



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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

## From the false miracles to the Holy Shroud: Holy Fathers invented the "Christian Tradition"

### The Temple of Jerusalem and the Apostolic miracles

In the first study we have proven the invention - made by the Christian scribes of "Acts of the Apostles" - of a fictitious "Act of the Sanhedrin" whose protagonists were inexistent Apostles arrested by the High Priest in order *"to be put to death"*.

The Holy Apostles who succeeded Christ - appointed by Him to continue to spread the message of salvation after His Passion and ascension into heaven while still residing in the Holy City of Jerusalem - were accused by the Sanhedrin of *"having preached in the name of him (Jesus)"* and of having performed too many miracles in front of the *"portico of Solomon"* (Acts 5,13-16).

These are ridiculous accusations: why would a High Priest of the Temple have wanted to execute those with such divine powers? We are dealing with a "Creed" based on the one and only testimony passed on to us by the "Holy Scriptures". These writings speak about men (like Jesus and the Apostles) who lived roughly two thousand years ago, had superhuman powers and carried out extraordinary miracles; men who, according to the evangelical narrations, interacted with other famous men who really existed and whose traces can thus be found in the historiography of this period.

In the first study we verified that the investigation concerning the false testimony about Theudas (Saint Thaddeus) which the evangelist Luke had Gamaliel give is based on a solely historical profile, simple to verify as the year of the death of Herod Agrippa I can be found in any encyclopedia; the same goes for the Roman Procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Julius Alexander.

The "theological" information regarding this false Act of the Sanhedrin, as reported in the Bible, demands further in-depth analysis; according to what was written by Saint Luke, the "Apostles" were arrested by the *"High Priest and by the Sadduceans full of spite"* as they were guilty of:

*"... work[ing] many signs and miracles among the people. One in heart, they allused to meet in the Portico of Solomon. No one else dared to join them, but the people were loud in their praise and the numbers of men and women who came to believe in the Lord increased steadily. Many signs and wonders were worked among the people at the hands of the apostles, so that the sick were even taken into the streets and laid on beds and sleeping-mats in the hope that at least the shadow of Peter might fall across some of them as they went past. People even came crowding in from the towns round about Jerusalem, bringing with them their sick and those tormented by unclean spirits, and all of them were cured"* (Acts 5,12/16).

The absurd exaggeration described above does not require commenting (it is just a small example), therefore the first question to ask oneself is: why is it that the detailed historiography of first century Jewish events reported by Josephus Flavius - who belonged to an aristocratic priestly family that resided in Jerusalem in those years and was member of the Sanhedrin - did not mention these events? There is only one possible answer: they never took place.

In addition to the clear paradox characterizing the narrated event, this statement is supported by an important detail: the *"portico of Solomon"*, where the Apostles champions of miracles met, did not exist at the time in which Saint Luke placed the event (right after the death of Christ). Let's see why.

### The Temple

In *"Jewish Antiquities"* (Ed. UTET 1998), Luigi Moraldi - translation editor appointed by the exegete biblicist Cardinal Martini - on page 980 (Book XV), footnote n. 96, reports various authors of studies concerning the Temple of Jerusalem based upon archeological excavations.

It must be added that - according to current researchers of the "Israel Antiquities Authority" - there are practically no remains of the Herodian Temple, apart from a few stones and two marble epigraphs prohibiting pagan Gentiles from going beyond the area reserved to them.

On page 984, footnote n. 104, which refers to the time needed to build the Temple - begun in 23/22 B.C. and inaugurated in 18 B.C. - Moraldi stated that "in reality the entire work was completed between 62 and 64 A.D", therefore under Procurator Albinus and during the reign of Nero, and certainly **after** the the stunning performances of the Apostles under a portico which at that time did not exist.

This is the theory which has been accepted by almost all archeologists for over half a century; it is also supported by many exegetical believers who, however, do not analyze the matter in-depth in order to avoid having to highlight the grave contradictions between the theory itself and the "evangelical testimonies". Moraldi also avoids dealing with these contradictions; in fact, at footnote n. 104 he limits himself to citing the passage of the Gospel of John which speaks about

the Temple (Jh 2,20) but "forgets" to mention the miracles carried out by the Apostles under the "Portico of Solomon" outside the Temple of Jerusalem. The conciseness of Moraldi is understandable: in the cited passage of the Gospel the Jews tell Jesus that the Temple was built in 46 years, without Jesus objecting to this totally wrong statement; moreover, we know that according to the Gospel the Saviour strolled under this portico. This is why the scholar avoids going in-depth.

It is also important to highlight that - according to "the tradition" - the long-lived Apostle John wrote his Gospel at the end of the first century, in other words almost thirty years after the destruction of the Temple by Titus; so if the evangelist had truly existed, in his "parable" he would have first of all described the grave event and, and after "advising" Jesus on how to answer back to the Jews, he would have dissuaded the Redeemer, at all costs, from strolling under the inexistent portico of Solomon.

Despite having said this, we must carry out another critical analysis in order to verify the errors committed by Christian scribes when they wrote up the "Acts" and transcribed the Gospel of John in his name ... long after the narrated events. In the historical documents there is evidence that the Temple was completed (including the external structures) and inaugurated by Herod the Great. Josephus describes the entire completed structure and its inauguration in Book XV, therefore we must disagree with the conclusions published by Moraldi and with those who share his opinions because, as we have always stated, the precise, detailed information which history has left us must be respected.

In 4 B.C. - shortly after the death of Herod the Great (Ant. XVII par. 254/264) - on the day of the Jewish Pentecost, a violent revolt broke out in Jerusalem against the Roman Procurator Sabinus (the conflict then spread to Galilee) and won support of the Jews, Galileans and Idumeans. During the fighting:

*"... the rebels climbed up onto the porticos surrounding the external courtyard of the Temple (par. 259) ... so the Romans, finding themselves in a desperate state, set fire to the porticos, and the roof, full of pitch and wax was engulfed by the flames and that grand and magnificent structure was completely destroyed" (par. 262).*

According to the description made by the Jewish historian, the monolithic columns of the colonnade were attached to the top by massive wooden architraves which supported the ceiling: *"The ceilings of the portico were made of massive wood ..."* (Ant. XV 416).

The very high columns fell down as a result of the collapse of the heavy ceiling which caught fire in an irregular manner, thus bringing down the columns themselves, which crashed into one another. It is important to highlight that the Portico of Solomon was located near the edge of a cliff which looked out onto a deep valley (the Valley of Cedron), into which many of these columns ended up and disintegrated irreparably.

The Jewish historian also illustrates the Temple in detail in his first work "The Jewish War" - completed in the seventies under Vespasian - in Book XV from par. 184 to 226. The close examination describes the three city walls of Jerusalem in par. 136/183, then from par. 142 to par. 145 we read:

*"The oldest of three walls, from the Hippicus Tower went all the way to the eastern portico of the Temple".*

The "eastern portico" was that of Solomon. In "Bellum" the descriptions of the "Ancient Wall" are "static" - as there is no link to warfare involving all the colonnades - in contrast with what is stated above with regard to the revolt in Jerusalem after the death of Herod the Great, during which *they were completely destroyed*. In 75 A.D. Josephus did not know that he would have later written "Jewish Antiquities", therefore he illustrated these massive structures in Book V of "Bellum" (Temple and city walls) before they were demolished once and for all by Titus. The Roman commander left standing only a few fortified towers for military reasons.

The descriptions of the Temple and of the walls with their imposing towers (which also mentioned their dimensions in detail) were made by Josephus only after looking at the final plan which he took pains to save with the consent of Titus. It would be impossible for anyone to cite measurements which were so precise so as to allow the exact reconstruction of reduced scale models.

Shortly before the sacking of Jerusalem, the Jewish historian writes in "Autobiography":

*"... there not being anything so precious to preserve and whose possession could offer relief to my misfortunes, I requested and obtained, thanks to the gracious concession of Titus, some holy books" (Bios chap. 75 par. 418).*

Joseph, in his final work "**Contra Apione**" (Book I from par. 28 to 46), highlights how carefully the Priests and High Priests of the Temple wrote up:

*"Annales worthy of faith for the transmission of public events of which my 'Antiquities' are an accurate extract ... and up to this day this custom has been observed".*

In the nineties (under Domitian) the Jewish historian wrote "**Jewish Antiquities**", his most detailed work, in which he dedicates an entire chapter to the "**Portico of Solomon**". In this work he mentions that **King Herod Agrippa II**, between the end of 63 and the beginning of 64 A.D. (shortly before the arrival of the new Procurator Gessius Florus sent in by Nero to replace Albinus), decreed that this structure not be erected due to the high cost.

This dating forces us to highlight an important detail: Josephus Flavius was not in Jerusalem when the King decided not to build the portico. As is mentioned in his work "**Autobiography**" (3,13/16), at the end of 63 he was sent to Rome by the Sanhedrin to ask Nero to release from prison several Jewish priests arrested by the previous Procurator Antonius Felix ... and remained here until about the middle of 65 A.D. (ibid 4,17). Upon his return to his homeland in 66 A.D., the revolutionary tension had already got underway: things were coming to a head, and Joseph, like everyone else, was worried more about the future than about the past and, at this time, was unaware of the details regarding the Temple. This is why he does not mention in "Bellum" the information concerning King Agrippa II; it will come to his knowledge thanks to the Jewish priests who continued to record "*Annales worthy of faith for the transmission of public events*". Therefore "Antiquities" becomes the proof that the Portico of Solomon was not rebuilt, otherwise the Pharisean historian would have been forced to mention this important piece of information, as important as the miracles performed by the Apostles ... of which there is no trace in the annals of the priests and High Priests of the Temple.

Towards the end of Procurator Albinus's term of office (Ant. XX 219/223), King Agrippa II, with regard to the Jewish people's demand that the portico of Solomon be built, declares: *"It is always easy to demolish a structure"* ... This phrase did not refer to a future demolition but to one which had already taken place in the past: the destruction of the porticos caused by Roman fire to defend themselves against the insurgents. And the King added: *"... it is difficult to build another (structure) and even more so this portico"*. There would have been no reason for the portico of Solomon to have been more difficult to erect than the two which had already been rebuilt, apart from the greater number of columns that had been destroyed (having fallen down into the Valley of Cedron). In reality the most difficult to build should have been the southern Royal portico which had already been rebuilt.

Beyond any reasonable doubt, what makes the proof of the inexistence of the portico of Solomon during the "Apostolic" period incontestable is the **sententious statement** made by the historian with regard to the event dated between the

end of 63 and the beginning of 64 A.D.:

*"... the inhabitants asked the King to build **the eastern portico**. This colonnade was a work of King Solomon who was the first to erect the whole Temple" (Ant. XX 220/1), which ends with the lapidary royal decree of Agrippa II: "... the King therefore **rejected their request**" (ib. 222).*

The majority of Christian historians recognize the mistake made by Luke the Evangelist (who speaks about the miracles of the Apostles at the Portico of Solomon), while others attempt to correct these mistakes through naive, superfluous tergiversations ... Well, this is understandable! It is not easy to admit being ingenuous and having undergone brainwashing based on the illusion of eternal life. Especially those who, after being indoctrinated, have dedicated themselves to the spreading of this propaganda in order to attract and brainwash new followers: they call this "apostolate"...

*"**Everyone came running towards the Apostles in great excitement** (as a result of a miracle), **to the Portico of Solomon**, as it was called ... When **Peter** saw the people he **addressed them** ... Men of Israel ... It is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of our ancestors, who has glorified his servant **Jesus whom you handed over and then disowned in the presence of Pilate after he** (Pilate) **had given his verdict to release him**. It was you who accused the Holy and Upright One ... **you killed the prince of life**. **God, however, raised him from the dead, and to that fact we are witnesses**" (Acts 3,11/15).*

**Inexistent Apostles, authors of miracles and sermons, invented under an inexistent portico:** thanks to this testimony even we atheists could not get out of believing in the "Resurrection of Christ", mainly because the Saviour himself managed to perform the Miracle of Miracles by "resurrecting" the portico of Solomon destroyed by the Romans:

*It was the time of the feast of Dedication in Jerusalem. It was winter, and **Jesus was in the Temple walking up and down in the Portico of Solomon**" (Jh 10,22/23).*

According to the Gospels, when the inhabitants of Jerusalem asked King Agrippa II to erect the portico, they were all soft in the head ... and the King even more than they were; being that the portico had already been rebuilt, the King could have satisfied them "*gratis*", thanks to the benevolence of Jesus.

### The "Christian Tradition"

As we have already said in the previous studies, Eusebius of Caesarea was the first Christian of the Court of Emperor Constantine able to access the State Archives and tamper with old chronicles. The venerable Bishop was thus able to "build" a "Tradition", made up of invented Christian characters, to be passed on to posterity in the form of "Historia Ecclesiastica".

Such a "Tradition", personified and represented by "direct witnesses", was indispensable in order to demonstrate the Advent of Christ, new God, and the future followers of His teaching, from the first century onwards. A "Tradition" recognized as historically substantiated, therefore officialized by all the Christian Churches around the world, and which to this day continues to be propagandized in schools in countries with governments closely linked to confessional power. "Tradition" which made use of the presence in the Empire of Jewish Christians (Messianists) **awaiting the advent of their Davidic Messiah** chosen by God to liberate them from Pagan enslavement. These Messianists, who were persecuted by the Romans, were passed off as "Jesuit Christians".

Unfortunately - for those who are dedicated to the function of "apostolate" and indoctrinate the young with banal, childish narrations - through the aid of archeology and philology we have highlighted the blunders made by the scribes when they inserted real and significant historical information both in the Gospels and in the patristic writings in order to make them truthful but without first taking the precaution of carrying out in-depth studies through the comparison of the events they had read about. Fallacious historical information - still latent in the holy writings which survived the evolution of an original Jewish myth before being reformed by Pauline Christianity - which escaped the copyists of the primitive Gospels when they copied it down into the current Gospels; the data, in fact, was not fully analyzed and was manipulated by people who were unaware of first century Israelite customs.

A series of mistakes deriving from the superficiality with which the historical data was handled, as in the case of the incredible coincidence regarding the imaginary community of Jesuit Christians, whose **mass conversion to Christianity was the result of the miracles performed by Saint Paul in Ephesus and in the Province of Asia**. The total Christianization of this large region - thanks to Paul, who was followed by the Apostle Saint John - was proven wrong because in contrast with the presence, substantiated by history, of the Governor of this Province: Publius Cornelius Tacitus, the most famous Pagan chronicler of the period ... who would have at least reported the presence of these Christians to Trajan as did Plinius the Younger in nearby Bythynia (see fifth and tenth studies). The presence of Christians, which according to "Acts of the Apostles" was certain, in the territory governed by the Pagan priest Tacitus is absurd, as verified in the previous studies; this absurdity, however, escaped the impostor Eusebius when he described the presence, in the known world of the time, of numerous "Ecclesiae" of followers of Jesus, converted from the time of His "Advent" and "Resurrection".

Here is another example of the fraudulent expedient through which Eusebius aimed at offering to posterity "evidence" - in his work "Historia Ecclesiastica" written up for this reason - of the adherence to "Jesuit Christianity of the Salvation" of no less than the Roman Emperor Philip, nicknamed the Arab, who held the high principate from 244 to 249 A.D.:

*"Gordianus had been Roman Emperor for six years when Philip, with his son **Philip**, succeeded him. It is reported that he (the Emperor), **being a Christian**, desired, on the day of the last paschal vigil, to share **with the multitude** in the prayers of the Church (where and when), but that he (the Emperor, sic!) was not permitted to enter, by him who then presided (who?), **until he had made confession** and had numbered himself among those who were reckoned as transgressors and who occupied the place of penance. For if he had not done this, he would never have been received by him (he who presided), on account of the many crimes which he had committed. It is said that **he** (the Emperor) **obeyed** (he went to confession) **readily, manifesting in his conduct a genuine and pious fear of God**" (HEC VI 34).*

Eusebius's decision to have **Emperor Philip I** appear to be Christian was not incidental as the most important office in the world was held by a Roman citizen of equestrian order, who was a native of Shahba in Trachonitis (formerly kingdom of King Herod Agrippa I but, after his death, it was reannexed to Syria by Claudius) and son of an Arab leader: this is the origin of the appellation "**Philip the Arab**". During the "public ministry of Jesus" **Trachonitis** was part of Palestine and its capital, Caesarea of Philip, was visited by Christ the Saviour and the Apostles (Mk 8,27-33; Mt 16,13-23). Trachonitis bordered on Galilee, the territory visited by

the "Son of God" and where He carried out many astonishing miracles before crowds of people:

*"He went round the whole of Galilee teaching in their synagogues, proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and curing all kinds of disease and illness among the people. **His fame spread throughout Syria, and those who were suffering from diseases and painful complaints of one kind or another, the possessed, epileptics, the paralysed, were all brought to him, and he cured them. Large crowds followed him, coming from Galilee, the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judaea and Transjordan**" (Mt 4,23-25).*

The many astonishing miracles carried out by the "Son of God" were handed down orally by the ancestors of all the inhabitants of the area who, in turn, would have inevitably preserved a lasting memory of such deeds.

These were the first reflections made by the venerable, deceitful Bishop, courtier of Constantine, eighty years after the ridiculous, schemed incident regarding Philip the Arab. **Eusebius** was the principal supporter of the salvation of humanity doctrine, and he **was thus forced to declare that Emperor Philip was Christian**.

After glorifying the Saviour Christ and giving him powers - displayed in front of crowds of cheering Palestinians - equal to those of God, the Bishop's ideological propaganda could not allow the inhabitants of this region to forget such miracles, as this would have constituted an incurable contrast with his doctrine; the need to avoid such a contrast applies all the more if, as chance would have it, the Emperor of Rome descended from this region.

Eusebius knew that no Pagan citizen would have believed in myth of the prodigious "Son of God" - capable of resurrecting the dead and of resurrecting Himself three days after His death - if the Princes of the Roman State, born and raised near a land where Jesus had displayed his talents, had not been Christian.

There was only one way for the Bishop to solve the evident contradiction: **Philip had to be remembered in history as the first Jesuit Emperor after the advent of Christ**.

But, as the exegetical spiritualists should well be aware of, "the devil makes pots without lids to cover them up": there are archeological findings and authentic chronicles of the period depicting an Emperor who contrasts diametrically with the description offered by Eusebius, who presents us the portrait of a pious Christian; such a contrast overshadows the dodgery intentions - based solely on Eusebian "History" - of today's overly-devout historians.

Five archeological findings consisting of Roman Military Diplomas made of carved bronze laminae - given *ad personam* by Emperor Philip to army veterans at the end of an honourable military career - all prove, incontestably, which cult the Emperor was dedicated to:

H. Nesselhauf. *Diplomata Militaria*, Berlin, years 1936/1955: CIL (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum) XVI 00149; CIL XVI 00151; CIL XVI 00152; CIL XVI 00153 and (we have published only the shortest of these Diplomas) CIL XVI 00150:

[IMP(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Iulius Philippus Pius / [Felix Aug(ustus) Pont(ifex) Max(imus) trib(unicia) pot(estate)] III Co(n)s(ul) P(ater) P(atriciae) / [M(arcus) Iulius Philippus nob(ilissimus)] Caes(ar) / [nomina militum qui militaverunt in] [a(nte)d(iem) VII Id(us) Ian(uarias)/Coh(ors) [Philippiana P(ia) V(index)/ M(arcus) Aure[lius]/descri(um) et recognit(um) ex tabula aenea/qu(a)e fixa [est in muro post] **templ(um) d(i)vi Aug(usti) ad Minervam]** ...

Therefore, **Marcus Julius Philippus** was not "universal Catholic Pope", but "simply" **Pius Pontifex Maximus of the Empire**; so, richly dressed, he professed the liturgy of animal sacrificing, carried out with his own hands as a propitiatory act of **adoration of the Pagan divinities**.

Instead of devoutly receiving, *"after having himself confessed"* (says Eusebius), the sacrament of the Christian Eucharist, nourishing himself with the "transubstantiated" Host containing the "blood and body of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Corpus Domini nostrum*) ... during the sacred rituals Philip swallowed the Pagan *"Hostia"*, which was: "the victim sacrificed before the Gods".

The fact that Emperor Philip I, called the Arab, was a devout Jesuit Christian, fearing of the God Jesus, is conveniently believed by all exegetes, with or without cassocks, who have faith in His Advent and the consequent "salvation for eternal life". The "spiritualist scientists" are aware of the need to be coherent with "the Christian tradition", so they are careful not to reveal to believers the motives of the deceitful Bishop (as we instead have done) so as not to highlight the contradictions capable of defeating their "apostolate". Santo (Pietro Giovanni) Mazzarino, illustrious historian of Ancient Rome, was not able to avoid "staining", through this acritical "flaw", his remarkable work **"The Roman Empire"** by endorsing the "testimony" of Eusebius: heritage of the Christian faith acquired at the Salesian Fathers School which he attended as a child.

Let's read how **the unconditional fideism of the Emperor** is represented by Professor Marta Sordi - teacher of Ancient History at the Università Cattolica in Milan - in her laudatory book whose tone is encomiastic, an excellent panegyric for a proficuous apostolate, entitled **"I Cristiani e l'Impero Romano"** ("The Christians and the Roman Empire"), Edit. 2004:

*"The peaceful expansion of Christianity goes hand in hand with the rise of the Christians within the ruling classes of the Empire who, **through Philip the Arab, attain the imperial throne**" (op. cit. pag. 203).*

Professor Marta Sordi, along with brilliant philologist Ilaria Ramelli and the usual well-orchestrated train of genuflexion supporters, before passing off Catechism as History, all together should have carefully looked at the sources and criticize, instead, Eusebius's "Historia Ecclesiastica", the only source from which "believers" have obtained information full of imaginative and banal invented details passed off as truth.

Numerous historians of the period, despite being convinced Jesuits, reported the chronicles of third century Roman Emperors, yet none of them mentioned that Philip was a Christian; the only ones who did so were Eusebius and one of his successors **John Chrysostom**, Patriarch of Constantinople. The latter spoke about the Christianity of Philip around 400 A.D. by specifying the name of the *"Christian leader"* - unknown up until this time - who warned the Emperor not to enter a Church without having been confessed. This *"Christian leader"* was **Saint Babila, another invented Bishop** with no personal details, **spiritual head of the Diocese of Antioch** and beatified ... to whom, in the centuries to come, Churches, Squares and Theatres will be dedicated.

The Venerable Archbishop **Chrysostom**, who was a native of Antioch, decided to make Eusebius's "testimony" more credible by perfecting it; he explains that the **martyrdom of Babila** was ordered (listen, listen) by **Philip the Arab**, because he dared prevent the Emperor from entering a Church. But, on the basis of Chrysostom's (which means "golden mouth") plan, **if both the name of the "Christian leader"** and that of the Church of Antioch were **known, they would have been mentioned in Eusebius's "live" chronicle**, in other words **prior to the "testimony" offered by Chrysostom** himself. Instead "golden mouth" wished to create a new martyr to be beatified and ended up contradicting the "Father of the Tradition" ... it was for this lie that the former was declared a "Saint" by the Universal Church.

From a reading of the martyrology (click to believe) of the **"Basilica of Saint Babila"** in Milan we learn: *"The fate of*

*the relics of Saint Babila is well-documented: the principal witness regarding the matter is still Saint John Chrysostom ...".*

But the invention of Saint Babila is made even more complicated (this is really something) by the version created by another great Saint of the Church: Saint Jerome. His "Tradition" was offered as testimony to posterity: *"The martyr Babila was brought to prison in chains by Emperor Decius where he died for the suffering underwent"...* and unaware of all this is Eusebius, who lived at a time closer to that of the narrated events and was an absolute champion with regard to the invention of martyrs.

A subsequent "pious" Christian historian, **John Malalas**, also **wrote about Saint Babila in the sixth century**, and he enriched the account which speaks about the "legend of the invented Saint" by including a detail which highlights the practice of scolding the Emperors: **Marcus Aurelius Numerianus**, Princeps of the Empire more than thirty years after the death of Philip the Arab. Numerianus was a short-lived Caesar on the throne of Rome, as he reigned for little more than a year (283/284 A.D.), just enough time to be **driven out of the Church of Antioch** by the harsh Bishop Babila, as stated by Malalas: *"for having his hands still stained by the blood of the pagan sacrifices"*.

A chronicle as ridiculous and disavowable as the previous ones, first of all because in Antioch, at the time of Saint Babila (therefore under Philip the Arab and Numerianus), there were no Christian Churches (we are in the third century A.D.); so, if the event had really taken place, **the first to mention a Christian Emperor by the name of Philip would have been the historian Ammianus Marcellinus** (from the fourth century), **a native of Antioch and interested in Christians** about whom he discussed in his chronicles. Moreover, *dulcis in fundo*, the venerable historian Eusebius of Caesarea, having lived at a time closer to that of Numerianus and Philip, would have been happy to report the entire story two centuries prior to Malalas, as **Numerianus** (unlike his predecessor Philip), rather than be confessed, according to the Christian historian Malalas ... **martyrized Babila** for having insulted him: here is the umpteenth martyrdom with miracles, "final beatification" and many **statues and relics** to be venerated by naive believers.

As said previously, a "holy legend" , that of **Saint Babila**, which one of his successors was unaware of: Saint Jerome. The latter, in **"De viris illustribus"** describes the life of **all the beatified Christian Bishops** from the Apostles onwards yet ... he fails to mention the famous Bishop as **"Saint Babila the beatified"** who was not martyred by the Christian "Emperor Philip the Arab" nor by Emperor Numerianus but, according to Jerome, by the inconvenient **Emperor Gaius M. Quintus Traianus Decius**. But Saint Jerome's deposition concerning Babila in **"De viris illustribus"** (LIV) cites as a source Eusebius of Caesarea's **"Historia Ecclesiastica"** ... but it is in **total contrast** with what we read today. All one has to do is reread the just-mentioned passage written by Eusebius (HEc. VI 39,1-4) which states that **Babila died of old age**. The historical blunder results from the contrast between Codexes drawn up by calligraphers who did not coordinate their efforts when inventing the legends of inexistent Christian saints, who were martyred by famous people who truly did exist yet had nothing to do with the events which they are said to have been involved in. The patched-up account of the martyrdom of Babila shows how the Christian scribes assembled the "Tradition" of the Saints and their **phony relics** through the centuries, passing it off as history; we can see that **false Saints invented many other false Saints** along with false martyrs and relics.

In this case, it all derives from the need which forced Eusebius to have Philip the Arab be "historically" Christian, being that the Emperor was a native of Trachonitis, a region which at the time of Jesus and of His miracles was part of Palestine, governed by Tetrarch Herod Philip, Herod Antipas's half-brother. Julius Capitolinus, Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, George Codinus, Landulfus Sagax, Sulpicius Severus, Dionysius the Younger, Paulus Orosius, Epitome of the Caesars, Ammianus Marcellinus, Gregory Nazianzenus, Isidore of Seville, Paul the Deacon and many others, **Fathers and Doctors of the Church included**; none of them, from the third century onwards, reported the extraordinary and unbelievable piece of information regarding a Christian Emperor of Rome prior to Constantine the Great; not to mention the fact that there are strong doubts regarding the actual Christian faith of the latter, which have been raised by numismatics and archeology. Any history or classical literature teacher, philologist or exegete cannot pretend to be unaware of such important information, which has come to light also thanks to archeological findings, numismatics and CIL.

The clumsy attempt to pass Emperor Philip the Arab off as Christian - even without taking into consideration archeological, numismatic and historical findings - from the point of view of believers also contrasts with the image of the Christian Jesuits which has been fed to us from infancy, "spiritual heritage" of Eusebius himself.

From Eutropius and from Julius Capitolinus's "Historia Augusta" we learn that Philip I had his predecessor, Emperor Gordianus III, divinized after having him executed. To ward off all suspicion, he had an important monumental sepulchral built in Gordianus's honour - so the latter could be adored - in Circesium, a Roman military fortress along the Euphrates. During his imperium Philip minted numerous coins and on the back we can still admire the many Capitoline Pagan divinities ... there is nothing Christian. As chance would have it, the imperial Regency of Marcus Julius Philippus saw the 1000th year of the founding of Rome (a.U.c. "ab Urbe condita", 753 years before Christ), and the Caesar celebrated the event a year later as he was involved in a war along the Danubian limes. In 248 A.D. the "Pious" Emperor commemorated the event through the minting of coins which depicted him as Pontefix Maximus in the act of sacrificing to the Gods; and for this extraordinary event he organized in the cities of the Empire magnificent performances and grand circus games ... and did not imagine that his days were numbered. After crushing several internal revolts, the following year (249 A.D.) he was assassinated by one of his generals, Quintus Decius, who usurped the throne ... thus not allowing him enough time to convert to Christianity.

While still on the topic, we feel that it is necessary to highlight another famous invented martyr: **Saint Biagio**. He was described by the priest Camillo Tutini (1594-1670) in **"Narration of the Life and Miracles of Saint Biagio Bishop and Martyr"**, drawing on a tradition dating back to the sixth century Byzantine physician Aetius Amidenus (who is mentioned by Tutini) and on an eleventh century Armenian Liturgical Synaxarion describing the Saint's life and suffering: a hodgepodge of absurdities that only a psychopath could have invented, yet normal for the Church which eternalized the Saint under torture in the Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel. All that you have to do is click on "Saint Biagio" and see what Wikipedia has to say.

Saint Biagio is the martyr who holds the world record for the number of relics of his body to be found in twenty-three basilicas, mainly in Italy, and which are an object of cult for indoctrinated believers. According to the Synaxarion we discover that Biagio was a physician, later **Bishop of Sebaste**, capital of Armenia Minor, which flourished at the time Eusebius of Caesarea, but, here the shoe pinches: **Saint Biagio Bishop and martyr is unknown to Eusebius of Caesarea**, the greatest inventor and "collector" of martyrs who underwent the most refined torturing of Christianity, and of **"all the Heads of the Church who showed through their own blood the authenticity of the religion which they professed"**. Eusebius could not have been unaware of Saint Biagio; and not only for the "carder" with which he was tortured (instrument made of wood with many nails used for thinning out sheep fur and camels) and, but most of all because they who created the Synaxarion made the grave mistake of placing him in **Sebaste as Bishop at the time of Eusebius**, who lived in the palace of Constantine in **nearby Nicomedia (Bithynia)**, therefore **non far from Sebaste**; as a result, it is impossible for Eusebius to have been unaware of the long and painful martyrdom

undergone by his colleague, Bishop of Sebaste.

As further proof of the belated ecclesiastical invention of the Bishop Saint Biagio, in addition to Eusebius, Jerome is also unaware of the Bishop (who he was invented at a later date) and **makes no mention of him in "De viris illustribus"**. The fact that in his work Jerome knows nothing about "Bishop Biagio" means that he was also unknown to the scribes who transcribed the "**Codex Ms 2Q Neoeboracensis**" of the "De Viris illustribus" dating back to the **ninth** century. The dating of this codex demonstrates that all the "documentation" concerning the life of Saint Biagio (relics included) in subsequent to his existence and the result of psychopathic imagination ...all that you have to do is go onto Wikipedia and read the account of St. Biagio in the "Liturgical Synaxarion".

#### The origins of a simulated "Tradition" ...

If there are those who believe that the eminent Bishop Eusebius limited himself to involving in the Christian faith one "simple" Emperor ... well they are badly mistaken. A God, capable of redeeming all of humanity thanks to the promise of eternal life, had to be "universal" and, as such, "certified" by unexceptionable international documentation from the time of His coming onwards. Therefore the high prelate called in to offer all at once "testimony" of "Advents", Miracles, Resurrections, Ascensions into Heaven, the very old King Abgar of Edessa, capital of Osroene, small yet ancient kingdom of Mesopotamia, beyond the Euphrates River and bordering on the east with Parthia and on the west with Syria. In his "Historia Ecclesiastica" (I 13) **the Christian Bishop, three centuries after** the death of the Redeemer of humanity, **says to be in possession of the copy** of the "**written testimony from the archives of Edessa**" consisting of a letter (it's online) which King Abgar wrote and sent to Jesus (**through the courier Ananias**), begging him to come and heal him of an incurable illness.

*"Abgarus, Ruler of Edessa, to Jesus the excellent Saviour ..."*

Jesus replied to this request with a letter, which he sent to Abgar by courier and in which he informed the King of his resurrection after death:

*"Blessed art thou who hast believed in me without having seen me ... But after I have been taken up I will send to thee one of my disciples, that he may heal thy disease and give life to thee and thine" (HEc. I 13,9);*  
*"To these epistles there was added the following account in the Syriac language: <After the ascension of Jesus, Judas, who was also called Thomas, sent the Apostle Thaddaeus to Abgarus>" (HEc. I 13,10).*

We are carrying out a long critical analysis whose aim it is to understand the mythological evolution of the Jewish Messiah through the aid of archeology, historiography and philology; but at this point, when coming across such "testimony" regarding the Advent of "Jesus" and his breath-taking miracles, we would be tempted to ignore its content, both idiotic and artificial, destined to be used to indoctrinate people with an intelligence quotient lower than that of a proto-ape. Believers incapable of understanding **the void created in the evangelical testimonies as a result of the Apostles' lack of awareness of the miracle; the Apostles were still alive and well when King Abgar V** (who died by the year 50 A.D.) **was healed of leprosy** along with a multitude of Edessene citizens ... **three centuries later thanks to Eusebius. Apostles** who in "Acts of the Apostles" are **incredibly unaware of the international super miracle performed by the Saviour of humanity**, miracle **officialized through the exchanging of holy letters and then given concrete form by the respective ambassadors**.

In fact Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430), in his work "**Against Faustus Manichean**" Book 28 chap. 4, highlights this fundamental detail:

*"If writings belonging to Christ himself and to no other author had come to light why, if they were truly his, weren't they read, weren't they accepted, didn't they find a place within the high circles of the Church, from his time onwards, through the Apostles and Bishops their successors, and spread ever so more until the present time".*

These obvious considerations prompted Pope Gelasius I (400-496) to decree as "apocryphal" the letters of Abgar and Jesus "witnessed" by Eusebius; therefore Gelasius would have never issued such a decree if the letters in the Archive of Edessa had truly existed as, instead, was claimed by Eusebius.

Against our will, surprisingly, today there continue to be scholars with high academic qualifications who take the childish design of the "Divine Providence" seriously, enriching it with further details, despite defining it as "*apocryphal of the second century*" (hidden), or "legend dating back to the second century". Among the many learned - who use their elbows to overcome their "competitors" and climb onto the sought after podium in order to be immediately gratified by the cheering High Clergy ... and obtain their eternal recognition - one worthy of mention is a young teacher of Philosophy and Theory of Language, Massimo Leone, specialized in semiotics, from the Greek σημεῖον (semeion) meaning "sign", needless to say ... "divine", as revealed in his advanced scientific research entitled "**The sacredness of the words of Jesus and Abgar**" (just click, the video is online and we recommend it to whoever desires to strengthen their faith in the Glory of the Lord).

After talking at great length in a psychedelic-semiotic-poetic prologue, the teacher explains, in an extremely contrite manner, the many testimonies (but not all of them) - produced during the centuries following Eusebius - regarding not only the divine words of Jesus but also His "**Holy Image**", sent by the Christ Saviour through the ambassador in Edessa himself. The teacher, in order to obtain the praise of applauding, dreamy spiritualists, is so intent on describing the heavenly events through acrobatic Pindaric flights characterized by "holy words and images"; yet he does not realize that the holy plane has plummeted before taking off ... thus saving us from the ostentation of his ability to "study" divine signs.

The "Holy Image" or "Holy Face" or "Mandylyon"\* of Christ **is a crucial detail which "escaped" Eusebius** (who limits himself to inventing the "Holy Letters"), but which did not escape the later Christian calligraphers who centuries later drew up special codexes with added details; their aim was to "perfect" the Gospels as these did not describe the figure of Jesus, and they took advantage of this opportunity and enriched His myth by attributing to Him other post mortem super miracles.

\* Today's scholars of the "Sacred" derive this word from Greek, from Aramaic and from Arabic, in order to indicate a normal handkerchief or veil (never a shroud) which, in our case, becomes unique in its kind because on it we find painted a Face which is "not the work of a human hand" and which the self-important call the "Acheropite Image": **The Mandylyon**.

This chimerical figure - which will transform itself into a cult practiced which to this day continues to be "comforted" by "spiritual scientists" - forces us to verify its authenticity from the very beginning.

This is a puffed-up legend but, at the same time, in contrast with the Eusebian chronicle which only speaks about the words of "Jesus" who informs Abgar of the sending of a disciple **after** His death and resurrection, without dispatching any "Holy Image".

And of course the unfaithful, unknown Christian scribe will be the one to send the Apostle Thaddaeus (whose invention we demonstrated in the first study) **to Edessa** in order **to heal King Abgar, his family and the sick people in the city**. This is a summary of the long, senseless Eusebian account from *Historia Ecclesiastica* (I 13,1/22) in which there is **no record of Jesus having sent His image** impressed on a cloth. Nor will we ever know what happened to the famous copies of the "Holy Letters of the Archives of Edessa" which the Bishop claimed to possess, while there is clearly an incurable contrast between the Eusebian "parable" and the New Testament Holy Scriptures which all the Fathers of the Church drew on during the previous centuries.

Obvious and elementary statements of fact with respect to which the repentant maximus teacher Massimo Leone keeps his distance. We are certain that at the peak of his career the precocious teacher will have become a new-generation stylist crouched on top of a column while profoundly meditating upon the lofty summits of "divine" semiotics: a discipline which will be forced, thanks to the rampant fideism of the scholar, to succumb to historical rationalism, the latter being more linear and pragmatic.

Among the many acritical, uninspired sources - ready to back clerical demands by belittling "pious" foolishness through constant apostolate - Wikipedia stands out as it does not realize that, after having highlighted them as divine documents ... inexistent letters cannot be dated; and for the same reason a "legend" which popped up out of nothing, and mentioned for the first time in the fourth century by the Christian Bishop Eusebius, cannot be predicated to the second century.

In compliance with the consolidated "ecclesiastical paradigm" of "certifying", through evidence created subsequently, the "historical" depositions concerning the silly tale are broadened by chroniclers who are in love with "miraculous" flavours; although basic logic would consider these depositions to be unreliable, they are used in order to confirm the archaic Christian "Tradition". After Eusebius's bright idea, we can observe a long line of people who decide to follow the now deceased Venerable Bishop, a procession made up of witnesses who are documented centuries after the described events are said to have taken place; it is superfluous to say that these accounts are all different and in contrast with one another, in other words they are incompatible, thus confirming how difficult it was for the scribes to consult one another and coordinate their actions before inventing stories. As is the case for the "**Doctrine of Addai**", a text paleographically dated to the fifth century, in which the legend invented by Eusebius is "continued" by enriching it with the invention of the picture of Jesus's image; it is a picture created by Abgar's courier who is said to have been a painter who, obviously, brought the portrait to Edessa where it was placed in Abgar's palace. Until the end of the fifth century the face of Christ was still "*made by human hands*".

Time was ripe for further elaboration of "history" and in the sixth century another legend "appears": the "**Acts of Mar Mari**". Here it is "specified" that the Abgar's painter "*was unable to depict Our Lord, so the Vivifier of the World took a cloth and pressed it onto his Face, just as he is*". By doing so the Acheropite Face - "*not made by human hands*" - finally arrived in Edessa.

A century later the "**Acts of Thaddaeus**" will also be written following a slightly different "procedure", but at this point the time was right for Byzantine scribes - today mentioned by clerical exegetes as authentic "witnesses to the facts" - to come into action. The "chroniclers of God" - aware that the legend begun by Eusebius of Caesarea was acquiring more details - did their best in order to make it even more "historically" truthful through the description of the marvellous powers of "Mandylion" of Edessa at the time of the attack on this city by the the armies of the Sassanid King Khusrow I which invaded Syria in 540 A.D.

The scribes copied ex novo the original Codexes (which were eliminated) regarding both the "**History of the Wars**" by the Byzantine historian **Procopius** of Caesarea and the "**Historia Ecclesiastica**" by the Christian historian **Evagrius** called "**Scholastic**" (Evagrius Scholasticus from Epiphania in Calesyria). Both authors lived in the sixth century A.D. The most ancient manuscript containing Procopius's "Wars" can be found in the **Codex Athos, Lavra H-73**, paleographically dated to the end of the **thirteenth** century; while the most ancient with regard to Evagrius is to be found in the **Codex Laurentianus L XIX 5**, dated to the **eleventh** century.

But the two antithetical versions that have reached us - through which the miraculous event that convinced the Persians to lift the siege on the city of Edessa (saved through a miracle of Christ, after His resurrection, by order of Eusebius) is described - are enough to disavow the truthfulness of the account.

Evagrius, who died after 594 A.D., was preceded by just a few years by another "pious" historical source: **Johannes Malalas** (491-578 A.D.), another fanatical sixth century Christian chronicler and native of Antioch in Syria (the region invaded by the Persians) who **knows nothing about the prodigies carried out by the Writing or by the Holy Image of Jesus**.

In the non-original text which has reached us - the Second Book of "**History of the Wars**" by Procopius - there are two scanty chronicles regarding the first seige of Edessa (540 A.D.), when the Persian Sassanid King Khusrow attacked the city but, once it had been besieged, "*... the King saw the words of Jesus to Abgar carved on the doors of the city...*", therefore the sight of the **Holy Writing** was enough to convince Khusrow to withdraw his armies and, with extreme naivety resulting from an "overabundance of faith", the Christian copyists made Procopius say ... "*Khusrow lost his way and he got a headache*" ... that is all.

In **Book IV chap. 27** of "**Historia Ecclesiastica**", during the war led by King Khusrow I, the Christian historian Evagrius - an authentic "witness to the facts" - reports (but the Codex was written in the eleventh century) that the Persians had surrounded the walls of Edessa with siegeworks; and in reference to the incident just mentioned by Procopius (Codex from the thirteenth century) which speaks about "*the words of Jesus to Abgar*", Evagrius adds: "*I will tell you what happened*" ... and he begins a new version of the account in which not only the "Holy Writing" "goes onto the battlefield", but even the "Holy Image" of Christ and His power "radiated" by sprinkles of ... "Incendiary Holy Water".

As a result Evagrius focuses his attention on an imposing seige tower made of wood which the Persians had built on a terreplein in order to more effectively hit the defenders. The latter, in turn, tried to set fire to the large structure after digging a long underground passage under it, but in vain:

*"... there was no way to set fire to the specially prepared stack of wood due to the lack of oxygen. Racked by despair the Edessenes brought an image which had not been made by human hands (Acheiropoietos), that which Christ, our God, sent to Abgar when the King wished to see Jesus. Inside the tunnel they wet the Image with water and they sprinkled a few drops on the wooden pyre. The Divine Power, urged into action by the faith of the Edessenes, carried out what they were unable to do: the fire spread everywhere and the wood became ash faster than the word".*

It is important to point out that the transcriber of the work written by the historian Procopius of Caesarea also mentions

the same event, but the chronicle he reports in Book II of the **"History of the Wars"** makes no mention of the "pyrotechnic display" of the **"Divine Power"** of the Holy Mandylion with the image of Christ which forced the Persians to leave Edessa. In fact Khusrow I, Sassanid King **"with an immortal soul"**, wins the war and forces Justinian to pay heavy tributes in gold, despite the Power of the "Holy Image".

Evagrius Scolasticus was a sixth century Byzantine Christian Prefect, close friend to famous "Fathers" and Stylite Hermits, to whom he was linked by a sublime mystical inspiration. With the meager intention of celebrating the glory of a utopic Universal Christian Empire wanted by God, Evagrius proposed himself as the historiographical continuator of Eusebius of Caesarea and, in line with the same principles, also wrote a hagiographical and malleable **"Historia Ecclesiastica"** marked by the denigration of heresies and the historicization of miracles. The scribes who copied the original texts were aware of this "flaw" of the Christian historian and, in his memory, respected his "coherence", but ... they made no mention of another famous Christian historian: **Johannes Malalas** (491-578 A.D.) - just prior to Evagrius - whose chronicles, dating back to as late as 565 A.D. (when Justinianus died), had the same "flaw". Malalas's **"Chronograph"** is made up of a series of historical chronicles which have reached us through the **Codex Baroccianus 182**, copied during the eleventh century, and the remains of the **Codex Criptense Z.a. XXIV** dating back to the **twelfth century**. Malalas of Antioch, who was present during the Persian attack of Syria, **made no reference to the extraordinary incident of the Holy Image** of Jesus and His miracle in the city of Edessa.

It is important to underline that Malalas's Christian fanaticism was so strong that he reports, as a historical event which actually took place, that the hemorrhage healed by Jesus was a very wealthy woman who, through a sort of vow, erected a golden statue in honour of her Saviour. Moreover, as mentioned above, he invented one of the many martyrdoms which, according to the shaky Jesuit "Tradition", the fake Saint Babila was forced to undergo by several Roman Emperors and, according to Malalas, by Numerianus.

It is not possible that a historian, so indoctrinated into the faith of Christ, could have allowed himself to miss the miracle of Edessa (performed by Jesus from High Heaven through his Holy Image). In fact **at this time Malalas was just over fifty years old** and thanks to this miracle he would have been able to add the incident to the corpus of his "Holy Chronicles", worthy of the finest monastic "Tradition", so rich in incurable contradictions passed off as "History" through the ecclesiastical testimonies conferred a posteriori.

In reality, until the end of the fourth century A.D. the Fathers of the Church of Rome, in contrast with the widespread idolatry of the Pagan world, did not recognize the possibility of representing the image of Christ and of the Saints, in compliance with the provisions of the Apostle Paul (II Cor 5,16) **"even if we were once familiar with Christ according to human standards, we do not know him in that way any longer"**, and in (Col 1,15) **"He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation"**, even Matthew (11,27) **"No one knows the Son except the Father and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son wishes to reveal him"**. On the basis of precise biblical commandments, so as to **cancel out pagan customs** among Christians, in **303 A.D.** the **"Council of Elvira"** was held in Spain, during which **Canon 36** was decreed:

**"We decide that there must not be paintings in Churches, so that upon the walls there not be painted what is revered and worshipped"**; this is confirmed by Eusebius of Caesarea in his **"Letter to Constance"**, the Emperor's sister, to whom the Bishop confirmed that **"... being that his mortal side ended with his life, Jesus Christ, after his death and resurrection, was no longer portrayable"**.

It was only in the fifth century that there began to be pressure from iconophiles (in favour of icons); this pressure became ever so strong that holy images were introduced into churches; this tendency culminated in the decision taken by **Emperor Justinian II Rhinotmetos** of Byzantium (end of the seventh century) to mint coins having the image of Christ. This was the first time in history that this took place and the Emperor, in order to safeguard himself from possible opposition, in **692 A.D.** convened the **Quinisext Council** which ratified the possibility of representing Jesus in human form.

The theological concept which made it possible to reproduce a divinity with pictures and statues was rooted in the variegated pagan culture; this was in contrast with a certain type of orthodoxy, deriving from that of the Jews, as in the Gospels there is no description of the figure of Jesus. Otherwise who would have prevented the evangelists from offering details regarding the physique and height of their Saviour Messiah? Such orthodoxy was adopted by the Fathers of the Christianity officialized by Constantine: an integralist doctrine which became intolerant towards the introduction of new Christian customs.

Instead those who felt the need to depict images of the Saints had to be supported by a "divine right" documented by both the holy writings and the historical accounts.

This is reason behind the "rising" of the legend invented by Eusebius - who, in the fourth century, had Jesus write a "divine letter" which was sent to an unaware King Abgar who had been dead for 280 years - which grew into a "Divine Coffin" containing the cloth with an image of the "Holy Face" impressed upon it thanks to the will of God himself, **"Vivifier of the World, Our Lord Jesus"**. And, as we have seen above, even historiography had to be "updated" in order to substantiate the divine powers of images and relics.

As a result of the evolution of this theological process, in the eighth century bloody persecutions, supported by pro-iconoclast Patriarchs, were carried out by Christian **Emperor Leo III the Isaurian** and continued by his son **Constantine V**, called the "Copronym" (which means name of excrement) by his enemies of the same religion. Such policies brought about ferocious, sanguinary fights between Christian "iconoclasts" (against the images) and "iconodules" (in favour); this struggle was characterized by anathemas, destruction of holy relics, ruination of frescoes and icons in Churches, removal of mosaics, mutilation of iconographers' (artists) hands, decapitations, torturing and fires. Today's genuflexion historians refer to these grave persecutions by using the euphemistic and reductive expression "iconoclastic disputes", as if we were dealing with lively condominium meetings.

At this time the theological tension involved, on one side, the Roman Papacy, in favour of icons, and on the other, the Byzantine Orthodox Patriarchate, against such images.

In November **731 A.D.** (right after his election) Pope Gregory III convened a Council in Rome in which ninety-three Bishops took part, denouncing iconoclasm and decreeing the **"excommunication of those who denied the possibility of gaining comfort from relics and holy images"**.

As a reaction to this decision, the first "Iconoclastic" Council was held in Hieria in **754** and presided by Patriarch Theodore of Ephesus during which the above-mentioned "Letter to Constance" (against the depiction of images of Christ) by Eusebius of Caesarea was read. The Council clearly decreed:

**"Anathematize those who depict the appearance of Saints on inanimate, mute icons with material colours, because such images bring no benefit; their production is a senseless idea and a diabolical trick; rather than reproduce within ourselves the virtues of the Saints in the form of living icons, virtues which have been handed down through writing, so**

as to spur us onto zeal the same as theirs".

As a reaction to this decision, an "iconodule" Lateran Council was held in **769**, followed in **787** by the **Second Council of Nicea**, which was truly **ecumenical** and whose conclusions, at this moment, were favourable towards images:

*"It has been demonstrated that the images of Saints are miraculous and perform healings ... Glory to You My God who carries out miracles through Holy Images ... we precisely and diligently state that the venerable and Holy Images, resembling the precious and life-giving Cross, which are painted or made in mosaic or any other suitable material, must be displayed in the Holy Churches of God, on holy furnishings and on vestments, walls and tables, in houses and in the streets; be they the Image of the Lord and God Saviour Our Jesus Christ, or that of the Immaculate Our Lady, the Saint Mother of God, or those of the Angels worthy of Honour and of all the Saints and Pious men".*

Other Councils issuing alternate decrees followed; they were purposely held by the respective factions ... but rather than "conciliate", they worsened the dispute.

The contrast went on until the time of **Charlemagne** who, after the Council of Frankfurt in **794 A.D.**, mediated between the two currents of thought and **gave his consent to the images** which, however, **could not be the object of cult**. In **843 A.D.** the regent Empress Theodora II of Armenia, widow of Emperor Theophile of Byzantium - after ordering the massacre of thousands of **Paulician** Christians, followers of the teaching of Paul of Tarsus (therefore against the representation of Christ) - restored the cult of the images in the East where, after a couple of iconoclastic attempts, it consolidated its position once and for all.

### In honour of Julian Chrysostomides of the Royal Holloway College

In 2000, year of the Grand Catholic Jubilee, Professor Michael Whitby, teacher of Classical Studies and Byzantine Ancient History, completed the prestigious editing of a modern translation into English of "**Historia Ecclesiastica**" (Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus) by Evagrius Scholasticus. As a professional duty, Whitby studied the "Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council of Nicea" held in 787 A.D., during which there was a discussion on iconoclasm. After viewing the results of this Council over 1200 years later, in the provided appendix of his book Whitby "feels the need" to confute the studies carried out by Dr. Julian Chrysostomides of "Royal Holloway College" London University; the latter had previously criticized, in a sharp and radical manner, the authenticity of the miracle of Edessa described in "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Evagrius Scholasticus, availing herself of studies regarding the writing and language styles. The teacher, a native of Constantinople, had a long academic career behind her; she was an expert researcher specialized in Classical Greek Literature and in Byzantine History texts, so by making use of precise analyses, the scholar came to the conclusion that the history of the icon was false and was the result of iconoclastic disputes between Christians (which we have just mentioned) during which much religious counterfeiting was produced.

Ms. Chrysostomides must be given credit for having come to these conclusions long **before** four radiocarbon 14 tests were conducted; these were carried out (between 2004 and 2007) on two famous holy findings, which today are still the object of cult, produced between the seventh and ninth centuries (characterized by fratricidal iconoclastic disputes). We will focus on these findings in a short while.

In order to better understand the terms of the discussion between the two experts of Byzantine history, they themselves highlight that, from the "**Acts of the Second Council of Nicea**" - which **Pope Adrian I** specifically asked Empress Irene of the East to convene in order to take decisions with regard to the cult of the images - we discover that during the fifth session of the Council, the monk Stephen presented a text written by Evagrius which contained no reference to the miraculous icon; on the contrary the Abbot George from the Monastery of Hyacinthus ("fortunately", according to Whitby) was in possession of another text containing evidence of the miracle of Edessa performed by the Holy Face of Jesus impressed upon a linen cloth: we read about this earlier, just have a look at the description of the siege tower containing the account of the "Incendiary Holy Image" of Christ. According to Ms. Chrysostomides the presence of two different Evagrian Codexes constituted fundamental proof that the cloth with Holy Face of Christ was simply the result of a false legend made up during the bloody Christian disputes between pro and anti-iconoclasts.

Whitby graduated from the "Corpus Christi College" in Oxford and we can imagine what sort of "imprinting" prevented him from understanding Chrysostomides's concrete reasoning; he therefore ventured into a laborious, useless criticism, both partial and deviant, focused solely on the unbearable (for the Prof.) analysis of the scholar. As a result of these two antithetical positions, we feel that we have the duty to analyze the substance by availing ourselves of further observations.

In his counter-analysis Whitby acritically devalues, by means of a method which historiography finds unacceptable, the Christian chronicler **John Malalas's** failure to offer testimony with regard to the miracle of Edessa; the latter, who was middle-aged when the marvel is said to have taken place, instead mentions the war conducted by the Persian King Khusrow who in 540 A.D. launched an invasion of Syria from nearby Mesopotamia, subjugating the former after having defeated the Byzantines (Malalas died in 578 A.D.). Moreover, the professor does not evaluate the dating of the Codexes and accepts, superficially, as archetype of the original the text which he personally translated; and in spite of evident importance of the Codexes, **he plays down the contrasts between what was written by Evagrius and by Procopius with regard to the description of the miraculous event**: contradictions which on their own are enough to prove that the miracle was invented.

Whitby avoids coming to logical conclusions resulting from the contrast between the two "Historia Ecclesiastica" written by the same Evagrius Scholasticus and present at the Council; this proves that the two different texts by the same author, one of which has no miracle, cannot be the originals but were copied after the narrated historical events took place, thus demonstrating that the iconodule Christian scribes invented the "divine manifestations" as they pleased. Therefore, in order to avoid such an obvious deduction, Whitby impudently states that the miracle was deliberately **"removed"** from the text of Evagrius lacking the miracle ... but he is well aware of being **unable to offer proof of this as this manuscript no longer exists**; and in a short while we will find out why.

Finally, Whitby gives no weight to the "**Letters of the Three Patriarchs**", a text apparently written by three Metropolitans of the Eastern Churches after an alleged Sinod held in Jerusalem in 836 A.D. with the aim of convincing Emperor Theophilus of Byzantium to intervene militarily in order to free Jerusalem and Palestinian Christians from Islamic occupation.

This document, which was analyzed by Chrysostomides, reveals the Patriarchs' approval of the icons by offering a completely different "testimony" of the miracle of the Mandylin during the siege of Edessa, **without the latter being aware whatsoever of the miraculous narration transcribed by Evagrius Scholasticus's copyists and dealt with in the Second Council of Nicea**.

The description of the event reports that King Khusrow ordered that wood from olive trees be piled up all around the

walls of Edessa, wood which he set fire to in order to create a thick smoke screen that would suffocate the inhabitants under siege (this is "pious" foolishness); but the venerable **Bishop Eulalius** of Edessa took the "Holy Image" of Christ and, showing it off, *"went around to all the bastions, until a miraculous gust of wind came which directed the flames towards the Persians forcing them to flee"*.

As history documents an Emperor Theophilus of convinced iconoclastic faith and adversary of icons and relics, in reality no Bishop would have dared submitted such a ridiculous story to him; therefore the letter has to be a fake, just like the unknown "Bishop Eulalius" of Edessa. In spite of this, the story continues to maintain its importance as it constitutes evidence of the production of fraudulent historical data by iconodule scribes who show a lack of coordination when puffing up the initial myth.

It must also be pointed out that were many iconophile Christian chroniclers during the iconoclastic struggles. They described history with the aim of magnifying the miraculous events linked to the "Tradition" of the followers of Christ; and one of these writers, who covered the period we are interested in, is the Byzantine **Theophanes the Confessor** (758-818), a scholarly aristocrat who became a monk by vocation and who in Greek wrote "**Chronicle**", which covers the period stretching from the time of Diocletian to the year 813 A.D. under Byzantine Emperor **Leo V** (775-820). Theophanes was an iconodule, convinced supporter of images and relics, and this is the reason why he was beatified by the Church. His "Chronicle" was translated into Latin by the monk Anastasius in the ninth century but ... in none of the narrated events was there trace of the spectacular miracle which took place in the city of Edessa thanks to the Holy Image of Christ.

There is another historian - personally present during this period and in the places involved in the conflict between Persians and Byzantines which began in **540** A.D. - whose chronicles, dating back to this time, become particularly precious for the comparison of the true events he witnessed and the miraculous events described centuries later by the copyists of Evagrius and Procopius.

His name is **John from Ephesus**, a Catholic Bishop and Byzantine historian. He was born in 507 A.D. in Amida (in Mesopotamia) and was consecrated Deacon in 529; he went to Constantinople and in **542** Emperor **Justinian** assigned him the command of the ferocious punitive expedition against the Zoroastrians and the last Pagans. He had tens of Churches built upon the ruins of destroyed Temples, and afterwards he carried out a merciless repression against Montanist Christians. In **558** (as a reward) he was ordained Bishop of Ephesus. He died in 588, year in which the last narrated events of his two works - "**Biography of the Eastern Saints**" and "**History of the Church**" - took place.

**The Bishop** - despite having lived through the period of the Persian wars against the Byzantine Empire led by King Khusrow ... just like the historian John Malalas, his contemporary who also was a witness to these events - **mentions nothing about the Holy Image of Christ which chased away the armies of the King of Kings "with an immortal soul" during the battle against Edessa** "The Holy City", protected by Christ Our Lord.

After these initial and substantial observations directed towards Prof. Whitby, let's go back and analyze his studies.

**In particular**, he does not consider that the monk Stephen and the abbot George were both in favour of icons and, like all those present at the Second Council of Nicea (all of whom were supporters of icons), were specialists of Christian texts with flawless knowledge of the "**Acts of the Apostles**"; they therefore were aware that, apart from James the Elder, those who continued Jesus's evangelical message were all alive when **Abgar died in 50** A.D., yet knew nothing about the King and his family being healed from leprosy ... neither through a simple "letter" nor through the "Holy Face". The synodal Fathers were aware that the successors of Abgar V did not convert to Christianity, in contrast with the tale according to which their ancestors and all the sick inhabitants of Edessa were also healed by the divine power of the Christ through an inexistent Saint Thaddeus ... according to the strange Christian "Tradition" deliberately created centuries later in order to indoctrinate believers - "blessed poor in spirit" - and the plethora of profoundly inspired sindonologists.

All those taking part in the Second Council of Nicea - an event which was of interest to the entire Christian world - recognized the importance of this gathering and they took it very seriously both in the form and in the method (which the clergy have always found congenial). Regardless of their hierarchical rank, every prelate knew that icons (just like relics) helped to **propagandize the Faith in Christ**, and a decree in favour of such images was necessary in order to recognize and *"demonstrate that the Images of the saints and of the relics were miraculous and performed healings"*: this is in essence how the Sinod ended.

Nothing more than a sort of "commandment" without any "evidence" as **the synodal Fathers made no reference to the "Acts of Thaddeus"** nor did they feel the urge to go to or send a witness to Edessa (not far from Nicea) in order to verify the presence of the **Holy Image of Christ, well-aware that it did not exist**; just as they were also absolutely certain of the falseness of the "Acts of Thaddeus". This explains how it was possible for the documented monk Stephen to display with impunity at the iconodule assembly the true text of "Historia Ecclesiastica" written by an Evagrius Scholasticus unaware of the miracle which took place in Edessa.

In effect, as we will soon see, history will evolve - even if through further rending contrasts between Christians - in favour of icons and relics to the point of exasperation ... as both we and Whitby can still see today.

As demonstrated in the Iconodule Council on Holy Imprints held in Turin in 2010 for the Grand Ostension of the Holy Shroud, during which Dr. Ester Brunet felt the need to "anathematize" in public the intolerable analysis of the now late Julian Chrysostomides who she explicitly mentions, and concludes her talk by stating that *"Whitby's analysis can be considered the umpteenth warning against the excesses of a certain type of interpolationistic criticism"* (in fact her "warning" is giving us the shakes) and to "substantiate" Whitby's study adds: *"according to the Giovanni Damasceno's neoplatonic theology all icons in a certain way are part of the dynamis, of the "energy" of the prototype; not because they themselves are bearers of the divinity (otherwise their veneration would be idolatry), but because they are transitus to those who are here represented"*. Brunet dragged in Plato, pretending to be unaware of the fact that naive common people, convinced by priests, know that unknown human remains belong to this or that "saint" and adore them on a daily basis as considered to possess miraculous powers. These are the "scientific" argumentations used by conceited iconodules, influential within clerical intellectual circles ... **as long as they do not say everything**.

#### **The codexes of Evagrius Scholasticus and Procopius of Caesarea tampered with by the scribes**

Four manuscripts which have reached us report the "**Historia Ecclesiastica**" by Evagrius Scholasticus containing the "testimony" of the miracle of Edessa; the oldest of the four, as we have seen, is the **Codex Laurentianus LXIX 5**, paleographically dated to the **eleventh century** A.D.

But in the original, according to the Church and its partisan experts, there is no trace of the "miraculous" Codex in Abbot George's possession at the **Second Council of Nicea**. Its disappearance cannot be justified because this Council was ordered by **Pope Adrian I**, the most authoritative representative of all Christianity and a convinced iconodule, therefore

responsible for the documentation relating to the "Acts of the Synod"; as a result, he would have duly sent to the Vatican in Rome the precious original of the **sixth-century Codex** written by Evagrius or, at least, a copy containing historical testimony of the breath-taking miracle. **Adrian I did not feel the need to go personally to Edessa**, or send a witness to this city not far from Nicea, in order to verify the true presence of the **Holy Image of Christ**, as **he was well-aware that it did not exist**.

In spite of the fact that there were no obstacles to the Pope behaving in such a manner, this journey did not take place; therefore passing off the **Codex Laurentianus LXIX 5** as the archetype of the "Historia Ecclesiastica" written by Evagrius is an opportunistic religious theory reflecting the pro-icon doctrine at the height of its prestige when the new Codex was drawn up in the ninth century.

Even **the Codex** with the "deleted" miracle presented three centuries prior to the Laurentianus by the monk Stephen at the Second Council of Nicea - Codex which genuflexion experts would lead us to believe is the **true original - has also disappeared**. Crucial facts which pro-clerical exegetes carefully avoid, but their motives are clearly evident: the historical time period of the manuscripts, which have miraculously reached us, sees widespread interest towards holy images and relics (fueled by a Church capable of seizing the opportunity); this sentiment was already very intense, thus forcing all the Priors of Abbeys equipped with copyists to take it into consideration ... and continue to nourish it by copying new Codexes and eliminating the previous ones. The same motives and the same fate apply for the **Codex Athos, Lavra H-73**, regarding **"History of Wars"** by Procopius of Caesarea, recopied by the scribes at the end of the **thirteenth** century.

On the basis of a tacit agreement obeying to "omertà", no prelate or scholarly believer (like the learned Ester Brunet) today thinks that it is dutiful to openly manifest that if all those present at the Second Council of Nicea - favourable to the Holy Images, just like all the participants to the previous and subsequent Councils (for and against icons) held to discuss the burning issue - had had the slightest opportunity to recognize the narration of **His Image**, left by Jesus himself when still alive, as truthful and original ... they would have all, with no exceptions and **from the very beginning**, "adored" rather than simply "venerate" such an image.

The Church - both its cultured followers opportunely placed in the most important teaching posts of Knowledge and its conciliar Fathers - is fully aware that the evangelists and the Apostles would have immediately written about the "parable of the Holy Image" in the **Gospels**; later, in **"Acts of the Apostles"**, they would have mentioned the "Holy Face" and the Jesus's international super miracle, which healed Abgar, his family and the inhabitants of Edessa from leprosy; such an event, finally, would have been glorified in the respective **Apostolic Letters** "mailed" to future memory by the "Successors of Christ", but which have reached us without any evidence of what would have been considered the greatest miracle performed by Jesus.

In addition, on the basis of the Holy Text all the exegetes of today's Christianity know, just like all the Synodal Fathers knew, that after Jesus's death **the Apostles came together for forty days** in Jerusalem along with the Virgin Mary, all of whom awaiting the Holy Spirit, **including Judas**, in charge of the salvific mission invented by Eusebius of Caesarea three centuries later:

*"After the ascension of Jesus, **Judas**, also called Thomas, sent **the Apostle Thaddeus** to Abgar".*

But, in the Holy Apostolic narration of their "Acts", Judas did not even have the Mother of Christ manifest this "will" expressed by her son when he was still alive. This is particularly due to the fact that **the Apostle Thaddeus** was unknown to the Lukan scribe of "Acts", therefore not present along with the other successors of Christ, who came together, *"in constant, concordant prayer"*, with His Mother.

This is why at The Second Council of Nicea all the conciliar participants, without distinction, were aware that **no Apostle, Father, Bishop, Pope or Christian** historian, until the time of Eusebius, had heard about the Holy Face or even about the simple "divine letter" which, in the two hundred years following the Bishop's death, will turn into the "Holy Image of Jesus". And even if, so as to favour an opportunistic "apostolate", all this is not revealed, the entire community of Christian genuflexion experts is aware of it today, just like all those taking part in the Second Nicea Council knew at that time ... with exception of, 1200 years later, the unaware Prof. Michael Whitby, a "Corpus Christi College" graduate, who wasted four pages on a opportunely "inspired criticism" of Julian Chrysostomides, to be offered as an "ad hoc" gift to believers, "the blessed who are poor in spirit", during the celebrations for the "Universal Grand Jubilee", Anno Domini 2000".

#### **More on the "Christian Tradition"**

During the Second Council of Nicea, Canon 82 from the Sixth Council (the 692 A.D. **Concilium Quinsexantum**) - convened in Constantinople by Byzantine Emperor Justinian II Rhinotmetus - was recorded. Canon 82, read aloud at Nicea II by the Protopresbyter Elia, decreed the possibility of representing Christ in human form:

*"We decree from this time onwards that, **rather than the ancient lamb (Agnus Dei)**, the character of he who removes the sins of the world, that is to say Jesus **Christ our God, be painted and depicted in human form**".*

Never - before and after all the Church's Councils, and not only those convened to discuss iconoclasm and iconodulism - had any Synodal Father mentioned symbols such as "fish", "wine", "grapevines", "anchors", "figs", "olive trees" and whatever else the imagination of today's conceited believers is capable of inventing; the latter write pseudoscientific treatises on the subject in order to create evidence of the existence of the ghostly Jesuit Christians during the first two centuries. Today the pictures of many foods and objects found in Pagan catacombs are "linked" to Jesus by overly-devout scholars ... even at the risk of expropriating the compassionate faith which ordered Gentiles to have their beloved dead in their descent towards the "Inferi" (the Kingdom of Hades) be "accompanied" by ordinary pictures of foods and objects which they enjoyed when alive. The representation of a simple Pagan banquet, very popular in opulent imperial Rome, becomes *"the last supper with the celebration of the Eucharist"*.

A mother nursing her newborn becomes *"the Madonna"* and the man admiring her is a *"Prophet"*; a shark which sinking its teeth into the survivor of a shipwreck is *"Jonah spit out by the whale"*; a grapevine with grapes is *"the Church of Christ"*; a simple shepherd is inevitably *"the Good Shepherd Jesus who gives his life for His sheep"* ... and so on and so forth.

Museums all over Europe preserve many tombstone **epigraphs**, paintings and graffiti - which could **also be found outside the catacombs** - where the ancient Romans recorded events of daily life ... but there is nothing pertaining to Christianity. The same goes for the all the vestiges spread throughout the territory of the Empire until the late period. It can be inferred that the thousands of martyrs, ready to face the most atrocious of tortures in order to not deny their faith (according to the fake "tradition"), in reality, even when able to remain unnamed, would have had a lot of problems engraving on marble simple graffiti or create paintings containing *"the sayings of the Lord" (logia)*; it was of course

claimed that the Author of the doctrine was Christ.

On the basis of the statements made by Vatican exegetes, the Popes Zephyrinus and Callisto were the *"Superintendents of the catacombs in Via Appia"* ... but, evidence shows that the lives of these Saints were "certified" at a later time by other Saints and were "attested" in medieval Codexes drawn up during the era of the iconodules. In contrast with the multitude of ancient inscriptions collected - starting with the cuneiform inscriptions on clay Sumerian tablets dating back to 3000 years before Christ - there exists no collection (Corpus Inscriptionum Christianorum) of epigraphs, epitaphs or ancient stone writings offering proof of the actual existence of numerous Christian Churches administered by their respective *"Bishops seated upon the throne"* and spread throughout the Roman Empire, as "postulated" by an ecclesiastical tradition created a posteriori. A real archeological "gap" confirming the previous studies thanks to which we have verified the inexistence of the Apostles and their successors at least during the first two centuries A.D.

The image of the **"Sun God"**, a mosaic from the ancient Basilica of Saint Peter's (under the current one at the Vatican) - which depicts the *Sol Invictus Deus Elios* as he ascends towards the zenith in the sky on a chariot pulled by rampant horses - is offered to obedient believers as the "Ascension of Christ". Pretending to be unaware of the evangelical "pious" donkey ridden by Jesus, tour guides very conveniently avoid explaining what this mosaic depicting a Pagan divinity was doing on the floor of the first Basilica of Saint Peter's ... fully conscious of the fact that a generic "archeological clarification" serves as a sort of "exorcism" against the evil thoughts of those practicing Catholics of today who have heard about, even if vaguely, a Christ Saviour ideologized by means of religious syncretism resulting from the mixture of diverse rites and spiritual practices.

The inspired experts hypocritically "get around" the "Ecclesiastical Tradition" by avoiding to reveal to faithful believers that **none of the Apostles, Apologetical Fathers, Bishops, Popes** and countless "chroniclers of Christ" **ever mentioned a Jesus represented as a "fish"**.

The hyped combination of the acronym "ictus", which in Greek means "fish", is just one of the thousand bizarre "Jesuit pocket size puzzles" invented ... nevertheless, for the prone indoctrinators who carry out "apostolate" this becomes the "encrypted key" for the tracing of inexistent followers of Jesus in the first two centuries. Therefore, unlike the phantasmal Jesuit PaleoChristians, only for today's Christians does a fish drawn inside an ancient Roman catacomb mean: "Jesus Christ Son of God Saviour". And the brainwashing has produced its exotic "fruits", to the point that in her study (please see the fifth study on the Apostle John) the Catholic philologist Ilaria Ramelli states that *"the christly value of fish is well known, thanks to the acrostic resulting from its Greek name"*; and after the brilliant professor postulates such a divine "bizarre acrostic", she manages to identify beneath the scales of an enormous turbot nothing less than ... Saint John the Apostle (sic! read to believe).

All you have to do is look for the suitable combination within the word by choosing initials, syllables or parts of the lemma, as in the case of an unaware *"piscis"* fish painted in an ancient **Pagan Roman catacomb**; in order to make the trick work, the word has to be translated from Latin into the Greek word **ΙΧΘΥΣ** (*ichthus*), from which the spiritual puzzle enthusiasts derive the expression **"Iesus Christos Theou Yios Soter"**, and then retranslated into the various mother tongues of "primitive Jesuit Christians". According to the "Tradition", the latter were plebeian Jews who spoke Aramaic ... all of whom attended the evening courses offered by multilingual training schools.

But there is more to come. As seen above, **the iconoclastic Christian Patriarchs also ordered the destruction of the "relics of the saints"**, and the gravity of this act was such that they were excommunicated by Pope Gregory III in 731 A.D. This event offered evidence (and continues to do so to this day) of an awkward situation for Pope Gregory and today unacceptable for Universal Church doctrine: Emperors, Patriarchs, Bishops, Presbyters, **all Christians**, decreed the end of the *"saintly relics"* for they knew that they were false ... like the Mandylion. The Grey Eminences of modern ecclesiastical exegesis carefully make sure that the Council records from the iconoclastic era are not officially published entirely in order to prevent the "Absolute Truth of Faith" from being tarnished by the humble testimonies of clergymen in good faith.

Convinced by a powerful "theological manipulator", the Mandylion of Christ was "documented" by the Christian scribe who copied the original manuscript of Evagrius Scholasticus (obviously destroyed) during the bloody, centuries-long iconoclastic war which saw Christians massacre other Christians. The Acheiropoietos cloth *"not made by human hands"* has never been seen by *"any human eye"*; even its future "apparitions" are legendary, recalled without any concrete historical data. These apparitions began towards the end of the Middle Ages yet today there is still no Church which can show off the "Holy Acheiropoietos Image" and claim it as authentic.

The fact that there are three different Mandylions in Italy, each of which is linked to a legend, is enough to demonstrate that they are false ... and ridiculous: just have a look at them! They are all from the Renaissance and are "preserved" in the Church of Saint Bartholemew in Genoa, in the Vatican in Rome, and in Manoppello (near the Italian city of Pescara). The latter town defines itself as the "City of the Holy Face" and propagandizes itself as a "Holy tourist attraction". Finally, the Vatican Mandylion is painted on a table ... after all, for Jesus it certainly was not a problem to impress His image on wood.

This final summary, focused and based upon a comparative study of essential historical data and New Testament and patristic documentation, aims at highlighting that the "centuries-old Christian tradition" is nothing but a contrived exaggeration; this was done through the verification of certain details from the many official Councils convened to discuss the subject of holy icons, which continued to be prohibited off and on until the Carolingian period ... From the Middle Ages onwards the history of holy Jesuit art sees the increasing efforts of the clergy to fill the void resulting from the lack of images of Christian divinities and their Saints, beatified by the Church along with their relics; this culminates, five centuries after the coronation of Charlemagne, in the most famous and controversial image of the mythological "Jesus" which Christianity had ever known ... nor heard about before this time: the Shroud of Turin.

### Loads of Holy Shrouds

Even prior to the Carolingian period, the people - who by nature were superstitious and "perfectly" indoctrinated thanks to the pulpits promising eternal life - wished to adore holy images and their will, inevitably, prevailed. After centuries of in-fighting among Christians, both the Pope in Rome and the Patriarch in Byzantium finally decided that *"icons strengthened the faith of believers"* ... so much more for Saint Paul's doctrine, but not for the souls of Paulician followers, who, after being massacred, were immediately barbecued in the flames of Hell.

The Clergy was, first of all, interested in popularity: which was acquired through a doctrine capable of vehicling the **ancient Pagan beliefs** - still present in the memory of the masses, who did not desire to give up the atavic protection of the "Tutelary Deities" - towards the "Patron Saints", thousands of whom were purposely beatified and "authenticated" by their respective relics, and the business connected to these "remains" skyrocketed in order to meet the never-ending demand.

The reason behind this pressing demand was ever so obvious: the common people, even before achieving heavenly immortality, during their daily life wished to be "defended" by divinities specifically "specialized" in protecting against mysterious, insidious illnesses of the body and of the mind ... and even trade guild profit-seekers wanted their simple day-to-day worries to be protected.

The result of all this can still be seen today: in comparison to the immortal "Heavenly Kingdom", the most populated Olympus has been demoted to little more than a pinhead.

Going much further down, in the earthly Cathedrals of the Christian World the complete remains of the same Apostles, Saints, Evangelists, Wise Men, Martyrs, etc. appeared miraculously - in order to strengthen the spirituality of the faithful brought together in the "sublime divine message" - and to this day they continue to be preserved. Therefore, in order to avoid exaggerating the overabundance of "clones", the Churches made do with the "particles of Saints", or rather pieces of the Blessed, the head or the thigh-bone, or even simple fragments of bone or blood, which could be more easily distributed ... like a dozen authentic "Holy Grails": the cup of the Last Supper containing the blood of Christ.

The "Holy Grails" were outnumbered by the "Holy Prepuces" belonging to twenty different circumcized "Baby Jesuses", whose authenticity was claimed by just as many Basilicas; as a result the Church of Rome, aware of the discredit the Prepuces had acquired (even within the public), prohibited everyone, through Decree n. 37 of 3 February 1900, from speaking or writing about the "Holy Prepuce" upon penalty of excommunication. This law was reconfirmed by Pius XII in 1954.

The "validations" of the relics were guaranteed by miraculous healings "certified" by special Congregations and regularly put on record and then endorsed by the Spiritual Leaders of the Dioceses to which those who were healed by the divine prodigies belonged.

But even the instruments used for "the Passion of Christ" were so high in number that they inflated the "Via Crucis"; not even one hundred "Cyrenians" would have been enough to help Jesus carry all the reassembled crosses to Golgotha for many were the pieces of wood forming the "Holy Cross" which were recovered. We also witness the same abnormal proliferation of nails, crowns of thorns, spears, whips, dice, tunics, ladders, cradles, mangers, etc.

Long before the three Mandylions described above, from the tenth century onwards we are witnesses to "tangible findings" and to the spreading of Acheropite images *"not made by human hands"*, implying: *"through divine will"*.

During the Passion the Holy Face was not dried and reproduced once, as stated in the Gospels, but ten times by a pious woman who later, through a calculated play on words, will be cleverly called "Veronica" (from "vera icon" meaning true image): the "originals" of the Image are preserved in the same number of Basilicas, Cathedrals and Monasteries.

But the true, most important Mandylion is the *"Sagrado Rostro"* (Holy Face) of the "Shroud of Oviedo", in Spain: a simple cloth with spots of blood and having no human body outline. We are dealing with a piece of linen cloth (85x53cm) which, according to the Gospel of John, was seen in the Holy Sepulchre by Simon Peter and the "favourite Apostle". The detailed "chronicle" put together by Bishop Pelagius of Oviedo (in office from 1101 to 1130), enriched with details by present-day inspired "sindonologists" - capable of reconstructing the two-thousand-year journey of the cloth, protected by Saint Peter in a "Holy Coffin" along with other relics - has made these scholars so certain about its authenticity that the Centro Español de Sindonología (CES: Spanish Centre of Sindonology), blessed by the Holy See, has dared to have the *"Sagrado Rostro"* undergo radiocarbon 14 testing to establish its dating with the ill-concealed intention of reopening the "matter" regarding the Shroud of Turin, already branded as false by the various C-14 tests which it has undergone.

But the disappointing outcome shattered the hopes of the mystical sindonologists: according to the instrumental analysis, the "Holy Face" relic dates back to **seven centuries after** the Passion of Christ (the period is that of the iconoclastic disputes between Christians). **After the testing** the Spanish spiritual scientists at CES "realized" that *"this dating may be the result of fungal contamination"*. On the contrary, the Instituto Nacional de Toxicología y Ciencias Forenses - after another C-14 exam - on **8 July 2007**, through Antonio Alonso of the "Ministerio de Justicia", communicates: *"the sole scientific evidence, that of the C-14 radiocarbon testing, shows that the relic is false"*.

Despite the proof of its falsification, ecclesiastical authorities continue to display the "relic" to the faithful as an authentic object of cult along with the "Holy Coffin" in which it was contained. A coffin which holds and preserves other relics whose dating now lies solely within the competence of the "Creed"; as a result of the the scientific "Passion" undergone for which the C-14 testing is to be blamed, the High Clergy does not wish to run further risks and has thus decided to avoid the "satanical" testing of these other relics. In addition, the Grey Eminences of the Church are well-aware that (yet they are careful not to even mention it to their obedient "Mystical Sindonologists"), on the basis of "the most reliable historical reconstruction" propagandized by the spiritual scientists, if the Saint Peter had actually taken the "Holy Coffin" (along with the linen cloth with the "Holy Face" impressed upon it), as postulated by the spiritual scientists, the Apostle would have given it to Mary; in fact, following the death of Her Son, the twelve Apostles spent days with the Mother of God. But in Acts of the Apostles we see them all together in the cenacle *"in constant prayer for forty days awaiting the Descent of the Holy Spirit"* ... without mentioning the presence of the Divine Relics, too important to be forgotten by the successors of Christ, especially the Holy Face impressed on the cloth by His will ... if the Holy Legend, assembled through contrasting testimonies of "Holy History", were true.

There is also the Holy Face of Lucca and the Holy Face of Sansepolcro (both in Tuscany, Italy), two wooden crosses both characterized by complicated, puerile legends and discoveries: their "usefulness" is linked to the preservation of their respective religious feasts, in addition to being a great opportunity for writers in love with "divine mystery".

Many Shrouds have been discovered: the Shroud of Carcassonne in France; the Shroud of Cadouin in France; the Shroud of Compiègne in France; the Shroud of Kornelimünster near Aachen in Germany; the Shroud of Cahors in France, along with the "Holy Cap" to absorb the "Holy Blood" which came out due to the "Holy Thorns" of the "Holy Crown". Other Shrouds also make their appearance: the Shroud of Aix-la-Chapelle; the Shroud of Arles; the Linen of Christ of Iohanavank in Armenia; the Holy Shroud of Lisbon; the Holy Shroud of Mainz; the Shroud of Paris; the Pure Shroud of Limoges, the Shroud of Akeldama in Jerusalem and many others ... but we have got tired of listing them.

Finally (we could not live without it) we have the complete "Holy Tunic" of Jesus in Argenteuil, France. It was given to Charlemagne by Empress Irene of Constantinople around 800 A.D.; the former entrusted his daughter Theodrade with the relic; she resided in the Abbey of Argenteuil where, with many twists and turns, it has been preserved to this day. On the tunic we can see spots of blood: one, on the shoulder, caused by the weight of Cross, other on the back where Jesus was whipped. With such a historical past and thanks to its precise correspondence to the excruciating evangelical narration, there was no believer in the world who had doubts about the authenticity of the tunic ... and went as far to challenge the outcome of the C-14 radiocarbon testing.

On 17 May **2004** the "Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique" of Saclay (near Paris) subjected the Holy finding to C-14 testing which dated the tunic to 650 A.D: a slap in the face for the "blessed who are poor in spirit". The partisan

sindonologists of the authenticity of the "Holy Tunic of Christ" refused to give up and they requested another analysis as a countercheck, due also to the pressure received from believers. The test was repeated in **2005** and the outcome of the analysis has the "Holy Tunic of Christ" date back to **750 A.D.**

**As is the case for the "Shroud of the Holy Face" of Oviedo, even the dating of the "Holy Tunic" of Argenteuil coincides with the bloody iconoclastic struggles** which forced Pope Gregory III to convene the Council of 731 A.D. in Rome; this meeting decreed the excommunication of Christians against holy relics and images of Saints.

Respectful of Julian Chrisostomides's memory, we have the duty to remember the preciseness of her analyses which have demonstrated that at the time of the iconoclastic struggles between Christians many false relics were produced; the four C-14 tests carried out in the first decade of the twenty-first century have confirmed the results of her studies.

The fans of the "Holy Tunic" worn by Christ seven centuries after His "Passion" have now resigned themselves to silence.

There are still a few pieces of the tunic remaining, to be found here and there in Basilicas and Cathedrals but, as in the case of the Holy Shroud of Oviedo, the High Clergy has confined its obstinate belief to the more Christianly reliable "Creed" ... and has limited itself to nourishing the Faith of naive believers with the latest scientific discoveries: pollen; type AB blood; the explosion of light of the resurrection; mitochondrial DNA ... all "compatible" with the land of Christ and His blood, which has reached us and has been *"almost cloned"* ... according to the conclusions expressed by the Italian showman and iconodule Roberto Giacobbo during the 18 March 2009 episode of the Italian T.V. program Voyager about **"The hidden truth of the Holy Shroud of Oviedo"**; this will be followed on 25 May 2010 by mystical reflections concerning **"The Holy Shroud"**, *"a mystery difficult to explain"*: words of "Saint" Giacobbo.

### The Shroud of Turin

**Fourteenth Century:** the era of the fratricidal iconoclastic fights between Christians has by this time been forgotten, the Crusades in the Holy Land have just ended and the monastic Order of the Knight Templars - "Comrades-in arms" of Christ" - has just been suppressed.

We are right in the middle of the paganizing iconodule era when, suddenly, in Lirey in France, a cloth "appears" for **the first time**, by will of God, in Anno Domini 1353; it was over four meters long, little more than a meter wide, weighed a couple of kilos and on the front and back contained an image of the "Holy Impression", which had remain fixed upon the linen which Christ was wrapped in after the agonizing Passion undergone 1320 years earlier.

Put aside the chronicle of the August Images of Christ (too numerous to all be investigated), let's move our attention to the **"Holy Shroud"** preserved in the Turin Cathedral, by taking into consideration the outcome both the C-14 radiometric tests and the falsities found in the Holy Relics which underwent C-14 testing between 2004 and 2007: the Holy Tunic of Argenteuil and the Holy Shroud of Oviedo.

The negative outcome of these tests frustrated the Church's desperate attempt to discredit the sacreligious condemnation to *"Damnatio Memoriae"* for ecclesiastic fraud as a result of the falsification of the Shroud of Turin. The judgment was passed on 13 October 1988, after three tests carried out simultaneously in three distinct laboratories located in Oxford, Tucson and Zurich, chosen by the ecclesiastic authorities from the "Pontifical Academy of the Sciences" along with the related protocol to be followed: this all received the blessing of Pope Wojtyla ... but not that of the C-14 testing; the univocal response of the the three independent institutes dated the Shroud between 1260 and 1390. Therefore totally compatible with the first "apparition" confirmed by concrete historiographical evidence.

The negative repercussions on the credibility of the Church and Its Doctrine soon arrived: while on Sundays stadiums overflowed with people, Churches became emptier and emptier and religion turned into a topic looked upon with indifference by the masses as the results of the various C-14 tests became known.

After being cornered, the Clergy has continued to show off its "false pretenses"; this is possible thanks to the media (all of which are complaisant), to the many package tours organized to bring crowds of people to Saint Peter's Square and to the omnipresent weekly "Vatican photo albums" broadcasted on TV.

Nevertheless - well-aware that that this staging is not enough to overturn the negative responses of science regarding the three relics examined - the Universal Church has proclaimed a Holy Media Crusade and summoned up the "Scientists of Christ", urging them to elaborate "latest generation" scientific theories to be presented at the Iconodule Council on **"Holy Impressions" held in Turin on 18-20 May 2010**: year of the Grand Sindonic Ostension. In the meantime, in order to put an end to the constant defections, the Clergy has studied a tactic of "containment" by having "Mystical Sindonologists" (MS), struck by "Divine Revelations", come into action as they are good at controlling those church-goers less inclined to critical thinking.

At the same time, from the High Heavens the Eternal Creator reveals to the Enlightened Elected Scientists (EES) that the Instrument of Satan has managed so far to deceive them by means of a "circumvention of incapable people": an illicit action to be punished according to the Penal Code, therefore all the tests are to be considered "invalidated". In addition, after having the initials "ENEA" appear miraculously on the Shroud of Turin, the Almighty, due to the grave Faith emergency, issues a rigid Divine Protocol to be followed as if it were a "Commandment": «All Mystical Sindonologists and Enlightened Elected Scientists must not publicly comment New Testament details, must stop inventing further "Divine Revelations" and strictly avoid mentioning both Christian Patristic history dating back to before the end of the fourth century and all Councils held from the sixth century onwards to discuss the "Holy Impressions" ... all violators will be punished by the Flames of Hell».

All the Enlightened Elected Scientists along with the Mystical Sindonologists, in compliance with the New Commandment, hold conferences, seminars, conventions, make TV documentaries and explain that we are dealing with an evil conspiracy: C-14 radiometric testing was not to be carried out. That's that. They instead explain the more valid "laser method" capable of demonstrating that the Shroud still preserves traces of the Explosion of Light which took place at the moment of the Resurrection. Even The Divine Revealer of Pollen (DPR) is sacred and reliable; the pollen "compatible with the Land of Christ" can survive 2000 years and offers evidence of the route from Jerusalem to Lirey in France where the extra-long shroud with the Holy Image of Christ removed from the Holy Cross appeared, by will of God, for **the first time** in 1353.

A completely new "historical" novelty was then introduced, stuff that not even the Blessed Karol Wojtyla managed to prophesize during his long pontificate: the Shroud of Turin and the Mandylion are the same "Holy Relic". A *"convoluted investigation"* first invented by the British writer Ian Wilson in 1978, and considered as such by the exegetes supported by the Church ... until recent times.

As we are dealing with an unknown cloth with no historical, New Testament and patristic references, at the date of its first appearance the Mystical Sindonologists - in order to overcome the absence of a Tradition (constituting a dangerous "impassé") and cover the over one-thousand-year silence regarding the Shroud - revived the "Legend of the Holy Face" (the myth which evolved from the Holy Letter of Jesus to Abgar) and explained to us that *"the Shroud in reality is the*

*Mandylion of Edessa*" which, initially, was conveniently folded four times so as to create eight overlapping layers which allowed for only the Holy Face to be visible. If there is then someone who objects and states that the Shroud of Turin represents a Holy Corpse with its eyes closed, while the Mandylion depicts a living Christ with his eyes open, the Church Sindonologists explain that all that you have to do is concentrate intensely and out comes the miracle: the eyes of both open and close as much as they like for the Divine Power listens to the Faith of the Just and fulfills their desires. Those who do not belong to this group cannot see or understand.

Hallelujah! A member of this group is the pious Italian TV presenter Giacobbo. On 25 May 2010, just five days after the Iconodule Council on **"Holy Impressions"** held in Turin, the program "Voyager" broadcasted "The Holy Shroud" on the Italian State Channel Rai 2. An investigation with a "High Scientific Profile" which aimed at unveiling the mystery surrounding the Shroud which had been wrapped around Christ's lifeless body: *"a mystery difficult to explain"*. From the start of the program the enchanting showman, accompanied by a heavenly choir as background music and by the voice of an off-stage narrator, immediately clarifies the mystery and explains that *"for centuries, this Divine Cloth, has preserved its secret: it is Christianity's most important relic, an almost tangible representation of the suffering and of the Sacrifice of a man condemned to terrible torture and to an atrocious death by crucifixion"* ... but, aware of the final Commandment decreed by God, **Giacobbo makes no mention of the results of the C-14 datings** which have already cleared up the "mystery" once and for all.

Within the "Media Crusade" both the Enlightened Elected Scientists and the Mystical Sindonologists, in virtue of the Divine Revelations received, provoke a "crossfire" of Holy Texts reported in countless books, lessons, records, short films and whatever else mystical imagination is capable of conjecturing: through the centuries, from Constantine the Great up until the Knight Templars ... going so far as to contradict one another.

In this sonorous Holy Hullabaloo characterized by nonsensical theories lacking historical and scientific basis, there is one authoritative, discordant voice which distinguishes itself from the others: that of Andrea Nicolotti. Who would have ever guessed?

The renowned scholar, who for many years has been involved in "mending" the widespread "bending" of history involving New Testament Truths, feels that, as a result of the Media Crusade in progress, the Church risks losing its credibility in the eyes of the intellectual and rational world, unwilling to be taken for a ride.

Andrea Nicolotti - having verified that the number of Mystical Sindonologists convinced that the Shroud of Turin and the Mandylion are the same relic has grown out of all proportion - deals with the matter seriously and in 2011 published a book containing an indepth study\* presented at the Congress held in Turin in 2010; this study, which makes use of historical, literary and iconographical sources, proves the foolish theory wrong by furnishing precise data and has no qualms about citing the first names and surnames of these sindonologists.

Doctor Nicolotti knows, and he is right (this time), that in the long run foolish arguments lose out and throw further discredit upon the already shaky credibility of the Church.

\* **"Dal Mandilio di Edessa alla Sindone di Torino, Metamorfosi di una leggenda"** ("From the Mandylion of Edessa to the Shroud of Turin. Metamorphosis of a Legend"). Nicolotti has also published on-line a specific study which can be freely consulted, entitled "Forme e vicende del Mandilio di Edessa" ("Forms and events concerning the Mandylion of Edessa").

The close scrutiny contains iconographical research which includes documented relics; it reconstructs the history of the famous reliquary preserved in Constantinople by the Byzantine Emperors starting in 944 A.D.

In 1204 the city was attacked and sacked by the Crusaders who saved the reliquary which became the property of Baldwin I, Emperor of Constantinople from 1228 to 1261. His son Baldwin II then sold it for an exorbitant sum to (Ludovicus) Louis IX called the Saint, King of France from 1226 until his death in 1270 (later he was truly made a Saint). At the end of the detailed historical excursus, Nicolotti states:

*We are able to know precisely which relics were handed over to the French sovereign as we have come across the text of a declaration, dated June 1247, which makes a list of these relics.*

*"The Holy crown of thorns of the Lord, and the holy cross; then the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; the Saviour's nappies with which He was wrapped in the cradle; another large piece of wood from the holy cross; the blood, through an amazing miracle, dripped from an image of the Lord struck by an infidel; then the chain, an iron constraint, whose shape was similar to that of a ring, with which, it is said, our Lord was tied; the holy cloth inserted in a wood frame; the majority of the stone of the sepulchre of our Lord Jesus Christ; the milk of the Blessed Virgin Mary; then the tip of the holy spear with which was used to pierce the side of our Lord Jesus Christ; another small cross, which in ancient times was called the triumphal cross, as the Emperors usually brought it to war to give hope of victory; the scarlet chlamys which the soldiers put on our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to ridicule Him; the cane which they placed in his hand in place of the sceptre; the sponge full of vinegar used to wet Jesus's mouth when thirsty on the cross; a piece of the shroud used to wrap Jesus's body inside the sepulchre; then the linen cloth which He wrapped around his waist in order to wash the disciples' feet, and with which He dried their feet; the rod of Moses; the upper part of the skull of the Blessed John the Baptist, and the skulls of the Saints Biagio, Clement and Simeon" \* (Epistula Ludovicus IX).*

This historical document confirms that until 1247 A.D. the much more famous Holy Shroud did not exist; as we know, it will make its first appearance in Lirey, France a century later, "devoutly" **complete**. Saint Louis, King of France, thanks to the power and capital at his disposal, would have certainly completed his already rich collection of relics by replacing the "piece of shroud", obviously false, with the "authentic" Shroud.

\* Saint **Biagio**, whose creation was demonstrated at the beginning of this study; Saint **Simeon**, who was also invented (see fourth study); the same goes for Saint **Clement** (of Alexandria) (see fifth study).

Nicolotti's analysis, which rules out the identification of the Mandylion with the Shroud of Turin, in reality (only with regard to this detail) confirms the conclusions of the most important Italian atheist sindonologists, Antonio Lombatti, CICAP (Comitato Italiano per il Controllo delle Affermazioni Paranormali) collaborator, and Luigi Garlaschelli from the Department of Organic Chemistry of the University of Pavia.

Despite "being supporters" of different "formations", the studies of these men (for different reasons) carefully avoid dealing with the bloody history written in the conciliar decrees regarding the relics and the representation of the Christian divinities. All these studies also avoid comparative reading of the New Testament documents and those afferent to the patristic tradition, which deal with the moment of the death and resurrection of "Our Lord" and the period which follows, that is to say when His successors come into action.

As far as we are aware, the **Final Protocol**, given the status of a Commandment and **revealed** to the Mystical Sindonologists and to the Enlightened Elected Scientists by God from the High Heavens, is also observed by the atheist scientists of the CICAP itself. That's too bad for them, because the miraculous apparition of the inscription "E.N.E.A." wanted by the Creator - which appeared on the Shroud during the Grand Ostension of 2010 and had never been seen before - was discovered, needless to say, by **E.N.E.A.** (these initials stand for the **Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Development**). And when "Science" takes action against "Science" ... things

get a bit complicated for "Science".

The news was officialized by Doctor Paolo di Lazzaro, head of the Excimer Laboratory located at the E.N.E.A. Research Center in Frascati, Italy; he immediately explains that the fact of having the same name is merely a coincidence, but the the following declaration better clarifies the position of the scientist and that of E.N.E.A.:

**E.N.E.A. Research Center in Frascati.** Press Office.

*"The Shroud is a scientific enigma with many faces."* Doctor Paolo di Lazzaro, head of the Excimer Laboratory located at the E.N.E.A. Research Center in Frascati, explains that *"The C-14 radiocarbon testing dated the cloth as originating in the Middle Ages (1260-1390) but this testing seems to have been hindered by calculation errors and by contamination, and it contrasts with clues provided by textiles, iconography, and history, all of which suggest that this cloth is older than what is revealed by the radiocarbon dating analysis"*.

It is not hard to understand that the Enlightened Elected Scientist has issued a Divine Judgement based on simple Faith as words such as "seems" and "clues" have no probative scientific value; such words are useful for stirring up and indoctrinating the naive, and Di Lazzaro is well-aware of this. Doctor Paolo Di Lazzaro knowingly fuels superstitious credulity by involving Science which he represents, therefore becoming a "witness" to the unreliability of Science itself, thus achieving the goal he had given himself: the Holy is certain, Science is not!

Doctor Di Lazzaro, before referring to "historical clues", should read History and at the same time read the Holy Texts and the patristic documentation concerning the "Successors of Christ"; then, after ten years of full-time studying, he will no longer dare to mix Creed and Science in order to insinuate strong doubts with regard to the analyses carried out by three internationally renowned institutes, all of which made use of scientific instruments which he himself relies upon to pronounce his "oracles".

The flash of inspiration which struck the Elected Scientist takes shape through the "reconstruction" of the "Divine Gleam of the Resurrection" which generated Christ inside the shroud that was wrapped around Him leaving upon it His Impression in the very moment he "disappeared".

*"The E.N.E.A. researchers believe that a powerful beam of ultraviolet light indelibly marked the Shroud of Christ"*, as stated by Giacobbo at the beginning of his program; he adds that *"a powerful light coming from the body of Christ was generated within the shroud"*. He then has a more than willing Di Lazzaro come onto the scene; the latter uses an excimer laser to produce a powerful ray of ultraviolet light *"containing energy equal to that generated on that day 2000 years ago"* (stresses Giacobbo).

The laser, aimed at a small sample of cloth, "manages" to ruin it by creating a stain or scorch (which the pious call "impression"). *"By changing the emission wave we obtained a much yellower colour, much more similar to the chromatic colouring of the sindonic image; the process involves the more external fibres, the ones exposed to the laser light"*, concludes the Scientist.

So what? What is so special about scorching and staining a piece of white cloth by means of a very powerful ultraviolet ray? The Elected Scientist instead explains to us how an "excimer laser" can reproduce the absence of geometrical deformations typical of a three-dimensional body to which a sheet of cloth adheres, like a mask on the face of a man. Why is it that when we straighten out the mask, well-ironed like the Holy Shroud of Turin, that which the Mystical Sindonologists call the "Impression of the Face", it ends up being a grotesque, immoderately enlarged face, and the same goes for the rest of the body ... but whoever created the fake was well-aware and made sure that the "Holy Body of the Shroud" had correct human proportions. That's right, yet much taller than the average human of the time: as appropriate for a God who towered above all of humanity.

Roberto Giacobbo, through a clever montage and effective media manipulation aimed at demonstrating the truthfulness of the Resurrection, has managed to enchant masses convinced of having viewed a scientific documentary ... in that moment ... then, when Sunday comes, stadiums and discos continue to fill up ... but Churches continue to empty.

Following the miraculous experiments carried out by the E.N.E.A. Laboratory on live TV, we count on the interest of the pious catholic scientist and divulger, Professor Antonino Zichichi; after obtaining the indispensable authoritative support of the world's most famous physicists, we would like him to do all that he can to ask the Norwegian Nobel Prize Committee in Oslo to put forward Doctor Paolo Di Lazzaro as a candidate for the Nobel Prize for Physics as the latter has managed to reproduce the energy emanated by Christ in the moment of His Resurrection. We are devoutly awaiting the official confirmation of the prestigious recognition, "pride" of Italian intelligence.

After this irritating series of "evidence", "theories", "confutations", "fantasies", "beliefs", "convictions", silly and often childish but above all superstitious and obstinate, we are left with simple and brief considerations which cannot be aside. Details which any priest or simple expert of holy texts and patristic tradition knows perfectly ... but which they, who are calculating opportunists, do not mention purposely.

After accepting the New Testament canonical evangelical narrations as truthful, all that you need to do is read them carefully and critically in order to obtain the information concerning the relics documented in the Holy Texts. With regard to the Shroud and to the veil used to dry the face of Christ, let's have a look at what the Gospel of John says after Jesus was placed in the sepulchre by Joseph of Arimathea accompanied by Nicodemus.

*"Nicodemus came as well - the same who had first come to Jesus at night-time - and he brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, weighing about a hundred pounds. They took the body of Jesus and bound it in bandages with the spices"* (John 19,39/40 Catholic C.E.I. Bible).

*"So Simon Peter set out with the other disciple (John) to go to the tomb. They ran together, but the other disciple, running faster than Simon Peter, reached the tomb first; he bent down and saw the bandages lying on the ground, but he did not go in. Simon Peter, following him, also came up, went into the tomb, saw the bandages lying on the ground and also the cloth that had been over his head; this was not with the bandages but rolled up in a place by itself"* (Jh 20,3/7 Catholic C.E.I. Bible).

This continues to be the official C.E.I. (Italian Episcopal Conference) translation in conformity with the "Codex Vaticanus Graece 1209": a Holy Writing in effect for over 1500 years and used to evangelize all Christianity.

The aim of the scribe who wrote this Gospel was to represent the embalming of the Messiah's corpse carried out by two authoritative Jews who had 100 pounds of balsamic mixture, according to rituals reserved for Kings and practiced in the East, from India to Persia to as far as Egypt. These were holy corpses which had to be protected from decomposition in order to give them eternal life; this was done by spreading ointments on the dead bodies and wrapping them in linen cloths soaked in the same substance.

The mixture of myrrh and aloes had this property but, as all believers recognize (in observance of the theology of the

evangelist), **Jesus** did not need the ritual for preventing the decomposition of His corpse: **He managed to rise from the dead on the third day ... before decomposing.**

Unlike the three Synoptic Gospels, **the Gospel of John - only one of the evangelists to attend and personally witness the events - makes no mention of the cloth used to wrap the entire body of Christ** after he was taken from the cross: according to the description from inside the sepulchre, **the only shroud was a piece of material placed on his head**, much smaller than the over four-meter long shroud which would have been necessary in order to wrap His entire body. In fact the Synoptic Gospels make no reference to a small shroud; therefore, while the burying of the body is the same in all the Gospels, the embalming procedure is carried out only in the fourth Gospel and without the long shroud.

Humanity's most famous burial regarding the same corpse is described according to two different and contrasting funeral rites; **this fact inevitably discredits the subsequent narration regarding the resurrection of the dead body**, phenomenon which contrasts with the laws of nature and is therefore **impossible**.

Since 1979 (under the newly-elected Pope Karol Wojtyla), the Papal Academy of the Sciences has expressed the intention (through a public protocol) of having the Shroud of Turin undergo various tests, among which radio-carbon dating. Since this time exegetes have focused their attention on the evangelists' descriptions of the Deposition and preparation of the burial of Christ's corpse, by highlighting the differences between the Synoptic Gospels (which describe a shroud) and **the Gospel of John which specifies that they "wrapped his body with bandages", not in the Holy Shroud.**

The Grey Eminences, and rightly so, were afraid that the publicity deriving from public testing of Christianity's most famous relic would have increased the curiosity of the masses, publicity would have inevitably brought about a denunciation of the grave contradictions between the Gospels and undermined their credibility. Moreover, to make matters worse, many critics had begun to insinuate that the falsifier of the Shroud was forced to ignore the Gospel of John as he could not carry out such detailed work on bandages. But the Church had its hands tied: if it had modified the translation of the Gospel of John, it would have provoked the reaction of critics and attracted even more attention towards the grave contrast between the various evangelical testimonies regarding the "resurrection of Christ". As is the case in the Gospel of Luke where the Apostle describes a Jesus who has just resurrected, interacts with the Apostles and has just enough time to have a light fish supper with them inside the "cenacle" and ... *"Raising his hands he blessed them, he withdrew from them and was carried up to heaven" on the same day* (Lk 24, 50-51). But the same Luke, in "Acts of the Apostles", provides a different version: *"He (Jesus) had shown himself alive to them (the Apostles) after his Passion by many demonstrations (sic): for forty days he had continued to appear to them ... As he said this he was lifted up while they looked on, and a cloud took him from their sight"* (Acts 1,3/9).

In 1988 don Antonio Persili, a priest from the Italian region of Latium - obsessed with the doubtful credibility of the "Resurrection of Christ" resulting from the evangelical contradictions and openly and superficially trivializing the millenary official version - on his own decided to "repair" the Gospel of John and published a study in a short volume which was ignored by the ecclesiastical authorities, not being able to do otherwise: **"Sulle tracce del Cristo risorto. Con Pietro e Giovanni testimoni oculari"** ("On the Tracks of Christ Resurrected. With Peter and John as Eyewitnesses").

After roughly twelve years of internal debates concerning the Shroud, a few Church exegetes began to think that it was the right time to modify this specific passage of the Gospel of John. Instead, the true ecclesiastical exegetes, the subtle Grey Eminences, have understood that the keen priest was driven by a sincere "surplus of faith" and they have played dumb, well-aware that if they had begun to "correct" the Gospels ... they would have been forced to rewrite them all from the very beginning, due to the "overabundance of contradictions" contained in these writings.

In 2000 A.D., year of the Grand Catholic Jubilee, the version (which continues to be unofficial) received from the evangelist Antonio Persili, thanks to the "Divine Revelation", began to circulate; it is centred on the passage of John, supplied with new theories and "duly" loaded with tortuous Grecisms found in dictionaries skimmed through unmethodically. But, not being enough to extrapolate a few words for the corroboration of his theory, he changes the words with new ones.

By ignoring the precise embalming ritual and the eschatological motives represented by the scribe, the above-read passage is modified in the "New Gospel" written by the Enlightened don Antonio Persili and enthusiastically accepted by conceited know-it-alls dedicated to apostolate, but who are frustrated by the Gospel of John ("favourite disciple of Jesus"), who is passed off as an "inexpert youngster" ... despite the fact that he was almost one hundred years old when he wrote the Gospel. A detail which the evangelist Persili and the depressed "wise men", "led" by the famous Jesuit journalist Vittorio Messori, are careful not to highlight. Here is the new "repaired" verse:

*"... (John) kneeling down, sees the **bands** lying about, but did not enter. Simon Peter who followed him also arrives and enters the sepulchre and contemplates the **bands** lying about and **the small shroud** which was on his head, not lying down with the bands, but **on the contrary wrapped in a unique position**".*

In addition to having the "bandages on the ground" disappear and availing themselves of a vague translation, the motives of the priest who wrote this passage and of those who share his opinions are evident as the very "need" to modify the Gospel is, on its own, enough to demonstrate that he who has carried it out is aware that it was written by a scribe who received no "revelation" from God; he therefore knows that he can "correct" it in order to reduce its contradictions with the other "resurrections". But we advise readers not to go onto the web to carry out "research" on the matter in order to avoid finding yourselves inside a media madhouse like the one regarding the Mandylion-Shroud, and mainly because ... it is useless.

The more falsifiers get worked-up in order to "save themselves" from the quicksand (or holy contradictions), the more they end up getting swallowed up.

It is not a coincidence that God dictated the Divine Protocol having the status of a "Commandment", on the basis of which all Mystical Sindonologists and Enlightened Elected Scientists must refrain from analyzing New Testament details: «Avoid, absolutely, further "Divine Revelations" and stop making reference to Christian patristic history prior to the end of the fourth century, in addition to any Council on "Holy Impressions" held from the sixth century onwards, all violators will suffer the Flames of Hell» ... Yes, the Eternal Father had very good reasons to avoid having the sand castle of lies be torn apart by the waves of historical rationalism.

After the Universal Church called the latest Holy Media Crusade and summoned the "Scientists of Christ", urging them to elaborate "latest generation" scientific theories to be presented at the Iconodule Council on "Holy Impressions" scheduled in Turin in 2010, the drum beat so loudly that by this time the list of the "Impressions" released by the "Holy Relics" is so long that the indispensable, servile Wikipedia, "For the Grace Received", has put them all on display. And we all know that any information that "enters" the web, remains there ... even if the source goes out of business.

So, starting with the Gospels, let's limit ourselves to following the route of the two relics mentioned in these writings and highly praised by practicing Christianity: the long Shroud of the dead Christ and the small shroud covering His head. The only person to enter the Holy Sepulchre was Simon Peter, who saw the two shrouds, meanwhile outside "Rabbuni, the Teacher" had already resurrected and was speaking to Mary Magdalene. Then, on the same day, the scenario moves

from the sepulchre to the house where the Apostles had taken refuge, and here Jesus, who has already resurrected, reveals himself to them for eight days. He then reveals himself to them on the "Sea of Tiberias", and from the lake ... the revelations continued in the Holy City in "Acts of the Apostles".

Here we read that the Successors of Christ come together for forty days: first in the Cenacle on the Mount of Olives, then in Jerusalem, along with the Virgin Mary, awaiting the Holy Spirit, *"all these were persevering with one mind in prayer"*. One of these is Simon Peter, the only one who entered the Holy Sepulchre, therefore the only one with the Holy Duty to safeguard the two relics of the Son and give them to the Mother of Christ. But the scribe of "Acts", who signs himself as Luke, knows nothing about the Shroud mentioned by the scribe of the Gospel of Saint Luke. Therefore this scribe does not feel the need to have Saint Peter return Her Son's Shroud to the Mother of God, the Theotòkos "Θεοτόκος", as she is called in the Lukan Gospel. The same goes for the small shroud which covered Jesus's head. At this point things get complicated for the iconodules treasuring relics. Judas was also present in the house along with the other Apostles; according to the "tradition" invented during the iconoclastic fights between Christians, he already had the small cloth with the Image of Christ alive. Judas had to feel the Christian obligation to have His Mother and the Apostles themselves see the cloth so that the latter would mention it in their Gospels and in their letters. Judas was also obliged to inform the Apostles that, after the descent of the Holy Spirit and in observance of the order written by Jesus Christ in his letter, he had to send Thaddeus to Edessa to give Abgar the Mandylion and save through a miracle the entire city afflicted with leprosy. All this according to the testimony of Eusebius reported three centuries later and which was broadened two centuries after the time of Eusebius in "Acts of Thaddeus":

*"After the ascension of Jesus, Judas, also called Thomas, sent the Apostle Thaddeus to Abgar".*

But, in the Holy Apostolic narration of their "Acts", not even Judas, who was present, expressed this "will" - ordered by Her Son when He was alive - to the Mother of Christ.

As we have seen above, this is the reason why all those present at the Second Council of Nicea knew that **no Apostle, Father, Bishop or Christian historian**, until the time of Eusebius, had heard about the "Holy Face" or even about the simple "divine letter" which, two centuries after the time of the Bishop Eusebius, will be transformed into the "Holy Image of Jesus".

While we are writing these lines, the uproar caused by the Media Crusade called by the Holy Mother Church to prove the existence of the **Holy Relics** has not subsided; on the contrary, things are worse than they were before because the iconodules protecting the "Divine Revelations" all argue amongst themselves and talk big and, as a result ... what God feared would happen, but tried to avoid through the Final Protocol ... has happened.

#### Acts of the Apostles

The Passion of Christ has just taken place, but the Apostles are still together with Christ and have supper as a family for the last time; then the Son of God, too busy governing the Infinite Cosmos along with His Father, leaves His Disciples and, after telling them that he would have them baptized by the Divine Power of the Holy Spirit, *"he was lifted up while they looked on, and a cloud took him from their sight"*. From the Cenacle, on the Mount of Olives, they returned to the Holy House they lived in Jerusalem and, awaiting the Solemn Descent of the Flame of the Holy Spirit which would have given them the Grace to carry out miracles under the Portico of Jerusalem, the Apostles ...

*"All these were persevering with one mind in prayer with the women, and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and with his brethren". And so it was for several days, from dawn until deep into the night, with devotion and absolute silence, certain of the Divine Providence of the Holy Spirit. Until late one night, while from the incensory spread a heavenly scent, the Saints, all around the dim light of a candid candle, continue to pray enraptured by a mystical ecstasy. When, in a dark corner of a large room, hidden behind wooden shelves where all the relics were arranged in a disorderly fashion and continued to arrive and increase in number, a small reddish, sinister flash of light in the thick darkness: the Eternal Belial, the Viscid, the depraved tempter of the virginity of Eve, who slipped into the house where the Holy Synaxis was kept, with a pious sneer, furtively introduces a strange object and, slowly, places it alongside the Holy Relics; then, as sinuously as he entered, the Evil One goes away...*

*After spending a night in their respective cells, the following day at dawn, the Apostles have just come together in the Holy Assembly, when Judas, not the traitor, addressing all those present says: «This night I dreamt about Our Teacher and Saviour who, after calling me Thomas, told me to send the Apostle Thaddeus to Edessa to heal King Abgar of his leprosy bringing His Image». They all look at him and are incredulous, then Simon Peter, head of the new-born Ecclesia, addresses him with severity: «Judas! Among us there is no Apostle by the name of Thaddeus; Jesus said that the Thrones destined to us in the Heavenly Kingdom are Twelve, so stop saying such foolishness». He then says to Matthew: «If Judas has had such a dream, you are to blame; as you continue to call him Thaddeus, you will embarrass him». Matthew then replies: «You are wrong Peter, it is Judas who, when asked his name, sometimes says it is Thomas, other times Thaddeus». At this point the Apostles become irritable and Thomas more than the others, until John, the disciple who Jesus loved, silences them through an authoritative gesture and turn to Judas: «Reflect a moment Judas, yours was simply an absurd dream. In reality never will it happen that you order an Apostle to go to Edessa, if this **Apostle**, as says Matthew, **are you yourself with the name Thaddeus**. Then, Peter is right: **here among us there is no Thaddeus** and stop passing yourself off as Thomas, otherwise Thomas will truly get angry». Although he did not show it, the number of Apostles present made him uneasy.*

*Peter, then, turns to Judas and in a conciliating tone says: «Look, let's count ourselves, you will see: Peter and John, James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholemew and Matthew, James of Alpheus and Simon the Zealot, finally Judas of James. As you see there are eleven of us, but outside the door there is Matthias, the twelfth, ready to replace Judas the traitor who, as we all know, killed himself by slitting his belly and scattering about his bowels». **In reality, Thaddeus was not among them** ... but at this point Matthew interrupts Peter: «Look Simon, you are wrong. I saw Judas hang himself with my own eyes». Peter replies in a choleric manner: «Matthew, this shows that you are cross-eyed because I also saw him and you can be certain that I see well». The matter threatens to worsen and the Pious women are worried, therefore John, the favourite of the Lord, because as far as he knew Judas the traitor had not killed himself, neither by hanging or disemboweling himself, says nothing in order to avoid a fight and, wisely, changes the subject. He asks Judas, not the traitor yet still mortified, to rearrange the Holy Relics, so as to distract him. The very delighted Apostle begins to do so and shortly thereafter, he finds among these a small tool which he had never seen before and which was not among those belonging to the Passion of Christ. Puzzled, he takes it, returns to the Holy Synaxis, while all are absorbed in prayer along with the Pious women and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and gives it to Peter. Simon, not the Zealot, looks at it carefully and exclaims: «Why it's a breast pump!» ... In the Ecclesia nobody notices the pale red colouring the cheeks of the Madonna.*

It was the "Holy Breast Pump", the one the Virgin Mary used when the evangelists Luke and Matthew obligated her

through their "nativities" (see ninth study) to remain pregnant for twelve years before giving birth to our Lord, the Vivifier and God Saviour. During the long, exasperating wait, the Mother of God was forced to lighten her load of milk which was gradually accumulating in her Holy Breast.

The Blessed Saint Louis IX, King of France, would have given up the throne in order to take possession of the "Holy Breast Pump", but he had to be satisfied with just the "Holy Milk" ... which, if one reflects well, is not something insignificant ...

**Fourth Century after Christ.** Eusebius of Cesarea wrote "Historia Ecclesiastica", the document which constitutes the foundation of "Christian Tradition"; and in Book I 13,11 he mentioned:

*"After the ascension of Jesus, **Judas, also called Thomas**, sent the Apostle Thaddeus to Abgar".*

This irresponsible testimony, as we have studied, has brought about an outburst of naive falsifications useful in proving a series of interrelated legends, one more idiotic than the other, supported by a fictitious iconodule historiography which was unknown in the first six centuries, and which culminated in the creation of the Holy Shroud of Turin 1300 years after Christ. The sindonologists of the Clergy - unable to base themselves on history or legend - were forced to identify this fake funeral shroud with the Mandylion of Edessa thus committing a grave and irreversible error. The Church of Rome - guardian of the centuries-old dogma of the infallibility of the divine Ministry belonging to all the Apostles and Bishops who succeeded them - for a question of coherence can no longer modify this absurdity without losing further credibility in the eyes of believers.

Every priest and Biblical scholar knows that identifying Judas with Thomas, overlapping them, means cancelling out one of the Twelve Apostles, thus contradicting the Gospels and Jesus himself.

In spite of this, their subtle, calculating minds are well-aware that if they highlighted this pious foolishness, there would be very serious repercussions on the credibility of the Church and on its Creed, capable of bringing about the collapse of the already shaky framework of superstitions which It has created through the centuries. As a result, the astute exegetes must make sure that practicing believers do not discover that the authenticity of the Shroud of Lirey, today preserved in the Cathedral of Turin, was the object of a Church investigation which, from the time of its first ostensions, declared the Shroud to be false; in other words, from when "it had just left the factory".

#### **Memorial of the Bishop Pierre d'Arcis to Pope Clement VII dated 1389**

*"Holy Father, a **short while ago** in the diocese of Troyes, **the dean of the collegiate church of Lirey**, consciously and wickedly, moved by the fire of meanness and greed, **not out of devotion but out of self-interest, has provided his church with a painted cloth with an artifice**, upon which a dual image of man was **cleverly** painted, that is to say both the front and the back, falsely declaring and pretending to believe that this was the shroud wrapped around Jesus inside the sepulchre and upon which remained the impression of Saviour's entire effigy, along with his wounds. This fact was publicized not only in the kingdom of France, but almost all over the world, to the point that crowds flocked here from all corners of the world. To trick the crowds and cleverly extort money from them, they lied and led people to believe that here miracles were carried out on some men, who had been paid, that pretended to be healed during the ostension of the Shroud, which everyone believed was the Shroud of the Lord. Informed of this, the late and memorable **Henry of Poitiers**, at the time Bishop of Troyes, persuaded and driven by many wise people, promptly took pains to conduct an investigation on the truthfulness of this fact, as being Bishop it was his duty to do so. Many theologians and other wise people claimed that which bore the image of the Saviour, in reality, could not be the Shroud of the Lord, due to the fact that **the Gospel made no mention of this stamped image**, while instead, if it had been true, **it is unlikely that such a fact would have gone unsaid or been omitted by the Evangelical Saints and it is unlikely that such a detail has been hidden or ignored until this day**. Finally, by diligently proceeding with the collection of information, he finally discovered the fraud and **the manner in which the cloth had been painted through an artifice, and it was proven, by means of the same artisan who had painted it, that it was the work of a man and had not been miraculously produced or obtained**".*

The Bishop Henry of Poitiers, in compliance with his duty, was able to issue a verdict after seeing and touching with his own hands the cloth painted a shortwhile ago *"through an artifice, by an artisan who had painted it"*. From a historical and religious point of view, the same opinion - with regard to the testimonies of the evangelists and of the Apostles - is expressed by Saint Augustine, which we mentioned at the beginning of this study (chapter entitled "The origins of a simulated tradition"). It is important to point out that Saint **Augustine** - who died in 430 A.D. - only **made reference to the letter which Jesus wrote to Abgar because he could know nothing about the image of Christ and His future relics** ... invented later on by the successors of the Vivifier and Saviour of humanity.

Only after examining in great detail the textual findings useful to this research - starting with the New Testament and patristic documentation and then going on to an analysis of the centuries-old ecclesiastical vicissitudes - the verified observations impose upon scientific rationalism the duty to recognize mass spectrometry's ability to date history thanks to ancient finds: operation which this tool has carried out in both in the past and present.

The pro-clerical Enlightened Scientists are fully conscious of this and, after devising sob stories in order to cast a shadow on and discredit the methods and findings of the laboratories called in by the Church itself, avoid requesting further C-14 testing for the Shroud of Turin: all that you need to do is cut a small piece of material (measuring a few square centimeters) from a sheet which is almost 4.5 meters long. New testing - as demanded by disappointed believers - which was carried out on "the Tunic of Argenteuille" in Paris and on the "Sagrado Rostro" of Oviedo ... but as a result of their outcome the grey subtle minds just prefer to talk, talk, talk ... in order to deceive and indoctrinate the naive through strange, "pious discoveries". As in the case of the "Sagrado Rostro" whose C-14 dating, ordered by the Church, was incompatible with the hard-headed beliefs of the Enlightened Scientists, who claimed that *"this dating may have been the result of fungal contamination"*.

Today, after centuries of lies, the powerful Clergy, with the support of confessional governments, has no other alternative than to call congresses and conventions at complaisant universities in order to preserve, nurture and "culturally" exploit the worst superstitions purposely created during the dark Middle Ages. The ancient, "Holy Counter-spell", scientifically "tailor-made", is well-prepared and packaged and more than ready to be **administered by the media to the naive masses** ... for the Greater Glory of Christ God, Our Saviour in the High Heaven ... and for the earthly well-being of His Ministers.

Emilio Salsi

[ go back ]