



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](#)  

Saint John, the false Apostle, witnessed by fake "Fathers"

The renowned humanist **Aldus Pius Manutius** (Aldo Manuzio, 1449 – 1515) was an important Italian Renaissance figure with a passion for classical studies, friend of many influential clerics and frequenter of ancient libraries; after collaborating for years with many expert manuscript researchers whose support was essential to the publication of works regarding Greek and Latin civilization, **in 1508** he printed an edition of "**The Letters of Plinius the Younger to Trajan ...**" (C. Plinii Secundi ... Epistolarum libri Dece ...) which included, **for the first time**, the collection of letters to the Emperor when the patrician governed over **Bithynia** as Legatus Augusti pro Praetore. In one of these letters written to Trajan in 112 A.D., the pagan Senator denounced the copious and abnormal presence of a Christian sect in that faraway Roman province.

With regard to the authenticity of the letter written by Plinius the Younger to Trajan and the relative response of the Emperor, for over a century many experts of worldwide renown have published contrasting theories: some of these are intricate and none are supported by conclusive historical information and thus are unable to go beyond generic opinions which inevitably are the result of preconceived positions. Believers are convinced of their truthfulness while non-believers affirm that these theories are false.

All of the documentation was obtained from a reading of the manuscript classified under **Codex Parisinus Latinus 6809**, paleographically dated to the sixth century. This codex was preserved in the Abbey of Saint Victor (near Paris) where the Dominican friar Giovanni Giocondo copied the codex and then handed over a copy to Aldo Manuzio. The latter published it in Venice and in 1508 all the scholars interested in studying the topic in-depth learned (for the first time) about the event regarding the Christian precursors, who were already present in the Province of Bithynia; between the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D. there were already many Christians in this land, thus prompting Plinius the Younger to inquire into the followers of the sect and its objectives and then submit the problem to Trajan highlighting its legal implications with respect to Roman Law.

This manuscript and others containing the letters of Gaius Cecilius Plinius the Second called the Younger, were kept in libraries belonging to mainly French abbeys directed by various kinds of ecclesiastical authorities. The documents were recorded into various codexes by copyists on the basis of a sole archetype (which was probably the original), but only some of these codexes contained the X book, the only one in which the correspondence (made up of 26 official letters, including the one regarding the primitive Christians) between the Governor of Bithynia and Emperor Trajan could be found.

The report sent to the Emperor by his Legate ("**Epistularum X 96**": it's on-line) contains the conclusions to the inquiry carried out – mainly by torturing and even executing numerous Christians – to establish the dangerousness of the new religious sect. According to the ecclesiastical "tradition", documented in the immense Greek and Latin patrology drawn up from the Middle Ages onwards (there is no manuscript dating back to before this time), those Christians subject to torture and execution should have been recognized as "martyrs".

Instead, when reading how Tertullianus in "**Apologeticum**" (2,6) comments the sad event, we discover that:

*"Plinius the Second, who governed a Province (which?), after condemning and forcing several Christians to renounce their faith, **struck by their number** and not knowing how to act, informed Emperor Trajan that they had no criminal intentions apart from their refusal of the pagan cult".*

This is very limited "indirect" testimony which deliberately "forgets", although unexplainably at a first glance, the most significant piece of information: **the torture and death of a large number of Christians ordered by the Governor of Bithynia**, Plinius the Younger.

It is important to point out that **the first manuscripts of "Apologeticum" date back to the tenth century**. This dating demonstrates that five centuries before Aldo Manuzio published the letters of Plinius the Second which included his reports to Trajan, **the Christian scribes were already aware of the letters which the Governor of Bithynia sent to the Emperor**.

And according to the Codex Parisinus Latinus 6809, the ancient ecclesiastical exegetes were aware several centuries earlier of the letter of Plinius the Younger and of the Christians who were tortured and executed. The high prelates had a copy of this letter, or perhaps even the original, yet they never published or made reference to it in the vast Christian patristic literature drawn up through the centuries; in spite of their duty and interest to do so ... on the basis of an initial superficial and widespread opinion.

It was in fact the reading of "Apologeticum" which convinced the learned Aldo to conduct an inquiry on the numerous Christians reported to Trajan by Plinius the Younger; thanks to Aldo's close contacts with members of the Clergy, the letter which Plinius Second sent to the Emperor came to his knowledge. His awareness of the letter led him to search for a copy of the tenth book containing the letter written by Plinius Second to Trajan in order to corner the "scoop", which

gave proof of the existence of primitive Christians by means of a historical document. At least this was his aim and that of those who helped him ... in very, very, good faith.

On the contrary, the "grey eminences" of the High Clergy – who up until Anno Domini 1508 had managed to hide the official letter of Governor Plinius the Younger and his intervention against the Christians – began to worry that sooner or later someone might discover the motives lying behind such grave deception. Well, today the time has run out.

After Christianity was recognized and equated to other religions by Constantine the Great, the Church did everything in its power to identify and compile the "Acts of the Martyrs", made up of proceedings regarding the agonizing deaths which the Christian followers of Jesus underwent, due to their faith, from right after His crucifixion ... onwards.

Today those "Acts" are found in the "Martyrology": a sort of official liturgical calendar in which the stories of the Jesuit martyrs of all epochs are described. And yet, **despite the historical evidence, the Christian martyrs of Plinius the Second have never been beatified** ... nor have they been commemorated as "unknown martyrs". Why?

After consulting the imperial archives under Constantine and viewing the authentic letters of Plinius the Younger, the "grey Christian eminences" became aware of the event and of what went on behind the scenes: **the episode** not only demonstrated that those "Christians" were Messianists but not followers of Jesus, but **undermines the credibility of all the holy "canonical" texts** and the feats narrated therein, in particular the feats of the **Apostles and their successors and those of the martyrs**. The grey eminences of the Jesuit clergy understood immediately that **the Christians in Bithynia did not know "Jesus Christ", the "Son of God", "Saviour" and "Redeemer" of all humanity**.

Evidence which forced the Christian scribes to modify the "holy writing" in the fourth century; this was done by adopting superficial and puerile method which can be demonstrated through a comparative reading of **"Acts of the Apostles"** and the **historiography of the time**.

Let's go back to Plinius the Younger **in Bithynia** and broaden the view on the territory subject to Rome: we can observe that in that same year (**112 A.D.**) **Cornelius Tacitus** - another **Legatus Augusti pro Praetore of Trajan** and friend of Plinius the Second as well as the principal historian of the Roman Empire – was **Governor of the Province of Asia, south of Bithynia** ... therefore ...

"They travelled through Phrygia and the Galatian territory, because they had been told by the Holy Spirit not to preach the word in Asia. When they reached the frontier of Mysia they tried to go into Bithynia, but as the Spirit of Jesus would not allow them ..." (Acts 16,6/7).

Let's see why God did not allow Saint Paul and Barnabas to go to the Provinces of Asia and Bithynia ...

The apostolate of Saint John

The study carried out by Simon the Zealot – "brother" "half brother" "relative" "cousin" of Jesus who, according to Christian writings, was the second Bishop of Jerusalem – demonstrated the inexistence of this man who also detained the highest priestly role of spiritual governance within the Christian community of the Holy City; the existence of his precursor, the Apostle "James the Minor", first Bishop of the same Diocese, has also been proven wrong.

The investigation regarding the presence of Christians (Messianists, non-Jesuits) legally denounced by Plinius the Younger in **112 A.D.** (which we report in "the false martyrs of Nero") allowed us to prove that there were no "pastoral" leaders of the Church of Christ in **Bithynia**. At this same date **there were no communities of Jesuit Christians and nor were there territorial leaders, not even in the Province of Asia** (whose capital was Ephesus) governed by the Roman Proconsul Cornelius Tacitus*, who was a pagan priest and thus would have at least denounced these Christians and, like Plinius the Younger, would have submitted the case to Emperor Trajan.

Even more so, because, according to the historiography attested in the manuscript laurentianus mediceus M II which appeared in the eleventh century, **Tacitus himself reports the massacre of the followers of Jesus carried out by Nero** who blamed the Christians for having set fire to Rome. In this same passage it is important to point out that the historian described the Christian sect as *"a ruinous superstition which, like a grave scourge, was spreading rapidly even in Rome"*: this animosity, therefore, was even more hostile than the one expressed by Governor Plinius Second.

* Ephesus became the capital of the Province of Asia Minor in 27 B.C. under Caesar Augustus. The presence of the famous Roman historian, Cornelius Tacitus, as Governor of this region is supported by the stone inscription found in Caria, located south of Ephesus, a city with many ancient Roman ruins. Today it can be found at the Museo Epigrafico in Rome and marked: CIL VI 1574 = CIL VI 41106 = AE 1995, 92 = AE 2000, 160.

In spite of the silence of Tacitus with regard to the numerous presence of Christians in the Province which he governed, everyone knew that **John the Evangelist "remained in the Church of Ephesus", capital of the Province of Asia**, according to what was written by Eusebius of Caesarea (Hec. III 23) and drawn on by **Clement of Alexandria** and **Irenaeus of Lyons**. The latter wrote in *"Against the Heresies"* (III 3,4):

"The Church of Ephesus, which Paul founded and in which John remained until the time of Trajan, is truthful testimony of the tradition of the Apostles".

This testimony is also reported by the alleged successor **Policrates, Bishop of Ephesus**, at the end of the second century, in a letter sent to **Pope Victor**, the thirteenth after Saint Peter; evidence of both men is given by the usual Eusebius (which forces us to verify whether they truly existed, as the Christian Bishop had the habit of lying):

"Even John, he who placed his head on the chest of the Lord, who was priest, wore the golden laminae (the Jewish "petalon" placed on the headdress of the High Priests), martyr and teacher, he fell asleep in Ephesus" (Hec III 31,3).

But it is not credible that a crowded community of Christians, built by Paul of Tarsus and residing in one of the richest and most heavily populated capitals of the Empire, could have remained without a Bishop from the very moment of its founding (up until the time of Tacitus); this is clearly evident in the "Letter to the Ephesians"* sent to the Christians of this city by the super Apostle. **John** - *"the Apostle who Jesus loved"* - was entitled to this spiritual honour by right, like Simon Peter in Rome and James the Minor in Jerusalem.

Being that both of them did not exist, just like Paul, as we have already proven in the earlier studies, we have the duty to verify the historical credibility of Saint John, Apostle who was the "favourite of the Lord".

It is important to highlight that Eusebius of Caesarea, in his *"Historia Ecclesiastica"* (from III 33 to IV) lists a series of Bishops *"seated on the Throne"* (before and during the time of Tacitus) in many areas, **but does not mention leaders in the large Christian communities in Bithynia** (governed by Plinius the Younger) **and in the Province of Asia**

(governed by Cornelius Tacitus).

*The "**Letter to the Ephesians**" written by Paul of Tarsus can be found in the New Testament canon. Here the Apostle speaks *"to the saints present in Ephesus who believed in Jesus Christ ..."* and reminds them of *"the Ministry assigned to them by Christ"* but **does not realize that in Ephesus lived the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Christ, entrusted to John** (Jesus's favourite Apostle) who, prior to Paul, was assigned the same Ministry by the Saviour before the latter's death.

In fact, the ecumenical council, purposely held in Ephesus in 431 A.D., broadened the scanty evangelical and patristic information and decreed that *"John took Mary and came to Ephesus"*. But in reality the letter of Saint Paul makes no mention of the arrival in Ephesus of the Mother of God and Saint John, *"the disciple who Jesus loved"*.

It is important to point out that in Ephesus, where Tacitus governed in the name of Trajan, there were many Christians, as clearly attested in the Holy Writing "Acts of the Apostles". Here we read about the long stay (over two years) of an imaginary Paul in this city and his fruitful work of daily conversion characterized by amazing miracles carried out in the presence of the inhabitants of the capital of this important Roman Province:

*"This went on for two years, with the result that **all the inhabitants of Asia, both Jews and Greeks (sic), were able to hear the word of the Lord. So remarkable were the miracles worked by God at Paul's hands that handkerchiefs 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"*** (Acts 19,10-12).

The only people who were not aware of these divine revelations were the historians, chroniclers and imperial officials spread throughout the Empire, including the Jew Josephus.

*"In those days **John, the favourite of Jesus, both Apostle and evangelist, was still alive in Asia, where, after returning from exile on the island of Pathmos for the death of Domitian (96 A.D.), directed the Churches of that region"*** (HEc. III 23,1).

*"But Domitian having been put to death and his acts, on account of his excessive cruelty, having been annulled by the senate, **John he returned to Ephesus and continuing there until the time of the Emperor Trajan, founded and built churches throughout all Asia, and, worn out by old age, died in the sixty-eighth year after our Lord's passion and was buried near the same city"*** (Saint Jerome: "De viris illustribus" IX).

Therefore **there is clearly a contrast between history and Christian ecclesiastical tradition** (which has come to us by gathering information from solely clerical sources), which must be confronted **with the silence of Governor Tacitus with regard to Christians in Ephesus**. City where the famous chronicler, patrician and pagan priest lived in the palace of the Pretorius (even before composing his works) without realizing that all of the inhabitants of the Province of Asia (which he governed) had become Christians thanks to the incredible miracles of Saint Paul and the presence of Saint John: two Apostles of Lord Jesus and pillars of the Church.

This is simple historical evidence which is to be added to what was reported in the earlier study regarding Paul (see separate study) and which demonstrates that the super Apostle never existed; therefore he could never have gone to Ephesus to convert masses of Jews and Greeks. In fact, if all of the inhabitants of the Province of Asia had become Christians, the Proconsul (and historian) Tacitus - in addition to reporting it to Trajan through an obligatory epistle - would have accused and tortured them like his colleague and friend Plinius the Younger, who in the same year persecuted Christians (Messianists, non-Jesuits) in neighbouring Bithynia.

This observation brought forward by means of a critical verification of history allows us to negate **the presence of Saint John in Ephesus** because **lacking in historical credibility**; therefore we must discover why the five "Fathers" - venerable Teachers who succeeded the above-mentioned Apostles and "historians" of the Church - although claiming to know about the life of John the favourite of Christ, knew nothing about his **miraculous torture; and John, like the "Fathers", was not aware of the great massacre of Christians carried out by Nero**.

The torture of the Apostle John (also known as *"the disciple who Jesus loved"*) has been passed down to us by the most scholarly apologetic Father as well as the most important author of Christian works: **Tertullianus**. **Over two centuries after** these alleged contrasting events regarding "Apostolic tradition" in the Provinces of Asia and Bithynia, **the Lucan scribes** (when able to access the imperial archives) **became aware of the absence of Christians, unknown to Roman historians in that vast eastern region**. So they decided to resolve the problem by calling in Jesus himself and the Holy Spirit in "Acts of the Apostles" to dictate to the "Holy Trinity"* the countries which Saint Paul had to evangelize (along with his assistant Barnabas) in order to spread the faith in Christ. And God, obedient, carried out the orders of the scribes:

*"They travelled through Phrygia and the Galatian territory, because **they had been told by the Holy Spirit not to preach the word in Asia. When they reached the frontier of Mysia they tried to go into Bithynia, but as the Spirit of Jesus would not allow them ..."*** (Acts 16,6/7).

* The Holy Trinity was invented by the very Venerable Fathers and Saints after declaring "the Holy Spirit **Consubstantial** with the Son and Father" during the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.

This "precious" evidence reported by Saint Luke was in contrast with the Apostolic mission itself which, inevitably, will later deny the **"prohibition of God"** and totally disregard it without further "heavenly" justification as Paul went to Ephesus ... according to the distorted imagination of the Lucan scribe.

This - along with the many other insipidities highlighted in the earlier studies - show the degree of hypocrisy attained by the "grey Christian eminences" in the drawing up of this "holy text" at a time when the Roman Empire had entered into an irreversible crisis and was forced to renounce the Capitoline divinities, accused of having been unable to protect the glory of Rome, and replace them with a new religion.

The current Jesuit Creed was designed by the Christians in the fourth century during quarrelsome Councils ending in the persecution of their dissident participants, declared as heretics.

The undertakings of the aspiring leaders of the Catholic world are described as such by **Ammianus Marcellinus**, the most important imperial historian of the fourth century A.D., in his **"Res Gestae"** completed by the year 378 A.D.:

*"Hordes of Clerics travelled for these Councils **at the expense of the State, from one part of the Empire to the other"*** (op. cit. XXI 16,18);

*"**No ferocious beast is as hostile to men as the majority of Christians amongst themselves"*** (ib. XXII 5,3-4);

*"**Those who aspire to the leadership of the Church of Rome, when they have achieved their aim, will be so impudent that they will accumulate wealth, thanks to the donations of the matrons, and go out in public on luxurious chariots and, dressed with great care, organize banquets more sumptuous than those of Kings"*** (ib. XXVII 3,14).

... And the historian Ammianus was not able to see what was to follow ...

Bishops, wearing flashy and very precious vestments, as greedy for power and privileges as Kings, through numerous "Councils" chose the "substance" and the "form" of the new "Holy Trinity" to be adored by mankind. For them, the means was the cult of Christ ... the aim: power. They were atheists.

Only cynical atheists could have "dreamed up" a divinity with the sole aim of enslaving people; thanks to their adoration of the new God, these believers would have inevitably recognized, venerated and maintained the new religion's "Ministers" in a life of comfort. It was a sought after power, an authentic source of domination and subjugation of the enemies (even the strong) of the Clergy.

The veneration of the ecclesiastical leaders was a form of spontaneous recognition in exchange for the promise of eternal life, granted by clerics to those who obeyed their Creed; for the others, be they pagans or sceptics, the threat of the flames of hell hung over them. Low-level theology in exchange for power. The Secular Holy Order of the ecclesiastical hierarchy began to practice the most profitable and, at the same time, worst form trafficking, widely defamed in "Acts of the Apostles": spiritual simony.

Constantine the Great began to assign real estate and land to the Christian Churches. In 390 A.D. the pious Emperor Theodosius, after massacring 6,000 Christian rebels in Thessaloniki, publicly asked for forgiveness in the presence of Bishop Ambrogius of Milan; he then emanated the "**Theodosian Decrees**" which outlawed the pagan cults and their respective Temples; those who did not observe the new laws would be sentenced to death and have their property confiscated. Imperial prerogatives having the force of law were granted in 554 A.D. to the Bishops by Emperor Justinian ... and for the centuries to come.

"So in the same way, none of you can be my disciple without giving up all that he owns" (Lk 14,33).

In spite of the precise teaching of Christ, until the 1960s **all His successors**, as Popes of the Church of Rome, wore on their heads a heavy golden "Tiara" studded with precious stones (the last to do so was Paul VI, advised to "adapt" to the times, rocked by student demonstrations), symbol of triple power: "Father of all the Kings and all the Princes", "Rector of the World" and "Vicar of Christ on Earth" (today the Pope still acts in His stead).

After the humiliation inflicted upon Emperor Henry IV in Canossa for having attempting to strengthen imperial power, Pope Gregory VII published his "**Dictatus to the Bishops**" in 1080 A.D., on the basis of which the Pope was the guardian of absolute power on Earth, in total disregard of the evangelical "dictation" of Christ (carried out during His sermon on the mount), according to which the poor and the humble would be awarded (in the after-life) Beatitude in the eternal **Kingdom of Heaven**.

This is instead the "papal" sermon given to the Bishops from the **pontifical throne**:

*"Make the whole world understand and know that **You can tie and untie heaven; You on Earth can give and take from everyone, according to their merits, Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, Duchies, Counties and all the possessions of mankind ... The Kings, the mighty of the Earth, today, must know how great You are and how strong Your authority is. They must make sure to not be disrespectful of the administration and organization of the Church**".*

The "Dictatus" to the Bishops was preceded by the famous "Dictatus Papae" written by the same Pope:

*"**All the Princes must kiss only the feet of the Pope; Only He can depose Emperors**"; "his sentences cannot be modified by anyone; on the contrary **he can modify any sentence issued by others**"; "**he cannot be judged by anyone**"; the Roman Church has never been wrong; nor, according to the testimony provided in the Scriptures, will it ever be wrong".*

This all happened later on because there were no Christian bishops until the end of the 2nd century A.D.: **they were not contemplated by the Gospels**. They belong to an invented "Tradition", created as "proof" of a *continuitas ecclesiastica* of the followers of the "Saviour" after His "Advent" and to justify the true "successors": the Bishops of the fourth century. Over two centuries after the Advent of Christ clerical scribes began to draw up documents which **gave the impression** of the existence of a strong "Jesuit Christianity", well-organized by its Bishops "shepherds of souls", starting in the first century; the most important community was located in Rome, seat of the Throne of Simon Peter, the first Pope: the true Church, sole guardian of the Tradition of the founding Fathers, faithful to the teachings of the Redeemer, holy defense against the rampant heresy of the false "Saviour Christs".

Let's continue to follow the method and great care with which the "grey theological eminences" created Patrology, pillar of the "Christian Tradition", by comparing the manuscripts of authoritative "Fathers" and making use of historical documentation (as always) in order to find out important information regarding the existence of the long-lived disciple who was the favourite of Lord Jesus: **Saint John**.

The oversights of the scribes of Tertullianus

Let's go back to "Father" Tertullianus in order to verify the "Tradition" of John, evangelist Apostle, on the basis of manuscripts which have reached us, and compare the coherence of these documents and the dating of the "variants" which have been created through the centuries. These changes are useful in establishing the truthfulness of the depositions regarding the "*Disciple who Jesus loved*" given by the alleged successors to the Apostles: **Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus of Lyons, Policrates of Ephesus and Pope Victor**; they are all mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea, as we have seen above, and we will now add to the list **Tertullianus** himself.

Through the analysis of the "Nativity of Jesus" (see study) we can see the grave contradiction which the medieval scribes ran into; in order to fill the chronological "hole" of twelve years between the births of Luke and Matthew, they had the inauspicious idea to have Tertullianus in "**Adversus Marcionem**" (IV 19) – a manuscript which "appeared almost **a thousand years after** the alleged "Father" – replace the imperial Governor of Syria Publius Sulpicius Quirinius with another, **Sentius Saturninus**.

As documented by historians, the latter, *Legatus Augusti pro Praetore*, was in office during a lapse of time in which Herod the Great could have carried out the "massacre of the innocent" to eliminate the new-born "baby Jesus". In reality, historical research demonstrates that Saturninus could have never carried out a census during which, according to the Gospel of Luke, the Saviour of humanity was born.

On the basis of what is reported, from the **10th century** onwards, by the medieval scribes who drew up "**Apologeticum**" (XVI 1) in Tertullianus's name, we have obtained one of the many pieces of evidence which support the theory of the falsification of the "martyrdom of the Christians by Nero" (see related study); this was done by comparing

the texts and the datings of the codexes which show that the "testimony", artfully attributed to Tacitus, is subsequent to that of Tertullianus by over a century. It is evident that **the author of the "Tacitean" manuscript 68 II, dating back to the eleventh century, knew nothing about "Apologeticum XVI", drawn up by another scribe at least a century earlier**, who, referring to the works of the Roman historian, accuses him of spreading rumors that Christians worshiped the asses at par of the Jews, without being able to imagine that a century after him **another scribe** would have reported on the **Codex Laurentianus MS 68 2** dating back to the **eleventh century**, the "Annales" of Tacitus in showing that **the Christians worshiped Jesus Christ, not donkeys**.

The scribes of God they were also inept when having Tertullianus in "**Apologeticum V 2-3**" provide "evidence" of an in-existent decree issued by Emperor **Tiberius** which imposed "**the death penalty on the accusers of the Christians**". The silliness of this is such that it even contradicts with "**Acts of the Apostles**" (Acts 11,26), where it is said that the Christians called themselves with this name for the first time in Antioch under the principate of **Claudius** (which lasted **from 41 to 54 A.D.**), while we know that **Tiberius died in 37 A.D.** We also analyzed this in-depth in the study regarding the Neronian martyrdom of the Christians.

The impressive Tertullian work, which grew through the centuries, and the subsequent inquiry on the life of Tertullianus himself (between the second and third century) - an "Apologetic Father" character **totally unknown to his coeval "Fathers" and to those who followed ... up until the fourth century historian Eusebius** - have brought us to the conclusion that **"Quintus Florens Septimius Tertullianus" never existed**. The literary work attributed to him was drawn up by a series of scribes who wrote in epochs subsequent to his imaginary existence. After Saint Jerome, Christian chroniclers such as Orosius, Sulpicius Severus, Saint Augustine, etc. etc. and in particular **Dionysius the Little** (who provided us the dating of the birth of Jesus) know nothing about Tertullianus. This is true until **the beginning of the ninth century A.D.**, when scribes began to write the first Tertullian works; over time they accumulated an immense yet improbable "**manuscript tradition**" attributed to him, which was then collated and **chosen, for the first time, in the 16th century** in order to exhibit dissimilar archetypes which could not be conjectured. A dense series of "Treatises" (mainly theological) attributed to the "Father" through various "editio princeps opera omnia" deriving from "families" of **contrasting codexes**. This demonstrates that the latter - in addition to other works attributed to Tertullianus and "lost" through the centuries - were not drawn up by Tertullianus (because if he had truly written them, he would have never presented contradictory evidence).

In addition to the incompatible works described, there is no evidence which supports the existence of the Apologetic Father Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus. He is mentioned by Eusebius of Caesarea, **the first to speak about him**, then Saint Jerome, Lactantius, Saint Vincent Lirinensis, Saint Gelasius and Saint Isidore of Seville, **through unauthentic ecclesiastical manuscripts** elaborated by other authors between the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance (from the tenth century onwards). It is to be pointed out that "Tertullianus" is cited by Jerome in "De viris illustribus" (LIII), but is dutiful to inform readers that the Codex of this document is subsequent (by one century) to the "Codex Agobardinus": the oldest manuscript (first half of the ninth century) that certifies the existence of the Apologetic priest "Tertullianus". Due to the vastness and importance of the manuscripts attributed to Tertullianus, both the Apologetic Father **Origen** and the martyr Pope **Hippolytus** of Rome should have known him as he was was their contemporary according to the "tradition"; and after them a succession of Bishops, Popes and Fathers who followed one upon the other until the time of Eusebius, **all of whom make no mention of Tertullianus**, in conformity with the datings of their respective codexes.

It must be pointed out that **Origen Adamantius** (185-254), one of the most important "Apologetic Fathers", after directing the school of theology in Alexandria, in 232 A.D. **founded his own school** (having many disciples) in Caesarea; it had a rich library containing holy and scientific texts and its aim was to search for and collect critical and philological studies concerning Christian doctrine. As the "Apologetic Pillar" **Origen was unaware of the impressive Christian research** attested in numerous works by the other "Apologetic Pillar" **Tertullianus** (155-230) and never mentions the latter, this means that at the time of Origen Tertullianus and the fruit of his intelligence did not exist. It is not possible that between the end of the second and the beginning of the third century an intellectual with knowledge of Greek and Latin, son of a centurion, fervent pagan for better part of his life (until the age of forty, as attested by Saint Jerome in "De viris illustribus" and by he himself in "Apologeticum"), after becoming a priest had the time and financial means to write - with the help of expert calligraphers - **an opera omnia of over thirty treatises** (without counting the ones which were lost) ... all of which escaped the "librarian" Origen.

Tertullianus's methodical task - entailing extremely vast and detailed knowledge of the classical, historical, philosophical, juridical and religious worlds - was carried out by maintaining, at the same time, a publicly documented position characterized by vehement ideological contrast towards imperial officials who would have "martyrized" him immediately, instead of having him grow old quietly, as reported by Saint Jerome. A literary work that is even broader than that of Josephus who, over a period of twenty-five years, not only benefited from the substantial financing given by two Flavian Emperors and a wealthy patron but was also able to have access to the imperial archives; and Tertullianus's contemporary, Roman Senator Cassius Dio (Roman History), encountered no organizational or economic problems and was able to consult both the Acts of the Senate and the imperial archives of his friend Alexander Severus during the twenty-two years needed to complete his monumental work. For Origen the task of drawing up the works was so demanding that it required the financial aid and scribes furnished by a generous protector "**the pious Ambrogius**" ... after converting the latter.

The lack of coordination, cause of much contrast as seen in the previous studies, was due to the fact that the Tertullian works were written by different scribes and put together at a later time; the elimination of the contradictions present in these works could have only been carried out by means an impossible comparative reading of the many manuscripts to be found in the many European and Byzantine Christian Ecclesiae, by this time divided by schisms and mutual anathemas motivated by subtle doctrinal exigencies and, most of all, by ambitions of "Primate" (as "power" is described by clerics).

As regards our attempt to verify the existence of Tertullianus, it is important to highlight **another falsification** of his testimony **in contrast with the other** conflicting **depositions** of the founding "Fathers": the deposition **regarding the Apostle John**.

Life, works and miracles of Saint John

The Apostle Saint John was first identified by the "Tradition" as an anonymous "**disciple who Jesus loved**", who was later called in as an eyewitness to the life of Christ narrated in a canonical "Gospel according to John" attributed to the Saint himself. The Saint was finally chosen by God as the guardian of the "Revelation" (Apocalypse) of the Redeemer and of His return (Parusia) ... no longer as "Saviour" but in the role of a terrifying "Executioner" who would have provoked the end of the world through a cosmic catastrophe and made way for the eternal "Kingdom of Heaven" for that part of humanity judged to be deserving. Saint Jerome (Hieronymus) recognized Saint John as "**Apostle, Evangelist and**

Prophet".

In spite of the exaggerated creation of a character known as the "Favourite Apostle" entirely dedicated to his "vocation", the "**Ecclesiastical Tradition**" of Apostles, Fathers, Bishops, and Popes (including Eusebius of Caesarea and his historian Hegesippus) **let John die of old age, confined to an island**: the only one to remain intact among the "**pillars of the Church**", the great evangelical Prophets and the multitude of Jesuit Christian "martyrs". A saintful life without suffering which had to be "corrected" in order to not contradict the entire patristic philosophy conceived in the fourth century, based on the imaginary struggle against pagan and heretical Christian idolatry which cost much bloodshed to **inexistent primitive Christians** persecuted by the evil forces of darkness personified by Emperors and Roman high officials.

The oldest handwritten Codex which attempted to fill the serious "void" of Saint John in Christian patristic martyrology dates back to the ninth century (the Carolingian era), and it is needless to say that here Tertullianus is called in as "first witness to the facts".

It is a reduced Tertullian "opera omnia"; one of the works present is "**De praescriptione haereticorum**", which **suddenly appeared** and was purchased (how could he let it get away?) by the powerful Archbishop Agobardus of Lyons (in office from 816 to 840 A.D.), great statesman in charge of relations between the imperial court of Charlemagne's heirs and the Church of Rome governed by Pope Gregory IV. Agobardus donated the manuscript to the Cathedral of Saint Etienne and officialized it without mentioning where it came from (how strange). The document is marked "**Codex Agobardinus**: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Ms Latina 1622". It describes the miracle "witnessed" by Tertullianus in "**De praescriptione haereticorum**" (XXXVI 2,3):

"... John was forced to support confinement on an island (?), after (when?) miraculously not undergoing suffering, despite being immersed (by whom?) in a bath of boiling oil".

It is not a chronicle, but no more than a ridiculous reference lacking historical data or supportive evidence; this is done deliberately in order to avoid contradictory verifications ... but not our considerations:

- today we know that olive oil boils at over three hundred degrees and if a man is immersed in it he will become a super "croquette" in just a few seconds;
 - only a "miracle" can allow a man to come out of such a bath unhurt;
 - whoever had witnessed such an event would have converted immediately (even we atheists of today), including he who had ordered it;
 - the Christian scribe who invented this form of capital torture did not have the slightest knowledge of the real tradition regarding the death penalties applied in the ancient world and in the Greco-Roman civilization in particular: there is no evidence of such torture in their literature ... and elementary common sense forces us to belie its existence;
 - who would have wasted over a quintal of olive oil to eliminate a man? And what large container set on a sturdy iron tripod could have withstood the high temperature of a fire for the time needed to reach boiling point?;
 - we are dealing with an Apostle whose exceptional "miracle" had a direct impact on Christian tradition, so all the heads of the Churches of Christ should have been informed **immediately**, without waiting for the news to be "officialized" almost **eight centuries later by a "Carolingian Tertullianus" as the "Eusebian Tertullianus" new nothing about this miracle**;
 - **the first to feel the need to report this incredible miracle should have been John himself**, who (according to the "Apostolic tradition") in his old age wrote the Gospel, the Apocalypse and the **three personal "letters" to future memory**; in these "letters" he would have surely given thanks to his "Saviour" ... but there is no account of this in those which have reached us;
 - all the documentation regarding the Christian "tradition" and **all of the ecclesiastical historians, Bishops, Fathers and Popes** who lived up until the time of Eusebius make no mention of this incredible miracle (including Eusebius himself), despite making reference in their writings to John.
- In conclusion, this is nothing but a show written by a medieval scribe directed by the authoritative hands of the Metropolitan, in order to strengthen the faith with a "demonstration" (directed towards believers) of the divine power of Christ the Saviour on the basis of an **astonishing miracle of the Apostle John "witnessed" by an apologetic Father invented centuries later: "Tertullianus"**.

Yet we are not the first to become aware of the contradictions characterizing this fake deposition "telephoned" almost a millenium later by an inexistent Tertullianus: the "grey eminences" of the Church were aware of this centuries ago and attempted to make the necessary adjustments. They were obliged to do so in order to avoid junking the codex officialized by the authoritative Archbishop (and already copied and widedspread) containing most of the "collected works" of the Father* and thus avoid cutting out too large a portion of Christian patrology.

* "Apologeticum" and "Adversus Marcionem" – two works we have already dealt with - **had not yet been invented** and thus are not present. It is important to point out that the dating of "Codex Agobardinus" is historically precise, while those which follow are based on approximate paleographical estimates which do not make use of the tools of mass spectrometry.

As this codex was the oldest, it had intrinsic value and formed the "foundation" upon which the "archetype of torture" could be built (in the absence of an authentic source) and attributed to an alleged living Tertullianus. A prototype to be selected among families of codexes drawn up in later epochs would have been useful for "conjecturing" the torture of Saint John. Codexes which were collated and chosen in such a way so as to hide their respective contradictions, fruit of the imagination of pious scribes and "dictated by an "overabundance" of faith". Let's try to verify what they studied in order to overcome the problem and, even more important, if they were successful.

According to "**Documenta Catholica Omnia**", Excerpta ex Migne Patrologia Latina – a collection of handwritten codexes dating back to between the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, translated and published two centuries ago – in "**Adversus Iovinianum**" by **Hieronymus** (Saint Jerome), **the scribe** (and author) "**reveals**" what **Tertullianus, who had died over a thousand years earlier** (he lived in the **second century A.D.**), "said" about Saint John to Father Jerome in **410 A.D.**:

"The Evangelist Apostle John, as a Prophet certainly saw the Apocalypse on the island of Pathmos where he had been confined by Emperor Domitian after the martyrdom endured for the Lord. Tertullianus also reports that he was immersed by Nero * in a jar (or barrel) full of boiling oil from which he came out purified (sic!) and more vigorous than when he went in" (op. cit. Book I 26).

* All the manuscripts and vetus latinae editions say "**by Nero**", but the Christian "editors" of the last three centuries falsify the translation by writing "**in Rome he was immersed ...**". They cross out "Nero" despite being aware of the fact that the devout scribes of past ages wanted to join the torture of John and the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, all of which

were perpetrated by this Emperor.

The reason why Nero must not appear guilty of having tortured Saint John is that the "grey Christian eminences" knew (and know) that if John had lived throughout all the first century, **he himself should have been the first to mention the abominable massacre of Christians ordered by the Emperor** ... but he who wrote the three letters attributed to the Apostle to demonstrate his existence was not aware of this event and knew nothing about the torture. No! Today it is better to keep Saint John "far away" from Nero: in consideration of the seriousness of the event, John's failure to offer testimony of the Neronian massacre would have become obvious to "outsiders". Anyone can understand that the Neronian martyrdom of Christians is false if the Apostle John makes no mention of it in the letters he wrote at the end of first century (especially after being immersed by Nero in an "invigorating bath" of oil at a temperature of over 300 degrees centigrade).

In particular, from the Renaissance onwards the grey "eminences" have known that the scribes continued to accuse Nero of torturing Saint John... without adding anything else, **thus demonstrating that the scribes themselves knew nothing about the spectacular mass torture of Christians reported in the laurentian manuscript M II** ... which blames the Emperor. Therefore, on the basis of the different versions of the Codexes reported above, Tacitus's laurentian manuscript was "corrected" at the very end of the Middle Ages; as a result, we must ask ourselves what we are waiting for to verify, by means of mass spectrometry, the dating of the laurentian manuscript M 68 II which thusfar has been estimated only paleographically.

In the meanwhile, taking note of the fact that the medieval scribes of the late Middle Ages decided to enrich the poor chronicle of the Carolingian Tertullianus with a Saint John "martyrized" by Nero (at least he tried). Moreover, that "invigorating divine bath" was good for his health and helped him to make it to old age. Domitian confined him to the island of Pathmos (in the Dodecanese) where he had the prophetic "Revelation" of the *"Candid Lord with voice of a trumpet"* on the end of the world. So it emerges that Saint John was extremely famous as the two Emperors personally took an interest in the *"Disciple who Jesus loved"* ... a reputation which was unknown to all the "Fathers", "Bishops" and "Popes" (who lived during Saint John's life and after his death), none of whom were aware of the "miraculous martyrdom".

This situation had to be proven wrong: the Church of Christ could not allow there to be a Saint John, favourite Apostle of Jesus, prophet and evangelist, who died with impunity of simple old-age. We have only mentioned one example, but from the Carolingian period onwards contemplative scribes of all the nations which converted to Christianity identified the feats of the Saint without any authentic original document; his feats were revealed by letting their imagination run wild and through the cross testimony of Fathers who "telephoned" one another centuries later.

He was attributed miraculous healings and was said to have made people rise from the dead: a power given to him by the Grace of God equal to that of Saint Paul and "supported" by paintings in the Churches of God. The "cleansing martyrdom" which occurred in Ephesus and no longer in Rome; the "jar" or "barrel" which became a "cauldron" (they realized that it would work better) and more and more "realistic" yet "apocryphal":

"The boiling oil turned into heavenly dew and John came out of cauldron fresher and more vigorous than when he went in"

... and, through his *"Legenda Aurea"* and others, we arrive at almost the end of the Middle Ages when the last "divine revelation" appeared: John the Evangelist drank, unharmed, a poisoned chalice offered to him by a pagan priest of the Temple of Ephesus.

Another variant: the *"cup with the viper"* (demoniacal symbol). "That cup" (sic!) was exhibited in the basilica of Saint John the Lateran in Rome for a few centuries, then it was "hidden behind the scenes" because considered to be "apocryphal".

Therefore, a series of myths regarding Saint John "supported" by Venerable Fathers and Saintly Bishops, **all of whom are subsequent to Eusebius of Caesarea. Why?**

It is easy to understand why: the codexes of the Eusebian "Historia Ecclesiastica" dating back to the fourth century, although corrected after his death*, by this time had been copied and scattered throughout all the dioceses and monasteries of Christianity; but after the many schisms which tormented the history of the Church, it would have been impossible to recover them in order to modify the history of the Apostle John: it was better to invent something new and attribute it to the Fathers who succeeded Eusebius.

* The Council of Nicea in which Eusebius took part was followed by many others (up until Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D.), with the aim of establishing the "substance" of Christ. The original manuscripts of the "Father" have not reached us because they were eliminated. They highlighted the difference resulting from the subsequent "creation" of the "Holy Trinity" characterized by a relationship between the "Mother of God" and the "Mother of the Son of God" "consubstantial and coeternal to the Father from the beginning of time".

The overabundance of late contradictory testimony regarding the "Martyrdom of Saint John" and the "feats" of the favourite Apostle forced the Church to trim this evidence by rendering "apocryphal" many *"Acta Iohannis"* or *"Virtutes Iohannis"*, unfortunately without being able to eliminate the contrast between the deposition of the first "Eusebian Tertullianus" (unaware of the martyrdom "in oil") and the subsequent "Medieval Tertullianus" (who instead was aware of this martyrdom).

The inspired exegetes were not able to find a credible explanation in spite of the absolute necessity for believers to adore a "miraculously saved Saint John" preached from the pulpits. The problem is made even worse by the total lack of "evidence" with regard to "who" carried out the torture and "when".

The pro-clerical historians are well-aware that **the credibility of the existence of the Apostle John and Father Tertullianus is at stake:** an unsettled question for them (but practically unknown to believers), and impossible to resolve (like in the case of the "Nativity").

Instead for whoever is interested in gathering information on the historic Christ – after acknowledging and highlighting the nonsense narrated in the manuscripts and uncovering the contradictions resulting from the scribes' aim to make such contradictions appear to be historically true – is forced to **brand as false protagonists both the Apostle John and Father Tertullianus**. Therefore, even the others "witnesses to John" mentioned by Eusebius, like **Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus of Lyons, Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus and Pope Victor**, were invented by the Bishop of the Court of Constantine the Great. Only long after the death of Eusebius, the Medieval scribes made these Fathers appear in "Christian Patrology" through cross references in manuscripts; this was done deliberately to support their alleged existence. This explains why Tacitus, the great historian and Governor of the Province of Asia, did not highlight the existence of Christians in Ephesus, unlike Plinius the Younger in Bithynia. There was no Apostle or successor who went to the Province of Asia to convert the Gentile pagans. Therefore, **if the Apostles did not exist, neither did the Bishops**

who were their successors; as we have demonstrated in the earlier studies regarding Saint Paul, James the Minor (first Bishop of Jerusalem) and his successor Simon (Jesus's relative and second Bishop of Jerusalem).

Saint Ignatius first pseudo-disciple of Saint John and Onesimus: two gross mistakes of history

But there is more. In 107 A.D. another Father of the Church of Christ, Saint Ignatius Bishop of Antioch - just five years prior to the arrival of the Proconsul Tacitus in Ephesus (112 A.D.), and exactly three years after the death of Saint John - wrote a very long letter to the large Christian community in Ephesus.

As we highlighted at the beginning of this study, on the basis of the historical testimonies of all the Fathers (including Saint Jerome) **there is no evidence of Bishops in the important city of Ephesus at the end of the first century.** This odd circumstance, which contrasts with the "tradition", aroused our suspicion and we therefore decided to discover the motive; we came across no trace of the Madonna "Mother of God" in this city and found no evidence of the presence here of the Apostle **John** - successor to Christ and the most **fit to sit on the papal throne of Ephesus** - who, according to the "Letter to the Ephesians" of Paul, did not reside in this city.

A thousand years after Paul founded the large Ephesian community the Church finally became aware of the significant absence of the spiritual leader in this metropolis. He had slipped from the minds of the creative scribes bringing about serious historical repercussions; the Church thus decided to seek the help of "**Ignatius of Antioch**", mentioned in the thirteenth century by the scribes of Eusebius of Caesarea (HEC. III 36); the latter report the words of the Saint who describes himself as having a lust for martyrdom:

*"I desire that nothing visible or invisible prevents me from reaching Jesus Christ: **fire, crucifixion, attacks of wild beasts, shattered bones, torn limbs, all my body crushed, may I be tormented by the devil in order to reach Jesus Christ**" (HEC. III36,9).*

He was therefore a very special man born in 35 A.D. and who lived - according to the visionary "tradition" assembled in the ninth century by the scribes of the "De viris illustribus" (XVI) - until 107 A.D.: the year of his inevitable torture and beatification. Here is his explicative martyrology, which today is still official:

*"Memory of Saint Ignatius, Bishop and martyr, who, as **disciple of Saint John Apostle**, ruled over the Church of Antioch right after Saint Peter. **Sentenced to be fed to wild beasts** under Emperor **Trajan**, he was brought to Rome and here he was crowned with a glorious martyrdom: during the journey, while undergoing **the ferocity of the guards, similar to that of leopards, he wrote seven letters to seven different Churches**, in which he urged his brothers to serve God together in communion with the Bishops and not to prevent him from being sacrificed as a victim for Christ".*

It is totally evident that the scribe and "biographer" of Ignatius, suffering from contemplative dementia, was unaware that the Romans, in order to make it impossible for the unfortunate guilty to escape, chained the prisoners destined to be devoured by wild beasts and then transported them in iron cages placed on wooden carts. **Never** would have the Roman militiamen prepared a large hencoop similar to a "one-room flat with a bathroom" - containing a scriptorium, stool, inkwell, papyrus scrolls and goose feather - to be used by the martyr Ignatius so that he could write seven letters as long as the Gospels and call in a "mailman" so that they could be sent to their respective addressees. *"The letters of Saint Ignatius have reached us like a precious testimony of the life of the primitive Churches"*; this is the comment made by today's enraptured enlightened historians, rejoicing for the constant efficiency of Ancient Rome's mail service. While the total lack of archeological finds - proof of the **inexistence of Churches** during the first two centuries - prompted the ancient scribes to banally offer evidence of the presence of numerous Christian followers of the Redeemer, today's Church exegetes prefer to turn a blind eye for they are convinced to be clouding everyone's mind.

Thanks to a miraculous space-time telephone call made a thousand years later, the Christian calligrapher of **Codex Laurentianus Mediceus 57.7** (paleographically dated to the eleventh century) had Saint Ignatius dictate to him another "**Letter to the Ephesians**" as a "supplement" to the "Letter to the Ephesians" of Saint Paul. **Ignatius**, finally - about seven hundred years after Eusebius had gone on to a better life and before him a series of Fathers and Christian chroniclers **including Saint Jerome, all of whom were unaware of the content - told the scribe that in Ephesus there was a Bishop by the name of "In the name of God I received your community in the person of Onesimus, imitator of Christ and given new life in his blood, your Bishop in the flesh"**. Bishop Onesimus of Ephesus, therefore, in 107 A.D. visited his colleague Bishop Ignatius of Antioch and was hosted by the latter in a large hencoop similar to a "one-room flat with a bathroom", which the Romans had furnished with a triclinium for the occasion. In the letter we learn that in **107 A.D.** the martyr Saint Ignatius addresses (as Paul had done prior to him) the Christians in the Church of Ephesus (**just a short time before Tacitus, who knew nothing about these Christians, arrived as Proconsul**) and calls the Presbyters by name to spur them *"to glorify Jesus Christ"* ... **but not even he mentions his teacher John** who - after the Madonna had already been "Assumed into Heaven" - until **104 A.D.** was there present and his contemporary: there is not even the slightest reference to the Apostle *"who Jesus loved"*. Even in this case, like in the letter of Paul, **Ignatius's failure to mention the Virgin Mary and his teacher John's arrival in Ephesus** undermines the credibility of both the Lord's favourite Apostle and the Mother of God, thus contradicting the official martyrology of the Church: an "Ignatius" (from ignus meaning fire) who (along with his teacher John) is wiped out by history (relics included), just like his "colleagues" and successors.

The detail which must be highlighted concerns the contrast between the codexes drawn up by the scribes who "engineered" the life of the "disciple who Jesus loved"; in fact, **for the scribe of codex 57.7 the Apostle John was not present in Ephesus**, thus allowing him to "consecrate" as Bishop and spiritual leader of the Christians in Ephesus just any Joe Blow by the name of "**Onesimus**" and to exclude a "**pillar**" of the Church as was John. The scribe of God, focused on "filling" the chronotaxis regarding the Bishops of **Ephesus**, was so foolish as to place **Onesimus as leader of the Christians in this city from 107 A.D.** onwards, thus demonstrating the presence of a large Christian community at the time in which Proconsul **Cornelius Tacitus** was **governor of the Province of Asia (112-113 A.D.)**. A testimony given in the eleventh century by a scribe unaware that another scribe of God, shortly after him, would have called in Tacitus as chronicler of the Neronian massacre and have him manifest hatred towards the martyrs of Christ. Rage which, coherently, would have expressed itself against the Jesuit Christians in Ephesus.

We have reported this "chronicle" in order to show that it is not at all easy to deceive history; neither by inventing it nor by changing it later on. In fact, in the same years in which the **Codex Laurentianus MS 57.7** was drawn up, another scribe, unaware of this codex, copied Tacitus's "Annales" into the **Codex Laurentianus Mediceus MS 68.2**, attributing to the Roman patrician the false testimony regarding Jesus and an unlikely "**Procurator**" by the name of Pilate; he also was so foolish as to have the pagan priest and greatest historian of Rome express his hatred towards the alleged Christians massacred after the fire of Rome in 64 A.D. Christians who - despite the miracles of both the super Apostle Paul and the "Lord's favourite Apostle" John, head of the

Church of Ephesus - were not present in this capital in 112 A.D. when **Tacitus**, as Proconsul appointed by Trajan, **governed the Province of Asia from Ephesus ... exactly four years after Saint Ignatius had "glorified" the Ephesian Jesuits**. In line with the hatred towards the Neronian martyrs expressed by Tacitus (according to the Codex Laurentianus Mediceus MS 68.2), the Governor and pagan priest of Ephesus, Cornelius Tacitus, should have carried out a massacre of Christians even bloodier than the one carried out by his friend Gaius Plinius Cecilius the Second in Bithynia in the same year.

In order to avoid the negative consequences (just described) concerning the existence of the **Bishop of Ephesus Onesimus**, the Church set his martyrdom in 109 A.D. under Trajan. But even the most mentally retarded understand that the subtle minds of the Vatican could not fix an earlier date as they were bound to the "**Letter to the Ephesians**" written by Ignatius of Antioch in 107 A.D., where we read that Ignatius received Onesimus personally and greeted him as the leader of the Christina community in the Roman capital of the Province of Asia. After the Annales of Tacitus were copied, the Church gained awareness of the contradiction it had created and - at the height of paranoia resulting from the "Tacitian syndrome" - created two consecutive Bishops by the name of "Onesimus", the first to be martyred under Domitian with rightful martyrology:

Roman Martyrology: "*Commemoration of the blessed Onesimus, which Saint Paul welcomed as an escaped slave and begot in chains as son in the faith of Christ, as he himself wrote to his owner Philemon*" (from Cathopedia, biography of Saint Onesimus);

while the second "Onesimus" is barely mentioned at the end of the biography, as if the Church desired keep its distance: "*The Christian tradition also speaks about a martyr Saint Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, stoned in Rome in 109 during the persecution of Trajan*".

A Bishop, both martyr and Saint, whose presence is a source of embarrassment due to the fact that he was placed as head of the Ephesian Church at the time of the Tacitus's governorship; as a result, the subtle minds of the Vatican have chosen to remove the subsequent episcopal chronotaxis of the Province of Ephesus.

In order to remove all possible doubt with regard to the invention of these Bishops - martyred, beatified and complete with relics, it is to be pointed out that Jerome does not know the two "Onesimuses"; this proves that they were invented subsequent to the "**Codex MS 2Q Neoboracensis**", dating back to the ninth century, containing Jerome's "**De viris illustribus**". In fact, as mentioned above, the "**Letter to the Ephesians**", attributed to Ignatius of Antioch, was drawn up, two centuries later, by **eleventh** century scribes and by them written in "**Codex Laurentianus Mediceus 57.7**".

The height of the absurdity is highlighted by Saint Jerome's unawareness of the fact that "the blessed Onesimus", mentioned in the "Letter to Philemon" written by an inexistent "Paul of Tarsus", had even become "Bishop". It is easy to invent martyrs and Saints, but problems arise when it comes time to search for the torturers in the historical documentation; the inventors of these accounts must be careful not to make blunders which make it impossible to "free" themselves of the false blessed and their relics ... as in the case of Saint Ignatius of Antioch.

"Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, Saint, martyr, his remains are, along with those of Saint Clement, in the urn under the largest altar of Pope Saint Clement at the Lateran" (Distinguished Relics and "Blessed Bodies" in Rome).

This is further proof showing how "the apostolic tradition" was created artfully by the Christian scribes who unscrupulously drew up "**letters bearing the names of invented Saints and Apostles in order to demonstrate their existence** ... but who inevitably ended up contradicting themselves. In final analysis, the great personality "forced" to come into contrast with history was the Apostle Saint John.

The Apostle John, Polycarpus of Smirne and Ireneus of Lyons: an invented holy triad

In order to highlight the method adopted by the Christian scribes in order to "demonstrate" the existence of Christian protagonists invented by them through the centuries, let's try and follow the creative imagination of Saint John's most famous disciple: the martyr **Saint Polycarpus**, who had been Ignatius's disciple, was consecrated as Bishop of Smirne in the ancient Roman Province of Asia (after Tacitus had passed away) by his First Teacher the Apostle John, "Jesus's favourite Super disciple".

Polycarpus - deriving from the Greek words "polys" (very much) and "karpos" (fruit) - according to the writings of the martyr himself, was born in 69 A.D. and in the late Middle Ages, many centuries after his own death, wrote a letter which allowed him to "witness" the existence of Saint Ignatius of Antioch; the latter, in turn, mentioned Ireneus of Lyon (Bishop of the Churches of Gaul); the latter was cited as the "source" of Polycarpus for having mentioned him (in the late Middle Ages) in "Adversus Haereses" (III 3,4) along with Pope Victor.

Polycarpus is also cited by Saint Jerome and **Eusebius of Caesarea** (HEc. IV 15,1-43). The latter was, in reality, the first inventor of Polycarpus, and asserted to be in possession of an "authentic" letter (which no one has ever seen) of the diocese led by the martyr Saint.

The most ancient manuscript of "**De viris illustribus**" is the **Codex MS 2 Q Neoboracensis**, dated to the ninth century (today kept at the Theological Seminary in New York), in which Saint Jerome in 392 A.D. speaks about the life of Polycarpus and describes his martyrdom which took place two centuries earlier:

"Polycarpus disciple of the Apostle John and by the latter ordained Bishop of Smirne and head of all the Christians of Asia... Later on, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, during the fourth persecution after that of Nero, by order of the Proconsul, in Smirne the martyr Saint was burnt while all the people were shouting at him inside the Amphitheatre" (op. cit. XVII).

Therefore a Saint martyred in Smirne after reaching the venerable age of 110, during the principate of **Marcus Aurelius** (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus governed the Empire on his own from 169 to 180 A.D.) and **at the same time** (something, to say the least, quite absurd as Marcus Aurelius had already died), under Emperor **Commodus** (Lucius Aurelius Antoninus Commodus) **in office from 180 to 192 A.D.**

Three centuries after the drawing up of this ancient manuscript, other medieval scribes transcribed ex novo the codexes (already mentioned in the third and fourth studies) of "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Eusebius of Caesarea and in which the Bishop and historian "witnesses" the life of Polycarpus and cites as his "source" **Ireneus of Lyons** ("Adversus Haereses" III 3,4). The text makes reference to a "**letter of the Church of Smirne**", sent by its followers right after the torturing of the Saint and received a century and a half later by Eusebius; but according to the enlightened historians the epistle "got lost" after being read by the Bishop: a pious alibi which we will prove wrong in a short while. In the letter contains a long, detailed description (reported in "Historia Ecclesiastica") of the spectacular martyrdom of the old man

protected by God, therefore invulnerable to the flames of the fire that would have barbecued him. As a result, his torturer was forced to stab him to death and, finally, send him into heaven (today he is still beatified as a martyr). Here is the passage describing the event which took place in the amphitheatre overflowing with people:

"The attendants set fire to the wood and while a great flame spread we witnessed a miracle. The fire in fact took on a vaulted shape, like that of the sail of a ship inflated by the wind, and surrounded the body of the martyr which was in the middle, yet his body was not burning like meat but like gold and silver burning in a furnace. And we could smell a strong scent similar to incense and other precious aromas. These wicked men, finally, seeing that the fire was unable to consume his body, ordered a confector (executioner) to go and stab him with a sword. After doing this, such a large quantity of blood came out that the fire went out (sic) and all the people were astonished by the great difference existing between non-believers and the elected" (HEc. IV 15,36-39).

It is not clear why there was not a mass conversion of the people of Smirne to Christianity (like the "elected") after seeing in the crowded amphitheatre the venerable Bishop grow red-hot in the furnace like gold and silver and then put out the flames with his own blood and remain unhurt until the final thrust. But the presumptuousness of the scribes of God - when they contrived these ridiculous "crosschecks" through letters written centuries later by Saints who they themselves had invented in order to confirm their existence - has proven to be totally incapable of basing these "crosschecks" on concrete historical data.

In fact, the scribes have the miraculous martyrdom, **unlike the testimony of Saint Jerome just (mentioned above)** date back to **Lucius Verus**, co-Emperor along with his half-brother Marcus Aurelius (from 161 to 169 A.D., year of Verus's death). In addition, the event (we have only reported a few excerpts) is inserted into a very detailed scenario yet is completely different from that of the most ancient codex, dated from the thirteenth century onwards, in which we have just read that the Saint, invulnerable to the fire, was killed with a sword. Nevertheless, after his death the scribes have a centurion who strangely, without any problem whatsoever, sets fire to the body and allows the other Christians to collect the bones.

It should be remembered that starting in the twelfth century holy inquisition tribunals were set up in order to legitimize the torturing and stakes which the Christian heretics underwent; as a result, the blessed Polycarpus, who was not a heretic, could not be consumed by the flames of hell. This the reason why his "fellow" martyrs, eliminated prior to him during the same persecution, did not need a burning stake:

"It is said in fact that the spectators present in the circus were struck by the wounds provoked by the scourges upon their deepest veins and arteries, to the point that one could see even their most hidden organs; they were laid upon caltrops and sharp nails; and finally, after undergoing all sorts of torture, they were fed to the wild beasts" (HEc. IV 15).

A description thought up by psychopathic spiritualists, and it is not a coincidence that the torturing of Polycarpus is also "witnessed" by the *"letter of Polycrates of Ephesus"* (being the Bishop in the capital of the Province of Asia), seen only by Eusebius (needless to say) and whose "text" can be read in his work *Historia Ecclesiastica* ... with great faith.

Similar contradictions have made it impossible for historians to accept the reality of a **Polycarpus** beatified centuries ago with all the "necessary" relics; and most important of all, having been the "teacher" of **Ireneus of Lyon**, the first great theologian of the Universal Church, the latter would have also lost credibility and the same goes for **Saint John** himself, their first great Teacher and initiator: a holy triad linked by direct personal relationships. It was for this reason that in the 1950s Pope Pius XII urged mystical experts to solve the "Polycarpus case".

Some years passed before any fervent believer managed to propose a theory capable of justifying the existence of Polycarpus, when finally, half a century ago in Anno Domini 1961, Doctor Marta Sordi - at the time aspiring after a professorship at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan - published **"La data del martirio di Polycarpo e di Pionio"** in «Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia» 15,1961, pp. 277 and fol.: an authentic spiritual "viaticum" which allowed the contemplative teacher to obtain a chair in the longed for University in 1969.

Now let's verify how the inspired expert managed to achieve her aim of catechizing history.

On the basis of what we have read above - from the testimony of Ireneus (mentioned by Eusebius) to that of Jerome - there is no reference to the name of the Proconsul of Asia (Smirne was located in this Province) who ordered the torture of many Christians. Any imperial Legate, in conformity with the authority inherent to their highest magistrate office, held the **ius gladii** conferred by the Caesar; **a power that he would have been able to exercise only after opening** and presiding over a **trial** against those accused of serious crimes, apart from those citizens holding Roman citizenship. The latter, unlike everyone else, had to be sent to Rome in chains on the first available trireme in order to put before a public court of law directed by several judges and in which the accused had the right to a counsel for the defence. yet these basic elements of the history of imperial Rome were totally ignored by the scribes of God when they invented the martyrdom of Saint Polycarpus.

In order to (at least) overcome the anachronism constituted by the contradictions concerning the "martyrs of Smirne" and avoid the negative repercussions on the existence of Polycarpus and Ireneus (as they were successors of Saint John, they undermined the credibility of the existence of their Teacher), Marta Sordi - after enumerating a series of theories, manipulating history like malleable "play dough" and utilizing expressions such as "likely", "very likely" and "without a doubt" - attempts to return to the logic of Roman law and takes pains to lower the incredible age of the over one-hundred-year-old Polycarpus. Having viewed the chronological succession of those who held the office of Consul, Sordi "discovers" that the diabolical Roman official, guilty of the martyrdom of the Christians, was the Proconsul Statius Quadratus, appointed Governor of the Province of Asia in 155 A.D. by Emperor **Antoninus Pius**; this the date she gives to the martyrdom of Polycarpus.

In order to (at least) overcome the anachronism constituted by the contradictions concerning the "martyrs of Smirne" and avoid the negative repercussions on the existence of Polycarpus and Ireneus (as they were successors of Saint John, they undermined the credibility of the existence of their Teacher), Marta Sordi - after enumerating a series of theories, manipulating history like malleable "play dough" and utilizing expressions such as "likely", "very likely" and "without a doubt" - attempts to return to the logic of Roman law and takes pains to lower the incredible age of the over one-hundred-year-old Polycarpus. Having viewed the chronological succession of those who held the office of Consul, Sordi "discovers" that the diabolical Roman official, guilty of the martyrdom of the Christians, was the Proconsul **Statius Quadratus ***, appointed Governor of the Province of Asia in 155 A.D. by Emperor Antoninus Pius; this the date she gives to the martyrdom of Polycarpus.

* According to the Diploma Military Roman "AE 1995 1824", L. Statius Quadratus was appointed Consul Ordinary in 142 AD; to create harmonious then proconsul of Asia in 155 AD, because of the inscription found in Magnesia, at Ephesus: "IGC 3410" = "IGR IV 1339".

In 2001 Anna Carfora - another enlightened expert with a passion for martyrs - presented another version of the events

and registered the copyright of her analysis on the martyrdom of Polycarpus and his Christian brothers in the essay having the contemplative title "**Morte e presente nelle meditazioni di Marco Aurelio e negli Atti dei Martiri**", La Città del Sole, Naples 2001 (pp. 68 and fol.). The pious scholar, taking cognizance of the fact that the Eusebian "Historia Ecclesiastica" is much more "colourful", moves the dating from 155 to 167 A.D. (under the joint principate of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus), year in which, according to Carfora, the Roman Proconsul was appointed for the second time (something very unlikely) as Governor of the Province of Asia. Anna Carfora contradicts Marta Sordi's study, yet that are both under the influence of a "excess faith" and do not realize that they have disavowed the most ancient depositions; and by distorting them from scratch, these two scholars are the first to demonstrate that they are ideologically false and goes as far as to illegitimately modify the testimonies handed down by means of ancient documents in order to make them credible ... with the ill-concealed intention of backing the Holy Mother Church. In fact, the inscriptions on reported concerning the proconsul Statius Quadratus, contradict the statements (divergent) Fathers, Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome Sophronius, proving that it is never existed St. Polycarp of Smyrna ... nor his senseless martyrdom.

But what does the Church say? Though pleased with the work done by its fervent followers ... it keeps silent and waits. Unable to do anything apart from removing the original sin contained in the first contrasting narrations, it hopes that the contemplative historians can do the rest. The same goes for the media which - unable to decide who to listen to - "canonizes" both versions, thus forcing an unaware Statius Quadratus to martyrize Polycarpus twice along with twelve Christians belonging to his confraternity: first under Antoninus Pius and then under Lucius Verus. But today, finally, the ghost of the Proconsul - a recidivous mass murderer - has been added to the other damned in the first circle of Hell with the posthumous approval of Dante.

But the Church cannot close the matter with an "Amen". The subtle minds of the Vatican realize that the two experts have, unconsciously, disavowed the testimonies of the Apostolic Fathers concerning Saint Polycarpus and have demonstrated their falsehood; therefore the Church cannot approve the work of the two scholars ... on the contrary: it has left everything as it was centuries ago with the hope that the masses of faithful sheep do not become bewildered and, as a consequence, begin to follow blasphemous history at the expense of Saint John, "*the disciple who Jesus loved*". In fact, here is today's official martyrology of Saint Polycarpus:

*"Roman Martyrology: **Memory of Saint Polycarpus, Bishop and martyr, who is venerated as a disciple by the Blessed Apostle John and last witness of the Apostolic era; under the Emperors Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, in Smirne in Asia, in present-day Turkey, in the amphitheatre before the Proconsul and all the people, almost a nonagenarian, he was burned at the stake while giving thanks to God for having considered him worthy of being included among the martyrs and of taking part in the chalice of Christ**".*

We have verified that according to the Church the death of Polycarpus took place under Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, without taking into consideration the studies conducted by Marta Sordi and Anna Carfora, drawn on by all means of mass communication which influence the general public by having them live in obscurantist medieval ignorance, starting with the compliant Wikipedia. The latter takes pains (it is good at doing this) to remind naive believers that the Blessed Polycarpus was he who sent in Saint Benign (fantastic name), Saint Andochius and Saint Andeolus and Saint Tirsus in order to "evangelize" Gaul: the miracles of the "Divine Providence" do not place limits upon pious foolishness. A detail which the readers have certainly noticed: the "*almost nonagenarian*" mentioned in the martyrology prompts us to suggest that the astute eminences of the Vatican study not only catechism but also arithmetic.

In conclusion, a macabre "dulcis in fundo". In line with the "tradition" of the invented martyrs, the ancient men of the Church have exhumed poor and anonymous remains, which to this very day continue to be passed off as relics of the Saint and distributed in various Churches so as to be adored by the blessed who are poor in spirit.

From the findings of the close scrutiny just rendered, there is no doubt that the character Saint Polycarpus is the fruit of pure imagination, therefore he could not have written any letter to the Philippians nor could he have mentioned "Saint Ignatius of Antiochia", who never existed (as demonstrated by means of medieval codexes earlier in this study). These considerations force us to continue to follow the "blessed career" of Polycarpus in order to verify the possible interaction between his ectoplasm and that of other Saints. In fact, the "Christian tradition" deriving from the holy pens of the scribes in a trance was forced (just like it is today) to link Polycarpus to Ireneus of Lyons, another spectral character described as the first great theologian* of Christian "canon".

* The archetype of the thick theological work attributed to Ireneus of Lyons has been obtained from the manuscripts: Claromontanus, ninth cent.; Marcianus 125, year 1057; Arundelianus, twelfth cent.; Vaticanus latinus 187, year 1429; Vossianus, year 1494; Erasmus, editio princeps, year 1526; Ottobianus latinus 1154, year 1530.

Ireneus *Ἐιρηναῖος*, having an isolated celestial Greek name meaning "seraphic", was born in Smirne, was also born from anonymous parents (just like Polycarpus) in order to avoid dangerous historical verifications. In this city, of course, he was bound to become the "favourite disciple" of Polycarpus of Smirne who, in turn, was the "favourite disciple" of the "favourite disciple par excellence": **Saint John the Apostle**. For Ireneus, the successor of these renowned Teachers, the path allowing him to become the Bishop of Lyons (Lugdunum) - capital of Gaul Lugdunensis from 177 to 202 A.D. - was cleared. Seated upon the episcopal throne of the Church of Lyons for twenty-five years, the incredible lack of archeological confirmation (the same goes for all the ghostly primitive Christian Churches) leads us to believe that Ireneus ordered his faithful followers not to leave any remains, not even the slightest trace capable of offering proof of their existence to posterity ... apart from his own body stolen by the "unknown people" following his rightful martyrdom. The large relic "appeared" many centuries later in the future Cathedral of Saint John in Lyons. The Holy Inquisition had been in full operation for centuries when in 1562 A.D. the Bishop's tomb was destroyed by Protestant Christians followers of John Calvin, against the idolatry of false relics in Churches. French Protestants who paid a high price starting on 23 August 1572, day in which thousands of them were massacred by French Catholics, who were indifferent to the precept of Jesus "*Glory to God and peace on earth for the men he loves*". This bloodbath is remembered in history as the "Massacre of Saint Bartholemew" and sparked one of the bloodiest religious wars of all time.

The diverse ideological representations of Christ contained in the primitive gnostic and apocryphal Gospels constituted proof of the fact that the "Saviour" - concept which had developed through the centuries - was a merely human invention; as a result, "Saint Ireneus" became indispensable for the clergy in order to offer believers testimony of the final Catholic doctrine which had won out over the others and had existed from the very beginning. This is the reason why the scribes of Christ invented "Saint Ireneus", had him become the principal cornerstone of Catholicism and, of course, wrote works about him and in his name in the centuries to come. The Church needed to demonstrate that the series of Councils - beginning in Nicea in 325 and ending in in Ephesus in 431 A.D. - did not define the "substance" of Jesus, one with the Holy Spirit, the Father and the Son and goes as far as to involve the Mother of God. For Christians Ireneus of Lyons was "proof" that the Gospels which have reached us were the true ones, writings which had already been "canonized" by the Bishop as they were faithful to the subsequent victorious Christian doctrine ... these **Gospels**, in

reality, were **written after 381 A.D.**, as demonstrated in the sixth study when analyzing the "Testimonium Flavianum" by Josephus Flavius.

The discoveries made thus far force us to proceed with our verification of the existence of Saint John and his direct successors. As always, we are helped in this task by Eusebius of Caesarea. The latter - strongly determined to relate these "crosschecks" in order to substantiate the life of the Holy Fathers who he invented - cleverly takes a small floral gift out of a **magic hat** and inserts it into his copious basket of lies entitled "Historia Ecclesiastica": Mr "Florinus". A spectral receiver of a letter whose original has been seen only by Eusebius (this also ended up in the litterbin by mistake). A "textual void" which is so serious that the genuflexion exegetes attempt to fill it by reporting the content of the letter but keeping it separate from the context documented by Eusebius - they, in fact, call it a "fragment", convinced that the world is full of simpletons ready to believe that this epistle truly exists. Here is the "fragment" through which Eusebius highlights the relationships between spectral ectoplasms in "Historia Ecclesiastica" (HEc. V 20):

*"In the letter to **Florinus, Ireneus** recalls his relationship with Polycarpus and says: «I met you when I was still a child, in lower Asia at the court of Polycarpus: you occupied a splendid position in order to enjoy a good reputation before him ... I can say that the place where Saint Polycarpus sat when speaking, his physical appearance and his relationship with John (Saint) and with the others who had seen the Lord, his miracles and his teaching; like Polycarpus who, after learning all this from the eyewitnesses to the life of the Verb (Jesus), reported it in his writings» ... This is what Ireneus says".*

This is what "Seraficus" had to say! This is the manifest conclusion made by past and current contemplative historians who do all that they can in order to create (but they totally fail) the life of a Saint Polycarpus who never existed. Mystical historians are well-aware that **if the Apostle John's favourite disciple never existed, neither did his amazing Teacher**; and they are also well-aware that **if Polycarpus never existed, neither did his "favourite disciple"**.

Of course certain facts have not been, and never will be, revealed by today's genuflexion experts: they choose other "demonstrative" analyses which will prove to be pointless. Now let's see how.

The martyrdom of Saint John

The grave historical "void" regarding the depositions on Saint John given by his "witnesses" (starting with Tertullianus) has been "filled" by **Iliaria Ramelli** (who has a degree in Classical Literature and Philosophy and is also an expert philologist). Rising to a position of prestige within the world of Catholic exegetes thanks to her studies on the Bible and the historic Jesus, she is considered by her religious fans to be a "**genius who shines in her own light**", which recalls the famous Messianic prophesy "*A star shall shoot forth from Jacob ...*".

In the year 2000, stimulated by the international Grand Jubilee being held under the papacy of the "Blessed Karol Wojtyla the Great", the scholarly scholar Iliaria Ramelli - making use of an acute analysis inspired by a profound "divine revelation" manifested ad hoc for the great event - resolved the "case" of the martyrdom of Saint John ... and published it.

Finally, after almost two thousand years the scholar discovered and disclosed to the entire Christian community who was awaiting, the identity of the true witness to the martyrdom of the "**Disciple who Jesus loved**": **Juvenale** and the Fourth Satire!

Yes, you have understood.

Decimus Iunius **Juvenalis** was a poet and a Latin rhetor who lived between 55 and 135 A.D. He wrote five books and in the first contains the famous fourth satire (it's online) which describes Emperor Domitian in Albalonga (where he was living at the time) convening a Council of terrified Senators to decide on how to cook an enormous turbot. It was decided that the prey, brought by a fisherman from Ancona as a gift to the Emperor (it was winter), was to be fried whole (in order to not ruin this delicious dish) in huge deep pan with a lid which, obviously, "**had to be found**". After the "consultation" the meeting was adjourned and the trembling dignitaries were brusquely dismissed by order of the "**Supreme Dux similar to the Gods**". Afterwards Juvenal concludes his work with this epitaph to Domitian:

*"Oh, if he had only spent his ferocious life on **this foolishness!** No, without being punished or object of revenge, he emptied Rome of its renowned souls, of its famous men. Only once the people began to have fear of him, he fell: this was fatal for him, while the blood of the Lamies was still dripping".*

This is all ... for us; everyday people who limit themselves to reading and perhaps smile at the content of the satire directed "post mortem" to the last Flavian Emperor and Supreme Pontiff, unsuited to be a leader, and a despot who easily issued decrees of capital punishment.

But the genius of philology, who "**shines in her own light**", from this simple text was able to obtain a "miraculous" analysis through which the professor discovered that the fish was **not a turbot but ... Saint John**.

The study was published and publicized on the web; all you have to do is type in the title:

The Fourth Satire of Juvenal and the Torture of Saint John in Rome under Domitian

Iliaria Ramelli

Milan. Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

The description begins with these words:

"The specific value of the strange episode of the fish - which is undoubtedly the heart of the satire - was probably underestimated" ... "the christly value of fish is well known, thanks to the acrostic resulting from its Greek name" and ends: "Therefore, the tradition collected by Tertullianus, Jerome, Ambrosius (?) and the apocryphs with regard to the presence of John in Rome and his torture at the time of Domitian acquires authoritativeness and historical importance" (sic!).

With regard to the analysis carried out, we would like to point out a detail which escaped her attention while she was

enraptured in mystical ecstasy: when the servants cooked Saint John they did not need a wick to light the fire under the big pan in which they fried the Apostle. They lifted the Saint, who was lying horizontally, and they brought his head towards the twigs which were set on fire with the **"tongues of fire of the Holy Spirit resting on his head"** (Acts 2,3).

As ordinary tax-paying citizens we must be astonished by the fact that it is possible for such "studies" to circulate in our universities, strengthened by fideistic judgements made by other spiritualist historians grateful to one another for the intellectual contributions brought in. The pious philologist is not alone. Today the naive scribes who worked centuries ago have been replaced by a plethora of pro-clerical exegetes who pass a creed off as if it were history and do everything in their power to make it seem credible (even its most foolish aspects).

Learned people, with or without a frock deliberately ignore the datings of the manuscripts, essential to the understanding of the evolutionary "construction" of the legends; these scholars hide the contradictions discovered to prevent others from highlighting their absurdity and straying away from religion. Their only aim is to "spread the word" by subjecting young people to constant brainwashing, with no critical analysis, evidence or rational demonstrations, but solely based on authoritarian persuasion backed by the media: cultured people who use knowledge to prevent others from knowing. They are unaware or pretend not to know that the Gospels describe two different "Johns", as we report in detail in the seventh study. The first was an adult **"boanergès"** zealot, **"son of the wrath of Yahweh"**, a Jewish rebel who was against the domination of Rome and enemy of the Samaritan apostates (in conformity with historical findings); the second, on the contrary, was a boy unknown to the other evangelists, who suddenly appears only in the Gospel of John during "the last supper" and identified as **"the disciple who Jesus loved"**. **The only apostolic presence below the crucified Messiah according to the Gospel of John, in contrast with the other Gospels and all the New Testament documents and with Roman customs and common logic:**

"Then all the disciples deserted him (Jesus) and ran away" (Mt 26,56).

In this specific case we have found **grave omissions** regarding basic historical data needed to critically verify the narrated events, omissions which are at the same time counterbalanced by other totally invented information: all together they have the aim of making a preconstituted theory truthful.

As in the alleged historicity of the "tradition" recalled through the "Hymns of Ambrosius", of which there are no manuscripts attributing the authorship of the hymn "Amore Christi Nobilis" (dedicated to John) to this Bishop and no manuscripts containing its dating (which inevitably takes place in a period subsequent to the invention of the torture). A "study" with an overabundance of bibliographical references whose authors of proven faith have not "wed" Juvenal, turbot, Saint John, Tertullianus, Fathers etc.

Ilaria Ramelli - who has become famous and highly regarded at an international level thanks to her discovery which has resolved the troublesome "Saint John case" hidden under the scales of an enormous turbot - has been interviewed and propagandized by widely-read newspapers and magazines and given support by the usual "choral" of pro-clerical scholars (well-orchestrated and specialized in catechizing history) ... like the great professor who has received many foreign academic awards and who is also an inspired mystic and teacher of "divine historical revelations": Marta Sordi, professor at the Università Cattolica. Such notoriety, which was the result of her studies, has prompted us to mention her; and we will continue to do so every time we realize that she has tampered with history in her writings.

Ilaria Ramelli and Marta Sordi agreed upon the "evangelist" Juvenal's "deposition" and the turbot "Apostle John" so as to **have the torture "in oleo" of Jesus's favourite Apostle take place under Domitian; their deceitful objective was to exculpate Nero**, indicated as the true author in all the handwritten codexes drawn up through the centuries. These two historians of the Church, both aware that **the Apostle John**, after his direct interaction with the Emperor who massacred the Christians - according to the Codex Laurentianus MS 68 written after the other manuscripts - **would have been forced to mention the abominable event to his disciples and in the three letters** to future memory. In order to "safeguard" the false slaughter of Christians perpetrated by Nero and described in the above-mentioned codex, Ramelli and all the other genuflexion exegetes did not hesitate to blame Domitian for John's torture (died in 104 A.D.), well aware that the relationship between Emperor Nero and the Apostle John would immediately make the silence of the latter with regard to the *ingens multitudo* of burning Jesuit martyrs crucified in imperial Rome in 64 A.D. leap before everyone's eyes.

There is another document: **"Codex Bodeleianus Baroccianus MS 182"** paleographically dated to the eleventh century. Here the scribes wrote down the **Chronographia of Iohannes Malalas**, a Christian historian from Antioch who **lived in the sixth century**. The codex - one of the sources of the vast "Greek Patrology" - also contains the work of Malalas (**"Chronaca X"** 340 D) in which we read:

"Under the reign of Domitian there was a persecution of Christians: he made Saint John the Theologist come to Rome and he interrogated him. Astonished by the knowledge of the Apostle, he was about to have him return secretly to Ephesus and told him: «Go and live in peace where you have come from». But he was reprimanded and confined to Pathmos".

Through its comparison with the other codexes we have mentioned (as read above), **in the sixth century** there could not have been any torture "in oil" of John (ridiculous), as is confirmed in "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Eusebius of Caesarea and by all the Fathers and historians which the Bishop made reference to ... after inventing them. Further evidence is furnished by **"Historiae adversus Paganos"**, a work written by the historian Presbyter Paulus Orosius by order of Saint Augustine; Book VII (10,5) of this work states that **"Domitian confined to the island of Pathmos the blessed Apostle Iohannes"** ... without undergoing any sort of grave torture.

Thus, there is a **sharp contrast with Neronian torture mentioned below and described in "Adversus Iovinianum"** (I 26) attributed to Tertullianus by **Saint Jerome (but dating back to the late Middle Ages)**; in this work **Jerome contradicts his testimony** concerning the torture undergone by the Apostle John under Nero described in another work entitled **"De viris illustribus"** (XVII). We find ourselves before undying contrasts which highlight the incompetence concerning the many antithetical depositions given by the scribes about the heroes who founded primitive Christianity. It is as if the right hand did not know what the left hand ... of God was writing. With regard to the existence of the Apostle John during the principate of Domitian, here is what **Jerome** states in **"De viris illustribus"**:

"In the fourteenth year of Domitian (95 A.D.), during the second persecution after that of Nero, John was confined to the island of Patmos and here he composed the Apocalypse. After the assassination of Domitian (96 A.D.), John returned to Ephesus where he founded and led the various Churches of Asia, and here he remained until the principate of Trajan. Exhausted by old age he died sixty-years after the death of the Lord (in 104 A.D.) and was buried in Ephesus" (op.cit. XVII).

Instead here is another "testimony" concerning Saint John offered by Jerome in "Adversus Iovinianum":

"The Evangelist Apostle John, as a Prophet certainly saw the Apocalypse on the island of Pathmos where he had been confined by Emperor **Domitian** after the martyrdom endured for the Lord. **Tertullianus** also reports that he was immersed **by Nero** in a jar (or barrel) full of boiling oil from which he came out purified and more vigorous than when he went in" (op. cit. Book I 26).

By taking cognizance of these absurd contrasts, it is not difficult to understand that we are dealing with an over thousand-year-old incessant mental manipulation practiced upon masses of human beings who, after being deceived by the utopian promise of salvation after death and the right to "eternal life", were subjugated by the power and interests of the privileged parasitical castes.

After **Eusebius of Caesarea** attested that **Ireneus of Lyon** had stated, in "**Adversus Haereses**" (III 3,4 and 30,3), that the over hundred-year-old **John** remained in Ephesus until the time of Trajan **without, as far as Eusebius knew, having suffered any sort of torture**, which hand of God did Ilaria Ramelli place herself on? ... So much for the enormous turbot fried in a pan by Domitian:

"All the presbyters who **in Asia** came into contact with **John, disciple of the Lord, offer testimony of his tradition. He in fact remained among them until the time of Trajan**" (HEC. III 23,3).

John makes no mention of his own prodigious martyrdom to any "presbyter" in the province of Asia nor to any of his direct disciples; and the same goes for the Neronian massacre of Christians. The contradictions found in the numerous "testimonies" attested by the scribes demonstrate that these testimonies were invented; the narrated events were therefore invented. In reality, what the spiritualist historians do not even intend to hypothesize did not happen: **the Apostle Saint John never existed ... nor did the other Apostles and their successors**, who were Fathers invented at a later time and passed off as "witnesses" to Apostles and martyrs.

In disregard of the true events, pious "scholars" deliberately manipulated history in order to correct the contradictions which the scribes ran into when they invented the ecclesiastical "tradition". They realize that they have tampered with correct information which has been handed down to us by the chroniclers of imperial Rome; nevertheless, in order to receive the praise and tangible recognition of the Clergy, who awards them professionally, they are willing to endorse documents aimed at conditioning the cultural growth of the young, who unknowingly end up thinking that what has been taught to them is the truth. The zealous "spiritual analyst" lie knowing that they are lying. In the absence of a law contemplating the crime of historical falsification we can only ask ourselves how these people are able to actually look at themselves in the mirror.

The "Holy" hack writers do not limit themselves to adulterating history but go as far as to tamper with holy texts when in these they find incompatibilities; they therefore ignore or pretend to be unaware that the Gospels describe two different "Johns", as reported in detail in the ninth study. The first - an adult Zealot "boanergès" - son of the wrath of Yahweh, a Jewish rebel who fought against Roman domination and an enemy of the apostate Samaritans, in conformity with historical findings; the second, instead, was a lad unknown to the other evangelists and who suddenly appeared **only in the Gospel of John** during the "last supper" and generically identified as "the disciple who Jesus loved". **This one and only apostolic presence** (even under the crucified Messiah) is **contradicted by the other Gospels, by all New Testament documents and by Roman rules in line with logic.**

"Then all the disciples deserted him (Jesus) and ran away" (Mt 26,56).

The following studies carried out on the specific topics will allow us to demonstrate that during the age-long evolution of the mythological "Messiah Jesus" the so-called "Apostles" and their successors were "theological sheaths", continuators of the salvific message of the "Redeemer" created deliberately in order to prevent any sort of attempt to identify these "Apostles" with the five sons of Judas the Galilean. The four eldest were killed between 36 and 48 A.D., while the youngest was eliminated by the Jewish priestly castes in 66 A.D., after destroying the Roman garrison presiding over Jerusalem and proclaiming himself King of the Jews.

Having Simon Peter, James (passed off as "Minor" and "Just") and John the Prophet and Apostle appear to be still alive would have demonstrated that they were not the Zealots of the "**fourth Jewish philosophy**" - the sect founded by Judas the Galilean - captured and crucified by Roman officials for rebelling against imperial domination.

Saint John "**the disciple who Jesus loved**" was invented by Christian ideologists and presented as **the only disciple under the cross**, in order to "show" that he could not be the King of the Jews executed by the Romans **on the cross**. An impossible presence in contrast with the Roman procedure governing the public execution of the death penalty in the Roman Empire.

The surveillance around the crucified (in order to guarantee public order) was carried out by means of a cordon of armed militiamen who prevented anyone from coming up to the condemned to death (including relatives and friends). According to Roman Law, a sign stating the person's name and the motivation for capital punishment was hung around the neck of the victim.

I N R I : IOHANNES NAZIREVS REX IVDAEORVM

Through the analyses contained in the respective studies, we demonstrate that the only authentic torture was that of John the Nazireus (Consecrated to God), head of the Zealots, who dared proclaim himself King of the Jews in 35 A.D., **after liberating Holy Jerusalem from pagan domination** while Rome was fighting against Artabanus III of Parthia. Until Easter of 36 A.D. (when was he executed by the Legate of Syria Lucius Vitellius) **John was recognized** by the Jewish people as "**Mesiah Jeshua**", Messiah and Saviour. Pontius Pilate did not execute the short-lived King of the Jews who dared challenge the power of Rome; he was executed by the plenipotentiary (of Tiberius) Vitellius who presided over the Orient at war.

For the first time, in 381 A.D., the Council of Constantinople designated the Roman Prefect **Pontius Pilate** as executor of Jesus Christ, thus modifying the earlier Nicene Creed dating back to 325 which made no mention of this. As demonstrated in the sixth and eighth study, from **381** onwards **the Gospels** - of which originally there were several versions - were **copied ex novo** into the respective codices in order to prevent historians from placing the events in their exact time frame and reassemble the details regarding the Zealot Jewish nationalistic insurrection led by the eldest son of Judas the Galilean. Yet the Ancestral Law did not provide for a losing divine Messiah. The true Messiah chosen by Yahweh would have crushed the kittim invaders of the Holy Land and saved the Israelites from pagan domination. After being defeated and executed John was disowned and forgotten by the Jews ... but not by the Essenes.

After the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple ordered by Tito and the resultant Jewish Holocaust, the Therapeutic

Essenes of Alexandria - thanks to their divine "gnosis" recalled by the "logos" conceived by the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria - attempted to give birth to a new kind of Messiah: no longer a "Dominator of the World" but a "Son of God" "Saviour of the World".

This was only the beginning of a doctrine whose evolution lasted centuries ... and culminated in pro-imperial Pauline Christianity characterized by the pagan Theophagic Eucharistical Sacrifice, "The Consecrated Hostia", indispensable for the "Salvation of Eternal Life".

Emilio Salsi

[[go back](#)]