



GOSPELS and HISTORY

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

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

LANGUAGES  

Paul of Tarsus, an invented super Apostle. Here is the evidence

Part I: summary

*"Now I am going to tell you a mystery: **we are not all going to fall asleep**, but we are all going to be changed, instantly, in the twinkling of an eye, when the last trumpet sounds. The trumpet is going to sound, and then **the dead will be raised imperishable**, and we shall be changed, because this perishable nature of ours must put on imperishability, this mortal nature must put on immortality. **And after this perishable nature has put on imperishability and this mortal nature has put on immortality, then will the words of scripture come true: Death is swallowed up in victory**" (I Corinthians 15,51-54).*

Saint Paul (like Saint Peter) in the holy Christian texts is described as having extraordinary and divine miracle powers and, in the case of Paul, these powers even exceeded those of Jesus. He also raised the dead (Acts 20,9-10), healed the crippled (Acts 14,8-10) and whoever was suffering, without even being present, through a sort of "tele-miracle" on the basis of an exclusive patent given to him thanks to the will of God:

*"So remarkable were the miracles worked by God at Paul's hands that **hankkerchiefs or aprons which had touched him were taken to the sick, and they were cured of their illnesses, and the evil spirits came out of them**" (Ac 19,11-12).*

The Apostles are characters who are only mentioned in the Gospels and in the Apologetic writings of the founding Fathers of Christianity; that is to say, a doctrine which was created to attract followers thanks to the illusion of the resurrection of one's body after death.

The question to be asked is whether Saint Saul Paul really existed and (as in the case of the other Apostles) verify if this figure is just simply ideological representation of a doctrine which must be "incarnated" by men chosen and inspired by God. A non-believer who is going to read about this Saint Saul Paul without previously having been influenced by religious sermons will immediately realize that the "brilliant" idea of Saint Luke - which aimed at having Jesus Christ create another Apostle "post mortem" - is an absurd inconsistency, both historically, as we intend to demonstrate, and theologically, as it clearly aims at revising a previous doctrine.

A God, to redeem humanity from sin, becomes man and subjects himself to a passion of blood and extreme suffering. After having preached, educated and chosen twelve "Apostles" with a precise mandate, and having returned to heaven, Jesus realizes that he had forgotten "something important", and therefore hurls a thunderbolt (an imitation of Jupiter) at a certain Saul Paul, blinding him, and he "verbally" **nominates another Apostle whose task it is to "update" the doctrine of the other "colleagues" that He himself had just educated**: it is a logic which can stand only if based on a millenary brainwashing.

Having nominated the twelve Apostles ...

*"Jesus sent them out, after instructing them as follows: «Do not make your way to gentile territory, and do not enter any Samaritan town; **go instead to the lost sheep of the House of Israel**»" (Mt 10,5-6).*

This nationalist "commandment", based on a mission of Jesus confined to his country (nothing would have prevented Christ from preaching wherever he pleased), had to be changed. But the modification of a doctrine could not be justified by a human need, therefore it was necessary to demonstrate that the Divinity manifested himself through another "Apostle", superior to the others, tool of His Revelation and guardian of the new "Truth" to be spread to pagan Gentiles. It was very simple: just invent "Saul Paul" and have him write a few "**letters**" which provided evidence both of his own existence and that of a new updated doctrine of the "sacrificing of the Son of God who resurrected for the salvation of the eternal life of mankind", thus demonstrating that the final Apostle (**never seen previously in the Gospels**) had truly existed.

*"«Now I want to make it clear to you, brothers, **about the Gospel that was preached to me, that it was no human message. It was not from any human being that I received it, and I was not taught it, but it came to me through a revelation of Jesus Christ**»" (Letter to the Galatians 1,11-12).*

*"«Someone is reckoned as upright not by practicing the **Law** (of Moses) **but by faith in Jesus Christ**»" (Gal 2,16).*

However, the contrast between the primitive holy scriptures and the letters, sent in a much later period, demonstrate that the Jew **Jesus had a different opinion**:

*"«Do not imagine that I have come to abolish the **Law** (of Moses) or the Prophets. **I have come not to abolish but to complete them**»" (Mt 5,17).*

The need for a second "Revelation" of Jesus resulted in the drawing up of special manuscripts, subsequent to the primitive Gospels (which were then destroyed), in order to officialize an apostolate which the spreading of a doctrine which had evolved from the original, and thus craftily create an ideological link in order to make it seem coherent from the very beginning.

"«You might as well say that if **my untruthfulness** (sic!) *makes God demonstrate his truthfulness, to his greater glory, then I should not be judged to be a sinner at all*»" (Romans 3,7).

The Gospels that we read are not the originals, but Saint Saul Paul came at an even later date, as is the case for "Acts of the Apostles".

On the basis of the datings – obtained without any evidence by experts with faith – the Apostles Mark, Matthew and John (authors of the Gospels) compiled the manuscripts long after Saul Paul had entered into action (which was immediately after the death and resurrection of the Savior). But, if Paul had truly existed, the "Evangelist Holy Apostles" would surely have reported him in their writings (as he was their "colleague" and author of marvellous acts carried out thanks to the impulse of Jesus Christ: this fact, strangely enough, does not emerge). The only evangelist who speaks about Paul is "Luke", who was neither an Apostle nor eyewitness of Christ. Only Luke has Saul Paul interact with Simon Peter and John (in "Acts of the Apostles"), both of whom do not mention in their writings the "acts" of the super Apostle thus determining a relentless contrast among the various "depositions".

Aware of the "gap" regarding the testimonies concerning Paul of Tarsus, the Church attempted to fill it by means of a vague reference in the "Letters of Peter"; but being that these letters were substantiated by an imaginary Polycarpus Bishop of Smirne, who in turn was "substantiated" by an inexistent "Ireneus of Lyon" (see fifth study on Saint John), these writings represent an artless mystification. In fact, Polycarpus is mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea over two centuries later in "Historia Ecclesiastica" (IV 15, 1-43) where it is said that the Bishop was martyred under **Lucius Verus**, co-Emperor (from 161 to 169 A.D.) along with Marcus Aurelius. On the contrary, according to Ireneus of Lyon ("Adversus Haereses" III 3,4) Polycarpus was martyred in 155 A.D. under Antoninus Pius. Saint Jerome also cites Polycarpus in "De illustribus viris": **this is all attested by scribes in the late Middle Ages.**

The total lack of textual references (which we have cross-compared) concerning the astounding "acts" of Christ's successors and those of the early Fathers is grossly superficial and the scribes who invented Christian mythology are to be held responsible for this.

Saint Saul Paul never existed as a person (we are about to demonstrate this with the help of history): it was only an ideology, "incarnated" by a man who was "Apostle and disciple of Jesus", as there was need for a political and religious solution for those Jews of the Diaspora whose existence in the provinces of the Roman Empire had become extremely difficult because they belonged to a fundamentalist and nationalistic faith which forced them not to submit themselves to any sort of doctrine, "Owner" or "Lord", apart from one's own God: "Yahweh". It was an imposed ideology deriving from the political and military evolution characterized by the atrocious defeat of the Yahwist patriots, with over a million of them killed in the wars against Titus and Hadrian; it was therefore **demanding by a Jewish religious faction** which decided to revise Zealot Messianism - on the basis of opportunistic pragmatism adapted to the times - through the revision of the Messianic prophecies of the Ancestral Law and by opening up to pagan cults of "salvation" after death, to the point of obtaining the grace of rising with an incorruptible body. In conclusion, a political anti-semitic doctrine in favour of the domination of Rome is founded ... **by order of God:**

"Everyone is to obey the governing authorities, because there is no authority except from God and so whatever authorities exist have been appointed by God. So anyone who disobeys an authority is rebelling against God's ordinance; and rebels must expect to receive the condemnation they deserve" (Romans 13);

"...you pay tribute also; for they are the ministers of God attending continually to this very thing" (Rm 13);

"Slaves, obey your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling" (Eph 6,5).

In the first century the Jewish sects (officially recognized) only believed in the immortality of the soul and not in the "resurrection of the flesh"; one of these sects - the Sadduceans - did not even believe in the former. For this fundamental ideological reason, the **"Acts of the Apostles" and the "Gospels"**, subsequently re-adapted, **constitute an outright accusation against the Jews.** Peter and Paul continuously condemn the Jews, the Sanhedrin and the Synagogues; they also cursed the Jews by blaming them, their children and the future generations for having spilt the **"blood of Jesus"**. The Church, despite all the evidence, today prevents its followers from knowing this basic aspect of the doctrine present in the holy scriptures. This attitude is both negative and embarrassing, as it discriminates against the Jews.

Now let's leave eschatology and begin to verify the story of the events regarding a man, Saint Saul Paul, or rather the "Apostle of the Gentiles".

According to the Evangelist he was born in Tarsus in Cilicia (Acts 22,3), and then was sent from one city to another of the Empire to preach, and in 58 A.D. arrived in Jerusalem. The dating is precise and can be found in "Acts" where it is said that **"when two years came to an end, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus"** (Acts 24,7). In fact, outgoing Procurator, Antonius Felix, handed over to his successor, Porcius Festus, in 60 A.D.; therefore - according to Saint Luke - two years earlier (58 A.D.), after a squabble and after offending the High Priest Ananias in the Sanhedrin, in order to prevent the Jews from **"rid(ding) the earth of the man"** (Paul)! **He is not fit to live!**" (Acts 22,22) Paul himself declares to the Roman Tribune: **"I was born to Roman citizenship"** (Acts 22,27-28).

Luke is trying to lead us to believe that, in the first century, in Judea, if a citizen was accused by the Sanhedrin of violating Jewish law and offending the High Priest, they could avoid lapidation by simply lying shamelessly (as did Paul) about their birthplace and declaring to be Roman citizens. And all were obligated to **believe his words** and be afraid; a Roman Tribune even had to shake: **"The Tribune himself was alarmed when he realised that he had put a Roman citizen in chains"** (Acts 22,29).

But the ridiculous becomes a farse for the exact opposite declaration given, shortly before, in front of the Tribune himself: **"I am a Jew and a citizen of the well-known city of Tarsus in Cilicia"** (Acts 21,39), reconfirmed shortly thereafter in front of a crowd in Jerusalem and **in the presence, once again, of the Tribune himself: "I am a Jew and was born in Tarsus in Cilicia"** (Acts 22,3). The Roman official, in addition, shortly before had suspected that Paul was the **"Egyptian"**, the head of a rebellion that had just been thwarted by the Procurator Antonius Felix (Acts 21,38). It is clear that the evangelist, when writing these foolish contradictions, was convinced that even the Roman Tribunes were stupid, as were those who would have read such contradictions in the future.

A real Tribune, which had to know the imperial laws in order to guarantee their observance, was aware that the High Priest of the Temple, who presided over the Sanhedrin, had been nominated by a Procurator chosen by the Emperor as governor; therefore, whoever offended the High Priest would have gone against Rome and have been forced to pay the consequences: **the Procurator, "cum iure gladii", had the right to execute ...**

According to the foolish interpretation of "Roman Law" described in "Acts of the Apostles", in Judea all the violators of the "Law of the Ancient Fathers", even foreigners (*peregrini*), simply had to say that **"I was born a citizen of Rome"**, and the authorities (in total good faith) rather than stone them, would have furnished them a trireme ship so that they could

reach Rome in order to be judged by Nero; because it is to the "Prince" of the Empire that the highest authorities, worried about the "Roman citizenship" of the Saint, will send Paul. This is how the events are described by "Luke".

In imperial times, the Commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem was an **equestrian military Tribune** (*Tribunus Cohortis*), conferred the deep red laticlave in order to highlight its importance. It is the "right to lie" to such a high ranking official about one's own birthplace and "citizenship" - revealed by Paul in the "performance" invented by the evangelist - which demonstrates the imaginative and childish foolishness of the author; he is unable to "control" himself and degrades the noble Roman official to a mere "subordinate" of the super Apostle:

"The Tribune then he summoned two of the centurions and said «Get two hundred soldiers ready to leave for Caesarea by the third hour of the night with seventy cavalry and two hundred auxiliaries provide horses for Paul, and deliver him unharmed to Felix the Governor»" (Acts 23,23-24).

This paradoxical scene is in contrast with reality. Tacitus (Annales XIII 34):

"At the beginning of the year (58 A.D.) the war had violently broken out again, war which had begun unofficially between the Parthians and the Romans for the possession of Armenia".

Josephus Flavius (Ant. XX ch. 8,173) describes the war between the Jews and the Syrians:

"When Felix realized that the controversy had developed into a war, he intervened by asking the Jews to desist".

While all of the forces of the Eastern Empire were needed in order to fight a war against the Parthians, while a civil war between the Jews and the Syrians is in progress ... an Imperial Tribune employs a military taskforce of that size to escort Paul after lying about his birthplace and with the suspicion (expressed by the Tribune himself) that he may have been a rebel leader such as "the Egyptian" (Acts 21,38). The latter was a Jewish prophet who led thousands of Zealot rebels who aimed at freeing Jerusalem from Roman domination; his plans were unveiled beforehand and crushed by the cavalry of Antonius Felix, but nonetheless "the Egyptian" was able to escape and avoid being captured (Ant. XX cp 8,167-172).

A person who had "Roman citizenship" were subject to Roman law. All people born in Rome were automatically Roman citizens (this was just one of the ways in which it was possible to acquire Roman citizenship in the first century): a right which Luca "accredited" to Saint Paul. It is not plausible that the Romans, in the first century, could grant this "right" without properly verifying the necessary documentation (as we are about to describe) as this would have been foolishly irresponsible on their part and would have been detrimental to the "right" itself, by defeating its purpose. This absurdity contained in the "Acts of the Apostles" (this would have brought about the closure of the Sanhedrin, which would have been unable to function because it lacked legal competence as anyone would have availed themselves of the "right" by simply lying). Today this foolishness is still supported by certain historians who perfectly understand that they are "saved" from ridicule only thanks to the ignorance of most people with regard to the contents of the "Holy Text".

In the first century B.C. Roman citizenship was granted to the Italic allies, and the Emperor (through an edict) had the power to confer this honour to the inhabitants of the Provinces: this recognition of citizenship brought many political benefits, such as the right not to be tried by non-Roman juries: this privilege remained in effect until 212 A.D. Before this date all the inhabitants of the Empire having "Roman citizenship" were registered in public archives and displayed so as to be consultable by anyone; in addition, every Roman citizen was issued a "Diploma of Roman Citizenship". The political importance of "Roman Citizenship" during the first two centuries A.D. is highlighted by the Caesar Augustus's commitment to this legal system; he, in fact, carried out three censuses in the Provinces of the Empire so as to identify those having a right to this citizenship (Res Gestae VIII).

During the principate, until 212 A.D., the diplomas of Roman citizenship were made up of two rectangular bronze tablets of various sizes (no larger than 15 by 20 cm), hinged and closed with a seal of authenticity in order to prevent anyone from tampering with the document.

Inside (*intus*) was carved the name of the Emperor who had issued the decree (with the honorific titles conferred to him by the Senate), that of the Consuls in office and the year of issue; this information was followed by the personal details of the beneficiary - his first name, **patronymic***, rank, civitas of origin, **tribe*** and nation. The diploma also stated whether or not the beneficiary had the right to pass on his status of *Civis Romanus* to his children along with the indication of the public place in which the original decree was posted. What was written on the outside (*extrinsecus*) was identical to what was written on the inside and for practical reasons was directly accessible, but the content could not be modified as the authenticity was guaranteed by the *intus*, protected by imperial seals.

* **Foreigners** who obtained Roman citizenship **had to change their first name** and adopt a new one made up of the **praenomen** and **aristocratic name of he who had conferred the citizenship** while their **original first name** became their **surname**. (the simple "Paulus", as a valid form of identification, was so reductive that it would have appeared as a total mockery in the eyes of any Roman Tribune, which would have reacted accordingly).

* The "**tribes**" were made up of 35 territorial districts in which Roman citizens were divided for tax purposes, military conscription, census and vote reports: all this information had to be verified by the Tribune.

Due to the vastness of the Empire, the Romans considered the diplomas of citizenship to be extremely important for identifying the loyalty of any citizen towards Rome. A precaution which guaranteed beyond all doubt the loyalty of any citizen with the right to a *cursus honorum* and, therefore, obliged to learn the Latin. Only a high Roman official, appointed by the Governor of the Province, had the right to break the seals in order to carry out a preliminary check but if a controversy arose (Paul who insults the High Priest of the Temple), the citizen was sent to Rome to verify, first of all, whether or not the information contained in the diploma corresponded to the content of the bronze public "*constitutiones*" (decrees) accessible to anyone and posted on a wall of the Forum. If there was no correspondence between the diploma and the respective "*constitutio*" the offender was beheaded on the Esquiline; on the contrary, if the authenticity of the diploma was demonstrated, the case (concerning the insult towards the High Priest) was forwarded to a court made up of several judges, which began a trial culminating in a final judgement.

As mentioned above, the story involving Saint Paul was set (Acts 24,27) in 58 A.D., but the Emperors, in the first century, according to what is reported by **Suetonius** in "Caligula 38", issued authentic "**Diplomas of Citizenship**", which were **official certificates** demonstrating one's right to such a prerogative and it was absolutely forbidden to usurp this right and ...

"Whoever usurped the right of Roman citizenship, was beheaded (by order of Claudius) **on the Esquiline field**" (Claudius 25).

According to law, the super Apostle Paul was obliged to show his "Diploma of Citizenship", which was carved on a sheet of bronze and conferred by the Emperor; therefore a simple declaration of the interested party was of no value.

As we have just documented, the absolution of Saint Paul, mentioned by he himself in his Second Letter to Timothy (IV

17), is puerile and false; just as deceiving is the chronicle of Eusebius of Cesarea, enriched by even more imaginative descriptions of Paul's "trial" (Hec. II 22,3/5).

In the story we have just read it is also important to point out **the serious anacronism regarding the dating of the holy office of the High Priest Ananias** (insulted by Paul) who, as highlighted above in the "Acts of the Apostles", **is in office in 58 A.D.** ... and we want it to be clear that the High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem, for the Jewish ecumene residing in the Roman Empire and in the Kingdom of the Parthians, was the equivalent of the Pope for Catholics today. After serious disorders between Jews and Samaritans, the High Priest **Ananias**, son of Nebedee, was arrested and sent in chains to Rome in **52 A.D.** (along with Anan, Captain of the Guards of the Temple) by the Legatus of Syria, **Ummidius Durmius Quadratus** (see "Jewish Antiquities" XX 131) and sent to Rome in chains to answer to Emperor Claudius (cfr Tacitus Annales XII 54).

From the reading of the "Jewish Antiquities" and "The Jewish War" written by Josephus, we know that after Ananias the Sanhedrin was presided over by the following High Priests (between 52 A.D. and the beginning of 66 A.D.): Jonathan, son of Anan (from 52 to 56); Ismael, son of Fabi (from 56 to 61); Joseph, called Kabi, son of Simon (from 61 to 62); Anan, son of Anan (in 62, for only three months); Jesus, son of Damneus (from 62 to 63); Jesus, son of Gamaliel (from 63 to 66); and Matthias, son of Theophilus "... *under Matthias the war of the Jews against the Romans began*" in 66 A.D. (Ant. XX cp 9,223).

The scene invented by Saint Luke - **the quarrel of Saul Paul who offends Ananias by calling him a "painted wall"**, and then retracts: "*I didn't know that he was the High Priest certainly scripture says "You will not curse your people's Leader"*" (Acts 23,5) - **is placed in 58 A.D.** and therefore it is a lie because **Ananias was deposed from the position of High Priest of the Temple in 52 A.D.** (Ant. XX 131). It would have made sense (one less error among the many) if he had had the argument with Ismael, son of Fabi, chosen as High Priest by King Agrippa when Antonius Felix was still Procurator, after the latter had executed the High Priest Jonathan son of Anan.

After the Governors of Rome had politically lost control of the situation, Ananias was re-elected High Priest in 66 A.D. and soon thereafter was killed by the youngest son of Judas the Galilean (sons bearing the names of the brothers of "Jesus"), who, in turn, was killed by Eleazar, Commander of the Temple Guards and son of Ananias, in order to avenge the death of his father.

On the basis of what is stated above, **the chronology of the events and the investiture of the High Priests forces us to say that the quarrel between Saint Paul and the High Priest of the Sanhedrin Ananias did not occur**, as is demonstrated by the chronological sequence of those designated as High Priests. By intercession of the High Priest Jonathan, Ananias was freed (but Jonathan was killed by Felix). No Procurator hierarchically lower than the **Lieutenant of the Emperor Claudius**, Ummidius Durmius Quadratus *, could have confirmed Ananias as High Priest with such a police record.

Last but not least, in reference to the names of the High Priests, including the specific chronology of the positions held, **all the above data were reported by the historian Josephus when Jew was personally present in the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem with the function until the end of Scribe 62 AD.**

* The Imperial Legate stationed in Antioch (Syria) remained in office until 60 A.D. (year of his death for natural causes), first under Claudius and then under Nero. No Procurator - obliged to hand over his duties according to precise rules - could have confirmed Ananias as "High Priest of the Temple and the Sanhedrin", even if the candidate had been proposed by King Agrippa II. Until the 66 A.D. revolt against the Romans, the High Priest selection was subject to the "placet" of the Procurators who, in turn, were subject to the "*Legatus Augusti pro Praetore*".

Another piece of evidence demonstrating the invention of the character "Saint Paul" can be found in the biography dedicated to him in 382 A.D. by the historian and Doctor of the Church (beatified) **Sophronius Hieronymus** in "**De viris illustribus**" chap. V:

"Saul belonged to the tribe of Benjamin and to the city of Giscala in Judea. After the Roman occupation of this city, he emigrated with his parents to Tarsus in Cilicia" (Op. cit.).

In the biography of Paul, Jerome cites "Acts of the Apostles" but makes no reference to the "Roman citizenship" of the Apostle, at the moment of his arrest, for he cannot accept the contrasting declarations (as we have seen) which Paul made with regard to his place of birth. It is, therefore, not by chance if Jerome decided to have him be born in Giscala (erroneously placed in Judea rather than in Galilee) "after the Roman occupation" of 6 A.D. (it is important to remember that Galilee was occupied by the Romans led by Vespasian in 66 A.D.). In fact, until 6 A.D. Judea was a Roman protectorate and the forces present in this region were subject to the Jewish Etnarch Archelaus while **the deployment of Roman soldiers in Judea** under the authority of a Prefect **began in 6 A.D.**, when the region was declared a Province of Rome and annexed to Syria by Caesar Augustus. As a result, the young **Saul moved to Tarsus after 6 A.D.** **Later on**, according to his testimony in Acts (22,3), he **went to the school of Gamaliel in Jerusalem**. But then ... why, when and how did the Jew Saul request and obtain the diploma of Roman citizenship? And in particular, not being born in Roman, according to what requisites? It was the lack of an explanation to these fundamental questions which forced Jerome to justify the Roman name of the Apostle as such:

"As soon as Sergius Paulus, Proconsul in Cyprus, believed in his preaching of Christ, Saul borrowed the name Paul from him" (Op. cit.).

In fact from a reading of "Acts" we see that Saul, from this time onwards, was called "Paul". In order to underline the importance of Saint Jerome's conclusions, let's remind readers that the Doctor of the Church translated the Bible from Greek into Latin, including "Acts of the Apostles". Having established that not even a Saint managed to patch up the bogus biography of his great predecessor, we advise the Paul's ectoplasm to resurrect and "appeal to History"... before "appealing to Caesar".

To conclude this first analysis regarding Saint Paul as a man who actually existed, a historian must recognize that no subject of the Empire could have acted against the laws of Rome in such a blatant way without paying the "price" immediately. A true equestrian Roman military Tribune, after taking cognizance of the Paul's contradictions regarding his Roman citizenship, would have first of all asked him to show his citizenship certificate; then, in fulfilment of its duty, it would have immediately put the boaster in chains, while Antonius Felix, acting as accuser and judge, would have beheaded him after a summary trial (as provided for by law).

A quarrel between any Jew (or ex-Jew, as in the case of Paul) and the High Priest of the Temple demonstrates that the author of this farse - which was written after the narrated events happened and without sufficient knowledge of the citizenship laws that were in effect at the time in which we are led to believe these events occurred - did not recognize the authority and the power exercised by who held this holy office. This power was subject only to the discretion of Roman legates or sovereigns, all of whom designated directly by the Emperor.

Even this "Act of the Sanhedrin" (like the one in the first study regarding the Gamaliel's speech quoted in the "Acts of the Apostles") is clearly deceptive and false like the character "Saint Paul": human incarnation of the doctrine revealed to

him by Jesus from heaven, doctrine which Christians continue to follow today.

Paul of Tarsus

Part II: summary

Thanks to the historical methodology that we are following - which allows us to verify truths and falsifications by comparing New Testament scriptures with the historiography of the time and archaeology - we can demonstrate that Saint Paul was an invented character and then certified as an Apostle "dazzled" by Jesus who had already risen into heaven. This is a rational method that we must follow, as it is the only way to learn about the origins of Christianity.

According to the falsifiers who wrote this document, the "Acts of the Apostles" should have constituted "evidence" of the spreading of the Christian theological message of "salvation" from Jerusalem to the furthestmost borders of the Roman Empire.

In order to "demonstrate" how this could have occurred in a period of only thirty years (which goes from the death of Christ to the arrival of Paul in Rome), in addition to the Apostles other protagonists with extraordinary thaumaturgical powers were invented to amaze the masses and convert them to the new religion. In acquiescence to the exegetic believers of the Christian "tradition", the "Acts of the Apostles" were compiled around 80 A.D., but the dating takes into account historical references resulting from the description of famous figures who actually existed and expressly mentioned by the scribes.

These are completely incorrect fideistic conclusions, which are also wrong from a deontological and professional point of view; we will now demonstrate this by verifying the facts and comparing them to history and archeology.

Saint Paul, Saint Philip and Saint Stephen

Herodotus, in "Historiae", referred to the lands south of Egypt as "Ethiopia". One these lands, Nubia (a region in the middle Nile located in present-day Sudan), after the decline of Egyptian domination, became the center of a great Kushite civilization: "The Land of the Black Pharaohs", with Meroe as its capital.

Acts of the Apostles:

"And he arose and went; and behold, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch, a high officer of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, who was over all her treasure, who had come to Jerusalem to worship, was also returning, and, sitting in his chariot, was reading the prophet Isaiah. And the Spirit said to Philip: Go forward and join thyself to this chariot" (Codex Sinaiticus Ac 8,27/29).

"**Kandàke**" is a hellenized appellative cited by Strabone; in reality, it **was not a name** but, in **the Nubian language** of the time, **was a royal title** of excellence attributed only to elderly **Queens**, revered warriors like their male counterparts. This language, in the region of Nubia, took the place of archaic Egyptian during the fourth century B.C. The most famous and strongest "Kandàke" of that period (according to the paleographers who translated the stone inscriptions) was Queen of Nubia and lived in the first century B.C.; but, in reality, her real name was **Amanishakheto: the only meroite sovereign who dared to attack a province of the Roman Empire**. The size of her pyramid (the richest among the 200 of the royal necropolis), located near Meroe and restored by archeologists, is evidence of her prestige.

The historians of the period - starting with the Greek Strabone (Geo. XVIII 1,53-54), followed by Plinius the Elder (Hist. Nat. VI 35,186) and lastly Cassius Dio (Hist. Rom. LIV 5) - **did not know the language and mistakened the title of "Queen", or rather "Kandàke"** (Katkè in Nubian) **for a name**, thus repeating the error committed by the scribes who had given an account of the famous and unique Kandàke who challenged Rome.

In his work "**Res Gestae**" (XXVI 25), Caesar Augustus describes the military campaign which he ordered the Prefect of Egypt Gaius Publius Petronius to undertake in **23 B.C.** in order to re-subjugate a part of Nubia; in 24 B.C. Queen "Kandàke" Amanishakheto - an indomitable warrior with "**a virile appearance, blind in one eye**" (as described by Strabone) - personally led a revolt against the Romans.

Petronius defeated the Nubians and forced a peace treaty on the sovereign; the treaty - which defined the borders of the Empire with the Meriot Kingdom - was stipulated with the Emperor on the island of Samos in 21 B.C.

Amanishakheto **died in 12 B.C.** and, as reported by Suetonius, the scrolls of the "Res Gestae" of the divine Augustus were deposited in the Senate after his death, thus becoming a direct source for the imperial historians.

The important archaeological ruins found in Meroe and the studies carried out by paleographers in the twentieth century have allowed us to decipher the language and discover the real name of the Queen, which was "Amanishakheto". We must highlight **that the only Kushite sovereign who entered into conflict with the Romans was Kandàke Amanishakheto**. This statement is supported by the fact that if the Greek and Roman historians of the first century had known about other Meroite queens ... all with the name "Kandàke", they would have been the first to realize that it was not a name but a royal title and therefore would have reported the real appellative to posterity.

The episode narrated in the "Acts" is of course dated after the death of Christ, between 30 A.D. and 40 A.D.; therefore the scene described is a lie as it took place more than fifty after the death of the famous Queen "Kandake" whose real name, as known, was Amanishakheto; **an eyewitness Evangelist** (Philip) of the Acts of the Apostles - **inspired by "an angel of the Lord"** (Ac 8,26) and by the "**Holy Spirit**" - should have been aware of this before inventing a eunuch official, "**Superintendent of the Treasury**" of a dead queen, and having him speak to Philip about the prophet Isaiah "announcing the Gospel" in order to convert him (Ac 8,30/40). **In fact this official should have known the real name of his queen and reported it to Philip**, explaining to him that the words "Queen Kandake" made no sense as they meant "Queen ... Queen", and - **as there was no language barrier** - he should have also reported the original meroitic title: "**Katke**" not "Kandake".

The Christian scribe who used the pseudonym "Luke", **long after the narrated events took place**, wanted to "prove" how the Christianization of Ethiopia began, and to do this gathered information from the historical sources of the period ... but these contained the error which misinterpreted the title of Queen Kandake by mistaking it for a person's name: a grave misinterpretation taken from historiography which today has proved to be a "mortal sin", as this alone would be enough to destroy the credibility of all the evangelical testimonies ... even if (as we are highlighting) history demonstrates that there is a superabundance of similar "mortal sins" in New Testament documents (starting with the

writings of Luke).

The genuflection experts - who have been caught out by this absurdity reported by an evangelist "inspired by God" - attempt to evade the issue and inexorably wander away from historical and archeological rationality. In fact, **from the death of Christ to the time of Nero, only Kings reigned in Meroe**: Pisakar, Amanitaraqide and Nebmaatse. Only later, between 62 A.D. and 85 A.D. did a female "Kandake" reign: Amanikhatashan. This detail, however, is superfluous because **these names could not have been known** and reported **by Greek and Roman historians** of the time ... simply because the three kings did not carry out a war against Rome but merely respected the treaties stipulated by their ancestor Amanishakheto with Caesar Augustus; they were perfectly aware of the risk which they would have run if they had attempted to reconquer the fertile regions around the lower and middle Nile.

It is also important to highlight that the grey eminences of the Catholic Church are now aware of the gross historical error committed by the Christian scribes (evidence of this is today provided by archeology) and are therefore modifying the above-mentioned passage from the "Acts of the Apostles". The English version of "Catholic Bible" (which can be found on the net) says the following: "... **kandake, or queen of Ethiopia**" (Acts 8,27). By simply adding "or" the clever exegetes, underhandly e deliberately translate "Kandake" into "Queen" so that it does not appear to be a person's name ... with two precise conclusions: first, make the English-speaking believers throughout the world seem incompetent; second, show that the "holy Gospels" were not "**dictated by God**", as falsely decreed by the Council of Trent, but were invented by clerics long ago (who were their ideological forerunners), therefore modifiable at any moment for "pius" opportunism. The occult manipulators of Christian faith exclude the possibility that a "lamb" belonging to the flock of acolytes can "get lost" through a simple verification of the very ancient Codex Sinaiticus.

On the basis of this gross error other related lies contained in the "holy text" can be discovered. Carrying on our study we can demonstrate **that the "Acts of the Apostles" were created by Christian scribes long after the events described in the "Acts" are said to have occurred**. The authors wanted to "confirm" the advent of "Jesus Christ" and the Apostles who spread his doctrine by inventing a series of people as "extras"; and it was their task to "attest" these extraordinary and miraculous deeds.

These important theological second leads were artfully created (as in the case of the Apostles), so that they could interact with famous people who actually existed and who are traceable in the historiography of the time, exactly like the places in which they recite (all well-known and described in the Gospel). The **error** regarding the word "Kandake" made by the imperial historians - who did not know that in the language of the Meroites the term was used to refer to the "Queen" - **was repeated, unconsciously, by the false Christian scribes**; but today - thanks to archeology and paleography, along with the historic date of the death of the warrior sovereign - we are able to highlight the falsification and demonstrate that "Philip" had been invented.

But this is not enough

According to the "Acts" (Acts 6,5), this "**Philip**" **was sent along with another six saints (his "colleagues")** to work wonders; they all possessed supernatural powers and one of them was the first martyr of Christianity: **Saint Stephen "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit ... who was filled with grace and power and began to work miracles and great signs among the people"** (Acts 6,5/8). So **if Saint Stephen was with an inexistent Saint "Philip", it is obvious that he also was invented** (like the other five).

It is also important to highlight that Philip was an Apostle who followed Jesus; he announced Jesus's "Advent" to his "fellow Apostle" Nathaniel (John 1,45) and eyewitnessed His elevation to heaven 40 days after the "resurrection" (Acts 1,1-12). This is just one of the many pieces of evidence which demonstrate that the "resurrection" of Jesus was invented; and Saint Philip (sic!) took part in the "miracle of the loaves and fishes" (Jhn 6,5/7). One must ask: Have the "blessed (believers) who are poor in spirit" read the Gospels?...

"The evangelist Philip had four unmarried daughters who were prophets" (Acts 21,9)

... but **the Church**, which is the first to be aware of the inexistence of this "Philip" mentioned in "Acts", today **denies that he was one of the Apostles** and hides the evidence from its followers; on the contrary, we provide its followers the testimony of the historian Bishop Eusebius of Cesarea (**Historia Ecclesiastica** III 31,2-5) in which, in reference to the Saint in the above-mentioned passages from the "Acts", he states that

"Philip was one of the twelve apostles ... after his death he rests in Hierapolis along with the tomb of his daughters".

In reality, if the scribe had meant to mention another "Philip", and not the Apostle **belonging to the "twelve"** (Acts 1,13), he would have done this by clearly **distinguishing between two protagonists bearing the same name: the Jews used the patronymic in order to do this**.

To confirm what was demonstrated in the first study "The Apostles did not exist", even this "Saint", like the other Apostles, was invented and depicted as **a Galilean Jew with an impossible Greek name**. Today he is once and for all cancelled from history.

This is still not enough

The martyr Stephen, according to "Acts", was lapidated by order of a Sanhedrin convened by a High Priest in the absence of the Roman Imperial Legate (and without even requesting his authorization) (see Antiquities XX 197/203); this was the only organ which had the power to consent an execution (*ius gladii*) ... therefore: false martyrdom, false Kandake, false Philip, false Sanhedrin, false Stephen and, needless to say, false miracles.

Note: The body of the protomartyr Saint Stephen was "discovered" and taken to Jerusalem in 416 A.D. by the historian Presbyter Paulus Orosius, collaborator of Saint Augustine, the brilliant Bishop and Father of the Catholic Church.

Miserable human remains, dug up almost four centuries after the narrated events took place, were cut into pieces and distributed to many churches in Europe; these remains continue to be venerated by the naive and "blessed who are poor in spirit".

And there's more

Another invented person is introduced into this false scene whose protagonist is a false martyr; he is one of utmost importance for the Christian faith: **Saint Saul Paul**; still young and at whose feet the **false martyrdom** of a **false Saint Stephen** takes place (Ac 7,58).

The series of lies described thusfar and confirmed by the studies mentioned above and by the ones which will follow,

demonstrate that Saint Saul Paul was not a real person but merely a lie created for ideological and doctrinal reasons.

Let's continue

The scenario extends to Samaria and ...

"The people unanimously welcomed the message Philip preached, because they had heard of the miracle he worked and because they saw for themselves. For unclean spirits came shrieking out of many who were possessed and several paralytics and cripples were cured" (Acts 8,6/7).

Afterwards, a new actor is introduced: **"After his baptism Simon went round constantly with Philip"** (Acts 8,13). **An invented Saint Philip cannot "accompany" a "wizard": even "Simon the Wizard" was invented.** The logical end for a puerile narration created for easily influenced and opportunely catechizable "consumers".

More

The "blunder" regarding Saint Philip made by the false Christian scribes - very clever "monastics" but not very knowledgeable about history - is similar to another contained in the "Letters" of Saint Paul (the 2nd to the Corinthians 11,32) and in "Acts" (12,4/7), when the copyists have the Apostle of the Gentiles declare:

"When I was in Damascus, the Governor who was under King Aretas put guards round Damascus city to catch me".

According to "Acts" **this event dates back to before 40 A.D.** (the year of his death), therefore this monarch had to have been Nabateus **King Aretas IV** of Petra whose daughter married Herod Antipas the Tetrarch, who then repudiated her after marrying Herodias.

But the father-in-law of Herod Antipas never reigned over **Damascus because it was part of the Roman province of Syria**: if this had actually happened **the imperial historians would have reported it** (as it would have been considered an important event). This fact, however, does not emerge. On the contrary, one of the ancestors of King Aretas IV, **King Aretas III, reigned over Damascus** over a century before Christ walked over the waters.

In 85 B.C., Aretas III, King of the Nabatean Arabs, conquered Damascus where he reigned until 83 B.C., when Tigranes II of Armenia (called the Great) conquered Syria, forcing Aretas III to abandon Damascus and take refuge in Petra. The Imperium of Tigranes II did not last long.

The relentless advance of the power of Rome, personified by Pompey the Great and his legions, provoked the decline of the eastern kingdoms of the Mediterranean and Aretas III took advantage of these conflicts to extend once again the borders of Nabatean Arabia as far as Damascus; but, in 64 B.C., the Proconsul Emilius Scaurus (Jewish Wars I 159; mentioned even in the Qumran scrolls), Pompey's Lieutenant, forced Aretas III to withdraw from Damascus and retreat to Philadelphia and then to Petra (which was even farther south), interposing the arid desert between himself and the Roman legions.

After Aretas III, Obodas II reigned over the Nabateans; the latter was succeeded by Malichus I, who was succeeded by his son Obodas III father of Aretas IV. The latter reigned from 4 B.C. to 40 A.D., but **never over Damascus**. It is extremely evident that Saint Luke glued his "little historical bait" to a wrongly numbered genealogical hook.

What has been described is documented and proven by archeology and numismatics. On the contrary, the inspired historians (who are in a total mystic crisis), in order to safeguard the evangelical "Truths", maintain that upon the death of Tiberius in 37 A.D. Gaius Caligula nominated Aretas IV as King of Damascus. These people lead us to believe that a king (who ascended the throne in 4 B.C. **without the "placet" of Caesar Augustus**) - after having attacked and defeated **Herod Antipas ally of Rome in 36 B.C.** - during the conflict between Rome and the Parthians **dared take control of the territories of Perea, governed by Herod but belonging to the Empire**. The "blitz" forced the King to take refuge in Petra in order to avoid being beheaded by Lucius Vitellius, Legatus Augusti (until 39 A.D.) of the Emperors Tiberius and Caligula (Antiquities XVIII 125).

So - according to the over-devout exegetes - with such a "record" he would have been awarded the throne of Damascus? In Syria? When between Damascus of Syria and Petra there was an immense territory under Roman domination which included Trachonitis, Batanea, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, Decapolis and Perea ... This is impossible! These exegetes need to demonstrate this with historical and archeological data as in the case of Aretas III and Petra. A "pious teacher" of history and classical literature needs to come along and publicly affirm that Damascus was granted to Aretas IV by Rome. Incidentally, Pompey the Great (in 64 B.C.) created a federation of ten cities - Decapolis - inhabited by Greeks and Romans; this federation - which was separated from the Kingdom of Judea and annexed to the province of Syria - was much further south than Damascus but ... much further north than the Nabatean Arabia of Aretas.

The initially victorious war which Aretas brought against Herod Antipas (vassal of Tiberius) in 36 A.D. provoked the reaction of Rome, which had total control over communication and maritime routes; these were indispensable for the flourishing trade carried out with the Orient. Therefore Petra - after achieving its maximum splendor under Aretas IV - remained isolated and underwent an irreversible economic decline and under Traianus, the Nabatean kingdom was definitively submitted to the Roman Empire by Consul Aulus Cornelius Palma.

The "inspired" historians with faith pretend (in bad faith) not to understand that "Saint Luke" pierced a series of "little baits" onto the hook of history to have them take the bait: the "little baits" are swallowed one by one as if they were consecrated hosts.

This huge religious lie cannot justify the right to change the past: the knowledge of how historical events actually occurred is a patrimony belonging to all of us.

A false Gamaliel in a false Sanhedrin; **inexistent Apostles who work miracles under an inexistent "portico of Solomon"** (Acts 5,13-16; cfr Jewish Antiquities XX 220-222 and fourteenth study); a false Saul Paul who offends a High Priest of the Temple who in reality had already been forced to resign from his role (six years earlier) by the Imperial Legate Ummidius Durmius Quadratus; Paul who allows himself to lie to a Tribune about his birthplace and who, in spite of this, believes he is a "Roman citizen" and does not demand to see documented proof (diploma of citizenship) as provided for by the same law he is trying to obtain justice from; a false "sudden inspiration" (will follow); Apostles with **"tongues of fire"** on their heads who speak all the languages known at the time (Acts 2,3-4) make people rise from the dead, heal the crippled and the multitudes from all sickness (Acts 5,12-16).

And yet the genuflexion exegetes who "apostolate" are ashamed to publicize this "holy text" ... priests are perfectly aware that it is ridiculous and they keep it hidden: as it were "apocryphal". Priests know that if the "blessed who are poor in spirit" today discovered the foolishness which it contains ... they would flee.

Famous teachers, inspired by the Holy Spirit, discuss at Congresses, reports are written, books are published which "analyze" the "Acts of the Apostles" from a historical and literary profile: "Jewish tradition" which meets "Hellenic tradition", "brilliance of Paul's synthesis", "studies on the probability that Seneca and Saint Paul wrote each other letters" (a mad absurdity which cannot be proven) ... which are entitled "Dear Saint Paul ... Dear Seneca"; a huge fish becomes Saint John fried in a pan (sic!) and martyred by Domitian (on internet clic on: Ilaria Ramelli - "La Quarta Satira di Giovenale e la tortura di San Giovanni a Roma al tempo di Domiziano", Università del Sacro Cuore di Milano - Italy); "The Fourth Satire of Juvenal and the torture of Saint John in Rome at the time of Domitian": laws fifth study. It would seem impossible that these "historical analyses" circulate in our Universities. It is impossible to read them all ... and they realize it; but the important thing is to highlight the proportions of the studies carried out (a bibliography which is nearly infinite): the naive must be impressed.

But no Pope has ever said in one of their many "General Audiences in Saint Peter's Square": "*«dear brothers and sisters, now I will read you the "Acts of the Apostles", beginning on the first page, just a couple of hours are necessary, and you will have the right to eternal life»*".

No! They know: the "Acts of the Apostles" is a puerile libellous pamphlet which was created to convince the "sweet naive" (with invented historical facts) of how Christianity and the related "doctrine of Salvation" spread. People who long ago could not gather information to verify if what is reported in the Gospels could have really occurred ... but today "Saint Peter's Square" would empty out.

Part III: summary

The "Sudden Inspiration of Saint Saul Paul"

In the previous study we demonstrated the inexistence of Saint Paul, Saint Philip, and Saint Stephen through the comparison of New Testament documents and historiography: actors of utmost importance who the Christian scribes have recited in the "holy text" of "Acts of the Apostles". Let's go back to "Paul of Tarsus", an invented person who was created in order to evolve Jewish Messianic doctrine (which becomes the foundation of a new creed) and **whose existence is documented in doctrinal writings which were compiled after the narrated events were said to have taken place.**

Although he carried out many flashy miracles in the provinces of the Empire, there is no trace of his existence, apart from the one invented by a posterior "tradition" artfully created and based on his cult.

He was imagined and described with juvenile expedients and gross historical errors, which are so evident that no one can affirm or demonstrate that Paul of Tarsus truly existed. On the contrary, it is the duty of a historian to highlight the falsity of his existence; a man who did not exist could not have written any letters, and the fact that there is a contrast among faithful Christian philologists with regard to the authenticity of the "letters" attributed to him confirms what we have just said: the **"letters" were written by others using his name and at various times in relation to the development of the doctrine.**

Before verifying the narration of the "sudden inspiration" of Saul who – according to the Bible – was a ferocious and zealous torturer who moved from nation to nation in order to massacre Christians, it is important to place oneself in the true context of the time so as to better understand what we are talking about.

Tacitus (Annales IV 5) reports that Antioch (Syria) hosted the Headquarters which controlled all of the Orient, a huge territory which answered to the Governor of Syria (Lieutenant of the Emperor), who commanded four legions plus auxiliary forces (having roughly the same number of men).

The following were subordinate - both juridically and militarily - to the Governor of Syria: all the Procurators, Prefects, Tetrarchs and vassal Kings with their respective armies. These soldiers - over 40,000 men - constituted a taskforce deployed in times of peace, whose task it was to defend the "limes" which ran from the Black Sea, Pontus, Armenia, the upper Euphrates to the Dead Sea (including Palestine). Rome wanted to defend itself against the potential threat of the Parthians who wanted access to the Mediterranean Sea, which was the most important trade route connecting the rich and fertile lands of the world known to those who wrote Western history ... and the Gospels.

The Caesars conferred the right to execute (ius gladii) only to the Governors of the Roman Provinces, commanders of adequate military contingents who possessed hegemonical and absolute territorial power. They were Magistrates with the power to act as both prosecutors and judges of inhabitants accused of committing crimes, apart from those subjects having Roman citizenship, certified through a diploma issued by the Emperor. Roman citizens were to be tried by a court made up of several judges, and if such a court did not exist in the territory in which the crime had been committed, they were sent to Rome in chains on the first trireme headed for Rome. These Governors had enormous military power, making it possible to guarantee the unity of a very vast Empire.

No high priest "*ἀρχιερεῖς*" (archiereis) of the many divinities worshipped in the territories under Rome's subjugation had the right to execute subjects of the Emperor; therefore the High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem could not suppress any citizen of the Empire without the prior consent of the Imperial Legate, even in the case of a violation of the Mosaic Law which was not binding for a Roman official ... and the High Priest was aware of this.

Ius Gladii was assigned to the client Kings, Tetrarchs and Ethnarchs ruling over the regions under Roman protectorate; they were granted the right to maintain an army with light armaments in order to guarantee public order and collect taxes.

This was the territorial, military and juridical scenario of the Roman Empire in the first century, which Luke made the bad mistake of ignoring when he invented:

"the sudden inspiration of Saul on the road to Damascus"

"Meanwhile **Saul** was still breathing threats to **slaughter** the Lord's disciples. He went to the **High Priest** and asked for letters addressed to the synagogues in **Damascus**, that would authorise him to arrest and take to Jerusalem any followers of the Way, men or women, that he might find. It happened that while he was travelling to Damascus and approaching the city, suddenly a light from heaven shone all round him. He fell to the ground, and then he heard a voice saying «Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?»" (Acts 9,1/4).

"I even persecuted this Way to the **death** and sent women as well as men to prison in chains as the **High Priest** and the whole **Council of Elders** (Sanhedrin) can testify. **I even received letters from them to the brothers in Damascus, which I took with me when I set off to bring prisoners back from there to Jerusalem for punishment**" (Acts 22,4-5).

This "evidence" of the existence of the first "followers of Jesus", with another strained reference to the High Priest of the Temple and of the Sanhedrin (for Luke it was an obsession which he could not avoid "tripping on"), is another "show" recanted by Roman law; the aim of this "production" is to preserve imperial domination by means of a group of rigidly hierarchical public officials.

The High Priest who presided over the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem did not have the power to send his thugs to arrest Damascene citizens subject to the jurisdiction of the Province of Syria, governed directly by Rome through an official stationed in Antioch: the Lieutenant of the Emperor, who answered only to the Emperor himself. The authority of the Imperial Legate would have been supplanted by the power of the High Priest and the Jewish Sanhedrin (but the power to "slaughter" men which was a prerogative belonging solely to the Romans).

Only an ascetic ignorant unaware of the historical context of the time could have invented such absurdities and presented them as a doctrine "dictated by God". Only the Princeps (Emperor) of the Roman Empire or the Senate had the power to ban and legitimize a cult; only the Emperor and the officials who he nominated and sent to the Provinces had the power to exercise "*ius gladii*" - the right to execute or repress inhabitants who provoked disorders (including those of religious origin).

In the territories under Roman domination governed by Kings nominated by the Emperor and loyal to Rome, monarchs were given the right to execute according to local law; however, no leader of a cult or sect had the right to persecute the followers of other cults, especially if they were **religious citizens (of any faith) residing in other territories subject to public officials directly nominated by the Emperor.**

The "cursus honorum" of the Roman high officials in the imperial Provinces called for them to respect a rigidly disciplined hierarchy imposed by the Caesar.

At the time of the "sudden inspiration of Saul", **Judea** was governed by a Prefect chosen by the Emperor and delegated full powers and the right to execute; only he, after having examined each individual case, could grant the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem the right to come together in order to make an unappealable decision regarding the possible execution, **in their territory**, of Jews guilty of having violated Ancestral Law.

In order to start up the procedure, the presence of a Prefect or Procurator was indispensable and the violation of Roman Law implied the immediate removal of the High Priest of the Temple presiding over the Sanhedrin (Antiquities XX 202-203).

In Syria (where Damascus was located) the military garrisons of Rome were indispensable in order to keep the Parthians under control; here the contingents were larger and strategically more important than the garrison stationed in Jerusalem which answered to the Roman Tribune. In theory **only the Tribune, and not the Jewish High Priest**, could have asked - through his superior, the Prefect of Judea, residing in Maritime Caesarea - the Lieutenant of the Emperor, Commander of the Roman Headquarters in Antioch, to arrest citizens of Damascus and extradite them to Jerusalem, in Judea.

Saint Luke planned that the "mission" of Paul - aimed at crushing the movement of the followers of "Jesus" - would have turned into a "mission" in favour of the "Christians" thanks to an extraordinary event: the "sudden inspiration". It was during this bogus journey - in contrast with the rigid hierarchical, military and juridical structure which answered to Caesar - that the evangelist invented the "conversion of Saul" (Acts 9,1/9) and, after having been "dazzled" and blinded by a Jesus who "*God raised ... to life, and of that we are all witnesses. Now raised to the heights by God's right hand*" (Acts 2,32/33), he **created** a new Apostle: "Saint Paul".

The scribe who attempted to prove the existence of Paul of Tarsus made his character wander towards Ephesus, capital of the Roman province of Asia Minor, where, according to the "Acts", thanks to the miraculous healings carried out, he was able to convert "*all the inhabitants of the Province of Asia*". This is obviously an exaggerated piece of news (therefore invented) which can be easily proved wrong by history and archeology.

As the presence of Paul of **Ephesus** is related to that of the elderly Apostle John, this will be discussed in the fifth analysis, in which we demonstrate the inexistence of the two pillars of primitive Christianity created after the resurrection of the Redeemer of sinful humanity.

Paul of Tarsus. The new "revelation" of God was incarnated by a totally invented character by one or more mystics, with no knowledge of laws, but clever enough to understand that the illusion of the "resurrection of the flesh" was an irresistible mirage for most men.

Thanks to the invention of the super Apostle Saul Paul, the founding Fathers decided to graft the ritual of the theophagic eucharistic sacrifice of the pagan Soter (Saviour) into the Jewish Messiah Jeshua ... but this would have violated the Mosaic Law revealed to the Semitic prophets by Yahweh. In fact, their prophecies did not contemplate the Advent of the "Divine Oiled" to sacrifice to the Divinity (in Latin "Hostia") which then resurrects and is divided into particles (blood and body) which are swallowed by the believers (in the form of a piece of bread) in order to have the right to eternal life. In order to do this, it was necessary to excogitate the intervention of the Messiah himself (who had already resurrected) in order to "authorize" from the high heavens a revision of the Bible through a new Apostle who is not mentioned in the Gospels.

During the third century the Roman Empire found itself unable to defend its borders. The power of Rome was no longer capable of withstanding the pressure of the peoples living along its borders, interested in invading the fertile territories under Roman domination.

The population of the Empire interpreted this weakness as a consequence of the lack of protection offered by the Capitoline gods and thus, spontaneously, turned to other religions (especially those of eastern origin), capable of satisfying individual existential needs, both during life and after death.

At this time Christianity was able to develop, obtain legal recognition and, finally, become the sole state religion within an Empire which was about to break up.

Among the many Christian sects - all believers of Christs conceived in different manners both in the form and in the divine substance - the one which prevailed was that of the followers of the doctrine of the Apostle Paul.

The Christianity of Paul - based on an illusion of the salvation of eternal life and officialized by an Empire in decline - prevailed and spread throughout the Roman Provinces; after the end of the Empire the Christianity of Paul spread to faraway territories ... and became the greatest brainwashing which humanity has ever encountered.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]