



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

[LANGUAGES](#)  

The fake "Testimonium Flavianum"

Part I

In our studies we have made reference several times to "Testimonium Flavianum" in a critical manner, especially in the third and fourth studies where we analyzed the false martyrdom of an inexistent Apostle called "James the Minor". It is now our duty to deal with the subject in order to explain what it is all about and tell our readers why we have expressed such a drastic opinion regarding a short passage which the majority of the proecclesiastical spiritual critics wish to certify as history.

Testimonium Flavianum

"Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, accused by the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; the Prophets of God had prophesized these and countless other marvellous things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day" (HEC. I 11,7/8).

This is the passage which offers evidence of the existence of Jesus Christ, as reported in "**Historia Ecclesiastica**", written by the Christian Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea and completed after the Council of Nicea held in 325 A.D. **Eusebius attributed the mystical rescript to the historian Josephus**; it will later be spread throughout the world in all languages from the late Middle Ages onwards ... **but it is unknown to all the Fathers of the Church until the fourth century: the era of the Bishop**. Unlike the other Christian Fathers, Origen (who lived in the third century) - in his work "Contra Celsum" (1,47) - claims to have read "Jewish Antiquities" containing the deposition of Joseph on John the Baptist (written in Book XVIII), but does not mention the historian as being a witness to **the miracles and resurrection of Jesus**. The fact that all the successors of Christ were unaware of this passage is on its own enough to demonstrate its non-authenticity.

The text which we have just rendered is exactly the same in all the manuscripts contained in the critical apparatus of "**Jewish Antiquities**" (Ant XVIII 63,64) which the ecclesiastical authorities made available to the German Professor of Classical Philology Benedikt Niese at the end of the 1800s, apparatus which to this day has remained unchanged. The Church gave this document the great burden of certifying the existence of the Saviour of the good, humble, pious men. In addition to referring to "Testimonium Flavianum" Eusebius also mentions the martyrdom of "James the Minor" when making reference to the incident described in Antiquities XX 200, but has "*James, brother of Jesus called Christ*" be beaten to death with a stick rather than being stoned. As readers are well- aware, we have analyzed the event in-depth in the third and fourth studies and demonstrated the falsity of the spurious introduction "*called Christ*".

So as not to have Eusebius of Caesarea - author of the "Historia Ecclesiastica" concerning the life of the Apostles and their successors - appear to be the deceitful creator of the "Testimonium Flavianum" (thus causing his work to lose all its credibility), the Christian exegetes rely on acolyte means of mass communication, **in agreement with the Vatican "Cathopedia"**, in order to throw off researchers. For example, this is "Wikipedia's" argument regarding this possibility:

"As Origen around the year 250 seems to know nothing about these possible interpolations, while many decades later they were known to Eusebius of Caesarea, it can be hypothesized that the commemorative interpolation took place between the time of Origen and that of Eusebius".

A theory based on a ghostly interpolator: is that all? Should this theory constitute the alibi which exculpates Eusebius? Impossible! We must be shocked by so much critical incapacity (or impudence) as **no-one**, even if in possession of a copy of "Jewish Antiquities" by Josephus, **could have manipulated an official manuscript privately** ... first of all **because it would have been pointless**.

The original works of the historian Josephus were deposited in the Imperial Archives right after being completed; the historian Suetonius was Superintendent of these Archives under Hadrian and read the works. Cassius Dio (Origen's contemporary) also had access to these writings, therefore **no-one could have benefited from the falsification of a privately-owned historical text**, whose original was authenticated publicly; at the very least they would have run a serious risk if caught in the act. **And no-one carried out a falsification until the eleventh century A.D.**, as we are about to verify by having a look at the codexes concerning Josephus's Jewish Antiquities. **Eusebius**, biographer of Constantine at the Imperial Court, limited himself to writing the Testimonium Flavianum in his work "Historia Ecclesiastica" but **did not dare tamper with the authentic writings of "Jewish Antiquities"** preserved in the Archives of Nicomedia, new seat of the Emperor of Rome from the time of Diocletian: a fact which we are about to demonstrate.

The oldest documents of the Jewish historian "Joseph, son of Matthias" come solely from ancient Abbacies having libraries furnished with scriptoriums; these Abbacies took possession of, translated and then destroyed the original manuscripts of which today there is no trace. Those which have reached us today are copies dating back a thousand years after the death of the historian, while the scrolls buried in the grottos of Qumran were recovered after two thousand years despite not being preserved with care.

The most ancient Greek text, which originally contained Books XI-XX of Jewish Antiquities plus "Bios" (Autobiography), is "**Codex Palatinus MS 14**", a tome written on parchment preserved at the Vatican Library. It is paleographically dated to the tenth century A.D. but is **lacking Books XVIII, XIX and XX, the ones regarding the era of Jesus and of his successors**.

As Books XVIII and XX - **codexes written in later times** - mention, respectively, "Testimonium Flavianum" and the "martyrdom of James the Minor", we must come to the conclusion that the "Palatinus 14" manuscript was a copy of the original text which did not yet contain the two excellent testimonies concerning Jesus and his brother James; **it would not have been logical for the Church to be interested in eliminating them** if they had been written earlier. But it is also true that those who were in possession of the authentic text - beginning with Eusebius - were forced to keep it hidden from the clergymen themselves in order to prevent anyone from carrying out a complete reading of the true events along with their respective Jewish protagonists living in Palestine at the time of Christ and of his successors: historical knowledge in contrast with evangelical truth. In last analysis, if Eusebius had falsified (by copying it ex novo) the authentic "Jewish Antiquities" by Josephus, the Church would have been able to show off the relevant Greek codex dating back to the fourth century A.D.; just like it did with regard to the oldest existing complete New Testament documents: the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus published in the same century.

Therefore it is not a coincidence if **the entire corpus of manuscripts** forming the critical apparatus - which the ecclesiastical authorities made available to Niese for the editing of the translation of "Jewish Antiquities" - **was drawn up after Codex Palatinus MS 14**.

The manuscripts written in Greek attesting the Testimonium Flavianum are:

- Codex Ambrosianus F 128 paleographically dated to the eleventh century;
- Codex Vaticanus Graecus 984, year 1354;
- Codex Plut. 69 Cod.10 Laurentianus, fifteenth century.

The TF manuscripts written in Latin, being that they have been translated from Greek, are not taken into consideration by the critics.

The first to contest the authenticity of Josephus's TF were European Protestant Christians - beginning with the exegetical philologists Hubert Van Giffen and Lucas Odiander (the latter wrote "Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae") - at the end of the sixteenth century; they availed themselves of scientific arguments which were then drawn on by others through analyses that became more and more convincing as time passed. Particularly effective was the criticism made by Louis Cappel, Jean Dailhè and Tanaquil Faber, ultimately accepted by the majority of international critics of all backgrounds, including Catholics.

The "apocryphal" findings contained in the TFs which have reached us but dating back to prior to the Palatinus 14 manuscript - among which the famous text written in Arabic by Bishop Agapius of Hierapolis (Syria) - are passages detached from the sequential historical context described by Josephus in "Jewish Antiquities" and, as we are about to verify, **are not the result of the consultation of the Jewish historian's original work**, but instead the result of the original report attested by Eusebius of Caesarea in "Historia Ecclesiastica", work which can be found in all Churches, but whose less credible contents were autonomously corrected by scribes when deemed necessary.

It is of utmost importance to highlight that "Historia Ecclesiastica" contains the historiographical framework created by the Bishop under Emperor Constantine as the foundation of the "Christian tradition" attesting the structure of the Fathers of the Church - starting with the successors of Jesus, the Apostles and the evangelizers - and accompanied by a series of martyrs. A long list of spiritual leaders and a multitude of Ecclesiae, duly described in detail (including their personal details) and duly devoted to martyrdom. Starting with the first three Bishops of Jerusalem *"who were blood relatives of the Lord"* (see fourth study), all the Churches had to be aware of their history from the very beginning and the relevant protagonists were often remembered during the Councils held in the centuries to come. An uninterrupted system of Saints - from the time of Christ to the fourth century of Eusebius - which is two thousand years old; we are dealing with a highly impressive *"Opera Omnia"* and no country in the world can offer such a detailed reconstruction of its own past ... with a detail which needs to be highlighted: the history of the first four centuries of the Holy See is based on the imagination of Eusebius and evangelists.

Among the several failed attempts to correct the cheekily pro-Christian of Eusebius's TF content which demonstrated the falsification of the work itself, worthy of mention is the "Testimonium Flavianum" reported in Book 10 of "**Chronography**" by the Byzantine historian Johannes Malalas (Antioch, 491-578) and attested in **Codex Baroccianus 128**; the latter is paleographically dated to the **eleventh century** and preserved at the Bodleian Library in Oxford:

"And from that [time] the destruction of the Jews began, just as Josephus the philosopher of the Hebrews wrote down these things, having said this also, that from when the Jews crucified Jesus, who was a good and just man, if indeed it is necessary to call such a one a man and not God, trouble never left the land of Judea. These things the same Josephus has placed against the Jews in his Judaic writings".

As Josephus never said that the Jewish misfortunes resulted from the crucifixion of Jesus, but instead were caused by the never-ending Zealot struggle against Roman domination, in reality almost all critics rejected the authenticity of this passage. It was **intentionally** formulated by a Christian scribe of the eleventh century indirectly and inserted in the works of Malalas to make the TF truthful; that is to say, the one attributed to Josephus by Eusebius of Caesarea, after removing certain unbelievable passages concerning the miracles and resurrection of Jesus which would have never been mentioned by a Jew.

But further along in "Chronography" the same "historian" **Malalas** demonstrates to us that he had **never read** "Jewish Antiquities", otherwise he would have never "witnessed" the martyrdom of James the Minor and made such a blunder:

"Galba (first Emperor after Nero) *was succeeded by Lucius Otho* (the second Emperor, Marcus Salvius Otho, while "Lucius" was his father's name) *who governed for three months* (69 A.D.). *Under his Empire died the Apostle James, Bishop and Patriarch of Jerusalem"*.

This passage - chronologically incorrect as James Apostle and Bishop of Jerusalem was, according to the "tradition", stoned in 62 A.D. - makes no mention of the event whose protagonists are the High Priest Ananus (died in 67) and Procurator Albinus (died in 69), and is followed by another unjustifiable error in which Malalas makes reference to the decapitation of John the Baptist in the city of Sebaste (in Samaria) rather than in the fortress of Macherunte (in Perea):

this is all mentioned by Josephus with historical preciseness. This is the reason why almost no-one (apart from a few simpletons) today takes the "Testimonium Malalasianum" into consideration ... as rationalism alone is enough to demonstrate the silliness of it all (including the TF) without there being need to involve philology.

In order to correct the undisguised pro-Christian content conceived by Eusebius of Caesarea, the **ninth** century sees the drawing up of a manuscript aimed at passing on a more credible TF by means of indirect testimony attributed to **Saint Jerome**: the **Codex MS 2Q Neoeboracensis** (kept at the Theological Library in New York). Here we find copied Jerome's work "**De viris illustribus**", where in Chapter **XIII** dedicated to the life of Josephus we read:

*"In the **eighteenth** book of Antiquities, **Josephus declares** very explicitly (sic!) **that Jerusalem was destroyed for the slaying of the Apostle James**. With regard to the Lord, he wrote: «In this same time was Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it be lawful to call him man. He was in fact an author of great miracles and a teacher for those who willingly accept the truth. He also had many adherents, both of the Jews and of the Gentiles, and was believed to be Christ, and when through the envy of our chief men, Pilate had crucified him, nevertheless those who had loved him at first continued to the end».*

Inadmissible! Jerome could have never written such nonsense as the hard-working Father had access to the original documents, as secretary of Pontifex Maximus and Pope, Damasus I; we must therefore condemn the deceitful intentions of the scribes of God, and so serious is the blunder that there is need for an explanation. A complete account of the Act of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem concerning the assassination of the Apostle John was given by the Jewish writer in the **twentieth** book of "Jewish Antiquities", yet it does not contain Josephus's declaration concerning the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem which took place eight years later (in 70 A.D.; the historian was aware that **at this moment no one could foresee the destruction** and that such a prediction had no connection whatsoever with the chronicle described (dealt with in the third study). In addition to this, in the reported passage it is stated that the Jewish historian described John the Baptist as being "a prophet": absolutely not! Josephus referred to the Baptist (in the chapter dedicated to him) as a "good man, liked by both the Jews and God".

The scribes of the above-mentioned codex inevitably made such a mistake as they **did not have the original text** of "Jewish Antiquities", but based themselves on Eusebius's quotes and attempted to correct his clearly flawed "Testimonium Flavianum". In fact, as specified above, the Jewish historian's work was deliberately hidden (even from the clergy itself) in an abbacy by the grey eminences of the Church.

With regard to the death of **James**, which however is not specified in the passage, the scribes went as far as to contradict James himself (half a millenium after his death): their deceit is evident as they did not consider the deposition concerning the brother of Christ given earlier by the Doctor of the Church. In fact, in Chapter **II** of "**De viris illustribus**" regarding the life of the Apostle **there is no trace of any sort of martyrdom undergone by James the Minor**: an event unknown to all Christian Fathers until the advent of **Eusebius of Caesarea**. As this detail escaped the scribes, we will explain why Jerome did not mention the James's torture described by Eusebius.

The latter chose a **spectacular death** for the Apostle, very **different from execution by stoning**; he in fact decides (HEc. II 1.5) to have him thrown down from the Temple of Jerusalem and then beaten to death: this method of execution is not reported, deliberately, by Jerome as the Father of Church realized that, if it had been true, many other Christian witnesses would have mentioned the event prior to Eusebius. Moreover, although preceding the above-mentioned "Codex Ambrosianus F 128" (which "canonized" the stoned James) by over two centuries, this spurious passage from "De viris illustribus" could not become the "source" of a later and more credible TF for the simple reason that **Eusebius**, in the **fourth** century, **inserted the first Testimonium Flavianum** in "**Historia Ecclesiastica**"; that is to say, a vast work made up of fundamental all-embracing documentation concerning Christian tradition with historical references to its heroic protagonists, who were Bishops, Fathers and martyrs. "Historia Ecclesiastica" is indispensable to all the Christian Churches - those of the Byzantine East and of the Roman West - **spread throughout the world** and therefore **cannot be eliminated** and replaced by another work.

The Vatican exegetes are well-aware of this evidence and they have never made reference to the above-mentioned passage for they realize that the contradictions which it contains would constitute proof of its falsification; they have instead preferred to adopt another TF - like the one we are about to analyze containing blunders which have been conveniently "adjusted" - in order to capture the attention of all current historians. However, as we are about to verify, the contradictions deriving from the Jewish religion professed by Josephus cannot, and will never be, overcome. And finally, in the second part of this investigation even the slow-witted can verify that all the TFs prove to be historical anachronisms... thanks to Eusebius. So let's carry on with our studies.

Until the end of the 1960s encyclopedias throughout the world highlighted the ambiguities of the TF and criticized the work's attribution to the Jewish historian, with negative repercussions on the credibility of the Church itself. But the situation changed in 1971, when Professor **Shlomo Pinès**, philosopher at the Jewish University of Jerusalem, published a new version of the TF based on tenth-century Arab manuscript entitled "**Universal History**" drawn up by the Arab Christian Bishop of Hierapolis Agapius (born? - died after 942 A.D.). Here is the text:

*"Similarly Josephus, the Hebrew. For he says in the treatises that he has written on the governance of the Jews: At this time there was a wise man who was called Jesus. His conduct was good, and he was known to be virtuous. And many people from among the Jews and other nations became his disciples. Pilate condemned him to be crucified and to die. But those who had become his disciples did not abandon his discipleship. **They reported** that he had appeared to them three days after his crucifixion, and that **He was alive**; accordingly he was perhaps the Christ, concerning whom **the prophets** have recounted wonders".*

It can be observed that "Testimonium Agapianum" is written in an indirect manner; this is also due to the fact that Agapius (in order to disclaim any responsibility) refers to a "chronicle" written by the Maronite Christian astrologer "Teophilus of Edessa": **attestation which no-one had ever read** but which was taken very seriously into account by Pinès and, as pointed out by the scholar himself, *"this could be a more accurate recording than that written by Josephus as it lacks those parts which have often been considered to be interpolations of Christians"*.

Despite using the conditional tense, Pinès took for granted that Josephus had written the TF differently from the "original" and in a manner which was admissible for a Jewish writer.

* There are a few manuscripts written by the astrologer Teophilus of Edessa (695-785) reported in the Codex Vaticanus Gr. 212, and the topics dealt with concern the influence of the stars on the lives of people; there is nothing of historiographical importance nor is there anything about Josephus.

Today's Church exegetes shamelessly affirm that: *"the work of Teophilus of Edessa has been lost"*. They are convinced that outside the Vatican lives a world of fools ready to believe that a true deposition on Christ - mentioned by a twit by the name of "Teophilus" from the Holy City of Edessa saved through a miracle by Jesus himself - "just got lost on its own".

Overwhelmed with euphoria by his "scoop", strengthened by the fact that he too was a Jew, which would have awarded him the glory and eternal gratitude of both Christians and the hierarchies of the various sects, Pinès did not bother to carry out more in-depth studies regarding Church Fathers' lack of awareness of the TF; it did not even dawn on him that the Bishop Agapius, as a Christian, would have been interested in correcting the silly testimony attributed to the historian Josephus by his predecessor Eusebius.

Similarly, he makes no mention of the "testimony" attributed once again to Josephus by the Patriarch of Constantinople Photius (Agapius's contemporary), who, in his imposing work "**Biblioteca**" (**Myriobiblion**, one thousand books) in the epitome dedicated to the historian, awards the Jew an excellent, yet false, "direct testimony" (a pious dream) concerning the "Nativity" of Jesus: *"At the time in which Herod reigned Christ was born from the Virgin to save mankind"* ... words of Josephus (sic). However, and this is the most significant piece of evidence, **without adding anything about the "original" TF** which mentions the **miracles and the resurrection of Jesus**.

Photius's quotation offers further **proof that the scribes added this "testimony" to the codexes of "Antiquities"** copied over **two centuries after the Bishop's death**, as verified above through the listing and dating of the manuscripts, starting with the "Codex Ambrosianus F 128".

A finding which confirms the conclusions of those critics who, like us, totally reject the authenticity of all the TFs, as they are passages never written by Josephus in "Jewish Antiquities". The same goes for the phrase deliberately added to a certain Jesus **"called Christ"**, brother of a certain James (the Jewish name Jeshua was widespread and was the equivalent of "Joshua"). In reality this Jesus was the son of Damneus, not of Saint Joseph or of the Holy Spirit, and the false interpolation "called Christ" was inserted by scribes into the manuscripts drawn up **after** the Codex Palatinus MS 14, which lacked this interpolation. Considerations which the eminent Christian exegetes have always been aware of, but which they continue not to mention to the blessed poor in spirit or, when asked to give an explanation, expatiate upon the subject offering absurd, inconclusive replies.

So, as expected, the high ecclesiastical prelates took advantage of the opportunity offered to them by the Jewish philosopher Pinès in order to "reopen" the issue of the "Testimonium Flavianum" and allow the Church of Christ to regain credibility, well-aware of having the support of all means of mass communication. In fact when reading the conclusions written by Wikipedia and those of the Vatican's "Cathopedia" you realize that they are identical and "assembled" according to the same logic which allows readers (thanks to their goodness) to choose among the different positions as if a survey had been carried out, as reported below:

- "The majority of experts partially accept it, attributing to certain Christian interpolators certain statements contained in it";
- "Some experts consider it completely authentic";
- "Some experts reject it completely".

Recognizing that "certain Christian interpolators" have inserted information found to be incorrect allows us to make an elementary observation: **the scribes of Christ were the only ones who wrote what they wanted in their codexes ... corrections included**. After attesting (too superficially) that a doctrine from the original passage of the TF was coherent solely with Christian faith, the scribes later realized that their doctrine was in contrast with Josephus's Jewish doctrine (so Josephus could not have written it) and some of them took it upon themselves to correct the mistakes. To date the Catholic Church, following the theories of the authoritative priest and biblicist John Paul Meier (cfr "A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus" - Doubleday 1991 - in the third chapter on the "Sources" dedicated to Josephus), is opting for a partial acceptance of the TF thus admitting the spurious interpolations created by its scribes. Considering that we - who have not been consulted by anyone and belong to the category of "experts who reject it completely" - feel it necessary to explain our reasoning (completely different from that of Meier, who is in line with Pinès), we have carried out further in-depth studies which have allowed us to strengthen what we have already demonstrated through simple historical common sense; as already stated, we are dealing with information which the eminent ecclesiastical exegetes, including Meier, have been aware of since the time of Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea.

Part II

Eusebius of Caesarea and the anachronism of TF

In "Historia Ecclesiastica" by Eusebius of Caesarea we read:

*"It is therefore demonstrated the falsity of the **"Acts"** against our **Saviour**, published **recently**, these, in fact, place under the **fourth consulate of Tiberius**, which coincides with the seventh year of his reign (21 A.D.), **the suffering which the Jews dared inflict upon our Savior**: but at that time **Pilate did not yet govern over Judea**"* (HEC. I 9,3/4).

According to what we have just read, Eusebius informs us of the recent publication of a version of "Acts of the Jesus" (which then disappeared, obviously) which differs from the one which has reached us today, **and in which the suffering of "Jesus"** is placed in **21 A.D.** (fourth consulate of Tiberius), that is to say under Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor. This detail is proof of the alterations carried out by the evangelical editors in order to sidetrack the research regarding who really crucified "Jesus" ... and the dating of an event which was clearly invented: according to these "Acts" **Prefect Valerius Gratus "sacrificed" Jesus**.

But Eusebius adds other details in the same "Historia Ecclesiastica" (HEC. I 10,1/6):

*"It was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, according to the evangelist, and in the fourth year of the governorship of **Pontius Pilate**, while Herod and Lysanias and Philip were ruling the rest of Judea, that our Saviour and Lord, **Jesus the Christ** of God, being about thirty years of age, came to John for baptism and began the promulgation of the Gospel. The Divine Scripture says, moreover, that he passed the entire time of his ministry under the high priests **Annas and Caiaphas**, showing that in the time which belonged to the priesthood of those two men the whole period of his teaching was completed. Since he began his work during the high priesthood of Annas and taught until Caiaphas held the office, the entire time does not comprise quite four years.*

*For the rites of the law having been already abolished since that time, the customary usages in connection with **the worship of God**, according to which the high priest acquired his office by hereditary descent and held it for life, were also annulled and there were appointed to **the high priesthood by the Roman governors** now one and now another person who continued in office not more than **one year**. Josephus relates that there were four high priests in succession from Annas to Caiaphas. Thus in the same book of the Antiquities (XVIII 34-35) he writes as follows: "**Valerius Gratus** having put an end to the priesthood of **Annas**, the son of (bar) Seth, appoints **Ishmael**, the son of (bar) Fabi, High Priest. And having removed him after a little he appoints **Eleazar**, the son of (bar) Annas the High Priest, to the same office. And having removed him also at the end of a year he gives the high priesthood to **Simon**, the son of (bar)*

Camithus. But he likewise held the honor no more than a year, when **Josephus**, called also **Caiaphas***, succeeded him." Accordingly the whole time of our Saviour's ministry is shown to have been not quite **four full years, four high priests**, from Annas to the accession of Caiaphas, having held office a year each. The Gospel therefore has rightly indicated **Caiaphas as the High Priest during the year in which the Saviour suffered**. From which also we can see that the time of our Saviour's ministry does not disagree with the foregoing investigation" (HEC. I 10,1/6).

* Josephus's quotation (Ant. XVIII 34-35), recalled by Eusebius, **places this event in 18 A.D.**, year in which the Prefect Valerius Gratus appointed Caiaphas; but it is important to point out that "Son of" (bar) is missing, which prevents the recognition of the family of the High Priest **"Joseph called also Caiaphas"**. It is not an oversight of the Jewish historian but deliberate censorship carried out by the Christian copyists, which requires a specific analysis in order to uncover the motives; as we have seen in the incident regarding "James the Minor", we are well-aware of the fact that if the scribes eliminate the patronymic within a Jewish testimony, they do so in order to safeguard the "truth" of their faith ... and **Caiaphas**, as we well know, **was Jesus's accuser**.

"They took him (Jesus) **first to Annas, because Annas was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was high priest that year"** (Jh 18,13).

What year are we speaking about? We all know that Jesus was crucified in 33 A.D., while Eusebius's above-mentioned chronicle - concerning the real names of the High Priests of the Temple appointed by the Roman Governors for no longer than a year - does not correspond to the dating of the current Gospels. But being that the Bishop refers to the dating reported in Antiquities by the Jewish historian, let's try to better understand.

As verified above through the datings of the codexes, from the eleventh century onwards the Christian calligraphers interpolated, in their manuscripts (**after** the Codex Palatinus MS 14), the spurious passage of the "Testimonium Flavianum" into "Jewish Antiquities" (XVIII 63/4); TF mentions the "testimony", falsely attributed to the historian Josephus, including **Pilate's sentencing of Jesus to the cross**. To date anyone - after having consulted the text and seen that the TF begins with the phrase **"At the same time ..."** - can verify that the event is placed ("pasted") **before 19 A.D.**, therefore **not under the prefectorial government of Pilate** but **under Prefect Valerius Gratus** and **under the high pontificate of Caiaphas**. As all historians of Christianity are well-aware, 19 A.D. is the year in which Tiberius expelled the Jews from Rome and sent them to Sardinia, an event which is attested in "Jewish Antiquities" by Josephus **after the crucifixion of Christ**. Therefore the **TF was inserted** by the scribes even **before the events which took place in 19 A.D.** and, surprise surprise, **consistent with both the above-mentioned "Acts of Jesus"** (used at the time of Eusebius) **and the "Creed" from the 325 A.D. Council of Nicea**. The latter **made no mention of Pontius Pilate** as the "sacrificer" of Jesus (Eusebius died in 340 A.D.), unlike the **"Creed" from the 381 A.D. Council of Constantinople** (convened by Emperor Theodosius I and presided by Bishop Gregory of Nazianzum) which stated that:

"Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate ...".

On the basis of the data obtained from the sources, the fact that "Testimonium Flavianum", **which reported the death of Christ**, was inserted by Christian copyists, having the work date back to long before Pilate governed over Judea, is neither by chance nor the result of an error made by Josephus (as the grey eminences would lead us to believe). **The scribes consciously placed the TF under the Prefect Valerius Gratus (Pilate's predecessor), when "Joseph, also called Caiaphas", was the High Priest** of the Temple of Jerusalem: the doctrine of the period mentioned by Eusebius was simply respected **as reported in "Acts of Jesus"** cited by Eusebius through a binding alteration in the dating of the death of the Saviour (placed in 21 A.D., during the **"fourth consulate of Tiberius"**). This change is the result of the imposition, mentioned above by Eusebius, according to which the High Priests **"were appointed to the high priesthood by the Roman governors now one and now another person who continued in office not more than one year"**. The fact that all the Gospels referred to **Caiaphas** as the High Priest of the Temple who accused Jesus, and being that he **could remain in office only one year** (he was appointed by Gratus in 18 A.D.), explains why today we continue to read a TF which reports the death of Jesus as taking place **before** the historical events of 19 A.D., in other words at the time of the prefectorial government of Valerius Gratus. The two-year discrepancy in the dating (19 A.D. rather than 21 A.D.), recalled previously by Eusebius in reference to the "fourth consulate of Tiberius", was deliberate; the scribes of "Codex Ambrosianus F 128" were aware that Caiaphas's term of office (under Valerius Gratus) lasted just one year, just like the earlier High Priests.

While this **grave error** can still be found **today** in "Jewish Antiquities", it no longer exists in the current "Acts". In fact, the **"Acts of Jesus"** were corrected after the **Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.** and placed in both the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, allowing us to date the two codexes to after the time of the Council. After verifying the correspondence between the historical events described in the Greek texts of "Jewish Antiquities" which have reached us (events which interconnect perfectly with the history of Rome), from a simple analysis of the **"Testimonium Flavianum"** **anyone can** understand that it is false because, **to date, "Jesus" is said to have been crucified** at the same time as when Josephus reports Tiberius's expulsion of all the Jews from Rome, that is to say **before 19 A.D.**, an important date because this is the year in which the historian **Josephus** records Tiberius's decision to expell all the Jews from Rome (Ant. XVIII 83), as confirmed by **Tacitus** (Annales 2,85) and **Suetonius** (Tiberius 36); **obviously when Caiaphas was the High Priest of the Temple**: precisely in **18 A.D.**

Therefore the scribes of Christ, interpolators of "Antiquities" fell into a second "chronological trap", to the point of contradicting the Gospels themselves: **the crucifixion of Jesus is said to have taken place many years prior to the execution of John the Baptist**, while the evangelists attest that he died before the Saviour. According to history, the death of the Baptist was ordered by Herod Antipas over 15 years after the "resurrection of Jesus" mentioned in the "Testimonium Flavianum", in other words between the end of 35 and the beginning of 36 A.D., **just before Antipas** was defeated in war by his ex-father-in-law, Aretas IV, King of the Nabatean Arabs. **The conflict took place in the summer of 36 A.D.** (Ant. XVIII 116/9).

It must be pointed out that in this passage Josephus states that **"the verdict of the Jews was that the ruination of the army of Herod was a vendetta of John** (the Baptist), **that is God thought it right to inflict such a defeat upon Herod"**. Therefore in 36 A.D. **both God and the Jewish people know nothing about the Advent of a divine Messiah**, author of extraordinary prodigies and acclaimed by the crowds in Jerusalem as **"King of the Jews"**, **incriminated by the Sanhedrin and executed by Pontius Pilate**: none of what is magnified in the Gospels "revealed by God" and in the deceptive TF is confirmed by history.

But, as the "Testimonium Flavianum" (including the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ) is something false created by Eusebius, the same goes for the TFs copied at a later date by other Christian scribes in order to correct the markedly incorrect doctrinal content shown off in the first TF. **As the scribes intentionally led us to believe that Josephus had written the TF** in "Jewish Antiquities", **each of these passages** - "corrected" after the fourth century in nine "apocryphal" TFs retrieved among the "creases" of Christian literature from the time of Saint Jerome **onward - must be**

placed in exactly the same place in "Jewish Antiquities" and we will thus always find the absurdity **that Jesus was "sacrificed" by Pontius Pilate when the Prefect of Judea was Valerius Gratus**. This is why the "mended" TFs are single passages, removed from the text of "Antiquities" and inserted in "chronicles" inconsistent with the precise historical context for reasons which are solely doctrinal. The chronological error regarding the TF, **consistent with a disused version of the "Acts of the Jesus"**, is systematically ignored by Christian exegetes (starting with the Catholic John P. Meier) and by critics in general ... surely by those expression of means of mass communication, faithful epigons of the millenary power of the Churches of Christ. This is Wikipedia's conclusion:

"Unfortunately, as the experts themselves are forced to admit:

«[...] textual critics are unable to resolve the matter. [...] In order to express an opinion on the authenticity of the passage, **we must examine its context, style and content**»".

The style and content of the TF have been the same for centuries and they have been of no use to experts, apart from allowing them to formulate subjective hypothetical judgements. The only analysis of the TF which is lacking is the one we have just examined: **the historical context** based on precise information ... but how many centuries are these "experts" going to take before arriving at a conclusion? So let's carry on with our studies.

How could the anachronism of the "Testimonium Flavianum" - which, however, is **present only in "Antiquities"** and "forgotten" by Josephus in "Bellum" - have survived intact the age-long critical verification carried out by the scribes and later univocally become part of the critical apparatus of the manuscripts submitted to Benedikt Niese for translation? Having taken into consideration the countless historical mistakes made by the scribes of God and highlighted in the studies which have already been published, we must not be astonished by the fact that they have always had doctrine prevail over history; therefore the copyists, in order to protect themselves in advance from possible contradictions, never subjected to comparative readings certain invented events passed off as true. It must also be pointed out that all editors of "Jewish Antiquities" translations carried out in modern-day languages from the time of Niese onwards have been obliged to choose (and such an obligation will remain in the future) among the same "families" of manuscripts already chosen by the ecclesiastical authorities and, inevitably, have reported the chronological error concerning the death of Jesus contained in the TF attributed to the Jewish historian.

A doctrine which is naively highlighted in the TF from Book XVIII of "Antiquities", where the scribes unequivocally state that **"He was the Christ"**, while in Book XX, in reference to the Apostle James, they write the vague expression **"brother of Jesus called Christ"**. The different wording of the two expressions was forced upon them by the awareness that the second event took place within the Jewish Sanhedrin: a court in which Elders, Doctors of the Law, Scribes and High Priests would have never been willing to accuse the brother of a Jewish Messiah. Therefore the copyists found nothing better than the expression "called", as if it were almost a nickname, for they, being unaware of Jewish culture, thought that this was enough to divert the Sanhedrin's attention away from their divine saviour: a Commander King chosen by Yahweh, who this people awaited as their Saviour (**Jeshúa**), and who would free the Promise Land from Roman yoke. In last analysis, **"called Christ"** meant as a nickname, when placed into the mouth of a Sanhedrin Jew, proves to be a ridiculous expedient, perhaps enough to convince fools yet offensive for its hypocrisy towards those who follow these studies. Simply pronouncing the word "Messiah" within the Sanhedrin would have forced its members to open a trial to establish whether they were dealing with the Jewish Saviour or the village idiot.

Josephus does not provide a chronicle concerning the "trial of Jesus Christ", thus meaning that the event did not take place. In fact, as the Jewish scribe deemed it necessary to report the "trial of James brother of Jesus called Christ" to the last detail, for the same reason he would have felt it to be of utmost importance to **publicize the chronicle** - dating back to just before the birth of the Sanhedrin historian - **of a Jewish Messiah King condemned by the Sanhedrin** of Jerusalem in addition to the related via crucis. Even more so as (according to the Gospels) the Jews were those who cheered Jesus as their King upon his triumphal arrival in the "Holy City" ... but who then "repudiated him" by popular acclaim and asked for his crucifixion, carried out by Pontius Pilate.

On the contrary in the TF from Book XVIII of "Antiquities" the Christian interpolators - following the logic of the TF written by Eusebius and in the attempt to become one with Josephus - were obliged to have the latter say that **"Christ was accused by our principal men amongst us"**, avoiding the word "Sanhedrin", which instead is present in the Gospels, well-aware that if it had been true the historian should have mentioned this Act of the Sanhedrin containing the Jewish Messiah's sentence: something so extraordinary could not have been passed over with silence. Instead we all know that **in "Antiquities" we do not find the Act of the Sanhedrin containing Jesus's sentence**. In addition, in the TF the scribes imposed upon the Jewish historian the solemn pronouncement: **"the Prophets of God had prophesized these and countless other marvellous things concerning him** (resurrection and miracles)". Another absurdity, again based on the lack of awareness of the **"tradition of the ancient fathers"**, customs and **prophecies** which Josephus wrote about in "Antiquities"; yet he makes no mention of this prediction contained in the TF. **This detail regarding the "Prophecies"** can also be found in the "Testimonium Agapianum" written in Arabic, which shows that the **Bishop Agapius and his powerful predecessor Eusebius of Caesarea creator of the first TF shared the same doctrine** and that the latter misunderstood both the works of the Jewish historian and Jewish traditions, thus misleading the former who used Eusebius as his source.

Finally putting an end to the imaginative statements made by the now late Professor Shlomo Pinès and by omnipresent grey eminences of all the Christian "tribes" including their "leaders", the latter being schemers interested in not losing face by defending a ridiculous deposition of the TF and who go as far as to rewrite this work ex novo even today (beginning with John Paul Meier); their behaviour does not surprise us due the fact that **"lupus mutat pilum, non mentem"** ... Much clearer in English: "a leopard can't change its spots".

The information given, analyzed through simple historical rationalism, also applies to the other TF "corrected" after the time of Eusebius. Studies which on their own are enough to close once and for all the question concerning the "Testimonium Flavianum", now in an irreversible coma although kept alive thanks to the "therapeutic obstinacy" of mass media Christianity addicts involved in hiding the final "De profundis" already psalmodized by history. However ... more is yet to come.

It is dutiful to remind readers that **the most ancient** manuscripts of the New Testament, those used by the clergy to indoctrinate all Christianity, the same Gospels of today, date back to the end of the fourth century (approximate paleographical dating): the Codex Vaticanus Graece 1209 and the Codex Sinaiticus 01. These two codexes were drawn up a few years prior to the Vulgata Latina, when **Catholicism was imposed by Emperor Theodosius as the sole religion** of a Roman Empire on the brink of final disintegration.

Prior to this, primitive Christianity was made up of many separate sects; the Bishops of each of these sects - each of whom considered himself to be the guardian of the authentic "divine revelation" - had a different way of representing the "Universal Saviour", son of God, the guarantor of the resurrection of the faithful after death, obtained in return for his redemption. The "gnosis" of God of the many Christian preachers with regard to constubstantiality of Christ with God and

the Father (same substance and nature), concept sanctioned at the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D., differed from that of the Arian Christians who did not recognize this dogma. This theological dogma gave birth to ferocious disputes among Christians; in spite of this reaction, the doctrine was later broadened in order to include the Holy Trinity. The new Creed was officialized at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., the year after...

380 A.D. - **Edict of Thessalonica**:

EMPERORS GRATIAN, VALENTINIAN AND THEODOSIUS AUGUSTI.

*It is our desire that all the various nations which are subject to our Clemency and Moderation, should continue to profess that religion which was delivered to the Romans by the divine Apostle Peter... According to the apostolic teaching and the doctrine of the Gospel, let us believe in the one deity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in equal majesty and in a holy Trinity. We authorize the followers of this law to assume the title of **Catholic Christians**; but as for **the others** (Christians), since, in our judgment they are foolish madmen, we decree that they shall be branded with the ignominious name of heretics, and shall not presume to give to their conventicles the name of churches. **They will suffer in the first place the chastisement of the divine condemnation and in the second the punishment of our authority which in accordance with the will of Heaven we shall decide to inflict.***

GIVEN IN THESSALONICA ON THE THIRD DAY FROM THE CALENDARS OF MARCH, DURING THE FIFTH CONSULATE OF GRATIAN AUGUSTUS AND FIRST OF THEODOSIUS AUGUSTUS.

This dogma was drawn up by the chancellery of Theodosius I in Constantinople and enacted by the Emperor with his seal, and valid in all the Provinces of the newly-founded Roman Catholic Empire; later, it was also inserted in the Codex of Theodosius II and has been in effect from this time onwards. Catholic Christians continue to refer to the dogma of the Holy Trinity when making the ancestral "sign of the cross", without reflecting upon the fact here there is no reference to the fourth divinity which at this time was unknown: the Mother of God. In 380 A.D. the Bishops and Emperors had not yet invented the Mater Magna "Madonna". It was only in 431 A.D. that the imperial Clergy solemnly declared that humanity was to adore the "**Θεοτόκος**" (Theotòkos): the new Great, Universal, Goddess and Super Virgin.

The Gospels had to be transcribed once again in order to adapt them to the Catholic doctrine which had defeated the other Christian ideologies, declared heretical after the many Councils held during the fourth century. The new (at the time) Greek and Latin (Vulgata of Hieronymus) Bibles became the source which, from the end of the fourth beginning of the fifth century, allowed the scribes inside the Convents to transcribe the many Gospels which priests then spread throughout the Provinces and the most remote territories of the known world. These new Gospels were spread in a very organized fashion by the Empire a few decades prior to the Council of Ephesus held in 431 A.D, thanks to the efforts of clergymen; but the many codexes in their possession contained the "Letters of Saint Paul" which did not yet contemplate the dogma of the Mother of God. The scribes of the letters of "Paul of Tarsus could not have been aware of the decision taken at the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. as they drew up these epistles prior to this date. This is the reason why, to this very day, Saint Paul knows nothing about the "Madonna".

It is important to point out that even before the time of Ephesus, when the first evangelical Gospels were drawn up, other changes were made.

"Identify the authentic divine Scriptures from the heretical ones, absurd and unholy, made up by charlatans, instrument of diabolical acts" (HEC. III 26,1).

As confirmation of what was mentioned by Eusebius himself, of all the "apocryphal", "gnostic" and "pseudo" Gospels - reaching us with paleographical datings prior to the two codexes Vaticanus and Sinaiticus - the official **New Testament "canonical" codexes**, unlike all the others, **are the only ones having names of famous people** who actually existed both in the Roman and Jewish worlds. These two codexes were not the first to be "canonized"; this can be deduced by the fact that the number and names of the Apostles mentioned by Eusebius in "Historia Ecclesiastica" do not correspond to those of the current Gospels. In fact, in the first study we have already observed the overlapping of the Apostles "Judas" and "Thomas" who the Bishop identifies in only one person, thus eliminating one of the "twelve" (HEC. I 13,11):

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

while, with regard to the death of one of the two Apostles by the name of James, Eusebius provides a "testimony" (see third study) which the compilers of the current Gospels were totally oblivious to:

"In reality there were two Apostles by the name of James: one, the Just, was thrown off the pinnacle and beaten to death with a club by a fuller; the other was beheaded" (HEC. II 1,5).

Everyone, especially believers, must admit that the diverging writings concerning the Apostles not only compromise the credibility of the "holy scriptures" (this is inevitable if we begin to confront these writings with history), but also bring us to the conclusion that Eusebius was in possession of another biblical codex containing New Testament documents which were partially different from those of today; a theory which can be verified in a different "Acts of Jesus" referred to by the historian Bishop Eusebius. It was necessary to revise the "Eusebian Codex" as a result of the many bloody Councils held during the fourth century (following that of Nicea) aimed at defining the "substance" of the universal Saviour, a concept of "divinity" which will be completed after the time of Eusebius through the introduction of the concept of the "immaculate conception" of the Only-Begotten Son of the Mother of God.

On the basis of the Gospel read by Eusebius, the Bishop stated in his work "Historia Ecclesiastica" (III 20):

*"**Judas, called brother of the Lord according to the flesh ...**".*

This declaration - confirmed by **Saint Jerome** in 392 A.D. in chap. 4 of "**De virus illustribus**" dedicated to the Apostle "**Judas, brother of James ...**" - demonstrates that a century after the death of Eusebius the Christians carried out a theological evolution of the "Blessed Virgin Mary", Mother of God (virgin before, while and after giving birth) as dictated in the Council of **Ephesus** in **431 A.D.** As a result the evangelist Luke, with a four-century delay, revised his Gospel - in order to make it compatible with the Council's will - by inserting in his "Nativity" (Lk 1, 43) the new dogma of the "Theotòkos" (**Θεοτόκος**) "Mother of God". This is how the Marian cult of the new divinity got started, despite the fact that to date it has not been accepted by all the Christian sects.

Besides, 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 God**, for the simple fact that "Ephesus" had yet to be chosen by the Catholic Bishops. Giovanni, prior to Paul, had been were invested with the same Ministry by the Redeemer on the cross, with the precise duty to look after His Mother without specifying where; it was the Ecumenical Council of 431 A.D., deliberately held in Ephesus, which defined the scanty evangelical and patristic information and decreed that "**John took Mary and came to Ephesus**".

In contrast with the synodal decision, **the letter of Saint Paul cannot be aware of the arrival in Ephesus of the Blessed Virgin and Saint John** for the scribes wrote it **before** the Bishops declared Mary the "Mother of God": a detail of utmost importance which is proof of the invention of the "*Θεοτόκος*" (she who generated God) in the "**Nativity**" of Luke written by the scribes **after** the letter of Saint Paul "to the Ephesians". And the fact that none of the Pauline letters mentions the "Mother of God" demonstrates that the Christian scribes (who drew up, after the Council of Constantinople held in 381 A.D, Paul's letters) were unaware of the later evolution of the doctrine "dictated" by the Bishops (not by God) when they chose the Marian cult, opportunely borrowed from the Goddess Isis and the Goddess Cybele, the latter called "*Mater Magna*" by the Romans, doctrine adapted to the new Christian Creed.

Another confirmation of the changes made to the earlier Christian doctrine - wanted by the Catholic Emperors and ratified at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. - can be found in Paul's "**Letter to the Romans**". When skimming through the epistle, we read that Paul of Tarsus greets thirty of the most important personalities of the Church of Rome but makes no reference to his "colleague" Peter, the head of this Church. The scribes of God drew up the "Letters of Paul" in his name **before** knowing that the Catholic religion was "*transmitted by God to the Apostle Peter*" and imposed in the entire Roman Empire through the Edict of Thessalonika **in 380 A.D.**

Almost four centuries after the Council of Ephesus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, **Nicephorus I** (758-828), was still in possession of a Gospel of Matthew in Aramaic and he compared its length with that of the canonical Matthew: the former was 300 lines shorter. The observation made by the Metropolitane in "**Stichometry**", with regard to the "*missing genealogy*" of the Saviour, is proof of the absence of the "**virginal birth**" in the **primitive Gospel of Matthew**; it had yet to be invented but was "introduced" later on along with the Eucharist (both were pagan cults) into the original Jewish Messiah. This is why the Christian Jews (Messianists), and the respective sects of the Nazareans and of the Ebionites (the Poor), did not recognize the canonical Gospels.

Moreover, as proof of the changes made to the primitive New Testament documents different from the later canonical documents which the Church has passed on to us, it is our duty to highlight Saint Paul's lack of awareness of the martyrdom of James the Minor, who died in 62 A.D. (see third study); this disinformation is shared by Saint John (died in 104 A.D.) and all the disciples and successors of the Saviour, Apostolic Fathers and apologists. This all confirms what we stated at the beginning of this analysis, well-aware that the falsification of the martyrdom of James the Minor - in the chronicle regarding the Sanhedrin in Josephus's Jewish Antiquities - was carried out in the Codexes drawn up by the scribes from the eleventh century onwards.

After these simple observations it is senseless to take for granted that the current canonical Gospels correspond to the original from the first century onwards; therefore the "7Q5" stamp-fragment (3x4 cm.) and the "P52" fragment of Rylands (6x9 cm.) contain no significant elements of historical or literary importance. Yet the fact that the expert spiritualists dare to arbitrarily carry out "stichometric" elaborations and match them with the canonical Gospels shows that they have no proof attesting the existence of these "holy texts" during the first two centuries. "Stichometry" was the term used in reference to the measurement of the verses or lines in a manuscript, just like the above-mentioned work of the Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople; nevertheless, after modifying and broadening to absurdity its meaning, faithful paleographers falsely highlight certain letters of the Greek alphabet - found on a "conveniently" dated papyrus fragment and passed off as the entire Gospe - and then used a lot of imagination to "adapt" and interpolate these letters wherever it was most convenient, thus carrying out literary plagiarism in order to indoctrinate the naive.

In any case what is most important for shedding light on the true events is the important data which we find **only** in the New Testament canonical documentation drawn on by the historiography collected in the state archives (where the scrolls were preserved at the time intact) **after** Christianity came to power. Such objective historical information allows us to identify and date events, adopting the same method used for the analysis of the patrology concerning the "successors of Christ" ... the same data which, through precise analyses already published in the present site, has allowed us to demonstrate the inexistence of the mythological characters created by the evangelists to support their religion.

Emilio Salsi

[go back]