



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](#)  

After James the Minor his fake successors disappear: Simon, Judas Just, etc.

Superstitious and profound faith – an atavistic Christian legacy imposed on subject peoples as a one and only religion during the late Roman Empire and which clerics spread in the centuries thereafter to the most far away lands – has over time (gradually but inevitably) been replaced by a spontaneous process of establishment of rational scientific disciplines; the "constitution" which represents the foundation of Christian doctrine – **the Holy Writings of the New Testament** – has been implicated in this process.

When the myth of the Advent of the Jewish "Saviour Messiah" (Jeshua) was created, various primitive Christian sects were born, all of which were based on different theological, eschatological and regulatory principles devised and written in "holy texts" by their respective founders who of course considered themselves to be "elected" by God and thus representatives of His will. To their followers they preached their precepts as His revelations promising "Salvation" and wellbeing even in the afterlife. They were the first "Fathers" who idealized different "Christs" and who for their supreme, peculiar knowledge ("Gnosis" in Greek) of "God the Saviour" were called "Gnostics". The forerunners of these "Fathers" – the true initial "witnesses" to the "Advent of a Jewish Messiah", "**Son of God**" – were the Essene Jews: they were the ones who prophesied Him as such while awaiting Him and they felt obliged to document His descent from Heaven ... after the holocaust perpetuated by the Romans against the Jews.

(The details of this important analysis will be discussed in a later study, in light of the latest verifications and comparisons carried out by Israeli paleographers on the scrolls of Qumran found near the Dead Sea).

The century-old theological evolution represented in the "gnostic", "apocryphal" and "pseudo" Gospels – as described by several "canonical" Fathers and which has reached us thanks partly to the discovery of codexes found or dug up accidentally by archeologists – was followed and "supervised" by the "Fathers of Christianity". The resulting theological conclusions (the same which we find in present-day Christian doctrine) were conceived by those Fathers who, during the 4th century – after numerous Councils characterized by persecutory disputes among opposing currents of thought – agreed on the definitive canon and established the "form" and the "substance" of Christ, His prerogatives, His relationship with men and their duties towards this new Entity. The non-aligned Christian sects were declared "heretical" and their representatives were eliminated or forced to flee.

In order to prevent the reconstruction of the evolutionary process of the doctrine and the eschatology contained in the doctrine itself – a reconstruction which would have highlighted the many versions created by men rather than a one and only incontestable "divine revelation" *. Therefore the Christian leaders were forced to destroy documents which were incompatible with the victorious "Universal Creed" and to "rework" the selected primitive Gospels in order to make them coherent with the established "canon".

* The "**Gospel of Judas**" (dated 275 A.D.) – recovered and deciphered recently, after being accurately checked by means of mass spectrometry – gives us a representation of "Jesus the Saviour" which is entirely different from the one we know: Virginal birth, Resurrection and theophagical Eucharistic sacrifice (which are the foundation of Christianity) are not present, while God the Creator is different. A diversity which is both serious and basic, and which can be found by comparing this Gospel with the two oldest and complete codexes which have reached us; both date back to the 4th century, on the basis of paleographical "estimates" which were not carried out spectrometrically (**a method of dating deliberately ignored by Christian manuscripts**): the "**Vatican Codex**" and the "**Codex Sinaiticus**".

After eliminating the conflicting texts and making the doctrine coherent during the 4th century, the Fathers took pains to document the "canonical revelation", enriching the Gospels (and in particular the "Acts of the Apostles") with historiographical references after being granted the right to access the Imperial libraries. The events and **the historical figures** (as they are depicted in the canonical texts) **do not appear in the other Gospels**.

The first Christian – who was strong and thus a frequenter of the Court of Constantine the Great – to exercise great influence on the imperial family, therefore allowing him to access the state archives, was the important and highly venerable Bishop **Eusebius of Caesarea**.

He made a doctrine, which in reality had an evolutionary past and was ideologically multiform (with followers who were his contemporary adversaries) appear linear and exclusive from the very beginning. Eusebius is to be given the "merit" of having created an uninterrupted "continuitas" of martyrs and theological Councils held by "*Highly venerable and Saintly Ministers seated on episcopal throne*" (expressions used by Eusebius) who were the Heads of the Churches of the Saviour right after his brief Advent: the Bishops and the "Popes".

He made a great effort:

*"To distinguish between authentically orthodox scriptures and heretical scriptures which are absurd and impious, made up by diabolical charlatans ... And we know that a certain **Menander** ... was a disciple of **Simon Magus**, and that he was also driven by the demons ... (and) deceived many by his magical art. And he persuaded his followers that they should not die ... And it was indeed an artefact of the devil to endeavor, by means of such **sorcerers, who assumed the name of Christians**" (HEC III 25,7 and 26,3/4).*

This Menander, who succeeded Simon Magus, never existed: like his "Teacher". The evidence of the invention of Simon Magus (another protagonist invented in "Acts of the Apostles") was reported in the previous analysis regarding Paul of Tarsus (who was also invented). In this case it is much simpler to prove that the "satanical favourite Apostle" did not exist: if the "Teacher" (Simon Magus) did not exist, neither did his disciple (Menander). The characters described are purely imaginary and ridiculous, and thus are not mentioned to followers during sermons ... despite the fact that for the Church both "Acts of the Apostles" by Luke and "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Eusebius of Caesarea continue to be part of the "Canon" and the "Tradition".

Benedict XVI, during the General Audience with the Pope held on 13 June 2007 defends the merits of the Bishop and describes him as **"the most qualified representative of Christian culture of his time"**.

It is important to know that the compiling of manuscripts regarding the "ecclesiastic tradition" - therefore a Eusebian history which is no longer original but made up of information which is partly invented and purified of its most macroscopic contradictions - is based on groups of codexes divided into two families which are only dated paleographically (an incorrect method when not accompanied by an instrumental verification, regardless of the religious conditioning) between the tenth and thirteenth century A.D, while "Editio Princeps" dates back to 1544. It is evident that the original Eusebian "testimony" was opportunely censored by ancient ecclesiastical critics. According to these codexes, Eusebius was not born in Caesarea of Palestine; this piece of news "appeared" suddenly during the Renaissance, but without identifiable birth records (he has no surname and there is no trace of his birthplace and that of his parents). This is evidence of the continuous adaptation of the entire work, which has even puzzled the editors of the translations. Their is a dual aim which is quite evident:

1st an Eusebius who was a "Palestinian" Bishop would have confirmed that in the **"Land of the Lord"** a large Christian community existed uninterruptedly from the very moment of His coming, community which was governed by various **Bishops among whom the most important was that of Jerusalem**. This role did not exist as we are about to demonstrate;

2nd separate the theological and historical contradictions "imported" into the manuscripts, by distinguishing them and attributing them to different "Eusebiuses".

The name **"εὐσεβής"** (eusebès) is a Greek adjective meaning "religious" and it is incompatible with the Semitic language of that region. Today's exegete believers say that this was his name due to the fact that he was Bishop of Caesarea of Palestine despite not being born in this city: a belated explanation with no textual confirmation and as such not very convincing. Due to the importance of his role (and for this reason remembered by history), it is impossible for him to have never told his calligraphers or to have never written in his works where he and his parents were born; on the contrary, **he would have been forced to give this information in order to distinguish himself from another Christian Bishop with his same name**. The latter was just as strong and like the former was an accredited frequenter of the imperial court of Constantine the Great: **Eusebius of Nicomedia ***.

We know that he was born in this city and thanks to the historian Ammianus Marcellinus (Res Gestae XXII 9,4) we know that he was a relative of Constantine the Great and therefore the only person eligible to replace the inexistent Eusebius of Caesarea: the biographical, religious, political, historical and geographical similarities are impressive and even overlap.

* This ancient and important city in Asia Minor became the main city of the Empire, after Rome, when it was chosen as capital of the Eastern Tetrarchy under Emperor Diocletian. As of 313 A.D. the court of Constantine the Great resided in Nicomedia; after the latter founded the city of "New Rome" (Constantinople) in 330 A.D. and made it the capital, he continued to live in the imperial palace of Nicomedia, considered to be the "center of the Empire", until his death in 337 A.D.

As the city of Nicomedia already had its own Bishop - and not by chance as he was related to Emperor Constantine - it was not at all logical for the spiritual leader of another city, Caesarea of Palestine, to reside so far from the throne he ascended in 313 A.D. and thus be unable to carry out his pastoral mission on behalf of the followers of Christ living in this Palestinian city.

This superficial coincidence of names is not credible and the only justifiable explanation lies in the need for the Church (after the Council of Nicea held in 325 A.D.) to hide a compromising Arian version of the Christian doctrine practiced during a period which immediately precedes many Ecclesiastical Councils aimed at defining the Essence of the Christian divinity. The method adopted consisted in the recording of Eusebius's works ex novo by eliminating those original theological concepts in contrast with the current doctrine. This is a long theological analysis that is separate from the present study and therefore we will continue to call him by convention "Eusebius of Caesarea".

Having said this, let's carry on our analysis of the Apostles and their successors.

In the previous study regarding the Apostle "James the Minor" (called also the "Just"), we demonstrated that this theological protagonist never really existed, and therefore **was not a Bishop chosen by the other Apostles as Head of the Church of Christ** in Jerusalem immediately after His death, resurrection and ascension into heaven (HEC. II 1,2):

"Then James (Apostle), whom the ancients surnamed the Just, is recorded to have been the first to be made Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem".

On the basis of the above-mentioned chronicle dating back to **62 A.D.** (reported in "Jewish Antiquities" by Josephus) which makes reference to James, if a Christian Bishop **"seated on the throne"** had truly existed - as Minister of God head of a community of followers of **Christ** (Jewish **Messiah**) in Jerusalem, but founder and legislator of a faith different from Judaism - the first to offer evidence of a Christian Bishop would have been the Jewish writer Josephus who would have referred to him as such, being that the historian (who by this time was a twenty-five-year-old eminent scribe of the Sanhedrin) was a conservative Pharisee in Jerusalem and a Jew awaiting the advent of the divine Messiah.

From the analysis it is evident that "James" (who incredibly had no patronymic) brother of a certain Jesus, passed off as "Jesus Christ" by the deceitful Christian scribes, was in reality brother of "Jesus son of Damneus", not Jesus son of Saint Joseph (if he had truly been the brother of Jesus Christ) and not son of Cleophas, husband of a Mary, passed off as sister of the Virgin Mary (it is senseless to think that the parents could have given the same name to both daughters)*; being that James was a brother of Jesus Christ, this would have meant that the Madonna had also married Cleophas.

* The Christian scribes - unable to admit that there were other children of the "Mother of God" who remained immaculate even after giving birth - were forced to clone "Mary" six times in the Gospels and in the "Acts". Five of these "Marys" (apart from "Magdalene") are related to "Mary" and mothers of sons whose names (which we have seen in the first study) are always the same and strictly Judaic: James, Simon, John, Judas and Joseph. Consequently, the Church has found itself in a predicament made up of "historical" lies added to the primitive Gospels at a later date; the Church is unable to find a way out of the fix and thus is forced to hide these lies and not examine them in depth to avoid putting Marian "dogma" in a difficult position.

The inexistence of the "Bishops" of Jerusalem – but the same goes for the other episcopal seats, Popes, "Apostolic Fathers" and Jesuit Christian martyrs – is also confirmed by the invention of the successor to the Apostle Bishop James, "brother of the Lord": **Simon, brother of Jesus** (Mk 6,3 and Mt 13,55) which the tradition cites as "relative of Jesus" or "cousin". In fact, the Church of Eusebius (in order to guarantee continuity) was forced to invent a "Bishop successor" to Apostle James (who was also invented), aware that the **"Episcopal throne" did not exist until the second half of the second century.**

Simon bar Kochba – a self-proclaimed Messiah who came to power after rebelling (132 A.D.) against Roman domination and proclaiming himself "Prince of the Jews" – as a Jew would have felt himself obliged to eliminate all the Palestinian Bishops (if they had existed) as they were **Leaders of a religion subject to the Empire and in contrast with his own.**

As we have done with James, let's analyze the history of **Simon, second Bishop of Jerusalem:**

"After the martyrdom of James (62 A.D.) and the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) the relatives of the Lord met here to agree on the successor to James. They unanimously designated Simon, cousin of the Saviour, as Bishop of Jerusalem" (HEc. III, 11).

This "Simon", who in the Gospels is known as "Simon Zealot" (according to the abstruse theories of the various religious factions of today) is sometimes passed off as a "cousin" of Jesus, son of an unspecified "Cleophas" (who is hypothesized as a brother of Saint Joseph) husband of "Mary", sister of the Virgin Mary; and sometimes he is passed off as a "half brother" of Jesus, son of Saint Joseph, born during an earlier marriage (but we do not know who he was married to). Therefore, in both cases, a Simon who is older than Christ himself who in the Gospel of John (Jhn 8,57), in defiance of the other evangelists, is said to be almost fifty years old; Jesus's age is also confirmed by the Bishop Irenaeus of Lyon (Lugdunum) at the end of the 2nd century.

We inevitably find ourselves in the presence of a very old man transformed into a martyr who (as we are about to demonstrate) turned out to be a "stray bullet" resulting from the heading off of the true original Zealot brothers, all of whom with authentic traditional Jewish names and protagonists of a true Messianic event which was later transformed into a myth by the Zealot Essenes residing in Egypt, forced to escape the persecutions ordered by Vespasian immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. (see "The Jewish War" II, ch. 8, 152/3; VII, ch. 10, 417/9).

"He also relates that Vespasian after the conquest of Jerusalem gave orders that all that belonged to the tribe of David should be sought out, in order that none of the royal race might be left among the Jews; and in consequence of this a most terrible persecution again hung over the Jews" (HEc. III 12).

We know that *"the tribe of David of Royal extraction"* belongs to Judeo-Christian mythology which was unknown and thus would not have had a great influence on the Romans who put to fire and the sword all the Jewish cities. In reality Bishop Eusebius – aware that **"Not even his brothers believed in Him"** (Jhn 7,5) was written in the Gospels and that a God author of portentous miracles not recognized by Christ's family was inadmissible – cleverly decided to "have the brothers of the Lord regain faith" (thus contradicting what is said in the holy writings) ... and does not of course place his family members among the disciples yet **assigns one, Simon the Zealot, to the "Episcopal throne"**.

When Eusebius attested these events in the fourth century how could he have known that three centuries earlier Simon had become Bishop of Jerusalem? Simple: he invented his personal Christian historian and called him **"Hegesippus"**. After depicting him as an **Apostate Jew** converted to Christianity – therefore with a knowledge of the Semitic language which would have made it possible to read the original Jewish and Syriac Gospels and thus give evidence of their existence – Eusebius first made the mistake of calling him by an incredible Greek name (Jewish parents would have never given such a name as the Jews were at war with the Greeks). Then, in order to avoid dangerous historical contradictions, Eusebius placed him in the second century (between 110 and 180 A.D.), **just after the death of the true Jewish chronicler Josephus** (who died in 105 A.D.), and sent him out to the Churches of Christ **"to accurately report and compile the tradition of Apostolic preaching"** (HEc.IV 8,2; IV 22,3).

Eusebius granted Hegesippus an "ad honorem" specialization for the ability shown in the search for martyrs and ecclesiastical positions (Fathers and Popes included), thus distinguishing the latter from the ignorance characterizing the other chroniclers of the time with regard to the vast Christian tradition represented by figures of utmost importance whose existence is not supported by archeological findings. The Bishop informed posterity that Hegesippus not only knew the Semitic languages but also had a vast knowledge of Greek, Latin and the various heretical gnostic Jesuit doctrines which we have mentioned above. All is reported in five books – "Hypomnemata" (Memories) – which no one, apart from Eusebius, has ever seen or read.

There is no historical confirmation of the existence of Hegesippus; in fact, after having "passed on" to us the existence of many Fathers, Popes, Bishops, Christian scribes, martyrs, etc, we discover that none of these characters ever mention him up until the time of Eusebius: the true creator of Hegesippus and his characters. Famous Fathers (for the "Eusebian tradition") who Hegesippus knew personally (as mentioned by Eusebius), and who in turn were not aware of the existence of such a cultured and famous Jew who had converted to Christianity and moreover in possession of original Gospels written in Aramaic and Syriac. This is historical "editing" is senseless and has no credibility. In fact, none of the Apologetic Fathers or Bishops described by Hegessipus (who lived while he was alive) called in to personify the long, uninterrupted "Sequela Christi" – famous prelates who were leaders of Churches in many important cities throughout the Roman Empire – ever existed, as no evidence of their existence is offered by non-Christian historians or by archeological findings. And this is what we are about to verify.

"Under Trajan a persecution against us broke out. Here found death Simon, son of Cleophas, who we have indicated as the second Bishop of Jerusalem (after James). Hegesippus himself is a witness to this. He adds that Simon, by them accused at that time, was subject for days, because Christian, to all forms of torture to the amazement of the present and then a met death like that of the Lord. He suffered martyrdom at the age of one hundred and twenty years under Trajan and the consularis Atticus ... Simon, tortured for many days, gave evidence of his faith in such a manner that all, including the consul, were amazed that a man of one hundred and twenty years could so resist, and thus was condemned to crucifixion" (HEc III 32, 1/6).

The exaggeration in this description is so evident that we must be astounded by the dogmatic conformism demonstrated by all the most important spiritualist teachers of the history of Christianity, who on the contrary do everything in their power to render it credible.

The aim is evident: in-depth research capable of contradicting these absurdities implies questioning not only the event itself but the entire "historical tradition" of Jesuit Christianity as reported by Eusebius and interpreted by Bishops, Fathers and martyrs. Every piece of information must be verified through comparative historiography, epigraphy, archeology and philology.

And this is what we are about to do.

According to the "**Chronicles**" of Eusebius, which have reached us through a Saint Jerome (whose works in turn have reached us through medieval manuscripts), the martyrdom occurred in 108 A.D., "*during the eleventh year of the reign of Trajan*".

Only a Christian scribe could have decided to have an **ex-Roman Consul "Consularis"** (cfr Tacitus: ANN. XIV 43; Suet: Tib. 41) with such a title and rank be present - after having followed by this date a cursus through various Magistracies, in our case with military imperium - and deserving of the *imperial* title of "**Legatus Augusti pro Praetore**", Governor of Syria, with the principal task of intervening (as did occur) in a possible war against the Parthians.

Hegesippus, incredibly, sent out one of the most powerful officials of the Roman Empire, having him travel over 600 km **from Antioch to Jerusalem**, to take part in (for many days) the endless tortured practiced on a venerable old Saint accused, along with others, of being "Christian", and then crucified like Jesus: it is the only way to convince him to stop living.

The way in which the Eusebius's passage is represented is so grave (as it involved the persecution of many Christians) that, inevitably, it should have certainly interested Roman law; thus the event could not have remained silent.

But Plinius the Younger was unaware of this "evidence"; just four years after this hypothetical event (we are in 112 A.D.) and with the approval of Trajan, he dealt with the problem of the Christians in Bithynia, by **officializing it for the first time** (from a legal point of view) after conducting a detailed recorded investigation which was then sent to the Emperor; according to this investigation, **there were no territorial leaders of the Church of Christ** seated on Episcopal throne. The analysis of this second incident is reported in the study regarding the false martyrdom of Christians attributed to Nero.

The scribe who invented the scenography regarding the martyrdom of Bishop Simon (recalling Hegesippus) simply had a quick, superficial look at history in the attempt to find a real character who he could transform into a "historical witness" so as to give credibility to the narrated event: the "**Consularis Atticus**" resulting from the above-mentioned passage of Eusebius.

But the medieval scribe (or artist) should have deepened his knowledge of the true events rather than worrying about decorating his codex with very beautiful iconographical images.

Being that he was a Consul, the cognomen "Atticus" on its own is too narrow and incomplete to be reported by an authentic historian: if Hegesippus had truly existed between 110 and 180 A.D. (according to evidence provided by the Church), he would have been a contemporary of **two Consuls** with this appellation, father and son, **the first** chosen in **133 A.D.** under Hadrian and the second (who was more famous) in 143 A.D. under Antoninus Pius.

An authentic chronicler - the same age (as in the case of Hegesippus) as the second "Atticus" who was much more famous than his father - would have felt obliged to distinguish between them and mention them by using their complete name so as to demonstrate a credible knowledge of these two figures, as was done by real historians who described them.

This evidence is confirmed by the epigraphic findings which have allowed archeologists to precisely determine the dating of the Consulate of the first "Atticus" (father), passed off as a "martyrizer" of the Bishop Simon. Being that the son of the Consul was renowned for his culture and for his generous sponsorship of important monuments, historiography and archeological vestiges have handed down to posterity his feats, which have been described in extreme detail from when he was still alive.

The father's complete name was "**Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes**", while his son's complete name was "**Lucius Vibullius Ipparcus** (son of) **Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes**", typical of second century Roman onomastic practice which prompted the nobility of the Empire to add the names of their ancestors to their own thus giving birth to long polynomials.

Having said this - and taken into consideration the puerile scene described above which is in itself impossible, thus demonstrating that the story was invented - we are left with the task of establishing the year in which the first "Atticus" was appointed Consul.

Two small bronze slates were found in 1986 in Bad Wuimpfen (in Baden-Württemberg) in an ancient Roman military quarter which later became the civitas regional capital (called Alisinensium) of the imperial province of Upper Germany; these slates were rejoined and they turned out to be a Military Diploma belonging to a veteran of the II Cohors Hispanorum:

AE 1990, 0763 = RMD-03,159.

[IMP(erator) Caesar divi Traiani Parthici(i) f(ilius) Traianus **Hadrianus** Aug(ustus) ... equitibus et peditibus duxiss(ent) dumtaxat] sing(uli) singul(as)/ **P(ublius) Sufenas [Verus]/Ti(berius) Claudius Atticus [Herodes Co(n)s(ulibus)]**/Coh(ortis) II Hi[s]p[anor(um)] P(iae) F(idelis) cui prae(e)st] / L(ucius?) [//] Ti(beri) Iul[i] [Urbani?] / Q(uinti) Lolli [Festi] / L(uci) Pulli [Anthi(?)

The discovery of this Diploma issued by Emperor Hadrian (whose imperial attributes have deteriorated) was dated between 129 and 133 A.D. by Margaret Roxan, a world-famous specialist. This diploma - which cites **Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes** and **Publius Sufenas Verus** (who were both Consuls) - was soon followed by another Diploma which provides further confirmation of the protagonism of these two military leaders along that *limes* of the Empire. This second Diploma was found in 1991 in Mautern (Austria) located in the ancient Roman Province of Noricum; it was **issued** at the time of Hadrian and is dated **after 129 A.D.**, year in which the Emperor accepted the title of Excellency "**Pater Patriae**" proposed by the Senate the previous year and attested by the numerous coins which have been found. The Diploma:

CIL 16, 00174 = AE 1991, 1286.

[IMP(erator) Caesar divi Traiani Pa[r]thici f(ilius) divi N[ervae] n(epos)] / [Traianus **Hadrianus** Aug(ustus) Pont(ificus) Max(imus)] / [trib(unicia) pot(estate) Co(n)s(ul)] **P(ater) P(atriciae)** [equitib(us) et peditib(us) qui milit(averunt) in] alis III et Coh(ortibus) V / [I Augusta Thracu]m et I Pann(oniorum) Tam[plana] Victrix et I Commagenorum] / [et] I Tungr(orum) [(milliaria) vex(illatio)]/[et] N[oricor(um)] [] cum est civitas iis [dat(a) aut siqui caelibes] / essent cum iis qu[as] post(ea) dux(issent) dum]taxat singul(i) singul[as] **P(ublius) Sufenas] Verus / Ti(berius) Claud[ius] Herodes Atticus Co(n)s(ulibus)]** / Coh(ortis) II Batavor(um) [(milliaria) cui prae(e)st] / L(ucius) Vitellius / ex / Octavio Octa[vi] f(ilio)

Being that Publius Sufenas Verus was one of the legates of the ancient Roman Province of Lycia and Pamphylia (in present-day Turkey) from 129 to 132 A.D. - confirmed by the "Opramoas dossier" * and taking into account that he was not appointed Consul Prior until the end of his term - the experts come to the conclusion that the elderly Atticus was chosen as Consul suffectus **after** the appointment of P. Sufenas Verus to the position of Consul prior; therefore less than eleven years before Atticus's son became Consul ordinarius in 143 A.D. under Emperor Antoninus Pius. The appointment of Herod Atticus (father) to Senator - granted by the Senate with "ornamenta praetoria" - historically dates back to the early years of Hadrian's reign. The experts are supported by the evidence provided by Philostratus in "**Lives of the**

Sophists" (2,1,1) where the rhetor attests that Herod Atticus (son) *"belonged to a family (on his father's side) that had exercised the Consulate two times"*.

* Licius Opramoas was a second century pagan High Priest, wealthy notable and benefactor of the less fortunate, who commissioned the carving of 69 documents on the walls of his sepulchral monument in Rhodiapolis (southern Anatolia, in present-day Turkey), precious documents which today allow us to reconstruct the series of Governors and High Priests *"ἀρχιερείς"* (Archiereis) of the imperial Roman Province of "Lycia et Pamphylia" between 103 and 152 A.D.

These findings – after being the object of numerous publications – were discussed at Wolfson College (Oxford) on 7 November 1996. The academic world gradually became aware of the fact that Claudius Herodes Atticus (father) was appointed Consul suffectus after 132 A.D., **under Hadrian and not under Trajan**. Experts specialized in epigraphy, archeology, history and philology, like Margaret Roxan, Géza Alföldy, Werner Eck, Anthony R. Birley, E. Groag, Anthony Spawforth, Malcom Errington and so on, have published analyses which confirm this historical truth while at the same time they all avoid an open controversy with the evidence provided by Eusebius-Hegesippus. A difficult decision, taken for political rather than scientific reasons, in order not to hurt the feelings of the Clergy and of believers who would not have stomached a historical discovery capable of **"bringing down" the truthfulness** of the sequence **of the "successors of the Apostles"** of the Saviour. The exegete believers know that the whole "ecclesiastical structure" – documented by Eusebius of Caesarea and **officialized by the present-day Churches** – according to the contrived medieval manuscripts, governed the entire Christian ecumene from the death of the Redeemer to the end of the second century A.D. Unfortunately, for the churchy believers, later verifications (cfr **ZPE 174** year 2010): **Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik** – Reinhold Merkelbach und Ludwig Koenen) demonstrate that Hadrian conferred the Consuls Publius Sufenas Verus (Consul prior) and Tiberius Claudius Herodes Atticus (Consul suffectus), one after the other, the honour of ruling over the consulate in 133 A.D.

Prior to the RMD (Roman Military Diplomas) archeological findings the theory dear to the spiritualist historians postulated a Judaea promoted by Trajan to the status of autonomous imperial Province **no longer annexed to Syria** in order to justify the presence of a Consul appointed by Caesar to "martyrize" the tough and "die-hard" one-hundred-and-twenty-year-old **Simon**, the **"second Bishop of Jerusalem"** who, according to what they have led us to believe, replaced "James the Minor" (Bishop and martyr) forty-six years earlier.

But **if a "second Bishop" never existed, nor could there have been a "first Bishop" of Jerusalem** ... therefore the **James**, brother of Christ, reported by Josephus, **could not have been the brother of Jesus Christ elected by the Apostles "Bishop of Jerusalem" after the death and resurrection of the Redeemer, but was someone else: James son of Damneus** who was the brother of a High Priest also called "Jesus" (as we have already demonstrated in the previous study).

Indifferent to the philological, historical and archeological discoveries which oblige us to modify untenable theories, the professor of history at the Università Cattolica, Marta Sordi, in the book **"Fazioni e Congiure nel mondo antico"** (published in 1999)* in a footnote on page 95 states – omitting the correct historical information that would have obliged her to mention a **"Consul"** – with arrogant authoritativeness:

"Tiberianus, governor of Palestine, to likely be identified with Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herod ..."

* Which means "Factions and Conspiracies in the Ancient World".

No teacher of **history** has the right to make **history** subservient to catechism because once the shady expedient is uncovered, their name will inevitably be remembered in ... **history**.

In 2003 Guido Migliorati, professor at the Università Cattolica, in his work entitled **"Cassio Dione e l'impero romano da Nerva a Antonino Pio. Alla luce dei nuovi documenti"** – conscious of the evidence which has convinced experts of many countries to revise a superficial belief regarding the martyred Bishop Simon (which are in line with the induced puerile teachings) and unwilling to renounce his ethical professionalism – on page 262 states:

"Tiberius Claudius Herodes Atticus to whom were granted the ornamenta praetoria thanks to a decree of the senate and who became consul in 132, therefore under Hadrian and not under Trajan".

Guido Migliorati does not go any further and avoids, like his colleagues of other countries, a more in-depth analysis; in other words, he does not compare his analysis to Eusebian pseudo-historiography in order to avoid arriving at conclusions which are devastating for Christian faith. In fact, the first Jesuit Bishop to disappear was Simon's successor: Judas the Just, son of James the Just brother of Jesus. The fraudulent Jesuit "tradition" goes as far as to install onto the "episcopal throne" of Jerusalem a nephew of Christ. Here is what Saint Jerome states in **"Chronicles"**:

"Simon, son of Cleophas, who was Bishop of Jerusalem, was crucified during the persecution of Trajan against the Christians. He was succeeded by Just".

According to the **"Apostolic Constitutions"** (7,46): **"he was succeeded by Judas, son of James the Just"**. This is confirmed by Epiphanius of Salamis in "Panarion" (66,20,1) and the first of many to attest this was Eusebius of Caesarea in his famous "Historia Ecclesiastica" (III 35); the impenitent, deceitful Bishop Eusebius very cleverly has Judas Just (HEc IV 5,3-34), son of Jesus's brother James the Just, be succeeded by a series of twelve other imaginary Bishops of Jerusalem, the last of whom is understandably prior to the coming of Simon bar Kochba, Prince of the Jews and the last Jewish Messiah who dared challenge Rome.

It is important to highlight that James, Simon and Judas Just – the first three Bishops of Jerusalem and invented by the bogus Christian "tradition" – were **"linked to the Lord by the flesh"**.

"Eusebius of Caesarea" – a privileged Christian Bishop who was as powerful and fanatical as the faith which blinded him – from his episcopal throne invented, wrote and officialized a false ecclesiastical history, recognized as the foundation of present-day Christianity, destined to the **"blessed poor in spirit"**. A "Historia Ecclesiastica" which we consider "naive", a polite euphemism ... which is very, very reductive. And this is only the beginning.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]