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Summary.

The purpose of this document is to put an end once and for all to the rumor and false conclusion that the mention of Christ in the works of Flavius Josephus was a later addition by Christians. This is something that so many people who have concluded Christianity to be a fraud, bad and harmful, have wanted so badly to be true that they have made it take on a life of its own in spite of the fact that there is absolutely nothing at all to support it. It is merely a combination of wishful thinking and a "best guess" by those who have no other information to go by; and who, in my learned opinion, are what I would refer to as sloppy researchers. I have already addressed specifics regarding their conclusions in another paper and so, find no reason to do so again here. Instead, I will give information from another point of view with regards to this, one which others have not known and therefore, have not been able to consider.

What this paper shows is that a) all of those who have been thought of as the 'prime suspects' for having added the mention of Christ to Josephus were actually all related to each other, and b) all descended from the individual who has been known as 'Flavius Josephus', but who, in actuality, was Arrius Calpurnius Piso, and the main author of the gospels and main creator of Christianity, and c) that these later individuals were in fact, trying to prevent people from finding associations between the writings of Flavius Josephus and Christianity. And thus, had no motive for adding the mention of Christ to the works of Josephus.

In addition to this, as I have already pointed out in my other papers, a "closed" or controlled environment existed at the time so that no one could write or otherwise publish or distribute literary works of any kind to the public under penalty of death, except for royalty and even those works had to be approved of by a panel of other royals. So, none of this was at all as simple as many people have thought it to have been. And it is because of all of these specific details that we can be certain of many more things than had been thought previously. Knowing that there were absolutely no literary works of any kind written and/or distributed within the Roman Empire without royal approval means that all religious texts had a royal source and were thus, distributed purposely.

And thus, any other literary creations which were written that had any connection to those religious texts were also, then written and distributed on purpose. Therefore, we can conclude from these basic facts that since the first of the gospels (Mark) had been finished circa 70 CE, and Flavius Josephus was finishing up his works circa the late 80's to the early 90's CE, that that portion of his work which mentions Christ, was most probably written about that same time. I had already pointed out the fact too, that if one is looking for connections between the works of Flavius Josephus and the NT texts, that there are many more of them than just the mention of Christ.
In fact, there are so many that if they were all to have been later additions by Christians, the whole of the work of Flavius Josephus would be of no value at all to historians, because the majority of it would then be corrupt. But this is not the case, as it was all original to it. And it was so for this reason; to advertise and make the new religion known. It was the same reason that other Roman authors of the time did so (remember, Flavius Josephus was aka Arrius Piso, a Roman, who happened to have ancestry from King Herod, and therefore, technically, he could claim to have 'Jewish' blood). Of course, they could not afford to be too obvious about it, and therefore, Pliny The Younger had to pretend to not understand it and to even be against it. Pliny The Younger himself, played a part in the creation of Christianity by writing epistles as 'Paul' (see Abelard Reuchlin's work and my work for more information about Pliny The Younger as the NT Paul).

All of these individuals were closely related and all of royal blood. Pliny The Younger was close to many of them and says so in his epistles as Pliny The Younger. He was in close communication with the Emperor Trajan and wrote his Panegyricus in honor of 'Trajan' (more about that another time). He also knew the historian Tacitus. Both Pliny and Tacitus make mention of Christians. The historian Tacitus was related to both Emperors Trajan and Hadrian, and they could trace their ancestry back to Augustus Caesar. Tactius's son, known in history as Pedanius Fuscus Salinator was married to Julius Piso's daughter, Julia. Julius Piso, Arrius Calpurnius Piso's son, was the one who wrote The Revelation.

And Julius Piso, himself, was married to Hadrian's sister Domitia Paulina II. As demonstrated in another paper, Pliny The Younger was a younger foster brother of Arrius Calpurnius Piso. And, the other mention of 'Christ' (as 'Chrestus') was made by Suetonius; who was actually the Emperor Antoninus Pius. He was an adopted son of the Emperor Trajan (his wife’s son from a previous marriage), and grandson of Arrius Piso through Claudia Phoebe, his daughter who married Trajan under the name of Pompeia Plotina. Yes, I realize that this is all very complex to those who are new to all of this, but it is something that has been known for a very long time to some of us.

Now, I will tell you why certain things were just too close for comfort for some of the Piso family members and their royal relatives.

Julius Piso & Suetonius. 666.

Marcus Aurelius & The Canon. NT books compiled, Canon OT books chosen.

Church Father Origen. What he said and why.

Eusebius & Constantine. 666 to 616. Council of Nicea and changing NT from Greek to Latin.

St. Jerome. Carried out change of NT from Greek to Latin.

====

To reach the correct conclusions in the study of ancient history, there are many things to know and be aware of at all times. The real, true and genuine study of ancient history and ancient texts (as well as ancient religion) is very complex - much more so than has been taught by traditional
scholarship. It involves so much more that has been either ignored, not thought of &/or not otherwise considered.

And this is particularly so of the time in which Christianity was being created and promoted; which was the first and second centuries of the Common Era primarily. Oh, it was promoted later on, such as during Constantine's time and later, but I am referring to when it was necessary to promote it to even get it known of in the first place.

To do that meant that it had to have been mentioned somewhere in some source or sources that were accessible in some way to the general public. And to be effective (that is, to get people to investigate it further), it had to be presented in some way that would get people to want to at least look into what it was about, or to peak their curiosity. The creators of Christianity knew that.

They knew that it need not have been presented as if it were viewed as 'good' by everyone, but that it had to appear as if it a) had happened in some legitimate way, and b) had been around for a longer time than it actually had been (for reasons that the creators knew well, because this was the same way that earlier religions were also started).

If, for instance, the Romans (or a certain group of them) had motives for creating it, they did not want to have believers know that, as that would certainly expose it as a deliberate fraud. They also knew that as generations went on, it would be more difficult to pin-point just when Christianity actually began, if they were to backdate the stories in the Christian texts to an earlier time than their own. It would make it appear as if a) it had already been established, and b) that it was legit as having originated in a certain way, somewhere other than Rome, by Romans.

A couple of things to bear in mind when examining the history of the time and the creation & promotion of Christianity during the 1st & 2nd centuries; One, it is necessary to know that there was a long, hard fought war going on at the time. And Two, to know just who were involved in that war. As well as Three, what the war was being fought over. And to do that you need to know, Four, just who the "Jews" were whenever they were mentioned in history or any other texts of the time, as well as Five, who their leaders were for each sect at what time.

Which also meant that, Six, you need to know just what sect of the Jews existed at what time, in what location/s at what time/s, and what changes had been taking place within Judaism itself covering a long period of time. To help with that, in viewing the war, I find it better to refer to those on either side in that war as either of the Axis or the Allies; just as was done with WWII.

You may be wondering what this has to do with Church Father Origin, or the Christian Historian Eusebius, and the Roman Emperor Constantine I. The answer is in a) how it is that they were all related to each other, and b) the parts that they had played in the fraud, as well as c) they were all Romans.

If you are already familiar with at least some of my other writings and/or papers, then you will know that I had made the case for the Roman authorship of the New Testament and therefore, the creation of Christianity. And, I have already explained just how and why it got started and when that was and by whom. See my paper 'The Beginnings Of Christianity & The Evolution Of The Popes' in AcademiaEdu.
There, you will find that I had pointed out that the Romans had installed Herod as King of Judea and of the Jews (meaning the Jewish sects & Temple). And I had explained the main reason why, as having been because of the long ongoing war between the sects of the Jews. The Pharisees, after a very long struggle to do so, had gained control of Judea and had the cooperation of the Jewish leaders, the Hasmoneans (or Maccabees).

However, their opposition, the Sadducees had complained to the Roman leadership and asked for their help to get back power and control of Judea. This is the reason that Rome interceded and installed King Herod as ruler of Judea and therefore, at least symbolically, of the Jews in total. Why was he chosen? Because publicly, he could be called an Idomean, when in reality, he was of royal Hasmonean blood from a collateral descending line - and therefore a legitimate Hasmonean cousin of Mariamne I, his first wife.

That is, the Hasmonean power was then transferred to this "new" line so that the leadership was renamed, but was virtually the same as it had been. The effect was simply to give back all power and control to the new Hasmonean line which was now going by a different name; the Herodians. In case this was too difficult to follow, it meant that the power that had been gained by the Pharisees was taken from them and given back to a Neo-Hasmonean line, so that the Sadducees had power over all of the Jewish sects once again.

What was the difference? The difference was what the war was being fought over in the first place. It was about the Pharisees who were fighting for a) basic human rights, and b) an end to slavery, as well as c) an eventual democracy. Those who were opposed to them were the wealthy royals who wanted to keep the status quo, because they were used to and enjoyed the lavish lifestyle that they had and did not want to give it up, even if it was the right thing to do. And that, is what this was all about. And, the main reason for the creation of Christianity; to help preserve the luxurious lifestyle that the wealthy royals were enjoying at the expense of everyone else. That is the reality, the ugly truth about why Christianity exists.

Also in my other papers I had explained that a college or committee had been set up by the Roman Emperor Tiberius in Tiberias at the western shore of the Sea Of Galilee. The purpose was to create a new religion. This was because both the Roman leadership, the Herodians and their many royal constituents throughout the Roman Empire, knew that just transferring power and authority to the Herodians was only a temporary fix. They had to come up with something more permanent.

And the answer to that was to cut out the Pharisees altogether by making a new religion that they were no part of and to insert into that religion all of the things that they, the greedy royals wanted to preserve for themselves. This is how and why the Jesus of the New Testament "saves" HIS people; because he saved not the ordinary non-royal people, but the greedy royals who wanted to retain their lavish lifestyle at the expense of all "commoners".

And, so, we then find how it is that those who were determined to destroy everyone and everything that stood in their way, finally did so. But in order to follow them and what they did, we must first know just who they were. We have a start. Tiberius was a part of it. And so were the Herodian leadership.

So, we start to examine their family trees and see who in their family and/or descendants then
played a part. One thing that we discover is that one of those who had participated in the creation of the new Roman religion (disguised as having begun in Judea or to the East in order to avoid suspicion of it being a Roman fabrication), is Seneca. It is very difficult to make a family connection between Seneca and either the Julian Caesars or the Herodians. But it is there.

In order that this never be either quick or easy to discover or even to understand, they deliberately made it very complex in a number of ways. One of which was to hide their true identities, and therefore, they true relationship to one another; as that would then expose their motives, and thus, the truth.

Seneca The Rhetorician was a teacher of Nero. He had to have been well-known to the Julian Caesars to have been in that position. And he was. He was a descendant of Mark Anthony. And Mark Anthony was a relative of Julius Caesar, and thus, also of Augustus Caesar and his family. This is better demonstrated with genealogical charts which I have provided elsewhere. Besides this, there were other connections, the Julian Caesars had been intermarrying with members of Seneca's family. This is also demonstrated with genealogies.

Bear in mind, each of those whom we have discussed and their exposed relationship to each other. Now, let’s look to the Herodians for a moment. The Herodians, once fully observed and understood, were 'Romanized'. They lived in Judea, but they had been educated at Rome in the Roman ways. And, they were the Emperor Vespasian’s ancestors. This is demonstrated in the same way, by use of genealogies showing what names were used to disguise their descent and relationship.

You cannot find these things out by simply reading texts and believing what you read; you must do much more than that, and you can't do any more than that if you do not know just what it is that you should do. And that is what has stopped so many before us from getting to the point where we are in understanding all of this. This is why we, those of us of the New Classical Scholarship are trying to train others how to do this all correctly, so that more people can better understand the true nature and context of ancient history and ancient texts.

There are texts, for instance, that are simply dismissed as 'crazy' or nonsense, such as The Revelation or the Historia Augusta, simply because those who have tried to examine them did not know how to do so properly and either gave up or just called them some derogatory term. They basically gave up, because they had no idea how to go about properly examining them. However, if one knows what they refer to, and how to read them as the authors themselves did, then, they do actually make a great deal of sense.

We are operating on a whole new level, which is why we can know what we do, while others are left either scratching their heads or just unable to believe that we have been able to uncover what we have. But those who learn from us and learn to study ancient history as it should be studied will know just what we do and they will be able to make further contributions of their own. We have already done a massive amount of work and laid a huge foundation for future work on all related subject matter.

Okay, now that we have covered this early portion of the creation of Christianity, and shown some of those who were involved and given reasons for their doing so, we will now take a look at each of the three individuals who are named in the title of this paper; Origen, Eusebius, and
Constantine. And, one of the main reasons that I chose to write this is because of those who keep insisting that the mention of Christ in Josephus was a later addition, in spite of all of the evidence there is to the contrary.

Those who postulate that portion of Flavius Josephus was a later addition, give their best (guess) case that it was put their by either Origen or Eusebius. So, I want to share with them what I know about both of these individuals and why it would make so sense for them to have done that, for the simple fact that it was not necessary, because it was already there. If they could have, in reality, they would have removed it, if anything. Because they were not who they seemed to be. They were not actual Christian believers, but descendants of those who created and first promoted Christianity. And, they actively tried to make it difficult to uncover the truth about Christianity. Again, already written about elsewhere.

So, the big question is just how are all of these individuals related? Well, since I have already provided genealogical information elsewhere for Seneca, and the ancestry of King Herod from Eleazar Auran, and also the descent of Emperor Vespasian from King Herod, I will not repeat those here, but instead, give you new information regarding these three (Origen, Eusebius, and Constantine), so that you will have those in addition to those included in my other work.

Now, fair questions to ask are; "where did you find these genealogies?" or "how do you know they are accurate?" Or, "how can I verify this?" Fair enough. Some are easier than others and some portions are easier to find than others. It took me a very long time to reconstruct these and I had many, many notes and had to understand many, many things. This cannot be done by just anyone, particularly someone who is not familiar with several of the things that I am; such as ancient genealogies. There are some which had been done previously, at least in part, which can help to make it easier.

But I always refer to primary sources first. I made note of every mention of everything associated with each and every person involved so that I had a detailed profile for each. Another thing that makes this very difficult for others is the fact that ancient authors had used alias names for both themselves and those that they were writing about. That means that in order to discover just who was related to someone else, you must also know what names they were going by besides those they made obvious to the public. And there is the real hard part. That is something that takes a lot of work and a long time to learn. I'll try to help you as best I can by sharing what I know of the various names used by certain individuals. But since the list can be a long one for each, one must develop lists for each individual profile.

Below are the only kind of genealogies that I can produce reliably in this format: straight-line stemma charts. At the end of each one will be general notes that explain just what the genealogies mean and how one may better understand them.
The Descent Of Constantine I From Emperors Augustus & Tiberius.

C. Octavius Laenas (d. 38 CE, descendant of Augustus Caesar)  
M. Rubellia Bassa (descendant of Tiberius Caesar)

Octavia Laenas  
M. Curtilius Mancia  

Curtilia Mancia  
M. Domitius Lucanus  

Domitia Lucilla I  
M. Calvisius Tullus Ruso (d. 109 CE)  

Domitia Lucilla II  
M. M. Annius Verus (aka Julianus C. Piso)  

Emperor Marcus Aurelius (born 121 CE, d. 180 CE)  
M. Faustina II (Daughter of Emp. Antoninus Pius)  

Lucilla Aurelia  
M. Emp. Lucius Verus (d. 169 CE)  

Domitius Ulpian/Dio Cassius/Origen  
M. Julia M. Soaemias,Vibia Severina & Gordiana  

Tiberius Claudius Marcián/Eutropius/Gregory/Pope Felix I  
M. Claudia Crispa (Dr. of Flavius Crispus)  

Emp. Constantius Chlorus I/Pamphilius  
M. Helena Britania & Theodosia  

Emperor Constantine I (d. 337 CE)  
M. Minervina & Flavia Maxima Fausta
Notes for the above genealogy: General notes for genealogy #1.

C. Octavius Laenas was directly descended from Emperor Augustus. Many genealogies are available that demonstrate this. His wife, Rubellia Bassa, was a granddaughter of Emperor Tiberius. Again, many genealogies are available for this. Direct sources included Suetonius’ ‘The Twelve Caesars’. Domitia Lucilla II was married to M. Annius Verus and they were the parents of Emperor Marcus Aurelius.

This M. Annius Verus was aka Julianus Calpurnius Piso, whose father M. Annius Verus, was aka Justus C. Piso, aka Justin Martyr. And he was a son of M. Annius Verus, who was aka Arrius C. Piso, aka Flavius Josephus, the NT Jesus, etc. Justus Piso (born in 77 CE) as M. Annius Verus, was married to Rupilia Libo Frugi (Piso), who was the daughter of Rupilius Libo Frugi (Piso), whose wife was Matidia (I), daughter of Salonius Matidius and Marciana, sister of Emperor Trajan.

Emperor Marcus Aurelius’ wife, Faustina II, was daughter of Emperor Antoninus Pius, who was son of Pompeia Plotina (aka Claudia Phoebe), from her first marriage to Rufus; but who was adopted by Emperor Trajan. Thus, we see just how all of these individuals were actually related, but also how they wanted the non-royals to be unaware of this fact. Therefore, they had genuine motives for keeping this information to themselves. And that was because knowing this helps people to connect the dots and make real sense of the involvement of their family members in the creation and promotion of the Christian texts and religion.

Emperor Marcus Aurelius in turn, had his own children marry other members of his family and close relatives. This too, makes it much easier to construct or reconstruct these genealogies as the case may be. Marcus Aurelius’ daughter Lucilla married his co-Emperor Lucius Verus and they had offspring. One of which was Domitius Ulpian (who had other names besides those we will list here now), who was aka Dio Cassius (or Cassius Dio, as some read it). He was also writing as Church Father Origen.

Again, to uncover just who all of these were, you must do the work that is necessary in order to do so; such as to build profiles, data bases and lists, including lists of their alternate or alias names. This was necessary for them to get away with what they did and still insure the integrity of their work (by not permitting anyone but royals approved of by royal committees to write), and by use of inherited names and titles, and using certain rules in which to create those alias names.

Origen’s wives were Julia Moesa Soaemias, and Vibia Severina, and he had also married Gordiana (of the line of the Gordians). One of his sons was Tiberius Claudius Marcian, aka Eutropius, aka Gregory, and (Pope or bishop of Rome), Felix I (brother of Emperor Diocletian/Dio Cleitanus). He (Marcian) was married to Claudia Crispa, daughter of Flavius Crispus, who can be shown in other genealogies. And their son was Emperor Constantius Chlorus I, aka Pamphilius. He was married to Helena Britania and Theodora. His sons were Emperor Constantine I and Julius Constantius I (who was Constantine’s half-brother). Constantine made Christianity the "official" religion of Rome, while his half-brother was both Pope Eusebius and "Christian" writer Eusebius. But, they were not Christian believers, they were of the family of Romans who created and promoted Christianity, a religion created for the purpose of saving the lifestyle of the rich royals at the expense of the rest of the world.
The Neo-Flavian Descent From Emperor Vespasian: Constantine’s Descent From Vespasian.

Emp. T.F. Vespasian (d. 79 CE)
  M. Flavia Domitilla I
   |
  Emp. Titus (d. 81 CE)
   M. Marcia A. Furnilla
      |
  Flavia Julia Titi (d. 91 CE)
   M. T. Flavius Sabinus IV
      |
  L. Vibius Sabinus (d. 97 CE)
   M. Matidia I (dr. of Emp. Trajan’s sister)
      |
   Matidia II
   M. Q. Laelius/Q.L.Aelius (Com.) & Julianus Piso/M.A. Verus
      |
   Laelia/Lollia (The Elder)/A.Com. Faustina (half-sis. of Emp. M.A.)
   M. Fulvius Pius aka C.Ummidus Quadratus (son of Emp. Ant.Pius?)
      |
   Fulvia Pia
   M. Publius Septimius Geta
      |
   Emp. Septimius Severus (d. 211 CE)
   M. M.A.Gal.Ant.Faustina (dr. of Emp. M.A.)
   M. Paccia Marciana (married 175-186 CE)
      M. Julia Domna (d. 217 CE)
      |
   Bassina Severa
   M. Claudius Apellinus
      |
   Claudia Bassina Apellina
   M. Flavius Numerius (Greek Prince)
      |
   Flavius Crispus (bro. of Emperor Claudius Gothicus)
   M. Aurelia (Gr.Granddaughter of Lucius Verus, & desc. of M.A.)
      |
   Fl. Claudia Aurelia Crispa
   M. Eutropius (aka Tiberius Claudius Marcian/Gregory/Pope Felix I)
      |
   Emp. Constantius Chlorus I (aka Pamphilius)
   M. Helena Britania & Theodora
      |
   Emp. Constantine I (d. 337 CE)
   M. Minervina & Flavia Maxima Fausta
Notes for the above genealogy: General notes for genealogy #2.

As I have often pointed out, there are many lines of descent now known. What I mean by that is that if this one or another one happens to be missing a generation or otherwise is incomplete, etc., there are still several others which give the same result. That is, there is no use in trying to disprove descent from one or another of these lines; the evidence is overwhelming and stands solid within extant primary source documents. These genealogies cannot be removed or ignored. They simply expose the truth of the matter.

Genealogy #2 shows the descent of the Neo-Flavians from the earlier Flavian Emperors; namely, Vespasian & Titus. Besides this, there are other lines of descent known and provable. Anyone who is familiar with ancient genealogies knows just how lines of several generations can be taken back in several ways; IF the ancestry indeed exists. Granted, some have been hidden or disguised by use of alias or alternate names. But that does not mean that the actual names & identities cannot be known and exposed, one must only know just how to find &/or uncover such things (see various papers on the subject).

Since there were four individuals within a succession with the same name (T. Flavius Sabinus) in the Flavian family of Vespasian (his father, brother, nephew, etc.), this has caused some confusion for a few researchers. However, it is clear to us after making various determinations, that they terminated in public history with Flavius Sabinus IV and that he is the one who was married to Flavia Julia Titi, daughter of Emperor Titus. His son, was L. Vivius Sabinus, who d. 97 CE. The name 'Vibius' was used to disguise his 'Flavius' name in history so that he would not be automatically linked to his father. They were of 'Jewish' descent (of Herodian descent), and therefore, used the Hebrew alphabet and spellings to create some of their family names (in addition of the Royal Language). 'V' = 'F', 'I' = 'L', vowels were dropped, exchange and/or invisible, and 'B' = 'V'. Thus, 'FL_VIUS' results.

Again, there are many other lines of descent from Vespasian & Titus to Constantine I. At some point, they will all become known and very well researched. This one, is one that has been known within Inner-Circle families since the time in question. Other lines of descent include descent via Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla. Even the Emperor Trajan grew up in the household of Emperor Domitian, and a line of descent is traced from him. And then there is the line from Arrius Piso, of course, who was descended from Vespasian’s brother, T. Flavius Sabinus II. So, knowing all of this, there is no need to belabor the point.

Now, L. Vibius/Flavius Sabinus (d. 97 CE), was married to Matidia I. He was her first husband. She was daughter of the Emperor Trajan’s sister, Marciana (d. 114 CE). Their daughter, Matidia II, then married Q. Laelius/Q.L. Aelius (Commodus) & M.A. Verus (aka Julianus C. Piso). Their daughter was Laelia/Lollia (The Elder) aka A. Commod. Faustina, sister of Emp. Lucius Verus and half-sister of Emperor Marcus Aurelius. She married Fulvius Pius, aka C. Ummidius Quadratus (son of Emp. Antoninus Pius?, I have the answer in my notes somewhere). They had Fulvia Pia who married Publius Septimius Geta, who was the father of Emperor Septimius Severus (d. 211 CE). His three wives are all given in the above genealogy. He had a daughter named Bassina, who married Claudius Apellinus. Their daughter was Claudia Bassina Apellina, who married Flavius Numerius (a Greek prince). Their son Flavius Crispus was a brother of Emperor Claudius Gothicus and Quintillus. Flavius Crispus married Aurelia, who was a Great-Granddaughter of Emperor Lucius Verus, and a descendant of Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Whenever descent such as
this is known, the line can be taken back via that line as well - for those who may not be aware of that.

Flavius Crispus and Aurelia had a daughter named Flavia Claudia Aurelia Crispa. In superficial history, she can be found married to 'Eutropius', who was actually aka Tiberius Claudius Marcian (Marcianus) and the writer Gregory, as well as Pope Felix I, and Ulpius Crinitus. He was son of Ulpian (Domitius Ulpianus), who was aka Dio Cassius, Church Father Origen, and Varus Marcellus; and whose descent can be traced back to Emperor Trajan (see the genealogies given in my other papers).

And, this 'Eutropius' was the father of Emperor Constantius Chlorus I, father of the Emperor Constantine I. And as has been pointed out in other papers and genealogies, Constantine’s half-brother Julius Constantius I, was aka Church Father and Pope Eusebius (his son and grandson also used the name 'Eusebius').

So, all of these links expose the relationship between all of these and thus, their motives too, are revealed, which solidifies and verifies all of this as well. It also gives the explanations for many things. It answers why it is that Constantine and his family were known as the Neo-Flavians or "New" Flavians, and how it is that they had the "right" to rule, and why it was that Constantine made Christianity the official Roman religion. And it shows how various members of the family had played their various parts in the creation and/or promotion of Christianity.

[Genealogy #3]

The Decent Of Vespasian & His Family From King Herod.

King Herod ('The Great', ruled 37-4 BCE)
M. Mariamne I (of the Hasmoneans, executed 29BCE)
  |
  Aristobulus (d. circa 6 or 7 BCE)
  M. Berenice (dr. of Salome)
  |
  Herod Pollio/Vespasius Pollio I (d. 48 CE)
  M. Mariamne (dr. of Joseph)
  M. Berenice (dr. of Herod Agrippa I)
  |
  Vespasia Polla (sister of Vespasius Pollio II, &/or Aristobulus)
  M. T. Flavius Sabinus I
  |
  Emperor Vespasian (d. 79 CE)
M. Flavia Domitilla

One may wonder just why Vespasian and his family were at war with the "Jews". He was not at war with all of the Jews, just all of them except for his own close relatives, the Herodians; who, were also the leadership or hierarchy of the sect known as the Sadducees. They left all of the Sadducean believers and all other 'Jews' in Judea, while the Herodians were evacuated to Rome,
just before Vespasian's siege upon Jerusalem and the Temple in Judea. All of this is evidence and shows their motives, which are now exposed and explain those things which were never explained before.

Abelard Reuchlin knew that Vespasian was descended from the Herodians, but he could not figure out exactly how. I discovered this. I explained how I was able to conclude this in my various notes. I too, knew that they were related. As one examined the history of the time, and as one begins to collect the data connected between the two, it becomes quite obvious. I even noted that on the coins of Vespasian and his cousin King Agrippa II, the two have a stunning family resemblance. This told me that he had to be somewhat closely related. So, the answer had to be within lines close to Agrippa II.

In addition to 'Flavius Josephus' (aka Arrius Calpurnius Piso), King Agrippa II and his sister Berenice were treated extremely well by the Flavians. I had collected all of the items that I could see that connected the Flavians & Herodians, both in the histories of the time as well as in the New Testament texts (they joked about it when saying, "Greet Herodian, my kinsman." I began to thoroughly examine all things. And, that included the possible use of alias names in order to hide or disguise identities as we already knew was being done with others of the time. I found that the name 'Vespasius' was fabricated.

Just as we see having been done on the coins of the time, we also find the use of abbreviations or shortened forms of names &/or titles being used to create aliases. And as also observed before, we found the use of letter exchanges. So, we found this connection via Herod Pollio I, who was aka other names. And there was good reason for that. The non-royal public was never intended to know this; at least not during their lifetime and for as long as possible beyond that time.

Because I don't want to say the same things over and over again which have already been stated elsewhere, I won't go over all of the connections and allusions given by Arrius Piso aka Flavius Josephus with regards to his ancestry; particularly, that of his descent from the Hasmonean royal house (see his 'Vita'). And the only known way to trace that back is through two individuals; a) King Herod 'The Great', and b) his first wife, Mariamne I, who was the daughter of Alexander and Alexandra Regent. The genealogy given for Flavius Josephus, by Flavius Josephus himself, is unverifiable in the form that he had given it, and makes no reasonable sense given what is known about the Hasmonean royal house.

Thus, it had to have come via another line. And he knew that that line would one day be revealed; because he, himself, makes it possible via his writings as Flavius Josephus. In my many attempts to find the answer to this, certain individuals kept reemerging because of various dates, places and other items which linked the closely to the connections I was investigating. One thing that I kept coming back to was the fact that Herod Pollio and Vespasius Pollio (I), both had the 'Pollio' name and had some connection to both the Herodians & Flavians. Another thing which I had noted before as having been used to hide or conceal identities is that of what may be called 'transparencies'. That is, where one family tree may be laid upon another to reveal the two as being the same; but with other names having been used. And, if this were the case here, this would reveal all of the necessary data to show the connections here to be correct. But, they would have to match.

Remember, I had explained elsewhere how that in order to expose the use of various alias names
required the researcher to build a profile for each individual involved. The same is true here as well. These profiles would have all available data on each; and having gained an amount of expertise in determining what names &/or identities were genuine and which were simply created aliases, I was able to make certain determinations where so many others still remained in the dark.

At the time, I was asking 'if’ questions and going down the line making comparisons and notes. So, IF Herod Pollio was aka Vespasius Pollio, then this would fill in some blanks and give us even more data regarding this family and these connections. It would give the name/s of his wife or wives, for instance. It would also reveal more about the children of Vespasius Pollio. IF Vespasius Pollio were aka Herod Pollio, then his brother would have been King Agrippa I; and that would explain why both King Agrippa II and the Emperor Vespasian would have a physical family resemblance. This is because they shared some fairly close family genes and shared the same common ancestry with each other as descendants of King Herod 'The Great'.

Now, though most people probably don’t think about some of the things that I do, I would like to point out another thing. There was a reason why public genealogies of ancient royals usually began at a certain point, with a certain person and is virtually impossible to take it back any further via superficial readings of the histories that were left to us. And that is because to connect them would reveal just what they were trying to hide; the connection to other royals (i.e., their royal lineage). This is because they were trying to hide the fact that no one other than royals were in control of everything and that no one but royals were writing and ruling. They had carefully created the illusion to the contrary and had to keep that illusion alive, because if they let the non-royals know what was really going on, they would have been killed and the whole system would have been overturned through a mass revolution.

Though they had to hide these facts, they nonetheless, joked about it among themselves in various ways. And, this brings us back to what I was saying earlier, that the name 'Vespasius' was a created name. It exposed Vespasius Pollio as a King, and thus, his and his descendant’s right to rule. The name made use of two component parts; 'Vas' ('Bas') and 'Pasius' ('Pacius'). 'Bas' was short for 'Basilius' ('King'), and 'Pasius' ('Pacius' = 'Peace'). This is why the Pharisees and Scribes referred to these descendants of King Herod (in the Talmud) as the 'Pasi' or 'Posi' (see my work on the use of phonetics in ancient spellings).

The Herodians were actually schooled in Rome and the Roman ways, but this is something that is still not generally known except to the most expert in the history of the time. Thus, this "Peace" as used in the name Vespasius, related to the phrase, "Roman Peace". Which simply meant that "peace" was guaranteed by destroying the opposition. "Roman Peace," therefore, meant that war was necessary in order to obtain a measure of peace; if only temporary. The name, also meant "(the) Peace King," or the "King Of Peace." This was later verified by Arrius Piso (aka Flavius Josephus), as a descendant of Vespasius Pollio, in his created character, the New Testament 'Jesus', as being "The Prince Of Peace."

This Vespasius Pollio (Herod Pollio) had both a son and daughter; Vespasius Pollio II, and Vespasia Polla. Vespasia Polla married T. Flavius Sabinus I, who had both T. Flavius Sabinus II, and the future Emperor Vespasian. So, anyone descended from either of these could then trace their ancestry back to King Herod 'The Great', and then also to his ancestry and/or that of his wives, including Mariamne I. That is, if this connection can be made, one may trace their ancestry back
to the royal Hasmonean house, and even to their ancestors as well. Arrius Calpurnius Piso was a
grandson of T. Flavius Sabinus II. And therefore, could trace his royal ancestry back through this
line. So, though not giving actual specifics in the ancestry given in the 'Vita' while writing as
Flavius Josephus, he was telling the truth about his ancestry from the royal Hasmonean house.

Concluding Notes: Some references. Remember that these genealogies need not reply upon only
one line of succession to trace ancestry back; there are multiple lines of descent, any of which can
be demonstrated and proven via historical sources.

For some of the listed genealogies already known or portions thereof, there are genealogies
available from The Augustan Society, and which can be found in Anderson’s Royal Genealogies.
There are other books of ancient genealogies, but some are very rare and may only be found in
either Italian or French. I would suggest that if you are serious about finding as much as you can
on these that you do so slowly and carefully. I would check out what is available at my local
college library. There are also several books that give many of the genealogies of Roman
Emperors and Royal Dynasties (aka Royal Houses), such as the more detailed Herodian
genealogies. Birley, for example, gives a very good detailed genealogy of the Antonine Dynasty
(Antoninus Pius & Marcus Aurelius). Also, some can be found online via a web search. But always
be discriminating in terms of accuracy and sources.

Other References: See the works of Abelard Reuchlin. For those scholars and researchers who
have reached the conclusion of a Roman authorship for the New Testament texts, see the work of
Bruno Bauer, James Ballantyne Hannay, Abelard Reuchlin, and Roman Piso. Though other
scholars and researchers have found information that supports the Roman authorship of the NT
texts and/or the creation of Christianity by Romans, most either did not mention this in their
works, as their conclusions, or otherwise make the connection or association. In the past, we of
the New Classical Scholarship and/or The Piso Project have referred to these scholars as
'Transitory'; meaning that their research was on the cusp of discovering the Roman authorship of
the NT texts; but for whatever reason, they never mentioned a Roman connection. Among those
researchers, we would place Sir Ronald Syme, Professor Randall Helms and Jacob Neusner within
that category.

In building our profiles to recreate the relationship between various individuals of the first &
second centuries and beyond, we must consult whatever data has already been compiled and
then check to make certain that it is all correct and do so using primary sources. One of the most
important sources for information about the Roman Emperors and their families is one that has
been neglected by most historians to date, and that is 'Roman Coins and their Values', by David R.
Sear (1988). This is one reference that should be available to all and should be found in all College
and University libraries; but usually is not. The main reason why this reference has been ignored
or not used by most researchers to date is because, a) it is expensive (around $80.00-$100.00 or
more a copy), and b) it has basically only been used by those who use it only for reference to
ancient Roman numismatics (Roman coins). But it gives valuable information about so many
things in one place; Emperors, their births and deaths, their wives and data about them, children,
parents, etc., when known. See the rest of our work and related works for more details.