically Jewish sects. We know, without a shadow of a doubt, that the "Nazarenes" were not the inhabitants of Nazareth which at the time did not exist, as proven in the study regarding Nazareth-Gamala; in addition, according to the Gospels the "Nazarethenes" were such staunch enemies of Jesus that they wanted to throw him down a cliff. Prior to Malalas, Saint Jerome (Hieronymus), in "**De Viris Illustribus**" (III 6-8) claims to have copied and translated into Greek and Latin (in 392 A.D.) the original Gospel of Matthew ... "*written in Aramaic, recognized and accepted by the **Nazareos**"* (Nazireos).

In final analysis "Nazareos" or "Nazireos" are the appellatives of the followers of a Jewish fundamentalist sect similar to the "**Galileans**", a term which did not only refer to the inhabitants of a region (as we have seen in the first study).

In the "Biblical Dictionary" edited by the famous Catholic exegete Monsignor Francesco Spadafora under the entry "**Naziritism**" we learn that "**Nazarene**" derives from the Jewish root word "**nazar**" (or rather without vowels "**n z r**"), meaning "devote or consecrate oneself". Here we are dealing with precise divine regulations contemplated by the Ancestral law, to which the Jews could adhere by binding themselves to God through a vow which lasted at least thirty days and sometimes for their whole life: **the Nazirite vow**.

It is thus confirmed that "Nazireos", "Nazareos" and "Nazarenes" are appellatives which include the same Jewish root "nizr", used to refer to the followers of a Jewish faction which, as stated by Malalas, was similar to the "Galileans", term which was often associated to all Jewish integralist rebels.

The followers bound to this vow were called "**Nazireos**" and they were prohibited from drinking any kind of liquor and anything capable of making them drunk, obliged to keep their hair and beard uncut and avoid touching dead bodies. It was thanks to this vow that Samson found the strength which allowed him to crush the pagan Philistines. As said above, Herod Agrippa the Great, as a knowledgeable Jew, so as to avoid problems with Rome, "disarmed" the hot-headed Nazireos by shaving them as did Delilah (Judges 16).

According to ancient Israelite tradition, the vow obliged followers to preserve Yahwist customs and fight against Canaanite polytheism. The Nazireos considered themselves "men of God" and, along with the Levites and prophets, made up the heart and profound conscience which inspired the Jewish struggle against idolatry aimed at the triumph of the cult of the one and only Yahweh. It is for this reason (in addition to the liturgical complex of the exterior acts) that the Nazirite vow bound its followers to morals and to life commitments which were spiritually superior to those expected from other Israelites.

The Mosaic Law dictated by Yahweh - along with the relevant historical heritage handed down by the mythological struggle of the ancestral Fathers who conquered and defended the Promise Land from pagan invaders - was perfectly coherent with the principles of the Nazirite vow. Teachings which were then drawn on by the "fourth philosophy" founded by Judas the Galilean when he sparked the revolt against Caesar Augustus after the latter had transformed Judea into an imperial Province and imposed the payment of taxes. The Nazireos - who followed an extremely pure lifestyle - made up the elite sect of the Zealot radical movement during the "Holy War" against Roman domination and Roman law.

For the Jewish people Roman rule meant the subjugation of Israel to the pagan divinities; therefore **Judas the Galilean**, on the basis of the biblical teaching of the Prophet **Amos** - who opposed both the corrupt priestly castes and the powerful Jews guilty of having reduced the population to poverty - postulated a subversion of Jewish society aimed at the abolition of slavery and the elimination of the privileged wealthy through the use of force.

*"You who trample on the poor and exterminate the humble of the Land ... by means of a sword all the sinners of my people will perish. I will rebuild the kingdom of David"* (op. cit. 8,4; 9,10).

Nationalist Messianic Zealotry was founded in 6 A.D. and attracted many followers among the Jews, especially the young:

*"The zeal which Judas (the Galilean) and Saddoc inspired in the young brought about the ruination of our cause"* (Ant. XVIII 10, ch. 1).

An extremist doctrine which provoked almost total destruction of the Jews. Rome refused to accept the loss of Palestine, a fertile land facing the eastern Mediterranean, lodged between the menacing Kingdom of the Parthians, Syria and the most important breadbasket of the Empire: Egypt. The Parthian sovereigns' desire to use force in order to penetrate into the rich basin of Rome's "*mare nostrum*" was always frustrated by the military supremacy of the imperial legions.

If there had been trace of Jesus belonging to the Jewish sect of the Nazireos, His vow would have prevented him from setting a table for dinner with a prohibited libation such as wine; as a result, it would have been impossible for him to transform this drink into human blood to be drunk by the Jewish "Apostles", thereby introducing a pagan ritual into the Jewish religion. This "sacrifice" - preserved in the "hostia", "the victim sacrificed to the Gods" - is the foundation of the new doctrine of salvation: Jesuit Christianity.

The Catholic priest Alfred Loisy, whom we mentioned at the beginning of the first study, was a profound expert of Semitic languages and Jewish customs; he therefore understood that "Nazarene" was a name which did not refer to a city unknown to history but was a title deriving from the Jewish root word "nazar" (nizr), origin of the term "Nazirite vow" ... and he dared say so openly and was thus excommunicated:

*"The tradition has set the residence of Jesus's family in Nazareth in order to offer an explanation for the nickname Nazirean, originally attached to Jesus's name. Nazireo is certainly the name of a sect with no link whatsoever with the city of Nazareth"* («La naissance du Christianisme» Alfred Loisy, 1857 - 1940).

**A Messiah consecrated as a "Nazireo" could have never given birth to the doctrine of Christian universal salvation:**

*"Anyone who does eat my flesh and drink my blood has eternal life, and I shall raise that person up on the last day"* (Jh 6,54);

*"Now as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and when he had said the blessing he broke it and gave it to the disciples. «Take it and eat» he said, «this is my body». Then he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he handed it to them saying, «Drink from this, all of you, for this is my blood, the blood of the covenant, poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. From now on, I tell you, I shall never again drink wine until the day I drink the new wine with you in the kingdom of my Father»"* (Mt 26,26/29).

Later, when the new religion reformed from Judaism came to power, Nazareth began to be built with the typical structures characterizing fourth century Christian cult; it was located 6 km from the capital Sepphoris which - at the time of the "evangelical" tale by the phony scribe "Matthew the Publican", who knew nothing about Jewish history - was burned to the ground by the legionaries of the *Legatus Augusti pro Praetore* of Syria, Publius Quinctilius Varus, in a Galilee shaken up by a bloody war.

But who chose the location committed a grave error: he did not take into consideration the description of Nazareth nor the location of the city reported in the primitive Gospels. And this is how it was passed on to posterity, without realizing that the description of the city reported in the Holy Texts corresponded to that of **Gamala, the city of Judas the Galilean and of his sons: John** (not "this"), **Simon, Judas, James and Joseph**.

[ go back ]