



# GOSPELS and HISTORY

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

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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

## History identifies the High Priest Caiaphas and Joseph, Jesus's youngest brother

### Part I

#### The High Priest Caiaphas

In the VI study, concerning the Testimonium Flavianum, we have highlighted how the Bishop **Eusebius of Caesarea**, in his "Historia Ecclesiastica", had censored the patronymic of the High Priest "Joseph called Caiaphas", which was the only paternal name missing in the list of the five mentioned High Priests. This clearly results also in the "Antiquities of the Jews" of the Jewish historian, in the codices that we have identified, which had been transcribed by the Christian scribes after the XI century to be then translated at the end of the XIX century by prof. Benedikt Niese. Therefore, at this point of our study, to proceed further we need to step back to the Eusebius "**Historia Ecclesiastica**":

*"Josephus relates that there were four high priests in succession from Annas to Caiaphas. Thus in the same book of the Antiquities (XVIII 34-35) he writes as follows: «Valerius Gratus having put an end to the priesthood of Annas, the son of (bar) Seth, appoints Ishmael, the son of (bar) Fabi, High Priest. And having removed him after a little he appoints Eleazar, the son of (bar) Annas the High Priest, to the same office. And having removed him also at the end of a year he gives the high priesthood to Simon, the son of (bar) Camithus. But he likewise held the honor no more than a year, when **Joseph**, called also **Caiaphas**, succeeded him». Accordingly the whole time of our Saviour's ministry is shown to have been not quite four full years, **four High Priests**, from **Annas** to the accession of **Caiaphas**, having held office **a year each**. The Gospel therefore has rightly indicated Caiaphas as the High Priest during the year in which the Saviour suffered. From which also we can see that the time of our Saviour's ministry does not disagree with the foregoing investigation" (HEc. I 10,1/6).*

As we have demonstrated in the VI study, the excerpt of Caiaphas, made by Josephus (Ant. XVIII 34-35) and recalled by Eusebius, dates this episode in 18 a.D., when the Praefectus Valerius Gratus named Joseph called Caiaphas the High Priest of the Jerusalem Temple. The lack of the patronymic "son of" (bar), which is part of the Jewish names, should be particularly noticed: this is a fundamental detail, preventing the recognition of the family of the High Priest. This is not an error but rather a censorship, made by the Christian scribes, which forces us to undertake a specific analysis to understand their motivation. Indeed, we have already seen in the episode of "James the Minor" that the Christian scribes used to eliminate the patronymic in a Jewish historical account to protect the "truth" of their faith ... to the detriment of History. As we well know, Caiaphas was indeed the accuser of Jesus.

When dealing with "James the Minor" we mentioned that this Act of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem was the only one written by the Jewish historian which has reached us and that it was left in "Antiquities" in order to have him give "testimony" concerning Jesus Christ and his brother James: this intention was unsuccessful, as demonstrated in the third and fourth studies. But are we truly certain that Josephus did not report other "Acts of the Sanhedrin" of Jerusalem? ... And why are many "Acts of the Sanhedrin" mentioned only in the Gospels and in "Acts of the Apostles"? Yet there were many serious grounds justifying the intervention of the highest Jewish tribunal.

The detested **Judas the Galilean** - often remembered by Josephus as the principal enemy of the pro-Roman priestly castes (starting with the High Priests nominated by imperial officials) - in 6 A.D. founded the "**fourth philosophy**", the most extreme Jewish integralist doctrine. Judas managed to drag the people into the incessant struggle against Rome which brought about the destruction of the Holy City and of the Temple; he was the Rabbi who led the Zealots **but the Jewish historian makes no mention of his death** while instead reporting the chronicle of the crucifixion of his children. **We know about his death described in the Sanhedrin reported in "Acts of the Apostles"** (Acts 5,34-40) while there is no trace of any intervention carried out by the true Jewish Sanhedrin. How can it be that Josephus did not give himself the satisfaction of writing a nice obituary for the bloody antagonist of his relatives and conservative Pharisean friends? A chronicle which, inevitably, would have drawn the attention of readers to the subversive conduct of Judas's descendants and would have contained all their names: such information would have allowed scholars to link these names to the brothers of Christ.

As reported in the first study, even the self-proclaimed Prophet Theudas is denounced in the **Sanhedrin** of "Acts of the Apostles", where we have verified that, in contrast with the Jewish rule according to which one must add their father's name to their own name, there is no trace of the prophet's patronymic; and there is also no trace of a patronymic in Book XX of "Antiquities" (par. 97/99). Therefore it is evident that the patronymic was removed, although we have demonstrated through a specific analysis that "Theudas" was only a title while his real name was "**Judas**". Moreover, **the head of the famous Jewish Prophet was brought to Jerusalem and displayed but the Sanhedrin** (the true one) **does not record the event: this is not credible.**

In fact the news regarding the Theudas which has reached us is incomplete: it is naive to accept that the Romans sent a cavalry squadron from Caesarea Maritima to the River Jordan in order to massacre men "incited" by the Prophet to cross the river and emulate the "watershed technique" used by Joshua and Moses.

For Roman Law what was described in "Antiquities" did not constitute a crime, but the Procurator Cuspius Fadus ordered the bloodbath because these men were revolutionary Jewish Zealots, subversive Sicarii, guilty of acting against the imperial sovereignty of Rome. Once they were brought to the attention of the Romans they were intercepted and, caught red-handedly, swords were run through them while attempting to cross the River Jordan to escape attack.

On this basis, in the first study we proved that Theudas was called **Judas**; and we discovered the connection between Theudas, Judas the Galilean and the crucifixion of the latter's children: **James and Simon**.

The incompleteness of the most important information and the lack of motives on behalf of the Romans in the description of these events are the result of the censorship of the text which has reached us. The Christian copyists could not unveil within the same Book of "Jewish Antiquities" (XX chap. 5), one paragraph after another, the names of three executed rabble-rousers, names identical to those of three Apostles and, even worse, to those of three of Jesus's brothers (out of four): **Judas, James and Simon**. The accusations of sedition against the three revolutionary Prophets could not be identical to those launched against the brothers of Christ because, inevitably, the latter would have been perceived as subversive; therefore the speech in favour of the Apostles made by Gamaliel in Luke's "Acts of the Apostles" (Acts 5,34/40) is an awkwardly disguised, overly manipulated truth which has ended up demonstrating the contrary (as we have verified in the first study).

At the beginning of the present analysis dedicated to Eusebius of Caesarea the Bishop lists – in the cited passage from "Historia Ecclesiastica" – the five High Priests of the Temple of Jerusalem (the first being Annas and the last Caiaphas) who succeeded one another during Christ's preaching, which lasted almost four years.

In par. 4 of the cited passage the historian – who specifically recalls "Jewish Antiquities" written by Josephus (XVIII 34-35) – lists the names of the five High Priests who presided over the Sanhedrin and states that they were appointed by the Governor of Judea Valerius Gratus (in office from 15 to 26 A.D.); but, on the basis of this information, we learn that **Jesus carried out his Redeeming Mission from 15 to 18 A.D.:** an "advent" having the same dating as another "Acts of the Apostles" in effect at the time of Eusebius (as reported by the latter in HEC. I 9,3/4) together with the TF from "Antiquities" (the demonstration is reported in the VI study).

Moreover, from the reading of "Antiquities" there is **no evidence that under the government of Pontius Pilate** (from 26 to the beginning of 36 A.D.) **there had been appointments of High Priests of the Temple, let alone having names the same as those contained in the list drawn up by Eusebius** (HEC. I 10,1-6); we only know that in 36 A.D. the Imperial Legate of Tiberius, Lucius Vitellius, went to Jerusalem and replaced Caiaphas **after** removing Pontius Pilate from office.

The historians with faith were satisfied with him being the High Priest of the Temple in 36 A.D., so that they could say that he also held this office in 33 A.D.: year of the passion of the Saviour ... according to them. They too lightly took for granted that Caiaphas remained in office as High Priest of the Temple from 18 to 36 A.D., that is to say for 18 consecutive years ... but, if true, there is no trace of other High Priests holding the office for so long since the time of the Hasmoneans (prior to Roman domination), in total contrast with what is also pointed out by Eusebius himself in par. 3 of the above-mentioned passage:

*"... appointed to the high priesthood by the Roman governors now one and now another person who continued in office not more than one year".*

Therefore, in addition to **Caiaphas, what happened to the other four High Priests of the Temple listed by Eusebius** and appointed by Valerius Gratus ten years before the arrival of Pilate? **Why doesn't Josephus report the names of the High Priests in office between 19 and 36 A.D.?** ... Despite this forced attempt to reconcile Eusebius with the current Gospels.

There is only explanation for the Jewish historian's failure to report that the High Priests remained in office for **"not more than one year": the names of the successors of Caiaphas** (appointed in 18 A.D.) **did not correspond to those contained in the Gospels**.

This is the motive which forced the copyists of "Jewish Antiquities" (from the eleventh century onwards) **to eliminate the high conferments of the High Priests of the Temple that took place between 19 and 36 A.D., in compliance with the tradition dictated by Rome**, as is evident in the years following 36 A.D.

In spite of this, as a result of the contrasts with the current Gospels the scribes did not limit themselves to censoring the true High Priests in office at the time of the alleged "mission" of Christ: other important events forced the subtle minds of God to "cut out" chronicles from "Jewish Antiquities" ... and not only.

In Book VIII of "Antiquities", which coincides with the time of "Jesus", there is clearly a **"historical void"**, unjustifiable if one takes into consideration the diligence with which the chronicler Josephus always denounces the cruel deeds of the Zealots. The accusation against the rebels - disciples of the leaders of the new nationalistic doctrine founded in 6 A.D. by Judas of Gamala – is expressed as such by the Jewish historian:

*"They (the Zealots) were to blame for the seditions and the great bloodshed, resulting from the mutual massacres carried out by the nationalist fanatics (the Zealots) who desired not to surrender to their enemies, and from the slaughtering of their enemies" (Ant. XVIII 23).*

*"Judas the Galilean led this fourth philosophy, the novelty unknown until this time, compatible with the all the opinions of the Pharisees apart from the fact that they (the Zealots) have ardent love of freedom, convinced that only God is their guide and Owner (Adonai) ... They have no fear of facing an unusual death and of vendettas against relatives and friends, in order to avoid calling a man "owner". False, deceitful individuals, who pretend to be inspired by God (Prophets), plot disorders and revolutions, push the people towards religious fanaticism ..." (Ant. XVIII 23).*

The archeological discovery of the "Scroll of the War" in Qumran is evidence of the reassuring language (based upon the certainty of divine aid) adopted by the Jewish Zealot Prophets to incite the masses to rebel against the kittim invaders.

*"Listen, Israel! You are about to fight against your enemies... Do not be afraid and do not be alarmed when they are in your presence. As your God accompanies you in your fight against your enemies and to save you...when in your country there is a war against an oppressor who oppresses you, and you play your trumpets and your God remembers you and saves you from your enemies ...".*

And, among the flock of believers, many followers went off and got killed ...

*"Judas the Galilean had persuaded many Jews not to take part in the census carried out by Quirinius in Judea. At that*

time (from 6 A.D. onwards) *the Sicarii* (the armed wing of Zealotry) *ordered a conspiracy against those wishing to accept Roman subjugation and used all means to fight them as enemies, depriving them of all their havings and animals and setting fire to their homes*" (Bellum VII 254).

*"And yet they had taken their name, **Zealots**, from their pretended zeal through which they aspired to virtue, both when they laughed, with **their beastly nature**, at the **victims of their abuse**, and considered as good the worst of all evils. However, **they all had the death they deserved**, as God gave to each one a just punishment; in fact **all the scourges that could ever hit a man fell upon them until their last moment of life, and they died through the most atrocious of torments of all kinds**" (ibid VII 270/2).*

But this information - quoted in the prologue of Book VIII of "Antiquities" and in a distant memory of Josephus recalled in Book VII of "The Jewish War" - do not find confirmation in the events dating back to the time of "Jesus" and his brothers the "Apostles". Two of them, **John and James**, in the Gospels are called "**Boanergés**", that is to say "sons of wrath"; they were ideologically prone to **setting fire to villages** of their enemies (cfr Lk 9,53). The copyists of "Antiquities" - the most detailed work written by the Jewish historian and the one with the most historical references dating back to this period - removed from Book VIII all the bloody acts carried out by the national liberation movement and reported by Josephus; this was done in order to avoid highlighting the names of the guerilla leaders subjected to torture when captured by the Romans: names which corresponded to those of the heroic evangelical saints.

This void, which constitutes an incredible lack of an account of the events dating back to the time of Christ, is indirectly highlighted by the Jewish historian Philo of Alexandria. The latter, after stating in his treatise "**De Providentia**" (II 107) that he frequently went on pilgrimages to the Temple of Jerusalem to offer sacrifices to God (without touching upon the existence of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, let alone their "miracles"), in his work "**Legatio ad Gaium**" (XXXVIII par. 299-303) describes the opinion expressed by Herod Agrippa I when describing Pontius Pilate's behaviour to Gaius Caligula, accusing the Prefect of being unable to repress the Zealot guerilla warfare:

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

The reference to the revolutionary Zealots is clearly evident and there is also clear proof of the powerlessness of the Prefect, who had the command over a limited military force, unable to contrast the numerous subversive raids taking place everywhere in a Palestine in which the "Nationalist Fanatic" Party had the majority.

**Philo** was a wealthy, privileged Jew and mentioned this piece of information regarding the recent past after the unfortunate Jewish Legation before Gaius Caligula dating back to 40 A.D. But **the Jewish philosopher**, who had profound knowledge of the Old Testament, **in his works makes no mention of the Advent of a Jewish divine "Messiah"** (Christòs) by the name of Jesus who, according to the Gospels, lived in the same land at the same time, author of extraordinary miracles, **acclaimed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem as King of the Jews** and by them called "**son of David**" ... nor knows anything about the crucifixion ordered by the Jewish Sanhedrin and Prefect Pontius Pilate.

The crucifixions were public executions - decided by the authorities representing the Emperor - aimed at dissuading anyone wishing to emulate the deeds of the condemned; nevertheless **the charges**, in the form of written reports, **had to be recorded in the Acts of the Sanhedrin** as events affecting the Jews, their religion and their priests directly, but **in the works of Josephus there is no mentioning of the Sanhedrin in the first century**, until the "martyrdom" of James the Minor in 62 A.D.

It seems as though the Supreme Jewish Tribunal, constitutional organ of the Sacred Law, did not exist during this period, in contrast with the "Acts of the Apostles" and the Gospels which both speak about its industriousness.

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

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

In fact - according to the "Acts" of a real Jewish Sanhedrin - during the "Trial of Jesus" the Jews would have never cursed themselves or their sons as reported in the Gospels (Matthew 27,25):

*"All the people answered: let the blood (of Jesus) be on us and on our children!".*

An eminent Jewish priest and noble such as Josephus - descendant of the Hasmoneans (on his mother's side) and of the aristocratic High Priests (on his father's side) - would have never accepted this paradox as being truthful, and the same goes for the Jews of the time and of today: after having praised their divine "Messiah", the Hebrews crucify him and curse themselves for eternity. If the event had absurdly occurred, it would have been of such gravity that the historian and priest, loyal to his creed, would have mentioned it in his chronicles.

**Apart from the period between 19 and 36 A.D.**, "Jewish Antiquities" reports in detail all the appointments and substitutions of the High Priests of the Temple who presided over the Council, whose only resolution (until 62 A.D.) is that regarding James, brother of Jesus. In effect Josephus dated the Jewish annales availing himself of the names of the High Priests of the Temple, just like Cornelius Tacitus who dated the annales of Rome by using the names of the Consuls.

*"After the death of Herod and of his son Archelaus **the constitution became aristocratic and the High Priests were designated** (by Rome) **to lead the nation**" (Ant. XX 251).*

So one must ask themselves: why did the historian pass on to us a series of names - **all of which have a patronymic** - of High Priests of the Temple of Jerusalem who presided over the Sanhedrin, without explaining the "acts" carried out by this organ? This observation brings us to a conclusion: the ideologists of Jesuit Christianity were forced to eliminate all the references and quotations from the true Acts of the Sanhedrin, from the death of Herod the Great to the "martyrdom of James the Minor", in order to place these resolutions - ideologically falsified by the scribes - in "Acts of the Apostles" and in the Gospels avoiding evident contradictions between the sanctified characters and critical historical analyses which would have revealed the true identity and deeds of these men.

Yet the most serious aspect was represented by "**trial of Jesus**", especially for the way in which it was conceived by the evangelists: a trial against the Jewish Messiah accused by the Sanhedrin of having proclaimed himself King of the Jews. If such a sensational fact had been true, it **would inevitably have been mentioned by the Jewish historian** as his parents would surely have been present at the bloody "via crucis" and crucifixion held in public. Therefore all the

Sanhedrin's interventions should have been reported by the historians in "Jewish Antiquities", **but the lack of a reference to the most important of them all, that is to say the "trial of Jesus", demonstrates the falsity of the trial itself** and inevitably disavows the credibility of the Gospels. This is why **all the Acts of the true Sanhedrin** mentioned by Josephus **had to be eliminated**, as if they had no impact on first century Jewish history. In fact, as confirmation of what we have just stated and as reported above, **the Christian scribes** who invented the "Testimonium Flavianum" **could not allow Josephus to declare that the Sanhedrin charged Jesus** but limited themselves to a vague **"... he was accused by our principal men ..."**.

During the research aimed at identifying the sons of Judas the Galilean (at the end of the Jewish War) history records the name of another important character who, according to the Gospels, died but was raised from the dead by Jesus: **Lazarus** (Eleazar in Aramaic). In reality a powerful Zealot leader sheltered in the fortress of Masada under Roman siege, man famous for having managed to convince about one thousand rebels (including family members), through the promise of the resurrection of their souls, to commit suicide in order to avoid being raped and enslaved by the legionaries. The "resurrection of Lazarus" in the Gospel of John aims at demonstrating that the rebirth of the body, not only that of the soul, is possible for Christians. The historian (Bellum II 447) states that (Lazarus) **"Eleazar...was son of Jairus, relative of Menahem and descendant of Judas of Gamala"** (ibid VII 253).

Let's make sure that we have fully understood: descendant of Judas of Gamala, son of Jairus and relative of Menahem, **"youngest son of Judas the Galilean"**. How are these blood relations related to each other? We have looked at all the possible answers and we have only found one which is valid: one of the daughters of Judas of Gamala married Jairus and gave birth to **"Eleazar", grandson of Judas of Gamala**. But, being daughter of Judas the Galilean, she was therefore a sister of John, who (as described in the seventh and eighth studies) for less than a year was the Jeshua, King of the Jews.

But now we must inevitably ask ourselves another question of fundamental importance: how did Josephus know that Lazarus was the son of Jairus? Was Lazarus a descendant of Judas the Galilean and related to Menahem, son of the same Judas? Why does the historian evoke such hateful memories of Judas the Galilean and his descendants in his works? The accusations made against the powerful subversive leader and his sons are much too frequent; **he knows them all** and points out their ancestry.

There are many possible answers, but **only one is more realistic than the others: Josephus**, son of (bar) Matthias, member of the most important priestly family in Jerusalem, **was related to the dynasty of the Zealot Pharisees**, Doctors of the Law (Rabbis), of **"great power"**, through his mother who descended from the Hasmoneans.

Let's carry on with the research on this basis. The historian says:

*"The excellence of our line is confirmed by our belonging to a priestly order. I am not only sprung from a sacerdotal family in general, but from the first of the twenty-four classes; and as among us there is not only a considerable difference between one family of each course and another, I am of the chief family of that first course also; nay, further, by my mother I am of the royal blood; for the children of Asmoneus (the Macabees), from whom that family was derived, had both the office of the high priesthood, and the dignity of a king, for a long time together. I will accordingly set down my progenitors in order. My grandfather's father was named Simon, with the addition of Pselus: he lived at the same time with that son of Simon the high priest, who first of all the high priests was named Hyrcanus. This Simon Pselus had nine sons, one of whom was Matthias, called son of Ephlias: he married the daughter of Jonathan the high priest, which Jonathan was the first of the Asmoneus, who was high priest, and was the brother of Simon the high priest also. This Matthias had a son called Matthias Curtus, and that in the first year of the government of Hyrcanus: his son's name was Joseph, born in the ninth year of the reign of Alexandra; from Joseph Matthias was born in the tenth year of the reign of Archelaus (6 A.D., year of Quirinius's census); as was I born to Matthias in the first year of the reign of Caius Caesar (37 A.D.)"* (Bios 1,1-5).

First his grandfather **"Joseph"**, then his father Matthias and finally him, Josephus ... but, his grandfather, "Joseph" was not by chance the "Joseph called Caiaphas" who, according to the Gospels, as High Priest of the Sanhedrin, did all he could to accuse "Jesus"? Just like his grandson, the historian Josephus, repeated the accusations against Judas the Galilean and his sons. The writer defines his **"line"** as being one of **"excellence ... the first of twenty-four classes"** ... yes, **"Joseph called Caiaphas"** seems to have all the requirements needed to be the grandfather of Josephus and thus son-in-law of Ananas, whose sons all became High Priests. In fact, when the youngest, also named Ananas, was killed by revolutionaries, Josephus was desperate, as if he had lost a dear friend or relative. Ananas, according to the Gospels, was the father-in-law of Caiaphas: they were both important accusers of the Saviour.

Traditionally, the priests of the Temple married the daughters of other priests of the same caste in order to strengthen their own dynastic and political power. They knew and associated with Judas of Gamala and later his sons; the latter were **"powerful Doctors"** (Rabbis), descendants of the Hasmoneans, pretenders to the "throne of David", but belonging to an extremist pro-independence religious faction which other Zealot Pharisees and anti-conservatives joined. **From the time of the census onwards** they had antithetical political and religious positions and were outright enemies who often killed one another: that is to say, the revolutionary nationalists against the pro-Roman conservatives.

The grandfather and father of Josephus were surely present at the Sanhedrin when "Jesus" was crucified ... but someone prior to us, taking cognizance of the historian's belonging to the most aristocratic priestly class in Jerusalem, must have drawn the same conclusion. The grey eminences were aware of the fact that **if Caiaphas had been Josephus's grandfather**, such a finding **would have forced the historian to report** in detail the Act of the Sanhedrin regarding the **"trial against Jesus"** - which we know did not take place - **but such a "void" would have contradicted the Gospels** (which speak about the trial in-depth and very clearly). The inexistent "trial of Jesus", due to the superficial manner in which it was created by the evangelists, ran the risk of being uncovered: the obscure prelates knew that the sentence was never issued. The prelates were certain that a subject of the Empire leading the seditious rebels against the sovereignty of Rome, after overwhelming the military garrison stationed in Jerusalem and proclaiming himself King of the Province of Judea (territory belonging to the Emperor), would have provoked the reaction of the Roman legions. Therefore, after being defeated and captured, he would have not, under any circumstance, been brought before a court: the Legatus Augusti, a magistrate with bestowed hegemonical powers, would have crucified the Zealot leader immediately after his capture.

The subtle minds of the scribes of God therefore decided to prevent the devastating truth from being unveiled through the identification of the family of the High Priest "Joseph called Caiaphas": the evangelical accuser of the Jewish Messiah. They therefore found a solution, or rather ... they attempted to do so as we are about to verify.

The fact that Josephus descended from an old and powerful family of priests prompted us to investigate and discover (there is a lot of evidence) that the historian was one of the grandchildren of **"Joseph, who was called Caiaphas"**, proclaimed High Priest by the Prefect Valerius Gratus in 18 A.D. (Ant. XVIII 35). Caiaphas was the accuser of Jesus Christ in the Gospels and, as just stated, someone else, many centuries before us, arrived at this conclusion and took steps in order to hide his ancestry ... yet did so badly.

The genealogy of the great priestly line of the Josephus, dating back to over a century and a half prior to the historian himself, contains a very grave error regarding his grandfather "Joseph". According to Bios (1,1-5) the latter was born ...

**"Joseph, born in the ninth year of the reign of Alexandra** (that is to say 68 B.C.); **from Joseph, Matthias** (the father of Josephus) **was born in the tenth year of the reign of Archelaus** (that is to say 6 A.D., year of Quirinius's census); **as was I born to Matthias in the first year of the reign of Caius Caesar** (37 A.D.)."

If this generational succession were true, Josephus's grandfather would have had a child at the age of 74 ... but this absurdity is proven wrong by an event which, along with others, allows us to clarify the matter:

**"When Herod the Great assumed royal power (37 B.C.) he killed Ircanus and all the other members of the Sanhedrin apart from Samaia"** (Ant. XIV 175).

One of the members of the Sanhedrin executed by King Herod in 37 B.C. - for having dared to accuse the latter of killing Ezechias, father of Judas the Galilean (Herod risked being stoned and did not forget this: Ant. XIV 167-168) - was certainly an ancestor of the **"priestly line of excellence"** to which Josephus belonged (dating back to the second century B.C.). **But this ancestor, who obviously had children, could not be his last grandfather "Joseph" born in 68 B.C., because his ancestry would have been broken and the future author of "Antiquities" would not have been born:** this is why **there is something wrong here.**

It is evident that there is a "gap" separating his ancestor **"Joseph", born in 68 B.C.**, and Joseph, his real grandfather; but the mistake was not made by Josephus: it is impossible for him to not have known his grandfather's age and to not have linked and remembered the massacre of the entire Sanhedrin which, inevitably, involved his ancestors' family, the most famous priestly line in Jerusalem. This mistake is intentional and is the result of a "mystical elimination" within his genealogy described in "Autobiography": a manipulation carried out by those who were ideologically interested in not having "Joseph who was called Caiaphas" (the High Priest) be Josephus's grandfather.

The motive which persuaded the scribes to eliminate the patronymic of the High Priest "Joseph called Caiaphas" - he who **accused the Messiah Jesus and had him condemned to death** - was that of preventing researchers from identifying Caiaphas's family.

We must point out that the name **"Joseph called Caiaphas"** corresponds to that of his **grandfather Joseph**; the grandfather of the Jewish historian had **a child at the incredible age of 74**; moreover, the patronymic of "Joseph called Caiaphas" is eliminated in both the patristic and historical documentation. All this information is absurd and - after highlighting and explaining that it was invented by Christians in order to hide the blood relation between Caiaphas and Josephus - clearly proves that the scribes tampered with historical texts in order to safeguard Christian doctrine.

Our scribe **Josephus**, in compliance with the duties deriving from his role of historian, **passed on to posterity all the names of the High Priests of the Sanhedrin who presided over the Sanhedrin** and who, for the Jewish world of the time, were the equivalent of today's Pope for Catholics. **This was done by mentioning**, as obligatory, **the names of their fathers** ... apart from one: **"Joseph who was called Caiaphas"** (Ant. XVIII 35).

This "way" of identifying (through an official historical reference) the High Priest is unique and does not belong the Jewish tradition (which called for both his first name and patronymic) nor part of the custom adopted by the author for **all the other High Priests**, whose first names had to be passed on to posterity along with their respective patronymics, all the more important if we consider the prestige of the the office held.

If we do not consider this "gap", we would arrive at the inevitable conclusion which **"mathematically"** excludes Josephus's grandfather from being the accuser of "Jesus", because if he had been **74** years old in **6 A.D.**, he would have been **103** at the time of the accusation ... according to the Gospels; while according to historical documentation he was **106** years old (and here the scribe of God stumbles) because **Caiaphas** was dismissed by Lucius Vitellius in 36 A.D. at Easter time. For the mystical manipulators the very old age of the High Priest of the Temple aimed at drawing the attention of overly indiscrete and meticulous historians away from the true identity of "Joseph called Caiaphas": the accuser of Jesus ...

And, strangely enough, the **"Nuovo Dizionario Biblico"** (New Biblical Dictionary), edited by Renè Pache, Edit. Centro Biblico (of the Holy See), year 1993, under the entry **"Sanhedrin"** there is a long description of the functions of this body **mentioning all of Josephus's quotations apart from one**: the above-mentioned passage reporting the execution of all the High Priests of the Sanhedrin ordered by Herod the Great after **37 B.C.** (Ant. XIV 175) following his appointment as King by the Romans. Even the previous **"Dizionario Biblico"** (Biblical Dictionary), Ed. Studium of 2 April 1963, edited by the famous Catholic exegete Mons. Francesco Spadafora, does not mention - at the entry "Sanhedrin" - this passage; this excerpt is the most important of all as it makes reference to the execution of **"all the members of the Sanhedrin"**, a singular event in contrast with Jewish tradition and Law.

Let's reflect a moment: if Caiaphas, Jesus Christ's most obstinate accuser (according to the Gospels) had really been the historian's grandfather, you can imagine what a detailed description of the life of the "Son of God" the writer would have been passed on to us. Josephus would not have been a "Jewish historian", but rather a "Jesuit Christian historian", being that both his grandfather and father touched with their own hands, in Jerusalem, the eagerly awaited "Messiah Jesus" ... and they would have surely told him the story as a child, especially if we consider that after accusing and crucifying him they saw:

**"And suddenly, the veil of the Sanctuary was torn in two from top to bottom, the earth quaked, the rocks were split, the tombs opened and the bodies of many holy people rose from the dead and these, after his resurrection, came out of the tombs, entered the holy city and appeared to a number of people"** (Mt 27,51/53).

According to the deceitful mystics, the shock of seeing zombies walking in the dark through the streets of Jerusalem should have forced "Caiaphas", his son Matthias and later his grandson (Josephus) to repent and convert to Jesuit Christianity. As proof of the fact that today the "grey eminences" are still involved in this obscure millenary task, we must point out that no film on the life and passion of Christ has ever shown scenes the horror of decomposed bodies strolling in the dark among the people through the backstreets and squares of the Holy City when He died.

The copyists could not resign themselves to the fact that the historian made no mention of the chronicle of these events and did not convert to Christianity; but, most important of all ... **the lack of a chronicle concerning these resounding facts proves that they did not take place.**

Yes, this is undoubtedly the motive behind the genealogical manipulation carried out by the historian: **"Joseph called Caiaphas"** was Josephus's grandfather, but with such a nickname he could not appear in the historical genealogy reported by Josephus in "Autobiography" due to the conclusions which researchers would have drawn. Instead, in the Gospels we only know the High Priest by his nickname: "Caiaphas".

But "Caiaphas" was not used as a person's name in the Judea of the time (an important detail): it was simply a title meaning "rock" and meant nothing on its own. On the other hand, "Joseph called Rock" - as reported by history - was a complete name with a precise meaning ... but, as we have seen, it had **no patronymic**.

The Jewish historian's **grandfather's name is censored in the Gospels, and there is no trace of his nickname in "Autobiography" and of his patronymic in "Antiquities"**.

In his work "Historia Ecclesiastica" Eusebius was the first to adopt the stratagem of interrupting the ancestry of Joseph called Caiaphas in order to prevent the identification of the High Priest who, according to the Gospels, accused the Jewish Messiah: if such a serious crime **had actually been committed**, Josephus would have been forced to give a full description of the event and include an account of the trial called by the Sanhedrin.

If Joseph had reported this Act, it would have inevitably contained the name of the High Priest Joseph called Caiaphas along with his patronymic (as he did with regard to the trial called by the High Priest **Ananus, son of (bar) Ananus**, against James brother of Jesus) and, as in the case of Ananus against James, the historian would have also highlighted Caiaphas's accusation against Jesus and the subsequent sentencing, torturing and death of the Messiah: a resounding Jewish event which would have confirmed the evangelical writings. Instead, we all know that in the historian's chronicles there is no reference to such vital details ... and Eusebius was perfectly aware of this "historical gap". But in order to prove the existence of Jesus Christ, in "Historia Ecclesiastica" the Bishop dared to draw up and insert an elusive and incorrect version of the Testimonium Flavianum attributed to Josephus and carefully avoids reporting any precise, significant information and limits himself to reporting anachronistical, unbelievable information regarding Pilate: this is nothing but a manifestation of Christian faith in contrast with Judaism.

At this point in our study there is still one piece of information lacking: the manner in which Jesus's fourth brother died.

## Part II

### Joseph, Jesus's fourth brother

*"Isn't this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses (Joseph) and Judah and Simon? Aren't his sisters here with us?" (Mk 6,3);*

*"Is not this the son of the carpenter? Isn't his mother called Mary, and his brothers, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" (Mt 13,55).*

The names we have just read in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew correspond to the four brothers of "Jesus"; in our studies we have demonstrated that the latter was called "John", while "Jesus" (Jeshua in Aramaic) was an appellative dictated by God as a divine attribute meaning "Saviour" (see eleventh study). We have managed to track down all these brothers by directly comparing all the information contained in the New Testament documents and historiography. The only brother who has yet to be traced is Joseph.

Joseph: he is the only brother who never comes onto the scene. The Gospels mention him as one of Mary's sons without going any further. There is nothing about this brother in the works of Josephus ... at least there seems to be no reference.

History records **Menahem** - thanks to the Jewish chronicler who mentions him several times - as being the **youngest son of Judas the Galilean**, the Pharisean Zealot who, as we recall, claimed the right to the throne of the Jews and promoted the census revolt of 6 A.D.

Menahem is a name which we find in "Jewish Antiquities" and, slightly modified, also in "Acts of the Apostles":

*"In the church at Antioch the following were **Prophets** and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, **Manaen**, who had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul ... So it was after fasting and prayer they laid their hands on them and sent them off" (Acts 13,1/3).*

Having verified that Saint Paul's journey to Antioch is aimless, we discover that only one of these men is the maker of deeds: *"Manaen, who had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch"*. This "reference" **forces** the historian to recall another "Manaem", described as a Prophet by the Jew in "Antiquities" and he who foretold the Kingdom to Herod the Great when the latter was still a child (Ant. XV 373).

We "must" observe that during their youth both Herod father and Herod Tetrarch son interacted with "Prophets" named "Menahem" who lived a generation apart from each other; this "accidental overlapping" is so forced that it inevitably arouses suspicion against the two prophets of "Acts" and "Antiquities" ... as if behind these names there had been a "pious" direction so as to make them seem common among the Jews of the time; but there is no evidence of the commonness of these names in the works of Josephus, apart from the name we have just mentioned ... which we also find in "Acts".

It is certain that in the first century no Jew with the culture of the conservative Pharisean scribe Josephus, shared by the Pharisean Doctor Judas the Galilean, would have ever given their son the name "Menahem", as it was the name of one of the most hated men in the Old Testament. The historian says that Menahem was a Jewish general who proclaimed himself king but was not recognized as such by his people ...

*"Menahem carried out a genocide against those of his own line, not even sparing the children and going beyond any sort of cruelty and barbarism" (Ant. IX 229/231).*

No! Judas of Gamala was a Doctor of the Law and, although a revolutionary, came from the same Pharisean school as the Jewish chronicler. The Zealot leader was educated and could not have given his son the name Menahem, which instead was fastened upon him by Josephus who saw that his behaviour was similar to that of the ancestral and ferocious biblical King Menahem, youngest son of Judas: Joseph, **who also proclaimed himself King in 66 A.D.**

The historian did not yet have the honorary surname "Flavius", which he adopted after the war; he was granted this surname by the "Gens Flavii" along with many other favours (first of all his life) received from Emperor Vespasian and his son Emperor Titus.

"Joseph" had the same name as "Josephus" (whose true Jewish name was Joseph), almost certainly relatives but surely enemies; the former was one of the hated nationalistic religious bandits described by the latter during and after the Jewish war which the historian took part in directly.

The Jew Joseph (Josephus) describes the conflict and his own interventions. Here he speaks about himself in the third person, like a chronicler reporting events experienced personally and as a protagonist, and observes himself from outside the context described; as a "hero", he is forced to mention himself frequently, therefore he cannot and does not want to be confused with the other detested "Joseph".

If the historian had used his name and thus accused himself unjustly, he could not have written the following: *"the death of the High Priest Ananias* (who he knew well) *had elated Joseph* (rather than Menahem) *and brought him to the point of ferocity"* (Bellum II 442); how could he have referred to himself as an "executioner" and "coward", insults used to describe "the other one", who has his same name and is responsible for the criminal actions described.

"Menahem" is the name to fasten upon this malefactor: a disgraceful brand name which had to be remembered in history. Moreover, if Josephus had referred to Menahem with his real name "Joseph", he would have been forced to include his patronymic: *"Joseph, son of* (bar) *Judas the Galilean"*. No! Impossible! ...His own name would have become the son of the most hated character in his works.

Therefore, so as not to be mistaken for "the other one", Josephus would have been forced to mention the name of his own father in the Jewish manner **every time he described the ferocious undertakings of Menahem: "Joseph son of** (bar) **Matthias"**. Even worse! **The historian's father, Matthias, would have been mistaken for the father of a famous assassin "executioner and coward"** by the name of "Joseph", tyrant and usurper of the throne ... or these identical names would have at least generated inextricable confusion, unacceptable for the precise historical identification of the protagonists of this event which was hateful for the writer.

No! It is better to rebaptize with the biblical name of General "Menahem" (who behaved as an *executioner and coward* with his people in order to be recognized as King) the other Joseph "powerful Doctor" who the historian knew about in detail, just like he knew about Eleazar (Lazarus) son of Jair. Both Joseph (Menahem) and Eleazar were descendants of the Doctor of the Law, Judas the Galilean, all of whom belonged to the dynasty of *"great power"*. The Jewish chronicler's account is an authentic manifestation of hatred, an emotional outburst, it is also an expression of his political and constitutional convictions; his ideology was in contrast with that of his abominable enemy who descended from a powerful priestly caste. This group aimed at reestablishing a Hasmonean-style monarchy in opposition to the priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem which had no intention of being deprived of its power and of losing its privileges.

*"In the mean time, one Manahem, the son of Judas, that was called the Galilean - who was a very cunning Doctor of the Law, and had formerly reproached the Jews under Quirinius, that after God they were subject to the Romans - took some of the men of note with him, and retired to Masada* (stronghold later occupied by his relative Eleazar bar Jair), *where he broke open King Herod's armory, and gave arms not only to his own people* (from Gamala), *but to other robbers also. These he made use of for a guard, and returned in the state of a king to Jerusalem; he became the leader of the sedition, and gave orders for continuing the siege"* (Bellum II 433-434).

*"The supporters of Eleazar rose up against Menahem and declared that it was not the case to rebel against the Romans driven by the desire for liberty and then sacrifice it to a village executioner* (not from Jerusalem) *and bear a lord who, though he should be guilty of no violence, was yet meaner than themselves"* (ibid II 443).

Joseph "Menahem" from Gamala (as he was son of Judas the Galilean), by this time leader of the Zealot national-religious movement, is a charismatic Doctor of the Integralist Law who, on his mother's side, belongs to the Hasmonean dynasty; from the time of his grandfather *"Ezechias, man of great power"* killed by Herod the Great, this line had sacrificed itself to liberating Israel from the domination of pagan Rome and the corrupt ruling castes.

He promotes and leads the revolt and, after attacking and defeating the Romans, kills his rival the High Priest Ananias; a new revolutionary Sanhedrin then recognizes him as King of the Jews.

Josephus does not speak about his investiture directly: Menahem did not receive the "chrism" of the Law as interpreted by the Jewish historian ... but certainly received, at least he did in this moment, the "chrisma" of the Law of the Zealot Pharisees, capable of conditioning through the use of force even the more moderate priests.

Before Menahem's death, the historian, disdainfully states that in September 66 A.D. the eminent Zealot, while leading his revolutionary faction, managed *"to wear the royal robes, adorned with great pomp"* (Bellum II 444).

*"Eleazar and his party* (the Captain of the Guards of the Temple, son of the High Priest Ananias killed by Menahem) *made an assault upon him in the Temple; for he went up thither to worship in a pompous manner, and dorned with Royal garments, and had his fanatical followers with him in their armor ... As for Menahem himself, he ran away to the place called Ophel, and their lay skulking in private; but they took him alive, and drew him out before them all; they then tortured him with many sorts of torments, and after all slew him, as they did by those that were captains under him also, and particularly by the principal instrument of his tyranny, whose name was Apsalom"* (ibid 440-446).

In the narrated events our learned writer considered the absolute monarchs who seized all power - both spiritual (high priesthood) and kingly - through violence as "Tyrants".

As we have seen, this power was short-lived as the priestly aristocracy managed to dethrone Menahem through a military coup.

Joseph "Menahem" son of Judas - born after the 6 A.D. census - during the third decade of the first century was not recognized as being a charismatic leader capable, through to his prophecies, of convincing men to risk their lives for a national religious ideal; therefore he was not the protagonist of deeds remembered by history or by the "holy writings" as in the case of a "prophet". As verified in the first study, this is the reason why his name appears only in the list of "Jesus's brothers", but not among the "Apostles".

Through the published studies we have verified that **John's (Jeshùà) brothers** were: **Judas** called Theudas, **Simon** called Kefaz, and **James** ... all of whom **corresponded to the sons of Judas the Galilean**, who had already been killed by the Romans; **the only living son was Joseph** ... But being that "Menahem" was the youngest son of Judas the Galilean, this means that **"Menahem" and Joseph were the same person**.

The young Joseph (Menahem) was educated at the Pharisean school in order to become a Doctor of the Law, while his older brothers - just like their grandfather Ezechias and their father Judas - were conducting a mortal struggle. Starting with John "Jesus", he saw them perish, one by one, due to the intensification of the guerilla warfare resulting from Rome's decision to reconstitute the Province of Judea annexed to Syria (44 A.D.) and suppress the large kingdom reunified by King Agrippa I, subjecting the entire Palestinian territory to the rule of Roman Procurators.

Later on Joseph, who by this time was more mature, stood aloof waiting for the right time to achieve the aim pursued by all the members of his dynasty: that of becoming King of the Jews. The execution of the **High Priest Ananias** and his presence within the Temple where he prayed while wearing a *"royal garment"*, brings us to the conclusion that Menahem, besides being King, was also the High Priest who replaced Ananias. Josephus makes no mention of this, but we understand why; as he belonged to a conservative priestly class, hostile towards the anti-slavery Zealots, it is obvious that he never recognized the legitimacy of the investiture Judas the Galilean's son (his ideological enemy) as "Messiah".

Joseph "Menahem" managed to become King but his reign was short-lived; in fact, as we have just read, he succumbed to Eleazar, the priest who was the Commander of the Guards of the Temple and son of the High Priest Ananias whose execution was ordered by Menahem himself.

Joseph, "called Menahem" by the historical chronicler, was the last of five brothers, men belonging to a Jewish dynasty which Josephus often referred to as being "of great power" ... A "royal blood" line which claimed the right to sit on the throne of the Jews which had belonged to the Hasmoneans, who were overthrown by the Romans and replaced with Herod and his descendants; this royal line involved itself, to the point of martyrdom, in a war against Roman domination within a historical context which was very dangerous and extremely difficult for the Jews.

*"After the death of Aristobolus (7 B.C.) Herod no longer assigned the pontificate to **descendants of the sons of Hasmoneans**. Even Archelaus, with regard to the appointment of the High Priests, followed the same policy and, after him, **the Romans who took over the government of the Jews** (6 A.D.)" (Ant. XX 249).*

After 6 A.D. there were two periods in which during the first century we witness an imperial power vacuum: the first lasted from the summer of 35 to Easter of 36 A.D., while Rome was involved in the war against the Parthians; and the second from 66 to 70 A.D., during the war against the Jews. It was only during these two intervals that the Romans were unable to prevent the descendants of the sons of the Hasmoneans from being appointed to the role of High Priest. The Hasmonean line finally died out in 73 A.D. when the Romans took Masada, the last stronghold of the Zealots, who were led by Judas the Galilean's grandson: Eleazar bar Jair (Lazarus son of Jair).

From a comparative analysis of the events narrated in the Gospels with those that actually took place, we discovered, right from the start, that the most important interpreters of the "Holy History" were the Zealot leaders of a Jewish integralist party, sons of Judas the Galilean. His eldest son John managed to ascend the throne of the Jews who recognized him as their King and Saviour (Jeshua for less than a year). After his death at the hands of the Romans, his brothers led the patriotic guerilla warfare: Simon, James and Judas, leaders of the National Liberation Movement which aimed at freeing their land from Roman rule, were driven by an ideal which the historian defines:

*"... **the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy, novelty unknown until this time**, Judas the Galilean was the author. These men agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty, and say that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord. They also do not value dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the deaths of their relations and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man "lord". Individuals who are false and liars, **pretending to be inspired by God** (Prophets), conspiring disorders and revolutions, drove the people towards religious fanaticism ..." (Ant. XVIII 10,23).*

The true "primitive Christianity", more appropriately called "primitive Messianism", was represented by the Zealot Messianist Movement, or rather the "**fourth philosophy, the novelty unknown until this time**", as it was called by the historian. The "fourth philosophy" - the doctrine created by the Zealot Pharisees Judas the Galilean and Saddoc - postulated a social and economic overturning providing for the abolition of slavery and the elimination of the pro-Roman, corrupt, conservative and aristocratic Jewish priestly castes aimed at preserving their privileges.

A doctrine which was the foundation of the most popular Jewish party and aimed at freeing the Palestinian territories in order to here rebuild the ancient Kingdom of Israel: a faith accepted by the majority of the Jews including those of the diaspora. According to the Zealots - on the basis of the "**Law of the Ancient Fathers**" - a leader, consecrated (Oiled) as King, thanks to the will and help of God (as in the case of King David), would have led and reunified the divided and scattered Jewish people under a new alliance (which included the Essenes) in order to crush the pagan invaders. A divine "Messiah" would have saved the chosen people of Yahweh from the power of Rome: a "Dominator of the World" whose kingdom would have lasted for eternity. The conservative Sadduceans and Pharisees were hostile toward the movement as they were against radical political, social and economic change resulting in the loss of their privileges. In order to prevent such change, the aristocratic priestly classes, along with the Herodian regents, favoured the ferocious Roman repression of the Jewish National Liberation Movement within which the Zealots represented the most extreme and popular ideological forefront up until the final military catastrophe.

For three generations the Zealot Pharisees and Zealot Essenes conducted dangerous guerilla warfare and were used to putting their life at risk ... they accepted this with courage and the contempt for pain was moulded into their struggle against the pagan dominators. There was a stoic acceptance of death based on the belief in the rebirth of the soul; an integralist and extremist religious indoctrination which had its roots in the heroic times of the Maccabees who, through their sacrifice, had freed from Greek Macedonian domination the land promised to the Jews by Yahweh. In Book XVIII of Jewish Antiquities Josephus, when speaking about the "fourth philosophy", says the following about the Zealots at par. 24:

*"And since this immovable resolution of theirs is well known to a great many, I shall speak no further about that matter; nor am I afraid that any thing I have said of them should be disbelieved, but rather fear, that **what I have said is beneath the resolution they show when they undergo pain**" (Ant. XVIII 24).*

John of Gamala, called the Nazirean (the eldest son of Judas the Galilean), and his brothers demonstrated through their actions that they accepted the risks that they were running and were psychologically prepared, for they knew that if they looked death in the eyes and did not bat an eyelash even in the moment of the most painful torture, such behaviour could be used as an ideological weapon and emulated by the young in order to achieve an objective that later revealed itself to be utopic. Josephus passes on to us:

*"...all had great admiration for their resoluteness and for their fortitude, or blind fanaticism call it what you will...they **received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with the soul that in a manner rejoiced under them**".*

**Ezechias, Judas the Galilean, John the Nazireus, Simon called Kefaz, James, Judas called Theudas, Joseph called Menahem and Eleazar bar Jair**: every member of this dynasty of Lords, descendants of the Hasmoneans, fought and took risks for a noble patriotic religious objective. They were in their own land, the Romans were the invaders ... therefore the pagans had to be driven out. But their obstinate coherence was in conflict with an Empire at the height of its power, capable of striking fear into all the bordering kingdoms which, in this period, were careful not to provoke Rome. The Zealots fought against this power and lost ... and along with them all the Jews.

The two Jewish "religious philosophies", that of the Essenes and that of the Zealots, were both against slavery and open to all social classes; they forged an ideological alliance in order to mobilize the Jews and rebuild the Kingdom of Israel. The two factions remained united from the 6 A.D. war of the census to the 70 A.D. destruction of the Holy City and of the Temple. This was a period of massacres characterized by hundreds of thousands of deaths, yet there is no trace of this bloodshed in the Gospels.

But there could be no trace of the true story - regarding the constant rebellion of a people who did not wish to submit itself to pagan domination - in the "Holy Texts" as it would have brought about the collapse of the Christian doctrine of "salvation for eternal life".

**According to the Gospels**, in this historical context - characterized by a nationalist Holy War which saw the bloody repression of revolts, famines and crucifixions - a group of twelve Jews and their Teacher Jesus Christ, indifferent to the bloodshed in their land, wandered around Palestine astonishing the crowds through speeches and miraculous deeds. An impossible Jewish Messiah, Son of God, unaware of the massacre being carried out against his fellow countrymen by the pagans: the invaders (kittim) of the Land promised by his Father ("Abba") to the chosen people.

*"Prompted by hatred and fury, the Roman soldiers enjoyed themselves by crucifying prisoners in various positions, and there were so many of them that there was not enough space for the crosses and not enough crosses for the victims"* (Bellum V 451).

Just after the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.), the Jews rebelled against the will of Caesar Augustus who ordered the division of the Kingdom in Tetrarchies assigned to the children of a half-Jewish monarch; unlike their father, these tetrarchs were not recognized as leaders by the Israelites. The violent rebellion turned into a full-scale war, thus forcing Rome to send into these territories imperial legions led by the Legatus Augusti pro-Praetore Publius Quintilius Varus in order to defeat the insurgents, two thousand of whom were crucified in public as warning against those wishing to emulate their feats. Nevertheless, from this time onwards the Zealots, who constituted the majority of the population, refused to submit to Roman rule.

The Christian scribes - who in later eras compiled the Gospels and the "Acts of the Apostles" - were careful not to have their heroes witness the feats of the national liberation movement active at the time, despite the fact these men were "Saints" of Jewish extraction.

According to the "historical" datings - tampered with by the Church after conquering absolute power in the fourth century A.D. - almost all the Apostles and evangelists saw the destruction of Jerusalem carried out by Titus, but none of them report the martyrdom by crucifixion of many Jews. A historical void in sharp contrast with first century historical events: silence deliberately made coherent through the lack of any reference to the existence of Christian Jesuits in the chronicles reported by imperial scribes, direct witnesses to the events of this period. This is the reason which prompted, after one thousand years, the scribes of the Abbey of Montecassino to falsify Cornelius Tacitus's work "Annales" by inventing the very absurd massacre of a large number of Christians, who in 64 A.D. were crucified, smeared with oil and set on fire like torches in order to light up a nonsensical and incredible Neronian "Bacchanalia". The calligraphers of God, when drawing up such silliness, did not realize that they would have been forced to rewrite ex novo all the vast "tradition" spread throughout the libraries of the Christian world in order to correct the contradictions arising from the lack of testimony on the Jesuit martyrs on the part of Roman historians, evangelists, Apostles and successors. as we have demonstrated in the previous studies.

This new representation of the Jewish Messiah gave birth to Christianity after the death of Josephus; an ideological image which, in the following centuries, evolved from the primitive Messianism concerning the *"fourth philosophy, a novelty unknown until this time"* (as reported by the Jewish historian), as a result of the genocide of the Jews perpetrated in three wars (from 70 to 135 A.D.) by the dominators who repressed all the Jewish revolts. Over a period of two generations the Romans caused more than one million deaths, the destruction of all the cities and most important villages in Judea, practically emptying it of its inhabitants, without taking into consideration the enormous number of slaves taken and the subsequent collapse of the slave market. The imperial power of Rome crushed whoever refused to submit to its domination, therefore a part of the surviving Jews, starting with the Jews of the diaspora residing in the Provinces, decided to transform the concept of Messiah "Dominator of the World" into that of Messiah "Saviour of the World". The new doctrine was created by the Essene Jews of Egypt who adopted the "divine Logos", which less than a century earlier had been conceived by the philosopher Philo of Alexandria, the most influential representative of the numerous Jewish community in what, at the time, was the second largest city of the Roman Empire and the most advanced from a scientific and philosophical point of view.

The elaboration of the "Logos" - embodied in the "Messiah Son of God" who, as such, would have "guaranteed" salvation and eternal life to its followers - took place after the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple by the Romans. The Essenes began the historical development of the Jewish "Messiah Saviour" whose evolution was characterized by various contrasting evangelical representations, thus making it necessary to convene numerous Councils throughout the fourth century (starting with the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D.) which had as their objective that of resolving the Christological controversies concerning the "substance" of the divinity of the "Saviour". The decisive Council, called in Ephesus in 431 A.D., decreed that the Virgin Mary, Mother of God *"Theotokos"*, had generated the Logos which "resided" in the man Christ "Son of God", despite the fact that He was already God *"consubstantial with the Father from the beginning of time"*. Whoever is capable of understanding this is a genius.

The Jewish holocaust perpetrated by the Romans was the dramatic conclusion of the Zealot people's struggle against their own Ancestral law; they were convinced of the Advent of a Messiah chosen by God and capable of massacring the most powerful army in the world. A continuous conflict waged by God's "chosen people" against the ruling Empire: struggle which saw the descendants of the Hasmonians lead the Zealots against the legions and auxiliaries of the Roman cohorts. A sad "epic" perfectly compatible with the true events of those years, reported (as seen in the previous studies) mainly by Josephus and Tacitus, but confirmed, despite the more reductive descriptions, also by Philo of Alexandria, Suetonius and Cassius Dio.

Emilio Salsi

[ go back ]