

Collapse of the Roman Empire

When we speak of Roman decadence, it is easy to assume that Rome lay down and died! Now one of the authors here, Andre Piganiol, makes an exceptional statement on this matter. There is no question that Rome had come to decay within, but this is to assume that when something is subject to decadence the picture in your mind is not necessarily the picture you're conveying by what you say—or maybe you're conveying the wrong picture altogether. Thus if Rome ceased because of internal decadence then the Beast never received a "deadly wound"—it merely rotted away! But this is not the case. The historian, Andre Piganiol, wrote: "It is too convenient to assert that at the arrival of the barbarians into the empire 'all was dead, it was a worn out body, a corpse stretched out in its own blood,' or, again, that the Roman Empire in the West was not destroyed by a brutal shock, but that it had 'fallen asleep.' Roman civilization did not die a natural death. It was murdered." That's exactly what Revelation 13 tells us! This author analyzes it very well—goes through and clearly outlines the causes which Gibbon and others had understood (and, as I have said, Gibbon does not in any one place name all the basic five reasons for Rome's collapse in exact order but implies that there were differences from century to century). But in the end Rome still had a significant amount of power and strength (just as the United States has today even though the end is near). /Dr. Hoeh was quoting from page 91 of the D. C. Heath and Company series in Problems in European Civilization entitled Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire—Why Did It Collapse? edited by Donald Kagan, Boston, 1966./

Early Russian History

In the concluding minutes of the period today we should look at pages 258-9 in Langer (242-3 in the old edition). In this and later sections on Russia, you will discover that the early period of Russia will be significant, and then the later period—that is, in the 13th century and then in the 17th especially. Of course it goes back to an earlier time.

The best solution is to make a study of Russia via maps. I feel that, unlike other countries where you make a study via people, the impression that you will be left with is much greater if you make a study with maps. If you make a study with maps, you will understand why Russia was nothing for awhile and then became something—you will understand why Russia is important today.

We have discussed the area which the eastern Slavs settled—that is, north-east of the Carpathians and south of the Pripet area (page 254 or 239, old edition). Check a map.

Now our story begins with the founding of the Russian state in the person of the family of RURIK. There is a great controversy whether the original RUS were Scandinavian or Slavic. Modern Soviet authors all take the view that the VARANGIAN RUS were not really the original Rus. But it is a significant fact that you will take note of the name Rus among the Scandinavians (or Varangians) as well as in Russia proper. It is also significant that the early Russian royal house came out of Norway and Denmark, and if there be any connection with the family of Benjamin and this area of Russia—remember that the only grandson that Jacob had by the name of ROSH was a son of Benjamin. You want to remember that! Benjamin had a son by the name of Rosh! (See Genesis 46:21.) And the Varangians were known as the "people of Rosh"—Rosh is the Hebrew, or Rus in the Indo-European tongue.

I have a book which came recently from England which points out that the ancestor of William the Conqueror was of the line of the Varangians who founded Kiev. The lineage is very clear—there is no doubt in my mind. It is supposedly not known what the ancestry of William was, but it is very clear: The lineage of the royal house of William the Conqueror goes back to the Varangians who founded Kiev.

This is quite significant because these people came out of Norway and Denmark and, in fact, that family that formed the chiefs of the Rosh were of the Danish house—that, to start with, was really Trojan as we have previously mentioned. It is a Trojan house from Troy via Danus I or Odin I who settled in Denmark after the Greek defeat of Troy in the First Trojan War (in 1181—the dates for Danus I are 1040-999, pages 50-51 of vol. two of the Compendium). And that is the line that we can trace down all the way into the Middle Ages—this is the line of Zarah. That's apoint to be borne in mind—this is one of the branches of Zarah via Dardanus (I Chronicles 2:3-6—note that Dara is Darda, see the margin, or Dardanus!). This royal line of Zarah via Dardanus founded the Danish house that got dominion in the days of David (1040 B.C.) (See page 453 of vol. one of the Compendium.) And this is the house into which the House of David out of Scotland later intermarried when it intermarried with the family of William the Conqueror. So constantly the House of David was intermarrying, one after the other in the transfer of the throne, into the House of Zarah as distinct from Pharez—keep that in mind.

The story is that the RUS came in having been invited. Now much more can be found in other accounts than I can give here; and Langer does not give a thorough picture, but much more is known. The whole chronology of Russia starts with the founding of the kingdom in the days of RURIK around 859 to 862 A.D. This 862 is a chronological date that is established and from there on there is a direct sequence. You can easily find this in all of the earlier works. Prior to this we have no chronology of anything that happens in Russia in the west. There were no kings as such that have left any records.

However, it is important to note that the tradition is that these people ruled over the region prior to a revolt of the Slavs. The Slavs revolted at some time before, probably a generation before the time of Rurik. There were many points of trade and control by the Danish House over much of Russia in order to establish control with the Middle East. The Slavs revolted—probably in the early 800's. And having revolted, these Slavs couldn't get together among themselves; and therefore they decided to ask the Scandinavian Varangians or Rus back again. So they were invited in—this is the story. Now the Russians don't like this story because it doesn't make good nationalistic history! Thus much of this is discounted, and Soviet historians want to reject these traditions. Now the man who preserved much of this was a historian and monk of the Russian Orthodox Church named NESTOR. On our last trip to Russia I saw the mummy of Nestor in an underground catacomb in Kiev where for nearly a thousand years all of the great bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church have been buried. It was an interesting experience to see the remains of the man who had written the whole record of ^{early} Russian history. And he tells to what extent the Romans originally, at a much earlier time, figured in driving the people out of the Balkans, out of Romania, into Russia. And then, later on, the coming of the Scandinavians into this region after they had already been there before—because the Israelites went through this region, they had to get to NW Europe. So they had control of it via trade in these late days in the Byzantine Period when we read very little in history anyway of Russia because we don't have a Herodotus to tell the story. So all of this comes from Nestor's Russian Chronicle.

Then within one generation the language of the Varangian Rus became Slavic—it was no longer Scandinavian. There was an intermarriage with the Slavic family and the royal house became essentially Slavic, but with a Scandinavian element, whereas the rest of the family went west and this gave rise to the person of William the Conqueror. That is why the successor to the throne was named OLEG, and then there was Olga and SVIATOSLAV and VLADIMIR—which are hardly Danish names! Anyway, this will give you the beginning part of the story which Langer does not include.

Read the subsequent history here carefully and see to what extent Russia for a long time after the time of Scandinavian control was overrun by TATARS. And how ultimately the Prince of Moscow, IVAN I KALITA (Moneybag) (1328-1340—look ahead to page 340) became the man who dealt with the Tatars by collecting taxes to gain enough power to drive them out. And thus Moscow came to dominate the whole realm.

Hungary

There are other traditions that modern Hungarian scholars point up. One of these is that the language of the ancient Sumerians (people of Shinar) has very great affinity in vocabulary and structure with the Magyar or Hungarian language of today. The contention of Western scholars, of course, is that such an absurd idea should be disregarded. I have a pamphlet that shows that when Hungarian scholars were allowed the political freedom to speak out apart from the Hapsburg oppression—the Hapsburg suppression of scholarship—they have certainly felt there was some connection with ancient Sumer or the land of Shinar because the language is so similar in many ways. When you see the words there is no doubt about that—there are remarkable parallels.

Of course, it is essentially a question of whether the people are the same. But if you would look at the story there are certain strong indications: The Germans and the Italians and the Hungarians all play a significant role in the history of Catholicism and the Holy Roman Empire. Remember that the Hapsburgs ruled over the Anstro-Hungarian Empire and these were the two people that combined to lord it over all others in Eastern Europe—the Austrians and Hungarians under the dominion of the Hapsburgs. Similarly, ancient Mesopotamia had its Assyrians, its Chaldeans, and its Sumerians—whoever these Sumerians were! So somewhere we have to find the answer to the puzzle of those Sumerians who were white.

The most striking thing is this: If you were to look at the statues of the ancient Sumerians, who often were bald with unusual facial features—they were round-headed; if I were to show you pictures of white Hungarians (as distinct from brown-skinned Hungarians who are undoubtedly Hivites—mixtures and others)—the true Hungarian that we think of is striking in this respect: There is no people that looks more like Sumerian statuary than Hungarians! The author of one of these books pointed this out. And I could see that immediately. There are some remarkable affinities!

Thus we have proof from three different approaches as just discussed: (1) We have the position of the people in terms of the culture of Western Europe; (2) there is the striking similarity in appearance; and (3) there is the language characteristic that is rather similar. After all, everybody came from Babel but a particular kind of language here, the Sumerian, has otherwise been lost to antiquity. We know very definitely that the Finnish people who descend from Riphath, son of Gomer (Gen. 10:3)—and there is clear evidence that these are the Finnish people in Russia—that they have strong traditions about being at the Tower of Babel.

Now, the fourth part of the story is that the ancestor of the Hungarians is Nimrod in their own tradition! And any early Hungarian book will tell you this: The father of the Hungarian nation is Nimrod! Now don't draw a wrong conclusion that therefore they are Negro. Now they describe Nimrod as the mighty hunter of Babel whose lineage the Hungarians trace to Japheth—which undoubtedly is on the mother's side. Hungarian scholars who use the Bible also trace it to Cush and Ham. But the tradition traced it through the mother, undoubtedly, because the German tradition says that Semiramis was "of the lineage of Japheth"—of the lineage of Japheth! Thus Nimrod himself was a very mixed person: His mother was—shall we say?—of white and oriental stock; his father, then, was Hamitic and Negroid. This is the picture you get.

Now this mighty hunter, Nimrod, of the time of Babel—that's the story in common Hungarian tradition—had two sons by an Alan wife (I believe the story is the Alans in the region of Bactria—something like that), one whose name was HUNOR and the other MAGOR. From Magor have come the MAGYARS but with no lineage. That is, there is no genealogy because the Magyars were not the ruling family. From Hunor, the firstborn, came the royal lineage. We have all the generations that were preserved—and there are sufficient to make it a perfectly legitimate list in terms of number of people and time—all the way from Nimrod and Hunor down to Attila the Hun! And, of course, all the lineage from the time of Attila down to ARPAD when the Magyars took over (see the list on pp. 262-3; no genealogy of Arpad in old edition).

Now if you were to go to Hungary today you would hear the Hungarians say, if you asked them who they are: "Well, we're Magyars but among us are the people of Hunor or Huns, but we don't know who they are as individuals"—because nobody, in other words, among the Hungarians is conscious of another lineage other than Magyar (from Magor). Whatever the other tribal groups, they lost their identity afterward and everybody today thinks of himself as a Magyar. Now there may be more to this than one thinks because, if the Huns were the ruling family, generally speaking the rulers are the ones who survive the least in numbers. That's the penalty of ruling!! If you read the story of the lineage of David in the Old Testament you will see how often this is the case—how, in the ruling family, one brother would execute all the others so he would have no competitors for the throne—and it just goes on and on like this. So, in the end, the evidence certainly seems to be that the Huns who were of this lineage were very few in number. Now it appears, of course, that some of the Hunnic realm is significantly traceable in history but the Magyars are not. It may well be that the Huns and Magyars separated; we have a great deal of history of the Huns on the borders of China for 400 years but we don't pick up the Magyars as any people—in other words, they were subject to others, they had no kings—this seems to be the clear evidence—they were not a royal family, they preserved nothing of their past directly.

But we know that some of the Sumerians gradually disappeared in ancient times from Mesopotamia until they were totally gone prior to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Ultimately Israelites, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Sumerians disappeared from the Middle East and remaining are Arabs and Aramaeans and Persians, and then in come the Turks. So the people who once were there are not now there basically—basically. Some are—we have remnants of Chaldeans and Assyrians still who are Christian, and they go by these racial names. One can see that they are Germanic in the general Western sense. But the conclusion we have to come to about the modern Hungarians is that they are a mixed people in their lineage: The lower classes certainly are the Hivites in the area; some, of course, may be other types. But the basic stock is white today, though there is a very dark element in the working-class population—very dark, brown-skinned people. But these brown-skinned people do not look like the ancient Sumerians and do not look like the true Hungarians who are white.

But if we start out with the ALANS who, in this case, would seem to be the children of Ul or Hul, the son of Aram (Gen. 10:23), then the bulk of the population is, in this sense, of the line of Aram and Shem with a lineage on the father's side that does go back to Nimrod through intermarriage. But the story is that his sons ruled over other ALANS and absorbed others so that the original group was not all from Nimrod; that is, it was a mixture. He gave rise to a basic element; but depending on what those two sons married into, you have different racial elements that will come along....

So we are dealing, in the case of the Magyars—after all, if there are over a hundred tribes to start with there probably were some divisions!—different racial groups making up the population, but dominated by the Magyars....

Notice ST. STEPHEN (997-1038) on page 261 (p. 245 old edition) who established the Arpad Dynasty at its highest point. Read the entire paragraph about him. He promoted agriculture. This shows that these people were not essentially nomadic but were basically a sedentary people who had to use the horse for a period of time as a means of travel. Now notice the significant fact that STEPHEN is crowned "with a crown sent by the pope"—and later he is made a saint! Then in 1077-1095 we have ST. LADISLAS (p. 264) who also supported the pope and was canonized. So notice that very strong connections were made between the Catholic Church and Hungary—very strong connections!! It is very strange, when you stop to think about it, that a nomadic (at least for a time) people like this should so quickly have suppressed paganism and other types of Christianity unless there is a strong element of Sumerian among them who had been anciently at the Tower of Babel and whose connection had always been with the Catholic religion from its earliest origins in the days of Semiramis!