

In Search of the Lost Ten Tribes, by Raymond McNair.

Chapter Two

italics

The Three Great Races

God inspired Moses to write: "These [the progeny of *Shem, Ham and Japheth—v.1*] are the families of *the sons of Noah*, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood" (Gen. 10:32).

Note carefully that the *three* main branches of mankind—the *three* great families—have descended from Noah through his three sons—Shem, Ham and Japheth. Many modern ethnologists do not agree with God on this point; but they have gone into hopeless confusion as a result of their rejection of this simple truth!

The Apostle Paul was inspired to affirm: "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17:26).

The following statement is a verification of this biblical fact: "Most physical anthropologists accept modern man as *one genus*, and *one species*" (*Ency. Amer.*, 1960 ed., vol. II, p. 20d).

Dr. Wylie explains this point very well:

When Noah comes forth from the Ark we see him accompanied by three sons—*Shem, Ham, and Japhet*. These are the *three fountain-heads of the world's population*. "These are the three sons of Noah, and of them was the whole earth overspread." . . . and after four thousand years . . . the population of the world at this day . . . is still resolvable into *three grand groups*, [or *four groups*—if we include the *brown* people as a separate race], corresponding [roughly] to the *three patriarchs of the race, Shem, Ham and Japhet* (*History of the Scottish Nation*, vol. I, p. 10).

Let us have the courage to deny the theories of atheism, agnosticism and so-called "higher criticism" which exalts itself above God, and makes gods out of its own pet theories. Let us believe the truth (which until a few years ago was commonly believed and taught) that mankind has been scattered over the face of the earth *since* the Flood; and that the nations of this earth have descended from Noah's *three* sons. There are many historical proofs which substantiate this *three-fold source or division of mankind*.

Let us now examine a few quotations which will verify the above statements from secular sources.

Black, White and Yellow

In the *Encyclopedia Americana*, we find the following statements:

Most physical anthropologists accept modern man as one genus, and one species; Reginald R. Gates, alone, suggests that there are five species. The majority viewpoint recognizes three major "divisions" or "stocks" which taxonomically occupy the level of sub-races. These groups are Caucasoid or "white," Mongoloid or "yellow," and Negroid or "black" (1960 ed., vol. II, p. 20d).

Then the *Encyclopedia Americana* proceeds to group the various people of the earth under the aforementioned divisions.

Keane also divides the races into (1) "Negroes," (2) "Mongols" and (3) "The *Caucasic Peoples*" (*Man Past and Present*).

The Living Races of Mankind, by Johnston and Harry, likewise divide humanity into three chief stocks or types:

It is essential, however, to a right understanding of the subject that a few paragraphs should be devoted to a consideration of the three leading types, or stocks, into which the human race is obviously divisible.

These three primary types, which have been in existence throughout the historic period and are probably of much greater antiquity, are familiar to all of us under the respective designations of the *white man*, the *yellow or red man*, and the *Negro or black man* (vol. I, p. 1, Introduction).

Confused by Evolution

How did today's confusion concerning the races come about?

How did God divide the "races" of the earth? Did he divide them into two, three, four, five, twelve, twenty, a hundred or more stocks, branches or "races"?

Until comparatively recently in man's history, those who studied the races divided them into *three major divisions*—just as God did in the Bible (see Gen. 10).

Since man has *rejected divine revelation*, and has turned to *evolution* as the true explanation for the development of the races, he has gone into hopeless *confusion*! Many anthropologists now speak of *nine* or perhaps a couple dozen different "races." Some even claim there are 100 or more races of man.

But this *confusion* is simply because men *reject* the simple teaching of the Bible—that God created all the races, and that, according to His Word, all nations have come from a *three-fold source*—*Shem* (and his wife), *Ham* (and his wife), and *Japheth* (and his wife).

The evolutionary approach is aptly illustrated by the following quote: "Why are there races of men and where did they come from? A final, detailed and demonstrably valid answer to these questions *cannot* be given now. Nor can it be given ten or even fifty years from now. It is *not possible* to have an instant or even a delayed replay of the origin of today's races of man.

What is possible is to build a rational framework for considering the *origin* of races. The *foundation* for such a framework is *evolution* and man's emergence as a consequence of its operation. It is man's *evolution* and his differentiation into racial varieties that we will consider in the next two chapters" (*Race and Races*, Richard A. Goldsby).

But if our racial foundation is based on evolution, can we ever arrive at the right conclusions? Emphatically not!

"Three Primary Races"

The simple fact is that there are just *three primary races* of man, and the latest information on this subject will but verify this important truth.

An article ("Races of Man") in *Collier's Encyclopedia* (1972 ed.), mentions the confusion in trying to define "race," and the chaos which prevails among some of those who try to classify the various *races*. Once the *evolutionary concept* entered the scene, confusion reigned in anthropology!

Even so, this article classifies all peoples of the world into *three primary races*: "PRIMARY RACE I—*White* ("European," "Eur-African," "*Caucasoid*." This same article then lists all of the *white* peoples of the earth under this first primary race.

"PRIMARY RACE II—*Negroid*." Then all of the *black* or dark races are enumerated.

"PRIMARY RACE III—*Mongoloid*." This article in *Collier's Encyclopedia* lists all of the yellow, Japhetic or Mongoloid peoples of Asia. It also shows that the *American Indians* are descendants of this Mongoloid branch of the human species.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1973 ed.), has an interesting article entitled "Races of Mankind." It says: "Satisfactory explanations for the *many differences among races* were difficult to formulate until after the advent of *evolutionary genetics* (see MAN, EVOLUTION OF). *Tradition* favoured an oversimplified phylogeny, a *three-race theory* and *admixture* to account for *all living races of mankind* . . ."

Yes, it is a fact that mankind once had held the biblical view that there were only *three primary races of man*, but when man accepted the *evolutionary concept*, he became more and more *confused*. He then classified man into many more races.

"9 Geographical Races"

This article in the *Britannica* then goes on to show that many anthropologists now divide the races into about nine geographical races:

"There are relatively few geographical races, and these coincide fairly well with the major continents or great island chains. In all, *nine geographical races* may be defined as follows: American Indian, Polynesian, Micronesian, Melanesian-Papuan, Australian, Asian, Indian, European, and African . . . Nevertheless, *geographical races* as units do not lend themselves to direct investigation."

But all of these "nine geographical races" can be simply re-classified into the three primary "races" or branches of the one great human family.

The World Book Encyclopedia (1972 ed.), also has an interesting article on the "Races of Man."

"The number of races of mankind varies according to the classifier and the purposes of his classification. At one time, many scholars divided human beings into three major races—Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid. Today, many anthropologists distinguish between larger and smaller population units. Some call these units geographical races and local races. They recognize 9 or 10 geographical races and hundreds of local races."

"Three Original Races"

'The Three-Race Theory. During the Middle Ages—from the A.D. 400's to the 1500's—Europeans knew about the darker-skinned curly-haired peoples of Africa. They also knew about the peoples of Asia, most of whom were shorter and had light-brown skins. These eastern peoples had straight hair, pads of fat over their cheekbones, and folds of skin extending from their eyelids over the inner corners of their eyes. This limited picture of the peoples of the world suggested that there were three 'original' races—European, or 'white'; African, or 'black'; and Asian, or 'yellow.'

"For many years, scholars attempted to explain all human populations in terms of the three 'original' races. They believed that all people belonged to one of those races or to some combination of them."

After man had held a simple, biblical belief in the three "original" races for thousands of years, along came *evolution*, and great confusion followed in its wake.

But why all the confusion?

All "races" on this earth can fairly easily be traced directly back to one of the three original races (Shem, Ham or Japheth), or can be shown to be a mixture or a combination of the three main branches of the human family.

Mixed Races

Many *Mexicans* are mixed between the Spaniards and Indians. Most *Hawaiians* are mixed between *Polynesians*, Orientals, Spanish and others.

So are today's Egyptians who are also called "Arabs." The *Arabs* are a mixed race. The patriarch Abraham is the father of many of these "Egyptian Arabs." Their father (Abraham) was Semitic, and their mother (Hagar) was Hamitic, but since Hagar took an Egyptian wife for her half-Egyptian son, this would have made him three-quarters Egyptian. Thereafter many other mixed elements entered into the racial composition of the "Arabs." These "Arabs," therefore are more Hamitic than Semitic.

Some of the "Arabs" have descended from other racial stocks. Richard A. Goldsby in his book, *Race and Races*, (1971 ed.), makes some interesting comments regarding the classification of the races of mankind. He says: "If we put members of the human species into groups according to physical characteristics, we can arrive at a number of branches,

called *races*, that will overlap each other to some extent. *Almost everyone's classification will include three large groups: the Mongoloid, the Caucasoid, and the Negroid*"

These three large groups roughly correspond to the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth.

This same author, in three separate sections of his book, surveys "The Mongoloids ('Yellow Man')," "The Caucasoids ('White Man')," and "The Negroids ('Black Man')." "

Notice how many anthropologists agree with the Bible that there are only *three major divisions, branches, families* or "races" of the human species (*homo sapiens*).

"It is essential, however, to a right understanding of the subject that a few paragraphs should be devoted to a consideration of the THREE leading types, or *stocks*, into which the human race is obviously divisible. These three *primary types*, which have been in existence throughout the historic period and are probably of much greater antiquity, are familiar to all of us under the respective designations of the *white man*, the *yellow or red man*, and the *Negro or black man*" (*The Living Races of Mankind*, by Johnston and Harry.)

As the Bible says, "God hath made of *one blood* all nations." And, as we have already observed, "Most physical anthropologists accept modern man as one genus, and one species."

We need to realize why many have gone into such confusion as to what constitutes "race," and why they are in a quandry regarding how many "races" there are. The world's leading anthropologists have *rejected the Bible* and have accepted the *evolutionary concept* in its place. The result? Confusion.

But if we accept the plain teaching of Genesis 10:32, it is clear that all the peoples on this earth have descended from *three families*—Shem, Ham and Japheth!

Not everyone, however, classifies the human race into this three-fold division. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* illustrates these *three "divisions"* or "stocks" of humanity (Caucasoid, Mongoloid, Negroid) and also adds a *fourth*—Australoid. But the Australoid type is clearly just a branch of (or sub-division of) the Negroid "race" of mankind! (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1960 ed., vol. II, "Anthropology").

Hammerton, in his *Peoples of All Nations*, likewise uses the same four stocks as does the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*—except that he says the *Caucasoid, Mongoloid* and *Negroid* races have all descended from the AUSTRALOID "race." Both Scripture and secular history show that he is merely guessing when he says the three main divisions of mankind have descended from the "Australoid" stock (J.A. Hammerton, *Peoples of All Nations*, vol. I, p. XI).

Ripley divides the human species into "four groups" so far as skin colour is concerned: (1) "Jet or coal black colour," (2) "Brownish colour," (3) "Yellow," (4) "White." There are many shades or gradations of the "dark" branch of humanity. But if we include the "brown" people as a sub-division of the "black" stock of mankind then there are just three branches of the human family.

There is *nothing* in the Scriptures *or* in science to prove that man just evolved (perhaps 1,000,000 or more years ago) and has roamed around in primitive infancy virtually ever since.

The Scriptures tell us that Ham (Heb. "burnt" or "hot") is the father, generally speaking, of the "Black" or burnt-appearing (Negroid or African-type) dark races. We are further told by the inspired writers that Japheth (Heb. "enlarging" or "stretching out") is the father of the prolific Mongoloid, the so-called "Yellow" Asiatic races. Japheth is also the father of some fair-skinned people. Shem (Heb. "name" or "renowned") is the father of most of the "White" Caucasian "races."

Every race or nation of this earth will fall into one of these three major divisions of mankind (Shem, Ham and Japheth), or else can be proven to be a cross-breed between two or more of these three main branches of the human family.

This does not mean that all of the races were fully developed immediately after the Deluge. It took some time before the three primary branches of mankind (White, Yellow and Dark) were fully developed as we know them today.

"RACE . . . The differences among races are essentially biological and are marked by the hereditary transmission of physical characteristics . . . All human groups belong to the same species (*Homo sapiens*) and are mutually fertile . . . Nevertheless, by limiting the criteria to such traits as skin pigmentation, color and form of hair, shape of head, and stature, and form of nose, *most anthropologists agree on the existence of three relatively distinct groups*: the Caucasoid, the Mongoloid, and the Negroid.

"*The Caucasoid (race)*, found in Europe, N. Africa, and the Middle East to N. India, is characterized as pale reddish white to olive brown in color, of medium to tall stature, with a long or broad head form. The Hair is light blond to dark brown in color, of a fine texture, and straight or wavy. The color of the eyes is light blue to dark brown and the nose bridge is usually high.

American Indians are Mongoloids

"*The Mongoloid race*, including most peoples of E. Asia and the *Indians of the Americas*, has been described as saffron to yellow or reddish brown in color, of medium stature, with a broad head form. The hair is dark, straight, and coarse; body hair is sparse. The eyes are black to dark brown. The epicanthic fold, imparting an almond shape to the eye, is common, and the nose bridge is usually low or medium.

"*The Negroid race* is characterized by brown to brown-black skin, usually a long head form, varying stature, and thick, everted lips. The hair is dark and coarse, usually kinky. The eyes are dark, the nose bridge low, and the nostrils broad. To the Negroid race belong the peoples of Africa south of the Sahara, the Pygmy groups of Indonesia, and the inhabitants of New Guinea and Melaneaia. Each of these broad groups (Caucasoid, Mongoloid, Negroid) can be divided into sub-groups . . ." (*The New Columbia Encyclopedia*, 1975 ed., art. "race").

Notice that "the Indians of the Americas" are included in "the Mongoloid race." This certainly rules out the American Indians being descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel—who had descended from Shem, who is the ancestor of the "Caucasoid race." (See Gen. 10 and 11.) Remember, some classify humanity into four groups or branches: (1) White, (2) Yellow, (3) Brown, and (4) Black. Since, however, most of the *brown* people have descended from Ham, it simplifies things if we class them with the "dark" races. In the main, they are a sub-division of the "dark" or "Negroid" branch of Ham's descendants.

The peoples of each of the three great branches of man must have inter-married with members of their own "racial type" in order to produce a true type of race. Such interbreeding would, over a period of several generations, tend to produce a distinct racial type.

The Hebrew word for Ham ("burnt") shows that his descendants were to be *dark* or *burnt-appearing* people. Secular history is also very clear in showing that Nimrod, a descendant of Ham, was certainly a dark man.

Black Nimrod

Shortly after the Deluge, Nimrod, a grandson of Ham, organized the first man-ruled dictatorship in defiance of God, and in defiance of Shem, who was successor to Noah in teaching mankind the ways of God (Gen. 10:6-11).

Nimrod and his harlot wife, Semiramis, started the old mystery religion of Babylonia which has permeated the whole world today—even including modern "Christianity."

Because of Nimrod's *idolatry* and also because of his despotic rule over his fellow man, Shem finally organized enough God-fearing men to destroy Nimrod and his power. History shows that Nimrod had fled to Egypt, and it was there that Shem and his followers finally put an end to the life of that wretched man.

Even at that early date, the Egyptians were an idolatrous people, and had been easily swayed by Nimrod. They had looked upon him as a great benefactor—a Saviour. After the death of Nimrod, his followers began to deify him. They looked upon Shem (and all who were sympathetic with him) as tyrants!

According to Alexander Hyslop's *The Two Babylons*, one of the names by which the Egyptians knew Shem was "Typho" or "Typhon"—meaning the *Desolator* or *Destroyer*. In other words, since Shem had killed Nimrod, their leader, they spoke of Shem as "Typhon" meaning Devil (*The Two Babylons*, pp. 65, 276, 277):

We have seen that Shem was the *actual* slayer of *Tammuz* [another name for Nimrod]. As the grand adversary of the Pagan Messiah, those who hated him for his deed called him for that very deed by the name of the Grand Adversary of all, Typhon, or the devil (*ibid.*, pp. 276, 277).

Hyslop illustrates (in *The Two Babylons*) a picture or likeness of

Nimrod (*ibid.*, p. 44) and the features are very clearly those of a black man—thick lips, etc. “Now Nimrod, as the son of Cush, was black, in other words, was a Negro” (*ibid.*, p. 34).

The prophet Jeremiah was inspired to write “Can the Ethiopian (Cushite) change (the color of) his skin. . . ?” (Jer. 13:23). The Hebrew word for “Ethiopian” is Cushite. So this verse should read “Can the Cushite change his skin. . . ?”

There can be no question that the present day Ethiopians (who are the descendants of Cush) are very dark skinned. *Nimrod* (son of Cush) was certainly a dark-skinned person!

Now let us notice some quotations from Plutarch which show that not only was Nimrod a black man, but *Shem* (the father of the majority of the Caucasians) was a fair person with a red complexion. “Typhon [Shem] had red hair” (*ibid.*, p. 73). “*Osiris*, [Nimrod], on the other hand, according to their legendary tradition, was dark. . .” (*ibid.*, p. 81). (Only fair-skinned people are truly “red in complexion”.)

Yes, Nimrod was a dark or black man, but Shem (Typhon—a derogatory name applied to him by the Egyptians) “was red in complexion” and “had red hair.”

For a further account of Nimrod’s death at the hands of Shem (Typhon) see *Diodorus of Sicily*, vol. I, book 1, para. 21, and para. 88. Notice the following interesting quote: “RED oxen, however, may be sacrificed, because it is thought that this was the colour of TYPHON (Shem), who plotted against *Osiris* [another name for *Nimrod*] and was then punished by *Isis* [Semiramis] for the death of her husband. Men also, if they were of the same colour as Typhon, were sacrificed, they say, in ancient times by the kings at the tomb of *Osiris*; however, only a few Egyptians are now found red in colour, but the majority of such are non-Egyptians. . .” (*Diodorus of Sicily*, book I, para. 88).

Thus we can clearly see that secular history shows Nimrod was a black man, and Shem (Typhon) was a person with a ruddy complexion, having red hair! These historical accounts show that Ham’s descendants were “dark” (not all necessarily black) and that Shem’s descendants were fair with “red” or ruddy complexions!

Some of the brown race and other sub-races are directly descended from Ham, while others developed as a result of intermarriage between members of the three primary “divisions” or “stocks” of mankind.

Two examples of sub-races are the Arabs and the Philippinos. Both of these “races” are a mixture of two or three of the primary divisions of mankind.

• *History Attests to the Three Races*

Here is a very enlightening quotation by Myers:

The Races of Mankind in the Historic Period.—Distinctions in bodily characteristics, such as form, color, and features, divide the human species into three chief types or races, known as the Black or Ethiopian Race, the Yellow

or Mongolian Race, and the White or Caucasian Race. But we must not suppose each of these three types to be sharply marked off from the other; they shade into one another by insensible gradations (Myers, *The Eastern Nations and Greece*, p. 14).

The black "race" inhabits primarily Africa south of the Sahara, parts of India and many of the islands. The yellow (Mongoloid) "race" lives mainly in eastern, northern and south-eastern Asia. Myers says the "Aryan or Indo-European" and also the "Semitic" peoples belong to the so-called white "race" which inhabits Europe, western Asia, North America, south Africa and Australia (*ibid.*, pp. 15, 16).

Of course, members of these three branches of humanity are scattered in many other areas of the world.

It should be pointed out here that the "Semitic" (Shemitic) peoples constitute, in the main, the white race.

Today the term "Semitic" is generally misunderstood and is consequently misused. Most people think that the Jews and Arabs comprise about all of the true Semitic peoples. The Anglo-Saxon-Keltic peoples who today inhabit Northwestern Europe are definitely Semitic and will later in this work be proven to be Shem's descendants. The Germans and other Europeans are also descendants of Shem.

Some of the descendants of Japheth, however, have light skins, but many of these Japhetic light-skinned peoples have a yellowish or olive tint to their skins. This can be witnessed in the Mongoloid peoples as well as in the original-type Greeks, and some of the Italians and Spaniards—who are descendants of Japheth through his son, Javan. Also, Japheth is the father of bronze- or red-skinned Indians inhabiting North, South and Central America.

After the Patriarch Noah and his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth and their wives came forth from the Ark, they descended from the Mountains of Ararat—in present day Armenia. Their progeny settled in the regions of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. They were still in this area at the time of the Confusion of Tongues when all of the families of mankind were scattered abroad on the face of the whole earth (Gen. 11:1-9).

How to Determine Race

Before we can trace the racial origins of the peoples under consideration in this volume, we must clarify certain words and terms which are commonly used by ethnologists and anthropologists. Let us first define the word "race":

The descendants of a common ancestor; a family, tribe, people, or nation, believed to belong to the same stock. . . . Ethnology. A division of mankind possessing constant traits, transmissible by descent, sufficient to characterize it as a distinct human type (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, art. "Race," p. 696).

Let us next see how this word "race" is defined by Myers:

Distinctions in bodily characteristics, such as form, color, and features, divide the *human species into three chief types or races*, known as the *Black* or Ethiopian Race, the *Yellow* or Mongolian Race, and the *White* or Caucasian Race (Myers, *The Eastern Nations and Greece*, p. 14).

Beside the three (four—if the Brown “race” is included) chief types or “races” just mentioned there are many other “races” or sub-races, with which most people are at least vaguely familiar.

The simplest division of the human family is into three races, the *Yellow Man*, the *White Man*, and the *Black Man*. . . (Anderson, *Extinct Civilizations of the East*, p. 14).

In recent years, ethnologists have tended to invent more and more names for all sorts of races and sub-races until the average student finds himself quite confused by such a labyrinth of names. One would need to possess a prodigious memory in order to remember all the names for the various races and sub-races as defined by some modern ethnologists.

Cephalic Index—Helpful in Determining Racial Affinities

The Cephalic Index is the main key, used universally by most, if not all, present day ethnologists, to ascertain racial affinities from skeletal remains.

One can readily determine “race” on the living populations by such tests as: skin color, stature, nasal indices, general build, color of hair and eyes, head shape, and by mental and personality traits.

But such tools elude the anthropologist who must determine the racial connections of a by-gone people from skeletal remains alone. With these silent men of yesteryear one can only judge their racial type by such measurements as general height, bodily proportions (from bone measurements), and the cephalic index.

Since the C.I. (cephalic index) is of utmost importance in determining the racial affinities of people from their skeletal remains, we shall examine this subject thoroughly, explaining the C.I. directly from the works of well-known ethnologists.

We shall have reason to rely heavily upon the cephalic index on numerous occasions to assist us in determining which racial type a particular people belonged to.

Professor Ripley, considered one of the world’s foremost authorities on “race,” has some interesting remarks on this subject:

The *shape of the human head*—by which we mean the general proportions of length, breadth, and height, irrespective of the “bumps of the phrenologist”—is one of the best available tests of race known (*The Races of Europe*, chap. III, p. 37).

Ripley then shows that the best way to measure the head form is by using the “cephalic index.” He says:

This is simply the breadth of the head above the ears expressed in percentage of its length from forehead to back. Assuming that this length is 100, the width is expressed as a fraction of it. As the head becomes proportionately broader—that is, more fully rounded, viewed from the top down—this cephalic index increases. When it rises *above 80*, the head is called *brachycephalic*; when it falls *below 75*, the term *dolichocephalic* is applied to it. Indexes *between 75 and 80* are characterized as *mesocephalic* (*ibid.*, p. 37).

See *The Passing of the Great Race*, page 19, for the same view, as expressed by Grant. Ripley points out that a broad head is usually accompanied by a rounded face, and that a long head usually has an oval face (*The Races of Europe*, chap. III, p. 39).

The cephalic index measurements are all "dependent upon the boney structure of the head." The C.I. (cephalic index) must be accurately taken, not including the "superficial fleshy parts" (*ibid.*, p. 39).

Ripley shows that the general shape of the head seems to bear no direct relation to the intellectual power or to the intelligence of any particular individual (*ibid.*, p. 40).

He mentions that the absolute size of the head of the individual is very unimportant to the anthropologist. "... Popularly, a large head with beetleing eyebrows suffices to establish a man's intellectual credit but, like all other credit, it is entirely dependent upon what lies on deposit elsewhere. Neither size nor weight of the brain seems to be of importance" (*ibid.*, p. 43).

The reader will observe that Ripley places a great deal of importance upon, not the size, but the general *shape* of the skull as the chief factor in determining the racial connections of a people from their skeletal remains. He shows the color of the hair, the eyes and the stature are open to modification by local circumstances (*ibid.*, p. 52).

On the other hand *the general proportions of the head seem to be uninfluenced either by climate, by food supply or economic status, or by habits of life; so that they stand as the clearest exponents which we possess of the permanent hereditary difference within the human species [from skeletal remains]"* (*ibid.*, p. 52).

The Cephalic Index Always Breeds True!

"Another feature which breeds true is less easily noticed—the proportions of the head. If looked at from above, people's heads vary between nearly round (*brachy-cephalic*, or 'broad-headed') and long and narrow (*dolicho-cephalic* or 'long-headed'). 'Roundheads' are rare in Britain, but are in the majority in central Europe" (*Oxford Junior Encyclopaedia*, vol. 1, art. "RACES AND PEOPLE").

"In the north and west [of Europe], the people generally have long and narrow heads, often fair hair and blue eyes (as nowhere else in the world), and tallish stature; there is a belt of rounder-headed, shorter, and less fair people stretching from Persia in the east, across central Europe, as far as

western France" (*ibid.*, p. 392).

"The typical Anglo-Saxon Englishman is tall, fair-skinned, with fair, wavy hair, and blue eyes" (*ibid.*, p. 39).

Craniometry Versus Phrenology

It should be pointed out here that craniometry, which includes the study of the cephalic index, is an accurate science, and has nothing whatsoever to do with the so-called "science" of phrenology, which contains much error and a little truth. Nearly all modern anthropologists and ethnologists utilize the cephalic index. Most of them agree that it is one of the most important single factors in determining "race" or racial affinities.

The value of the cephalic index can, therefore, hardly be overstressed. As we have already observed, the C.I. is of especial value when classifying skeletal remains. When trying to determine the racial type to which an individual belongs, one is at a distinct disadvantage when working with skeletal remains.

In such cases, he cannot judge the color of the hair, eyes, or the shape of the nose or lips. Here is where the C.I. is of utmost assistance. By this means one can classify skeletal remains to a fairly accurate degree.

Means of Determining Race—According to Haddon

Let us notice how Haddon, another well-known ethnologist, defines "race."

"The term 'race' is employed in various senses, but usually to connote a group of people who have certain well-marked characters in common" (*The Races of Man and Their Distribution*, p. 1).

Haddon indicates that the main physical characters which he employs to determine race are: hair, skin-color, *form of the head*, stature, the characters of the face, nose, and eyes (*ibid.*, p. 5).

He then proceeds to mention the various kinds of hair—straight, smooth, wavy, frizzy, curly, and woolly. The hair varies in shades from black, and dark browns, to red and different shades of blond.

This author proceeds to show the different skin colors—white, yellow, brown, and black. He shows clearly that the pigmentation of the skin has nothing whatsoever to do with environment! In other words, *the dark races are not dark-skinned because of their having lived for many years in the hot, tropical regions*; neither are the light-skinned people fair complexioned because of having lived many years farther north in the colder, cloudier and more temperate zones (*ibid.*, p. 8).

Haddon next mentions a number of points relative to stature, showing that some races are naturally taller than others, but that environmental factors can definitely increase or retard the height of the members of any race (*ibid.*, pp. 8, 9).

In regard to the form of the head, Haddon says:

21

A very valuable character is *the general form of the head*. When looked at from above some heads are seen to be long and others short, the former are also generally narrow and the latter broad. This distinction is illustrated by the *cephalic index* (C.I.), which is the ratio of the breadth of the skull or of the head to its length, the latter being taken as 100 (*ibid.*, p. 9).

Haddon proceeds to describe such characters as the face, nose and eyes. Faces may be classified as long and narrow, broad, square, round, oval or "disharmonic."

There are many different classifications of faces and noses, and a lengthy discussion is not necessary. Let it suffice to say that some noses are long and narrow, others are broad and thick, some are hooked or aquiline, others are up-turned, while still other types are straight.

Eye colors range from black through brown, steel blue, light blue, grey and green. There are other differences in the eyes. There is the horizontal and more-or-less wide-open eye of the Europeans and the North Asiatics, the almond-shaped eye of South Europeans, South Africans and Near Easterners, and the "Mongolian eye" which is called the slant-eye, slit-eye, or the oblique-eye. Haddon also mentions the picanthic fold or the Mongolian fold, as it is sometimes called, which covers the inner angle of the eye of Mongoloid peoples and of some Negroes (*ibid.*, pp. 10, 11).

There is one more very important point which must be stressed regarding the C.I. It must be understood that some ethnologists use only two cephalic indexes—dolichocephalic (long-headed) and brachycephalic (broad-headed). With such ethnologists all cephalic indexes below 80 are classed as dolichocephalic and all over 80 as brachycephalic.

C.I. Defined

This method of classifying all head forms as either dolichocephalic or brachycephalic is clearly explained in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:

Cephalic Index . . . if the shorter or transverse diameter falls below 80 the skull may be classed as *long* (dolichocephalic), while if it exceeds 80 the skull is *broad* (brachycephalic) (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. V, Art. "Cephalic Index", p. 684).

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary uses the same method of measurements for classifying brachycephals ("80 or above") and dolichocephals ("less than 80").

Most ethnologists use the term "dolichocephalic" for a C.I. of less than 80, and "brachycephalic" for a C.I. of 80 or more. Haddon uses only two—dolichocephalic and brachycephalic (*The Races of Man and Their Distribution*, p. 9).

Later, we shall see abundant evidence proving that *northwest Europeans* are overwhelmingly a dolichocephalic (C.I. 80 and under) people.

It can further be proved beyond question that the long-headed Scythian (or Sacae) skulls which were formerly found on the Steppes all across South Russia and northern Europe from the Danube to the Don River (and even

farther east) are today found in type *only among northwest Europeans*. These long-headed folk who formerly inhabited South Russia have been succeeded by a round- or broad-headed "Slavic" or "Alpine" type of people. The long-heads were pushed further west by successive waves of Eastern invaders, until today they are only found in appreciable numbers in northwest Europe and, of course, in the countries colonised by these peoples. There are Negroid and Latin type long-heads, but other factors such as general bone proportions make it very difficult to confuse the Nordic long-heads with the Latin and African type of long-heads.

Grant shows that the use of the cephalic index is "the best method" of determining the particular type of race of the European populations:

In dealing with European populations the best method of determining race has been found to lie in a comparison of proportions of the skull, the so-called *cephalic index* (Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race*, p. 19).

From the standpoint of the C.I., Europe is divided into two types—dolichocephals and brachycephals. The broad-headed people are, with few exceptions, found in the inland and mountainous districts. The long-heads are almost invariably located on the coastlands and islands of Europe.

The dolichocephals (long-heads) are further divided into two main groups: (1) the *Nordics* who inhabit northwest Europe, and (2) the *Mediterraneans* who inhabit the southern regions of Europe, and are mainly found in the countries contiguous to the Mediterranean Sea.

The Scythians (or Sacaë), who formerly lived in South Russia, were of the Nordic branch of the dolichocephals. The foremost authorities on the Scythian question are generally agreed on this point. Other characters enable a trained ethnologist to clearly differentiate between the skeletal remains of Nordics and Mediterraneans. The Nordics are longer-limbed, have typically larger skulls, and are generally larger-bodied than are the Mediterraneans.

The difference between Nordic and Mediterranean skeletal remains is as easily discernible as is such difference readily noticeable between the living northwest European Nordics and the south or southeast European Mediterraneans.

We have seen from a number of foremost authorities on the "race" question that the cephalic index is of utmost importance to the ethnologists when sorting out and classifying skeletal remains. *The general shape of the skull remains more constant than any other tangible racial character*. Height, weight and other minor characters are sometimes altered by environment.

However, there is as yet no scientific proof that the basic shape of the skull of any race has ever yet altered noticeably except by intermarriage with a race having a different skull type, or by deformations. The skulls of ancient Egyptians are identical with those of the unmixed modern Coptic Egyptians.

Some, however, fail to distinguish and rightly interpret skeletal findings. To illustrate this point, it is well to show that *in some countries* the skulls found in the ancient cemeteries indicate that the population at one time was

that of a long-headed type. Skulls from modern cemeteries or skulls from the living population, however, may generally be of the broad-headed type. Some anthropologists hastily jump to the conclusion that the general shape of the skull of this particular population has changed from that of a long-headed race to that of a broad-headed people.

But the truth is that a long-headed people at one time lived in that country and were buried in the older cemeteries. Subsequent invasions by round- or broad-heads supplanted the older population so that the modern population, and consequently those interred in the later cemeteries, are those of a broad-headed type of people.

There are instances where this has been reversed—where a broad-headed people had formerly inhabited a certain territory, and were later driven out by a long-headed race.

Our final remarks in this chapter regarding the C.I. are from Professor Sayce. He adds:

*One of the most important characteristics that distinguish races one from another is the shape of the skull. Certain races are what is called dolichocephalic or long-headed, while others are brachycephalic or round-headed. These terms relate to the proportion of the length of the skull to its breadth. . . . Stature often corresponds to the form of the skull, a tall stature accompanying a long skull, and a short stature a round skull (*The Races of the Old Testament*, chap. I, pp. 26-28).*

Sayce says that a skull with a C.I. between 70-80 is dolichocephalic, and one which is between 80-90 is brachycephalic.

He points out, however, that stature is largely dependent on food and nourishment, and is, therefore, not a sure test of race:

*Stature by itself cannot be regarded as one of those physiological traits which separate race from race. It may be a racial characteristic, and is so in some instances; but in other cases it is dependent on the nourishment given to the growing child (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 27).*

One should bear in mind that craniology is not always a safe guide. Skulls are sometimes artificially distorted from their natural form. In fact, there have been tribes in which distortions have been customary. When dealing with ancient skulls, therefore, the craniologist must be on his guard against any such deformations. One must be sure he has enough specimens to give a true representation of the subjects he is studying. It is nearly always unsafe to argue from "a single instance" (*ibid.*, p. 27).

Here is a most important statement which bears remembering:

*Apart from artificial distortions, however, the shape of the skull is one of the most marked and permanent characteristics of race. It is startling to see how unchangeable the same type of skull is reproduced, generation after generation, in the same race (*ibid.*, p. 28).*

Did you notice that Sayce is very specific in showing that apart from "artificial distortions" the general skull type of a particular race is reproduced unchanged in generation after generation.

Sayce then shows that the shape of the skull is due to "physiological causes" which act from the moment one is born (*ibid.*, p. 28).

24

Which Is the Superior Type?

Which is the superior racial type—the dolichocephals (long-heads), or the brachycephals (broad-heads)? According to Isaac Taylor, the superior type is that of the brachycephalic races. He says:

Virchow, Broca, and Calori agree that the brachycephalic or (Turanian) skull is a higher form than the dolichocephalic. The most degraded of existing races, such as the Australians [aborigines], Tasmanians, Papuas, Veddahs, Negroes, Hottentots and Bosjemen, as well as the aboriginal forest tribes of India, are typically dolichocephalic; while the Burmese, the Chinese, the Japanese and the natives of Central Europe are typically brachycephalic (*The Origin of the Aryans*, p. 241).

Most books written in the English language, however, claim that the long-headed people are the superior type of human being. They reason that it has been the long-headed Nordics of northwestern Europe who have been the ones to "make history."

Madison Grant expresses this view very well in the following words:

"The English, Flemings, Dutch, North Germans and Scandinavians are descendants of the Nordic race while the dominant class in Europe is everywhere of that blood" (*The Passing of the Great Race*, pp. 61, 62).

Grant explains that the Nordics all over the world are a race of adventurers and explorers, soldiers and sailors; "but above all, of rulers, organizers and aristocrats in sharp contrast to the essential peasant and democratic character of the broad-headed Alpines" (*ibid.*, p. 228).

"The English," says Ripley, "are distinctly long-headed" (*The Races of Europe*, p. 41).

Which is the superior type? The answer to this question seems to depend more upon the shape of the head of the particular writer, or upon his personal fancy or prejudice than anything else.

The fact that the northwest Europeans (who are generally classed as long-headed Nordics) have been the dominant peoples of Europe, and of the world, is undoubtedly more dependent upon the blessings of the God of Israel than upon the particular shape of their heads.

The fact, as mentioned earlier, that the aboriginal Australians and other backward peoples are decidedly long-headed should prove that long-headedness alone is not synonymous with greatness. The northwest, "Nordic," dolichocephalic Europeans have become great because of the blessings they received from Almighty God.

Acquired Characteristics—Not Inherited

There is another misunderstanding which should be cleared up at this point. Some ethnologists, who, unfortunately, believe in the theory of evolution, believe that the light races are light-skinned because of their having resided in the cold, cloudy regions of the earth for a long period. Likewise they foolishly assume that the darker races are darker in skin color and pigmentation as a result of having lived in or near the tropical zones for many thousands of years. A more absurd and unscientific theory is hardly conceivable!

One of the best known and most inexorably binding laws of science shows that "acquired characteristics are never inherited"! Such a theory is quite unscientific, to say the least. Haddon (according to Sayce) completely refutes any such ideas!

"The dark colour," says Haddon, "which is characteristic of race has nothing to do with climactic influences" (Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, chap. I, p. 37).

Sayce goes on to show that the *fair-skinned Kabyle* and *swarthy Bedouin* who live side by side and in the same manner and under the same general conditions, in the same climate, eating the same food—these two contrasted peoples who live in North Africa are *totally different* in skin pigmentation.

The *Egyptians* and the *Nubians*, as another example, have lived in the Nile River valley for several thousands of years. Though they have lived side by side under the same general conditions, there is still a vast difference between the Egyptian and his darker neighbor the Nubian—except, of course, where there has been intermarriage.

The dark colour of the black races is due to a pigment which is spread under the true skin immediately beneath the epidermis or scarf-skin (Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, chap. I, p. 37).

Professor Sayce discusses the subject of the sun-tan. He points out that:

Such *tanning*, however, is never permanent and *cannot be inherited*. It is wholly distinct from the dark tint which distinguishes the skin of the Italian or Spaniard, and still more from the brown hue of the Mali or Polynesian (*ibid.*, p. 38).

With the points which have been mentioned in this chapter regarding "race" firmly in mind, we shall now be able to discuss with comprehension terms commonly employed in the describing of "race" such as the cephalic index. With these various means of determining racial affinities, we are now able to trace the racial origins of the peoples of northwest Europe through both history and archaeology.

Chapter Three

Early History of Israel

Our search for the modern identity of the "Lost Ten Tribes" of Israel will be made much easier—if we first study briefly the hoary origins of this ancient and illustrious people.

It is God who makes and unmakes nations (Job 12:23). "Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance . . ." (Isa. 40:15).

King Nebuchadnezzar of ancient Babylon had to learn this lesson the hard way. After a period of severe chastisement from God, he acknowledged God's overruling hand in human government. "He [God] doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What does thou?" (Dan. 4:35).

The Apostle Paul also understood this important truth: "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts 17:26). It is God Almighty that determined beforehand the frontiers of the nations.

Moses also realised that God sets the national inheritances of all nations: "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam. He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. 32:8).

It is well known that Abraham was a descendant of Shem. And it was through Abraham and his descendants that God Almighty promised certain great spiritual and physical blessings. The spiritual promises of *grace* (salvation) are generally understood by most Christians.

But very, very few appear to have diligently studied the promises of physical blessings which God just as assuredly promised to Abraham and to his offspring—his *race*! Let us now consider some of these promises of the physical, material blessings which God solemnly promised to Abraham and to his descendants.

What Did God Promise?

Just what did God Almighty promise the patriarchs? Here are some of the more important of those divine promises:

- 1) Abraham's descendants were prophesied to become "as the dust of

the earth" (Gen. 13:16). This has never been fulfilled in the Jews—the House of Judah—alone!

2) "Many nations" and "kings" were to descend from Abraham (Gen. 17:6). Certainly, the Jews alone have never comprised "many nations."

3) These "nations" and "kings" would be born from Abraham and Sarah through Isaac—not through Ishmael (Gen. 17:16).

4) To Abraham, God said: "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen. 22:17).

5) This promise was repeated to Isaac and Rebekah: "Be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them" (Gen. 24:60). Surely no one will argue that the Jews have ever comprised thousands of millions!

6) Isaac, Abraham's son, was divinely inspired to bless his son Jacob with this tremendous blessing: "Therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee" (Gen. 27:28, 29).

7) Now notice this fantastic promise which God made to Jacob: "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north and to the south" (Gen. 28:14). God predestined Israel to become great colonisers! Jacob's seed were to be "as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude" (Gen. 32:12).

8) Later, God changed the name of Jacob—meaning "deceiver" or "supplanter"—to Israel, meaning "overcomer with God" (Gen. 35:10). "And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee and kings shall come out of thy loins" (verse 11). At no time in their history have the Jews been a company of nations.

Joseph's Two Sons

9) Joseph had two sons—one named Ephraim, the other Manasseh. It was these two sons (Ephraim and Manasseh) who were promised the great birthright blessing—the choicest material and physical blessings ever given any people!

"Reuben [was] the firstborn of Israel . . . but, forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph [Ephraim and Manasseh] the sons of Israel. . . ." (I Chron. 5:1).

Notice carefully the blessing that was given to Ephraim and Manasseh. "He [Manasseh] also shall become a people, and he shall be great: but truly his younger brother [Ephraim] shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations" (Gen. 48:19).

10) Joseph (remember, Ephraim and Manasseh were Joseph's sons) was prophesied to become "a fruitful bought by a well" (Gen. 49:22). Verses 23 and 24 show how other nations would invade and war against the descendants of Joseph, but he would be given victory by his God.

Furthermore, the descendants of Joseph (or, of Ephraim and Manasseh) were to become the great colonizers of the earth: "Joseph is a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall" (Gen. 49:22).

11) The people of Israel were prophesied to become a mighty people, ruled over by "a king"—having the strength of a unicorn (Heb. ox) and were to be "as a great lion."

"Behold, I [Balaam] have received commandment to bless: and He hath blessed: and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity [or misfortune] in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness [trouble] in Israel: the Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them. God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn [Heb. ox] . . . Behold, the people [of Israel] shall rise up as a great lion, and lift up himself as a young lion: he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey, and drink the blood of the slain" (Num. 23:20-22, 24).

This remarkable prophecy was given by the false prophet, Balaam. Even though he had wanted to curse Israel, God forced him to prophesy the truth—to foretell these blessings to befall Israel.

Judah—The Lion

12) Judah was prophesied to be the tribe which would produce the kingly line in Israel. "The sceptre [of a king] shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver [or ruler's staff] from between his feet, until Shiloh [the Messiah] come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be" (Gen. 49:10).

"For Judah prevailed above his brethren and of him came the chief ruler [or King]; but the birthright was Joseph's" (I Chron. 5:2).

It was to be Judah, as a tribe, which would be referred to as a "lion" because the "Lion of the tribe of Juda" (Rev. 5:5) would later be born into this tribe. "Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up?" (Gen. 49:9).

Each of the Twelve Tribes of Israel anciently had its own standard, its tribal symbol or coat of arms (see Num. 2:1-34).

The tribal symbol or standard of Ephraim was an ox or a unicorn. Interestingly, the people of Britain are referred to under the symbol of "John Bull" to this very day. And the unicorn (ox) is one of the two main symbols found universally on the coats of arms of the British Royal Family.

The ensign, standard or tribal symbol of the tribe of Judah from time immemorial has been a lion. And, surprising as it may seem to some, the real symbol of the tribe of Judah to this very day is not the "Star of David" (though Jews use this symbol today) but is the lion (see article "Flag" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*).

Before we can see how the aforementioned prophecies have been fulfilled in the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples of Britain and the Commonwealth—and in the peoples of the United States and the democracies of north-western Europe—we must briefly survey the ancient history of the people of Israel as mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures.

Israel's Ancient History

Although the nations of Egypt, Assyria and Babylon were founded long before the Kingdom of Israel was established, the history of Israel is the most fascinating of all!

The nation of Israel has descended from Shem through the Patriarchs—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Jacob, whose name was later changed to Israel (Gen. 32:28), was the father of twelve sons who became the founding fathers of the twelve tribes comprising the nation of Israel.

During the lifetime of the patriarch Israel (or Jacob) severe drought and famine gripped the land of Palestine. Joseph, one of Jacob's twelve sons, had become the second in command under the Pharaoh in the land of Egypt. He was, in fact, Egypt's Prime Minister! Joseph invited his father, Israel, and his whole family to come down and dwell in the very choicest part of the land of Egypt—the land of Goshen (Gen. 46:28). The total number of all the house or family of Israel (if we include Joseph and his two sons) who went down into Egypt (circa 1731 B.C.) was seventy souls (Gen. 46:27).

The sons of Israel and their descendants lived in Egypt for about two hundred and forty years. See Dr. Torrey's "Comments on Exodus", chap. XII, for a clear explanation of the exact numbers of the years of Israel's sojourn in Egypt (*The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*, p. 46).

In about 1491 B.C., Moses (a man of great ability) was given the charge of leading the infant nation of Israel from Egypt to the Promised Land.

How many Israelites were there at the time of the Exodus from Egypt? According to Dr. Adam Clarke there were "upwards of three millions" (*Clarke's Commentary*, vol. 1, pp. 357-358). Jamieson, Fausset and Brown in their *Critical and Experimental Commentary* say there were 2,400,000 Israelites who took part in the Exodus (Vol. 1, p. 317). There were undoubtedly between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 who left Egypt under Moses!

If this phenomenal population increase seems incredible, consider the following facts:

In 1800 England had a population of about 8,000,000; the United States had circa 7,000,000. A century and a half later, England had nearly 50,000,000 (not including the millions who emigrated to the Commonwealth countries)! The U.S. grew to about 170,000,000 in this same period. The population of any country (if unchecked by warfare, famine, birth control, or disease epidemics) increases very rapidly!

Notice what God said concerning the people of Israel: "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people: for ye were the fewest of all people: But because the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn unto your fathers. . . ." (Deut. 7:7, 8). God had solemnly sworn unto the Patriarchs that He would bless Israel so that they would become a very prolific people.

Notice God's oath which was repeated to all of the patriarchal, founding fathers of the nation of Israel! To Abraham, God had said: ". . . I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea

shore" (Gen. 22:17). Unto Isaac's wife, Rebekah, it was said: "Be thou the mother of *thousands of millions* . . ." (Gen. 24:16). Unto Jacob (or Israel) God had solemnly promised: "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south. . ." (Gen. 28:14).

These are only a few of the many promises which God made to the Patriarchs concerning their children. God truly had solemnly sworn that the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were to become as the "stars," as the "dust" and as the "sand."

Notice another very important promise which the Almighty God made to Israel (or Jacob): "And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply: a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee and kings shall come out of thy loins" (Gen. 35:11).

Yes, the descendants of Jacob were prophesied to become a "company" ("multitude"—Gen. 48:19) of nations." The Jews have never comprised more than one small nation! But all of the descendants of Israel collectively were to become a *multitude* or *company* of nations!

Israel in the Promised Land

Because of faithlessness, outright rebellion and gross iniquity, the people of Israel who took part in the Exodus were all denied entering the Promised Land—except Joshua and Caleb, who, as a reward for their faithfulness to God, were commissioned to lead the nation of Israel across the Jordan river and into the Promised Land (Num. 14:30). There were about three millions of Israelites who occupied the Promised Land under Joshua circa 1451 B.C.

In the Promised Land Israel was ruled over by judges for about four *and a half centuries*. "And after that He [God] gave unto them Judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet" (Acts. 13:20).

From the time Joshua led the Twelve Tribes of Israel into the Promised Land (in 1451 B.C.) until the time that the ten-tribed House of Israel was taken captive (in 721 B.C.) was a total of about 730 years (*The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*, p. 182).

But in the time of Samuel (about 1092 B.C.) the people of Israel wanted a human king. God granted them their desire, but protested—showing them the tragic consequences of their action (1 Sam. 8).

Saul was the first king of Israel, but because of his refusal to rule Israel according to the laws and ways of God, he was rejected and David was chosen as his successor. King David ruled Israel wisely, and when he died his son, Solomon (Heb: "peaceable") ascended the throne and ruled the Twelve Tribes of Israel. He governed Israel judiciously during his lifetime, and as a result there was great peace and prosperity throughout the land during his reign.

When King Solomon died, his son, Rehoboam, ascended the throne. Because of his unwise policies and exorbitant taxes, the northern Ten Tribes of Israel revolted (in 972 B.C.) from the leadership of the throne of David.

and formed a separate kingdom under the leadership of their newly elected king, Jeroboam (I Ki. 12).

After the revolt of the ten-tribed House of Israel from the leadership of the kings of Judah, we thereafter read of "Israel" and "Judah" as being distinct nations though they were closely related. The term "Israel" (in the national sense) thereafter referred to *the northern ten-tribed House or Kingdom of Israel* (whose capital was Samaria), and the term "Judah" referred to the Kingdom of Judah which was comprised of the tribes of *Judah, Benjamin* and most of the *Levites*. The capital city of the Kingdom of Judah was Jerusalem, but the capital of the northern Kingdom of Israel was Samaria.

What is the origin of the name "Israel"?

The first use of the name Israel in the Bible is found in Genesis 32:28, where the angel who wrestled all night with Jacob says: "Thy name shall be no more called Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed."

"Israel" is derived from a Hebrew root which literally means "he that strives (or prevails) with God."

As Jacob became Israel, so his descendants through his twelve sons became the tribes of Israel and the Israelites When Israel was divided by civil war in the time of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, *the northern kingdom alone retained the name Israel*, while *the southern kingdom was called Judah*. From that time on we read of the kings of Israel and the kings of Judah, although the inhabitants of both kingdoms continued to be called Israelites in the older and broader sense of the inhabitants of the old land of Israel (Stimpson, *A Book About the Bible*, pp. 235, 236).

When Israel was rent by civil war under Rehoboam (king of Judah) and Jeroboam (king of Israel), "the northern kingdom alone retained the name Israel," after which the southern kingdom was called—not Israel—but Judah.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* also shows that the name of Israel was for some centuries "applied to the *northern* kingdom as distinct" from the nation and the peoples of Judah:

ISRAEL (Hebrew for "God strives" or "rules"; See Genesis 32:28. . . . Israel was a name borne by their ancestor Jacob the father of the 12 tribes. For some centuries the term was applied to the northern kingdom, as distinct from Judah, although the feeling of national unity extended it so as to include both (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art., "Israel," p. 885).

The Origin of "Jew"

The inhabitants of the southern Kingdom, as the author just quoted pointed out, were sometimes called Israelites; but they were never called the "House of Israel" or the "Kingdom of Israel." However, *not one Scripture can be produced to prove that the inhabitants of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel were ever called Jews!* Throughout the histories of Israel

as found in the books of the Kings and of the Chronicles of Israel and Judah, you will notice that there was intermittent strife between the Kingdom of Israel and the Kingdom of Judah.

In fact on one occasion, the army of the ten-tribed northern Kingdom of Israel entered Jerusalem as the victor (II Kings 14.).

The first mention of the word "Jews" in the Bible is also found in this same book:

Then *Rezin king of Syria*, and *Pekah son of Remaliah, king of ISRAEL* came up to Jerusalem to war: and they besieged Ahaz, but could not overcome him. At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria and *drove the JEWS from Elath*. . . (II Kings 16:5, 6).

In verses 7 and 9 you will notice that King Ahaz of Judah, in order to get out of this dilemma, sent messengers and silver and gold from the very Temple of the Lord to the Assyrian King, Tiglath-Pileser, to secure the aid of the Assyrian monarch against his enemies, King Rezin of Syria, and King Pekah of Israel.

The Assyrian king, Tiglath-Pileser, in response to this letter invaded the ten-tribed House of Israel and carried them into captivity.

We have observed the origin of "Israel," but we have not seen the *origin* of the word "Jew" even though we have seen the first place in recorded history where it is used.

How did the word "Jew" originate?

"Jew is derived from Judah (Yehuda), the name of the fourth of Jacob's twelve sons. *The territory in Palestine occupied by the tribe of Judah was called Judah and its inhabitants the children of Judah [or Jews]. After Israel split into two kingdoms, the southern section, comprising Judah, Benjamin and Simeon, was known as the Kingdom of Judah,*" while the northern tribes were called the *Kingdom of Israel.* (*A Book About the Bible.* George Stimpson, p. 236).

In 604-586 B.C. this Southern Kingdom of Judah was destroyed and its people were deported to Babylon, where they remained for 70 years. At the end of this 70-year-period under Persian protection, a remnant of this Babylonish captivity returned to Palestine and established the Jewish nation and the Temple worship once again. "This state, like its predecessor was called Judah" (*ibid.*, p. 236).

Notice how the word "Jew" developed through the centuries. Stimpson says:

The inhabitants of Judah (Yehuda) called themselves *Yehudim* in Hebrew and *Yehudaye* in Aramaic. To the Greeks and Romans *Yehuda* became *Iouda* and *Judaea* and the inhabitants *Ioudaios* and *Judaei*. The name of the inhabitants of the Hebrew commonwealth passed through the following successive linguistic stages: Hebrew, *Yehuda*, Greek, *Ioudaios*, Latin, *Judaeus*, Old French, *Juieu*, and English, *Jew*. One of the earliest known uses of the English form Jew is dated 1175 A.D. (*ibid.*, p. 236).

These are a few of the many different forms or ways of spelling this word "Jew." For still further interesting spellings of "Jew" see *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. Notice the following interesting statement: "For centuries adherents of the Mosaic faith who lived in Judea were called Jews, while those of the dispersion were called Israelites" (ibid., p. 237).

Stimpson has clearly shown that for centuries those who adhered to the "Mosaic faith" in Judea were called by the name of "Jews" while the Ten Tribes of Israel in the dispersion were called Israelites. He showed that the word "Jew" finally came to denote "any adherent of the Mosaic faith."

Notice this significant statement from Josephus:

So the Jews prepared for the work: that is the name they are called by from the day that they came up from Babylon, which is taken from the tribe of Judah, which came first to these places, and thence both they and the country gained that appellation" (*Antiquities of the Jews*, book XI, V:7).

It is superfluous to quote from any more authorities showing what has already been clearly pointed out in this chapter—that Israelites are descendants of Israel, and that Jews are either the physical, fleshly descendants of Judah or else those who have taken up the Jewish faith and have consequently been termed as "Jews" because of their Jewish beliefs.

Reuben was the firstborn son of Israel (Gen. 49:3), and was therefore the first "Israelite" (son of Israel). The Jews were the sons of Judah, but we do not know when the sons of Judah were first called Jews.

The following quote gives in terse form a few important facts concerning the celebrated people of Israel:

"Israel . . . (as understood by Hebrews, = striven with God), in the Bible, name given JACOB as eponymous ancestor of the Hebrews, the chosen people of God. The 12 tribes of Israel were named for 10 sons of Jacob (Reuben, Simeon, Judah, Zebulun, Issachar, Dan, Gad, Asher, Naphtali, and Benjamin) and the two sons of Jacob's son Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh); the 13th tribe, Levi (the third of Jacob's sons), was set apart and had no one portion of its own. After the break in the Hebrew kingdom under REHOBOAM the northern kingdom, consisting of all but the tribes of Judah and Benjamin and a number of Levites, was called Israel, while the southern kingdom, composed of these latter elements, was known as Judah" (*The New Columbia Ency.*, 1975 ed., art. "Israel").

Again, note that this article clearly reveals that there was a "northern kingdom" consisting of but *ten tribes*, while the "southern kingdom" was composed of Judah and Benjamin and a number of Levites."

It is hard to understand how so-called students of the Bible can read the historical accounts of the rupture of Israel into two distinct nations, and somehow fail to understand that *Israel* and *Judah* from that day forward remained two distinct peoples. *Israel* (consisting of the "Ten Tribes") first went into captivity in the latter half of the eighth century B.C., and *Judah* was taken captive over a hundred and thirty-five years after *Israel* had been dispersed among the nations. The peoples of these "Ten Tribes" of dispers-

ed Israelites never returned, while a portion of the "Jews" of the kingdom of Judah did return to Palestine, where they lived in the days of Jesus Christ and the twelve apostles.

"The tribes of the north [of Israel] united under Jeroboam, previously one of Solomon's officers, and formed the kingdom of Israel; those of the south, led by Solomon's son Rehoboam, formed the smaller but more strongly united kingdom of Judah. The two kingdoms were constantly threatened during much of the following two centuries (935 B.C.-725 B.C.) as powerful states emerged to the east and west. In 722 B.C., Sargon II captured Samaria, capital of Israel, and most of the Israelites (the LOST TRIBES) were exiled. Judah passed under an Assyrian domination, then under Egyptian, and in 586 B.C., under Babylonian, when the Temple was destroyed and the people were exiled until their return was permitted by CYRUS THE GREAT (538 B.C.)" (*The New Columbia Ency.*, 1975 ed., art. "Jews").

Israel's Captivities as Mentioned in the Cuneiform Inscriptions

A very important archaeological discovery bearing upon the history of the people of Israel in their pre-captivity period is the *Black Obelisk*. Kinns, quoting from the front of the Black Obelisk, says: "The tribute of *Yaua* (Jehu), *son of HUMRI* (Omri): silver, gold, a golden cup, golden vases, golden vessels, golden buckets, lead, a staff for the hand of the Kings, and sceptres, I received" (Kinns, *Graven in the Rock*, p. 494).

A footnote referring to this incident says: "It is possible that the writer of this inscription did not know who Jehu's father was, or he might have meant that he was a royal son or *successor* to Omri, whom he knew to have been a prominent sovereign."

Jehu. On the Black Obelisk, 'Jehu' (=Yaua), 'the son of Omri' (=Khumri), is represented as giving tribute to Shalmaneser II. . . . He was 'son' only as a successor to the throne of Omri the late king. He was the son of Jehosaphat and grandson of Nimshi (Norton, *Bible Students' Handbook of Assyriology*, pp. 105, 106).

The *Black Obelisk* is a black alabaster stone which was set up by Shalmaneser III at Nimrud. On its four sides is inscribed an account of the expeditions undertaken by Shalmaneser during the thirty-one years of his reign, and depicts scenes representing the paying of tribute by the kings whom he had conquered.

*"The description 'son of Khumri' is thought merely to show that Jehu was an Israelite, because Israelitish territory was called 'BIT KHUMRI' " (*A Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities of the British Museum*, pp. 46, 47).

Important Assyrian Inscriptions

(Sargon) the conqueror of the Thamudites, the Ibadites, the Mar-simanites, and the Khapavans, the remainder of whom was carried away and

whom he transported to the midst of the land of *Beth-Omri* (Sayce, *Assyria*, pp. 178-179).

Another extract from this same work, from fragments of the Annals of Tiglath-pileser IV, says:

The towns of *Gilthead* and Abel-(beth-Machah?) on the frontier of *Beth-Omri* [Samaria], the widespread (district of *Naphtali*) to its whole extent I turned into the territory of Assyria. My (governors) and officers I appointed (over them) . . . *The land of Beth-Omri* . . . a collection of its inhabitants (with their goods) I transported to Assyria (*ibid.*, pp. 176, 178).

Here is a further translation from the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser. Luckenbill cites a notable instance of the use of the name *Omri* ("*Bit-Humria*") in *The Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*:

Gala'za(?), Abilakka, which are on the border of *Bit-Humria* (*House of Omri, Israeli*) . . . the wide land of *Naphtali*, in its entirety, I brought within the border of Assyria. The land of *Bit-Humria* . . . all of its people, together with their goods I carried off to Assyria. Pakaha, their king they deposed, and I placed Aasi' (Hosea) over them as king (Series 1926, vol. I, par. 815, 816).

We know the English word for the Hebrew name of the people of Israel as recorded in the Scripture was just simply "Israel," "House of Israel," or the "land of Israel" and similar names. But what name or names did the Gentile nations (the neighbors of Israel) use when referring to the land or to the House of Israel?

This question is very ably answered by Dr. Schrader, in his remarks concerning the Assyrian inscriptions:

Israelites. The name *Israeli* does not occur in the inscriptions as a general term for the *Israelites*. Nor does it, as a rule, appear as the name for the Northern Kingdom. Instead of this the name that is usually employed is *mat Bit-Humri* i.e. *land of the House Omri* . . . (Schrader, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Old Testament*, vol. I, pp. 137, 138).

Israel came into contact with Assyria at a much earlier period, and was in fact tributary to Assyria in the ninth century B.C. (*ibid.*, p. 144).

Israel . . . The usual term for the Kingdom of Israel in the Assyrian inscriptions is not this, as we have already observed. The ordinary designation was rather *Mat Bit-Humri* or *Mat Humri* "land of the house of Omri," or "land of Omri," or merely "Land Omri" (*ibid.*, p. 177).

The translations just cited from Dr. Schrader's book will, it is hoped, suffice to give the reader ample knowledge of the most important cuneiform inscriptions bearing upon the history of the nation of Israel.

Israel's First Invasion

The following cuneiform report from Ashurnasirpal, king of Assyria, indicates the ferocity of the Assyrian army: "I marched from the Orontes . . . I conquered the cities . . . I caused great slaughter, I destroyed, I demolished, I burned. I took their warriors prisoners and impaled them on stakes before their cities. I settled Assyrians in their place . . . I washed my weapons in the Great Sea [Mediterranean]."

The fate which was about to overtake the Northern Kingdom of Israel was not a pleasant one. And the kings of Israel were well aware of the destruction, cruelty, and misery to be wrought by the powerful Assyrian army.

We have seen a number of quotations taken directly from the cuneiform writings excavated in the Middle East, proving the absolute veracity of the scriptural account. Thus again we find the Bible stands completely verified. Let us now go to the historical accounts of the *invasions* and the *deportations* of Israel as found in the Scriptures.

The Kingdom of Israel was invaded on *three different occasions* by the *Assyrian* monarchs. *First in 738 B.C. Pul*, also called Tiglath-pileser, in the reign of Menahem, king of Israel, invaded the northern outskirts of the Kingdom of Israel. Menahem bribed the king of Assyria with a huge sum of 4,000 pounds of silver (II Ki. 15:19). This bribe temporarily, at least, averted the greed of the Assyrian monarch, and he thereupon retired from the land of Israel not having occupied the northern portion which he had invaded: neither did he carry away any Israelitish captives at that time.

The prophet Isaiah was inspired to refer to this *First Invasion* as a "light affliction" on the land of *Zebulun* and the land of *Naphtali* (Isa. 9:1).

The land of these two tribes lay immediately to the west of the Jordan River extending from the northern extremity of the border of Israel down to a point just southwest of the Sea of Galilee. You will find this *First Invasion* of the land of Israel described clearly in II Kings 15:19, 20:

And Pul the king of Assyria came against the land: and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver, to give to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria turned back, and stayed not there in the land.

But the kings of Israel who ruled over the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel (called Samaria) paid little attention to this "light affliction." They still continued in the sins of Jeroboam.

Israel's Second Invasion

Shortly after this, God again sent the Assyrian ruler, Tiglath-pileser, back to the land of Israel, this time to afflict the people of Israel with greater severity. A new king had arisen over the nation of Samaria by the name of Pekah.

And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord: he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. In the days of Pekah king of Israel came *Tiglath-Pileser*, king of Assyria, and took Ijon and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and *Gilead* and *Galilee*, all the land of *Naphtali*, and carried them captive to *Assyria* (II Ki. 15:28,29).

This brief *Second Invasion* of Israel (their first captivity) occurred (according to Ussher) in the year 733-732 B.C.

Notice all of the towns and territories described in the above reference were located in the general territories of the tribes of *Naphtali*, *Gad*, *Reuben*, and the half tribe of *Manasseh* lying east of the *Jordan*. The tribe of *Naphtali* was situated in the extreme northern part of the Kingdom of Israel, and lay immediately to the west of the *Jordan River*, the *Sea of Galilee* and *Lake Hulah*. The one-half tribe of *Manasseh*, and the tribes of *Reuben* and *Gad* were all located immediately east of the *Jordan River* and the *Dead Sea*. This territory had been known as the *land of Bashan* and *Gilead*.

Numerous Scriptures show that the half tribe of *Manasseh*, the tribe of *Gad*, and the tribe of *Reuben* all had their inheritance on the east side of the *Jordan River* (Deut. 29:7,8; Josh. 1:12-15; 12:1-6; 13:7-8).

It is also interesting to note that *Moses* had given this land to these tribes before his decease (Josh. 12:1-6).

If one will follow this *Second Assyrian Invasion*, he will see that the *Assyrian king*, *Tiglath-pileser*, swept down from the north through the northern tribe of *Naphtali* going south to the *Sea of Galilee* where he turned eastward and conquered the three aforementioned tribes lying to the east of the *Dead Sea*, in the region called *Trans-Jordania*.

We are informed that the *tribe of Reuben* prior to the *Assyrian invasions* had extended its territory all the way to the *Euphrates River* (1 Chron. 5:6-9).

Comparison of Biblical and Cuneiform Accounts

Let us now compare the biblical account of this second *Assyrian invasion* (Israel's first captivity) with the *Assyrian's* own *cuneiform* account of this same incident.

The biblical account says: "In the days of *Pekah* king of Israel came *Tiglathpileser* king of *Assyria* and took . . . *Hazor* and *Gilead* and *Galilee*, all the land of *Naphtali*, and carried them captive to *Assyria*" (2 Kings 15:29).

The *Cuneiform Text* of *Tiglathpileser III* reads: "Bet-Omri [meaning the northern Kingdom of Israel] all of whose cities I had added to my territories on my former campaigns, and had left out only the city of *Samaria* . . . The whole of *Naphtali* I took for *Assyria*, I put my officials over them as governors. The land of *Bet-Omri*, all its people and their possessions I took away to *Assyria*." (From: *Western Campaign and Gaza/Damascus* campaign 734-73 B.C.)

The Bible says: "And *Hoshea* . . . made a conspiracy against

Pekah . . . and slew him and reigned in his stead" (2 Kings 15:30).

The cuneiform text reads: "They [the people of Israel—'Bet-Omri'] overthrew Pekah their king and I made Hoshea to be king over them." (From: *Gaza/Damascus* campaign.)

"When the armed hordes of Assyrians withdrew from Palestine they left Israel mortally wounded, smashed to the ground, decimated by deportation, beaten back into a tiny corner of the northern kingdom. . . . All that was left of Israel was a dwarf state, a tiny pinpoint on the map: the mountain of Ephraim with the royal city of Samaria. There lived king Hoshea.

"The southern kingdom of Judah still remained free from foreign domination—for the time being. But it had to pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser III.

"The warlike Assyrian colossus had enclosed in his mighty grip the whole of the 'Fertile Crescent' from the shores of the Persian Gulf, from the mountains of Persia to Asia Minor, from the Mesopotamian plain through Lebanon and Anti-lebanon as far as Palestine. Alone, away to the southwest, the 20 acre royal city of Samaria with its few square miles of hinterland, providing it with corn and barley, was unsubdued" (*The Bible as History*, Keller, p. 241).

Another account of the *Second Invasion* of the ten-tribed northern Kingdom of Israel, or Samaria, is found in the fifth chapter of the book of I Chronicles:

And they [referring to the three tribes living east of the Jordan—i.e. the half tribe of *Manasseh*, the tribe of *Gad*, and the tribe of *Reuben*] transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a whoring after the gods of the people of the land, whom God destroyed before them. And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-pileser [. . . Pul, king of Assyria, even the spirit of Tiglath-pileser . . .], king of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the *Reubenites*, and the *Gadites*, and the half tribe of *Manasseh*, and brought them unto *Halan*, and *Habor*, and *Hara*, and the river *Gozan*, unto this day (I Chron. 5:25, 26).

Before going to the cuneiform inscriptions for verification of the Second Invasion of Israel, let us again recall that this Second Invasion of the land of Israel was a more grievous affliction than the former.

Now let us read again the inspired account of this Second Invasion of Israel: "Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first He [God] lightly afflicted the land of *Zebulun* and the land of *Naphthali*, [referring to the First Invasion] and afterward did more grievously afflict her [the Second Invasion] by way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations" (Isa. 9:1).

Cuneiform Account of the Second Invasion

Again we return to the cuneiform inscriptions where Israel's First Captivity (the Second Invasion) of 733-732 B.C. is mentioned:

"The cities of . . . Gaia'za(?), Abilakka, which are on the border of Bit-Humria . . . the wide land of Naphtali, in its entirety, I brought within the border of Assyria. My official I set over them as governor. . ." (Lukenbill, *The Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. I, p. 292).

The Assyrian account of this invasion of the land of the ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel is as follows:

The land of *Bit-Humria* . . . all of its people, together with all their goods I carried off to Assyria, Pakaha, their king they deposed, and I placed Ausi' (Hoshea) over them as king (*ibid*).

The Assyrian name for Pekah was Pakaha, and their name for Hosea was Ausi.

Israel's Third And Final Invasion

Despite two invasions by the Assyrian monarchs—the first light affliction of Israel, and the second more severe affliction, when a number of the tribes were carried captives to Assyria—the kings of Israel and their people still turned a deaf ear to their God. They could not see the handwriting on the wall. They went on blindly as though no calamity could overtake them. How could such a disaster befall them? Were they not God's "chosen" people?

But whether they knew it or not, the Assyrian king was already plotting the culminating defeat, the complete overthrow of the ten-tribed House of Israel, called Samaria. Israel was about to be invaded by the Assyrians for the third and final time!

The account of this *final deathblow* to Israel, her *Second Captivity* dealt by Assyria, is recorded as follows:

Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to *Samaria*, and besieged it *three years*. In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took *Samaria*, and *carried Israel away into Assyria*, and placed them in *Halah* and in *Habor* by the river *Gozan*, and in the cities of the *Medes* . . . *there was none left but the tribe of Judah only* . . . He . . . *cast them out of His sight*. For He rent Israel from the house of David . . . the Lord *removed Israel out of His sight*. . . . *So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day* (II Ki. 17:5-6, 18-21).

What was the date of this final captivity? The commonly accepted date of this second and final captivity is 721 B.C.

Observe closely who it was that was brought into the land of Israel (Samaria). These Gentiles were still residing there in the time of Christ.

And the king of Assyria brought *men from Babylon* and from *Cuthah* and from *Ava*, and from *Hamath*, and *Sepharaim*, and placed them in the cities of *Samaria* instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed *Samaria*, and dwelt in the cities thereof (II Ki. 17:24).

In the sacred account just quoted, there are a number of important points which should be brought to the attention of the reader. Notice why God let Israel be taken into captivity. They had become very sinful, had degenerated into loathsome and sensuous Babyionish and Phoenician religious practices, and had even caused their sons and daughters to "pass through the fire" (II Ki. 17:17).

Assyria's Deportation Policy

Here is an interesting account of the downfall and final overthrow of the northern Kingdom of Israel:

"After *Jeroboam* died [He was ten-tribed Israel's first king], Israel's political disintegration began almost at once. *Zechariah*, his successor, was murdered after only six months on the throne. *Shallum*, the murderer, was in his turn slain by *Menahem*, who was able to reign for ten years. It was he who was forced to pay Tiglath-pileser III a huge tribute to keep Assyrian soldiers out of the country and to keep the borders intact. *Pekahiah*, Menahem's son, was the victim of yet another overthrow. *Pekah*, his killer and successor, was not so successful in his dealings with the Assyrian monarch. Tiglath-pileser III lopped off Galilee and the Plain of Sharon from Israel. In addition he *deported* many people to the north. It was a rehearsal for worse to come. Yet *Pekah* clung to the throne. With increasing desperation he sought to form an alliance of small states to withstand the onslaught which all knew would come sooner or later. *Rezin* of Damascus joined, but Judah's *Ahaz* refused. *Pekah* and *Rezin* made war on Judah [2 Kings 16:5-9] with the intention of replacing *Ahaz* with someone more amenable to their coalition . . . Israel was to last only a few more years when *Hoshea*, Israel's last king, mounted the throne over *Pekah's* bloodied, assassinated remains" (*Discovering the Biblical world*, Frank, pp. 118, 119).

But God was about to deliver the peoples of the rebellious Kingdom of Israel—the Ten Tribes—over to a cruel oppressor: "*Hoshea* intermittently gave tribute to the Assyrian kings, apparently paying when he felt he had to and withholding on other occasions. In the long run whether or not he paid did not really matter. It was just a matter of an Assyrian king coming along who coveted the riches of Samaria and who wished to be rid of this Israelite flea who occasionally annoyed the Assyrian elephant. *Shalmaneser V* was the king.

"He crashed into Israel, his plume-helmeted soldiers everywhere laying waste to villages, towns, cities, to fields, flocks and to people. Israel was ruined, but Samaria was still there. *Shalmaneser* settled down to besiege the capital city, and the wisdom of *Omri's* choice became clear to all. Suffering was terrible, but the hill of *Shemer* was not breached. Seasons changed; the siege dragged on. And then *Shalmaneser* died. Often in such a circumstance a siege would be lifted until succession to the throne was clear and a new monarch was firmly in control. But on this occasion the transfer of power seemed immediate and smooth. *Sargon II* continued to tighten the noose on *Samaria*. Finally, after three years the city fell, and with it came to an end this strange, violent and occasionally glorious nation of Israel, a nation that

had done so much to bring about its own destruction" (*ibid.*, p. 119).
 What would happen to this unfortunate city—and to this seemingly-cursed people?

"In 2 Kings 17:6 is a simple statement: 'In the ninth year of *Hoshea* the king of Assyria captured *Samaria*, and he carried the Israelites away to Assyria.' Sargon's own records excavated at Khorsabad tell us that he deported 27,290 people and integrated fifty Israelite chariots into his own striking force. . . . They were, in any case, most of the leaders of Israel in every field. It was Assyrian policy to *deport* such peoples from a conquered territory and replace them with the same sort of people from another conquered area. This is the policy Sargon followed now. The leaders of Israel, the TEN TRIBES of the north, were taken and scattered to all parts of the vast Assyrian Empire. They had little opportunity to maintain their identity over the generations. They became 'the TEN LOST TRIBES of Israel'" (*ibid.*, pp. 119, 120).

But, in spite of Israel's divine punishment by going into captivity, the Jews (the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and some of the Levites) of the Southern Kingdom sinned even worse than did Israel. They, too, would soon go into captivity—to Babylon for seventy long years.

Ten-Tribed Israel Lost its Identity

In the year 586 B.C., "the walls of Jerusalem were leveled, and what remained after a year and a half of siege, a month of occupation and terror brought by Nebuzaradan, was put to the torch

"Unmitigated grief was their [the Jews'] companion, and surrounding hills echoed to the lamentations and bitter wailings of those who left behind, witnessed the destruction of the people [and Kingdom] of Judah. The Exile had begun as the Babylonians put into motion their policy of *deporting* captured peoples. . . . There was little in those hot days of the late summer of 586 B.C. on which to base hope. And four years later in 582, when the governor, a Judahite named Gedaliah, was murdered by Judahite extremists the Babylonians were once more upon the land exercising swift justice, taking more into exile and causing still more to flee. Would Judah go the way of [Ten-Tribed] Israel? Like the TEN TRIBES of the north who had been taken into Assyrian exile a century and a half earlier, would it *lose its identity* altogether.

"Judah did survive . . . It was also the beginning of the *Diaspora*, the dispersal of a great body of Jews to places outside of Palestine" (*Discovering the Biblical World*, Frank, pp. 130, 131).

Thus ended the Southern Kingdom of Judah. And though the Ten Tribes of Israel have never returned to their Promised Land to this very day, about 50,000 Jews did return during the days of Ezra, Nehemiah and Zerubabel. "But to the vast disappointment of many there was *no general return* of large numbers of people. On the contrary, our evidence from the *Diaspora* [the dispersal] at this time shows Jewish communities settling more and more into the life of their adopted lands [in Babylon, Egypt, Asia Minor, etc.].

Yet, when trustworthy documents do become available again, the situation around 450 [B.C.] shows that town life is reviving in *Yahud*, as the Persians called the area. But Jerusalem, 'wide and large,' had few people and no new houses (Nehemiah 7:4)" (*ibid.*, p. 144).

The Area To Which Israel Was Deported

Another very important point that should be brought to the reader's attention is mentioned in verse 6 of the previous reference:

"The king of Assyria took Samaria and *carried Israel away* into Assyria, and placed them in *Halah* and in *Habor* by the river of *Gozen*, and in the cities of the Medes."

In connection with this also note verse 23:

"... So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto *this day*." The expression "unto this day" refers to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah who directed the final canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures. This statement proves that the Ten Tribes were still in exile about 400-450 B.C.

If you will consult an accurate map of these times, you will note that *the people of Israel were deported to the lands lying immediately south of the Caucasus mountains and south of the Caspian Sea*. Keep this location in mind as it has a most important bearing upon points which will be mentioned later. (See *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. I, pp. 569-571; *The Imperial Bible Dictionary*, vol. I, pp. 347-350.)

Here is another interesting point:

"And the Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers, until He had *cast them out of His sight*" (II Ki. 17:20).

What is meant by the expression "cast them out of His sight"? Speaking of the Promised Land, the land Israel was to inherit, God had revealed His concern for it in the following words:

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for, *the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it*, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year" (Deut. 11:12).

Notice that this Scripture shows the eyes of God are always on the Promised Land. When Israel was removed from this land, God spoke as though they were removed out of His sight.

Ezekiel was inspired by God to write the following comment concerning Israel's captivity:

I scattered them among the heathen, and they were dispersed through the countries; according to their way and according to their doings, I judged them. And when they entered unto the heathen, whither they went, they profaned My Holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land (Ezek. 36:16-20).

The nineteenth verse just quoted is of special importance. It says that God had "scattered Israel among the heathen" and "dispersed them through the countries." Keep this fact in mind as we later go through some of the

historical sources following the footsteps of Israel from the time they left their ancient homeland in Palestine until they reached their modern-day lands.

We have already observed that the people of the northern ten-tribed Kingdom of Israel were in the biblical account called "Israel," "Kingdom of Israel," or "House of Israel," whereas the people of the southern Kingdom of Judah were called "Jews," "Judah," or the "Kingdom of Judah."

The people of the *northern* Kingdom were *never called* Jews! The people of the southern Kingdom were, however, sometimes still called Israelites. But there is not one instance in sacred or secular history where the northern Ten Tribes of Israel were (as a nation) ever called Jews.

The Population of Israel in 738-721 B.C.

The population of Israel at the time of the Exodus from Egypt was undoubtedly somewhere around three millions. The Twelve Tribes of Israel inhabited the Promised Land circa 1451 B.C. They remained in this land for about 730 years before finally being taken captive. (Remember also that they were a very prolific people.)

How many Israelites were in Palestine when the Assyrian kings began the captivities or deportation of this people? (For further comments regarding Israel's population in 741-721 B.C., see: *The Expository Times*, vol. IX, p. 168.)

Population of City of Samaria

Let us now notice a few significant statements from Salo Baron in regard to the population of the Jews.

During the Eichmann trial held in Israel in 1961 Baron testified against Eichmann by giving some astounding figures regarding the Jewish population and their slaughter by the Nazis in World War II.

The London *Daily Express* of April 25th, 1961, referred to Salo Baron as "Professor Salo Baron, reputed to be the world's greatest living authority on Jewish history. . . ."

In his book, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Baron, speaking of the Israelitish captivity by Assyria, says:

The 27,290 deported from [the city of] Samaria in 721, mentioned in the well-known inscriptions of Sargon, represent only a fraction of the Israelitic exiles. We must add not only a number of women and children who accompanied them but, in all probability, unrecorded further groups deported in 734-733, and perhaps 720. Similarly Sennacherib's boast about the effects of his campaign against Judah in 701, "200,150 people, small and great . . . brought out of their midst and counted as booty," whether or not absolutely accurate, reflects a large-scale involuntary expatriation (vol. I, p. 95).

Professor Baron says, "There were not less than four hundred settlements classified as towns" in the land of Israel prior to the Assyrian captivity of 721 B.C. (*ibid.*, vol. I, p. 72).

Since Sennacherib deported "200,150 people small and great" in "his campaign against *Judah* in 701" this proves that there must have been a few million Jews at that time, for it would appear that the bulk of the Jewish population was left intact and was carried into captivity over 100 years later by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

Recall that this *Assyrian* invasion of *Judah* occurred in 701 B.C., or 20 years after the remnant of ten-tribed Israel had gone into captivity. And yet after myriads were slaughtered and 200,150 were deported there must have been many hundreds of thousands of Jews living in Palestine at the time of the Babylonish invasions of 604-585 B.C.

This further proves that the small southern Kingdom of Judah must have had at least two or three millions of inhabitants prior to the Assyrian invasions. Consequently *the northern Kingdom of Israel* (composed of not two, but ten tribes) *must have easily contained a population of five to seven million or more at the time of the beginning of the overthrow of Israel by Assyria* in 738-721 B.C.

According to reliable estimates there were somewhere around 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 or more people in Israel and Judah prior to their captivity. The Promised Land was formerly a "land flowing with milk and honey" and could have easily supported this number (Ex. 3:8; Lev. 20:24). Also remember that the population of the United States increased from 7,000,000 to about 170,000,000 in a period of 150 years—A.D. 1800-1950.

It was after this land vomited out these rebels that God turned it into a desolation. Since the small family of Israel grew from 70 people to about 3,000,000 in a short period of 240 years while in the land of Egypt, it is probable that there were even more than 7,000,000 people in the land of Palestine just before Israel's deportations. From the time that Israel occupied the Promised Land until the captivity encompassed about 730 years.

38

Chapter Four

The Land of Israel's Captivity

In our search for the Lost Ten Tribes we have seen that the scriptural account shows the people of Israel were taken into captivity by the Assyrians to the land of the Medes and the Assyrians. Any reliable map showing the lands of Media and of Assyria for this period, will reveal that these two territories were located *south of the Caucasus Mountains, southeast of the Black Sea, and south to southwest of the Caspian Sea*. It is very important to keep the general location of this territory in mind because later it will be shown that all of the modern nations of northwest Europe comprising most of the so-called "Nordic races" came from this very area of the Caucasus in Asia.

Also bear in mind that the remnant of the northern ten-tribed House of Israel were finally invaded and conquered in the year 721 B.C., or perhaps as late as 718 B.C. The exact date is not of any great importance in this instance.

But the southern Kingdom of Judah was not conquered and deported to Babylon until circa 585 B.C., when Nebuchadnezzar at last beat down the walls of Jerusalem and completely demolished the city, killed many of the Jews and took the remainder, except the poorest of the land, to Babylon. Remember, *Babylon lay to the east of Palestine. Israel had been taken to an area north of Babylon 130 years before the Jewish captivity*. The Bible and secular history both show that the Ten Tribes of Israel never mingled to any great extent with the exiles of Judah. The peoples of these two distinct captivities remained separate.

The Jews remained in the Babylonish captivity for 70 years. After this time God stirred up the hearts of the Persian kings, Cyrus and Darius the Great and others who issued three different decrees (536 B.C., 457 B.C., 444 B.C.) permitting the Jews to go back to Jerusalem to build their Temple and to re-establish the Jewish nation (Halley, *Bible Handbook*, p. 312).

There were about 50,000 Jews who returned from the Babylonish captivity (Ezra 2:64; Neh. 7:66), plus about 1,000 priests and Levites who returned with Ezra to set up the Temple worship.

Only Judah and Benjamin Return

Did any from the Ten Tribes of Israel return to Judah in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah? Here is the answer from the Bible:

✓
falses

Now when the adversaries of *Judah* and *Benjamin* heard that the children of the captivity builded the Temple of the Lord God of Israel, then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto Him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur, which brought us up hither (Ezra 4:1, 2).

Did you notice that only *Judah* and *Benjamin* were mentioned as having returned to Jerusalem?

"Then all the men of *Judah* and *Benjamin* gathered themselves together unto Jerusalem within three days . . ." (*ibid.*, 10:9).

Notice again that only the two tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin* were mentioned as having returned to the Holy Land at that time. Does this not prove that there were no other tribes present, except as we shall see later *some of the Levites*? In the book of Ezra, the Levites are mentioned about twenty-one times; and in the book of Nehemiah they are mentioned over forty times. These numerous references to the Levites prove that many of the Levites returned with their Jewish brethren from the Babylonish captivity to the land of Judah.

A casual perusal of all the biblical and historical material regarding those who returned from Babylon, will show that only a small portion even of the Jews returned to Palestine at that time. Most of the Jewish people remained either at Babylon, Alexandria, Egypt, or else were left scattered throughout the provinces of the Persian Empire.

The Apostle Peter was inspired to write:

The [Jewish] Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you" (I Pet. 5:13).

The Apostle Paul shows that the gospel of (or to) the circumcision had been committed to Peter, whereas the gospel of the uncircumcision had been committed to him, Paul (Gal. 2:7). Peter was the one in charge of the dissemination of the gospel to those who were circumcised, that is, he was sent primarily to the *Jews*. Paul was commissioned to oversee the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles.

We know from historical sources that many Jews remained in Babylon. Some estimate the Jewish population to be over 1,000,000 at Babylon in the time of Christ. The church which Peter mentioned at Babylon was undoubtedly a Jewish church primarily.

Since there must have been at least 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 Israelites inhabiting the territories of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah just prior to their deportations, just how many were there in the northern ten-tribed House of Israel at that time?

The southern Kingdom of Judah, remember, was comprised of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and undoubtedly the majority of the Levites. Taking all of these into account, the Kingdom of Judah may well have contained two or three million inhabitants at the time of the Jewish captivity (586 B.C.), and the northern Kingdom of Israel must have had a population of at least 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 at the time of her captivity by Assyria.

Such a computation seems well justified judging by *David's census* (I

Chron. 21:5). *According to that census, there were 1,570,000 "men-at-arms" in Israel and Judah, and this did not include the tribes of Benjamin and Levi!*

King David's Important Census

The most important and most controversial military census in the history of ancient Israel was commanded by King David, and was carried out by the top general of His army, Joab.

"And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number (take a military census of) Israel.

"And David said to Joab, and to the rulers of the People, 'Go number Israel from Beersheba even to Dan; and bring the number of them to me, that I may know it.' " (I Chron. 21:1,2).

". . . Wherefore Joab departed, and went throughout all Israel, and came to Jerusalem. And Joab gave the sum of the number of the People unto David. And all they of *Israel* (i.e. the able-bodied fighting men from about 20 to 50 years old) were a thousand thousand and an hundred thousand *men that drew sword*: and *Judah* was four hundred threescore and ten thousand men that drew sword. But (the tribes of) Levi and Benjamin counted he not among them: for the king's word was abominable to Joab" (vv. 4-6).

Carefully note that Joab took a census of all the able-bodied men of *Israel* who were able to bear arms and it came to 1,100,000. plus 470,000 men of "*Judah . . . that drew sword.*" At that time (the middle of the 11th century B.C.) the total number of "men that drew sword" in both "Israel" and Judah" came to 1,570,000!

This account of the fighting men of Israel in David's time is a little clearer in the Moffatt translation:

"So Job retired; he went all over Israel and then came back to Jerusalem. Joab reported to David the total number of the people who had been *registered* (for military service); all in *Israel* amounted to one million one hundred thousand men-at-arms, while *Judah* numbered four hundred and seventy thousand men-at-arms" (I Chron. 21:4-6).

Bear these important points in mind. Israel and Judah had a combined army of well over a million and a half men during the time of King David's reign—approximately three centuries before Israel was taken into captivity by king Shalmaneser of Assyria in 721 B.C.

Some may think this is too high a population figure, but we must remember that the greatly-reduced land of Israel today supports nearly three million. The total area of ancient Israel was several times larger than it is today. And we also need to remember that the "Promised Land" was at that time a land "flowing with milk and honey." Though the modern country of "Israel" is relatively productive, it is undoubtedly not nearly so productive as it once was.

Why is King David's census (conducted in the 11th century B.C.) so important? Simply because his royal military census reveals that the people of Israel had become very populous by the time of David. They may have been

40

even more populous by the time of Israel's captivity—a little over three centuries later.

It is very important to keep this in mind, for there are those who foolishly assume that the population of Israel only amounted to perhaps a few million, or less, at the time when the Assyrians deported the main bulk of the Ten Tribes into the general area of modern-day Iraq and Iran.

Since the population of Israel in 721 B.C. must have been at least seven to ten million—we need to ask: “Just what happened to those teeming millions?” Later, we shall see that the very time of Israel's captivity, or shortly thereafter, is the precise time in history when certain hitherto unknown “tribes” (Scythians, Sacae, Cimmerians) burst upon the world scene.

Since there were one million, five hundred and seventy thousand able-bodied “men-at-arms” in *Israel and Judah* in David's time, there may have been seven to ten million people living in all Israel at that time. It would be rare indeed for any nation to have one-tenth of its total population eligible for military service at any given time! And remember, this was *about 300 years before Israel was taken captive!*

Putting all of these points together, one cannot help but conclude that Israel's population (excluding the people of the Kingdom of Judah) *must have been at least five to seven millions by 733-732 B.C.*—the beginning of Israel's captivities!

The Dispersion

In the 7th chapter of the gospel of John is recorded a very interesting conversation between Christ and the Jews. Christ had spoken about going to a place which would be inaccessible to the Jews. He was, of course, referring to heaven. But the Jews, misunderstanding Him, said: “Will He go unto the *dispersed* among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?” (v. 35).

Who were the dispersed (Gk. *diaspora*)?

Dr. Bullinger gives the following note regarding the *diaspora*. “*Dispersed* (The) *Diaspora*, *dispersion*, (occ. James i, 1, and 1 Pet. i, 1) . . . John vii, 35.” (*A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek Testament*, 8th ed., p. 228.)

Remember, we have already seen that when Israel sinned against their God, He solemnly declared, “Wherefore I poured my fury upon them for the blood that they had shed upon the land, and for their idols wherewith they had polluted it: and I *scattered* them among the heathen, and they were *dispersed* through the countries . . .” (Ezek. 36:18, 19).

Who were the ones who were to be “dispersed through the countries”? Only the Jews? No, God says *Israel* had been *scattered* and *dispersed* among the Gentile peoples. The Jews only comprised the people inhabiting the small *southern* Kingdom in Palestine; whereas the ten-tribed House of Israel inhabited the *northern* part of the Promised Land. Also bear in mind that the House of Israel were carried into captivity, some in 733-732, and the remainder in 721 B.C. The Jews were taken captive to Babylon circa 604-586 B.C.

This Greek word "diaspora" referred to all of the Israelites which were dispersed or scattered throughout the whole world. The overwhelming majority of the dispersed ones at this time were Israelites from the "House of Israel."

The Twelve Tribes Scattered Abroad

Few have ever noticed that the Apostle James wrote an epistle to the dispersed tribes of Israel. "James a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, *to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting*" (Jas. 1:1). The Revised Standard Version and the Moffatt translation render this verse as follows: "*To the twelve tribes in the dispersion.*"

This epistle of James was *not* addressed to an individual, or a church, or the "elect," or the "saints," but it was written to "*the twelve tribes in the dispersion.*" Nearly every other epistle in the entire New Testament is addressed to a particular church, or to the "saints" of a particular city such as Rome, Corinth, or Ephesus, or to some particular individual, such as Timothy, or Titus. The epistle of James was not written to the saints primarily, but to the unconverted Twelve Tribes of Israel.

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members" (Jas. 4:1). Notice that James is not speaking of saints warring among themselves. They would not have been "saints" had they literally been fighting among themselves! He was referring to carnal-minded Israelites!

Should We Seek the "Lost Sheep"?

Some express the erroneous opinion that it is wrong to be concerned about the present-day whereabouts of the people of Israel. They would not hold such a view if they realized how much of the Bible is devoted to prophecy directly concerning the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel—whoever they may be! The Bible clearly reveals that certain blessings were to accrue to these "lost sheep" in the "last days," only to be followed by a great national calamity of unparalleled proportions brought on them because of their ingratitude and disobedience (Jer. 30:7).

Let us see what Christ thought about this subject. In the great commission to the twelve disciples, as recorded in Matthew, chapter 10, we find Christ giving the following charge: "Go not into the way of the *Gentiles*, and into any city of the *Samaritans* enter ye not. But go rather to the *lost sheep of the house of Israel*" (Matt. 10:5,6).

The Two-Faced Samaritans—Israelites?

Who were the Samaritans? Huxley and Haddon show that "the blood-groups of the Samaritans show no affinity to those of the Hebrews" (*We Europeans*, p. 186).

The present-day Samaritans, according to their blood groups, are not closely related to the Hebrews. Who were the Samaritans who lived in

42

Samaria in the time of Christ?

According to II Kings 17:24, they were Gentiles, who had replaced the Israelites. We are informed that the King of Assyria brought men from *Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, and from Sepharvaim*, and placed them in "the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel."

Josephus informs us that these Samaritans were two-faced. They claimed kinship to the Jews only when it would be to their advantage. When the Jews fell into disrepute, the Samaritans disclaimed any racial affinity with them.

But now the Cutheans, who removed into Samaria . . . are called in the Hebrew tongue Cutheans, but in the Greek tongue Samaritans. And when they see the Jews in prosperity, they pretend that they are changed, and allied to them, and call them kinsmen, *as though they were derived from Joseph*, and had by that means an original alliance with them; but when they see them falling into a low condition, they say they are no way related to them, and that the Jews have no right to expect any kindness or marks of kindred from them, but they declare that they are sojourners, that come from other countries (*Ant. bk., IX, chap. XIV, sec. 3*).

In Christ's day, the Jews had "no dealings with the Samaritans" (John 4:9).

Now let us return to Matthew 10:5, 6. Notice Christ told the disciples not to go into any city of the Samaritans (because they sometimes claimed they were Israelites even though they were not)—neither were they to go into the way of the Gentiles.

Who were the Gentiles? The word "Gentile" in the Hebrew and Greek languages simply means "nations"—including, of course, all of the nations outside of "*the nation of Israel*."

Also notice that Christ told the apostles to go to "*the lost sheep of the House of Israel*."

The Palestinian Jews were not lost in the physical sense. Neither were their Jewish brethren lost who were scattered through the world. The Jews have always retained many of their customs, traditions and laws, such as the observance of the weekly and annual sabbaths, and their dietary regulations which prohibit the use of blood, fat, or unclean meats. (See Lev. 3:17; 11:1-31.) Their observance of the sabbath has kept them from being lost wherever they have gone (Ex. 31:13-17). Remember, *the Jews have been scattered, but never have they been "lost"* so far as their racial identity is concerned.

Who were the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" referred to by Christ?

In the *spiritual* sense, all Israelites (of both the houses of Judah and Israel) were "lost."

For, "all we like sheep have gone astray" (Isa. 53:6).

But . . . in the *physical* sense, the Jews were not lost. Since they kept God's Sabbaths, their racial identity was never lost. However, the fleshly, physical descendants of Ten-Tribed Israel had been "lost" for centuries by Christ's time.

43

The Twelve Apostles sent out by Jesus Christ went first to the spiritually "lost" of Judah—to the Jews.

Later, however, after Pentecost, the Apostles went out to the spiritually "lost" people of Israel who were also "lost" to the world in the physical sense. History and tradition reveal that the Twelve Apostles did go to the physically (and spiritually) "lost" sheep of the "Lost Ten Tribes of Israel" in the years following the establishment of God's Church on Pentecost in 31 A.D.

Christ told His disciples to go to these "lost sheep." Jesus certainly knew the whereabouts of the dispersed people of Israel at that time, even though they were undoubtedly "lost" so far as most people were concerned. The apostles would have to find the "lost sheep" before they could go to them and teach them.

God Searches Out His Sheep

In the 34th chapter of Ezekiel, God solemnly indicts the "shepherds (pastors or ministers) of Israel" for a number of things which they have neglected to do, including their neglect in searching out "that which was lost."

Son of man, prophesy . . . and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds. Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? . . . *neither have ye sought that which was lost*; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. My sheep *wandered* through all the mountains, and upon every high hill: yea, my flock was *scattered* upon all the face of the earth, and *none did search or seek after them* (Ezek. 34:2, 4, 6).

Yes, God himself will search for His lost sheep.

In verses 9 and 10 God shows that He is "against the shepherds." "I, even I, *will both search my sheep, and seek them out*" (v. 11). When will God seek out His sheep? This will occur at the Second Coming of Christ. God shows that at that time David will be resurrected to become their shepherd (v. 23).

The clergy stand foremost in the ranks of those who oppose the truth regarding the identity of modern-day Israel. They are often intolerant toward anyone who does have the concern, or the zeal to *seek out* the "lost sheep of the House of Israel."

Now we should clearly understand the importance of tracing historically the people of Israel from the time of their captivity in 733-732 and 721 B.C., throughout their dispersion and wanderings through the countries, and finally to their present-day national homelands.

What Became of These Teeming Millions?

We have seen that there must have been at least 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 Israelites dwelling in the northern Kingdom of Israel at the time when the Ten Tribes were taken into captivity.

We now come to the most important question of all—“*Just what happened to those multiple millions of Israelites who were taken bodily from their own homeland in Samaria and were transported into the lands of Media and Assyria—just south of the Caucasus Mountains, to the area of the southern shores of the Caspian Sea?*” Yes, just *what happened to these teeming millions of prolific Israelites?*

This is a question which has perplexed countless millions down through the ages and has baffled Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish theologians as well.

Let us notice what Graetz, a prominent Jewish historian, has to say on this question of the “Lost Ten Tribes of Israel:”

The kingdom of the Ten Tribes, of Israel, had existed for two centuries and a half . . . but in one day it disappeared, leaving no trace behind. The country vomited out the Ten Tribes, as it had vomited out the Canaanitish tribes. What has become of them? They have been looked for and believed to have been discovered in the distant East as well as in the far West. Cheats and dreamers have claimed to be descended from them. *But there can be no doubt that the Ten Tribes have been irretrievably lost among the nations* (Graetz, *History of the Jews*, vol. 1, p. 265).

Do not millions erroneously hold the same view which Graetz has expressed? Many believe that “the Ten Tribes have been *irretrievably lost* among the nations.” Such a view, however, is incompatible with the facts!

Next let us notice what the *Jewish Encyclopedia* has to say on this most vital question of just what happened to the myriads of Israelites who were deported from the northern Kingdom of Samaria in 733-732 and 721 B.C.:

TRIBES, LOST TEN . . . As a large number of prophecies relate to the return of “Israel” to the Holy Land, believers in the literal inspiration of the Scriptures have always labored under a difficulty in regard to the continued existence of the tribes of Israel, with the exception of those of Judah and Levi, which returned with Ezra and Nehemiah. *If the Ten Tribes have disappeared, the literal fulfilment of the prophecies would be impossible: if they have not disappeared, obviously they must exist under a different name* (*ibid.*, p. 249).

First, note carefully the significance of the foregoing statements. It is true that (as stated) many prophecies speak of *Israel* and *Judah* (Ezek. 37:15-22; Jer. 3:18; 51:15).

Secondly, note that God’s Word is at stake on this matter of whether the Ten Tribes still exist: “If the Ten Tribes have disappeared, the literal fulfilment of the prophecies would be impossible.” But remember, the Scripture cannot be broken (John. 10:35; Tit. 1:2).

Thirdly, notice that “If they [the Lost Ten Tribes] have not disappeared, obviously they must exist under a different name.” And that is precisely the case—they *do exist under a different name!* How else could they be “lost” if everyone *knew* their identity?

(F)

Confusion About Identity of Lost Ten Tribes

In the Apocrypha it is presumed that the TEN TRIBES still exist as tribes. Thus Tobit is stated to be of the tribe of Naphtali, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs assume their continuous existence. In the Fourth Book of Ezra (xiii. 39-45) it is declared that the Ten Tribes were carried by Hosea, king in the time of Shalmaneser, to the Euphrates, at the narrow passages of the river, whence they went on for a journey of a year and a half to a place called Arzareth (*Jewish Ency.*, p. 249).

The article then mentions all of the places or countries where the Lost Ten Tribes have supposedly been located: North Arabia, India, Abyssinia, Persia, Yemen, Armenia, Afghanistan, South Russia, China, the Sahara, Japan, Australia, Peru, Mexico, North America (the aborigines), and Denmark. According to this article, the *Lost Ten Tribes* are identified with the "English," the "Teutonic race," with the "Sacae," (or *Scythians*), and with the "*Tuatha da Danaun*" of Irish tradition (*ibid.*, pp. 249-252).

In fact, there is hardly any people who have not, at one time or another, been identified with the "Lost Ten Tribes." The great arch-deceiver, Satan, has caused this confusion in order to keep this knowledge lost to modern-day Israel. Also such confusion on this vital subject has caused people to scoff at the real truth.

G. Moore, indeed, attempts to prove that the high-class Hindus, including all the Buddhists, are descendants of the *Sacae*, or *Scythians*, who again, were the Lost Ten Tribes (*ibid.*, p. 250).

Later, we shall see conclusive proof that the *Sacae* and the *Scythians* were included in the dispersed tribes of Israel. We will see that the *Sacae* and *Scythians* settled in northwest Europe—and not in the Orient!

The identification of the *Sacae*, or *Scythian* with the *Ten Tribes* because they appear in history at the same time, and very nearly in the same place, as the Israelites removed by Shalmaneser, is one of the chief supports of the theory which identifies the *English people*, and indeed the whole *Teutonic race*, with the *Ten Tribes*. *Dan* is identified sometimes with *Denmark*, and sometimes with the *Tuatha da Danaun* of Irish tradition (*ibid.*, p. 250).

This last admission is of utmost importance. One of the "chief supports" of the "identification of the *Sacae*, or *Scythians* with the *Ten Tribes*" is that these *Sacae* or *Scythians* "appear in history at the same time, and very nearly in the same place." *The Sacae or Scythians do not appear in history before Israel's captivity. But they do appear in the areas of the Black and Caspian Seas, shortly after Israel was deported to those same general regions.*

The *Scythians* are generally found a little further north than Israel was located at the time of her deportation to *Assyria* and *Media*, and the *Sacae* (a *Scythian* branch) had moved from the southern shore of the Caspian Sea (the land of their captivity) to the districts lying east of the Caspian.

125

Also bear in mind that this article in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* mentions that the "English people," "the whole Teutonic race," "Denmark," and the "Tuatha da Danaun" are all identified with the *Lost Ten Tribes*.

We shall shortly see abundant historical proof showing that the Anglo-Saxons, and the proper Teutons, the Celts, Gauls, Cimbri and the other peoples who settled in northwest Europe are all descendants of the "dispersed" and "scattered" Lost Ten Tribes of Israel.

It will also be shown that the words "Teutoni" and "Germani" were first applied to Celtic tribes who were in no way Alpine-type Germans. These true Teutoni and Celts are no longer found in Germany in any appreciable numbers!

This same article in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* then goes on to mention that more literature has been written on the identification of the English as Israel ("Anglo-Israelite") than any other.

The second most publicised belief is that which identifies the *American Indians* as the descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. Joseph Smith held this view, and propounded it in the *Book of Mormon*. (See 1920 ed., pp. 22, 429-432.)

American Indians from Japheth

The following facts clearly reveal that the American Indians are not, and indeed could not be, the descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel, who had descended from SHEM. The American Indians are descendants of JAPHETH, the brother of Shem and Ham. JAPHETH is the father of the MONGOLOIDS!

"Racial Origins. According to the evidence now available, the ancestors of the *American Indians* came into the Western Hemisphere from Asia . . . The most probable route was by way of the Bering Strait region; other avenues of entry may have been used, but it is likely that the bulk of migrants came in through what is now *Alaska* and slowly spread across North America and from there into Central and South America.

"Physical Characteristics. In physical features the American Indians bear out their affinity with Asia. *The physical characteristics common to all American Indians also are common to the Mongoloid peoples of Asia, hence American Indians are classed as part of the Mongoloid racial group.* Although frequently called 'redskins,' the typical skin color is a medium brown, and is red only when so painted. The hair on the face and on the body is sparse, the hair on the head is straight, or occasionally slightly wavy. Both hair and eyes are dark and the face is large and broad with *high cheekbones*. These are the features common to *all*; beyond that there is great diversity. Some groups are tall, as are many of the tribesmen of the Mississippi Valley; Others are short; some are long-headed, though more are *round-headed*; the Mongoloid fold of the eye [the slant eye] is found among some individuals in all tribes, but it occurs in a much higher proportion of some tribes than of others" (*Collier's Encyclopedia*, 1959 ed., vol. 10, art. "Indian Tribes, North American").

Clearly, the facts as given in the Bible, as well as the facts of history, archaeology, and other evidence all prove that the American Indians (as Mongoloids) are *not* descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel—for the Israelites were the offspring of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob through Noah's son, Shem. With these facts in mind, we need not waste our time looking for the Lost Ten Tribes among the aboriginal Indian tribes of the Americas.

American Indians Not the Lost Tribes

The following references from the *Book of Mormon*, are believed by the Mormons to indicate that the American Indians have descended from the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel, and were therefore "brethren" to the Jews who were living in Palestine in the days of Christ's human existence.

"And I looked and beheld a man (Jesus Christ) . . . and he went forth upon the many waters, even unto the seed of *my brethren* (the American Indians), who were in the *promised land* (living in what is now the U.S.)" (1 NEPHI, chap. 13).

"And I beheld the wrath of God, that it was upon the seed of my brethren (the American Indians); and they (the Indians) were scattered before the Gentiles (meaning the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic colonists in America) and were smitten." (ibid.)

This text (and others as found in the 13th chapter) from the *Book of Mormon* are supposed to reveal that the American Indians, as descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes, would be afflicted and defeated by the so-called Gentile "white" peoples from Europe who colonized what is now the U.S. and Canada.

But the facts of the Bible, secular history, archaeology and scientific investigation all reveal that the majority of the Indian tribes living in North, Central and South America have descended from *Japheth*, and *not* from *Shem*. Their physical features of most of the American Indians as well as their blood type all reveal that they are closely related to the Mongoloid tribes of the Orient. The American Indians are clearly *not* the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel!

Goldsby definitely classifies the American Indians among the "Mongoloids"—"American Indians—the indigenous populations of North, South, and Central America." They are listed along with the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Indonesians, Mongolians, Vietnamese, Tibetans and others (*Race and Races*, Goldsby, pp. 31-35).

There are many reasons why we know the American Indians and the orientals, etc., are not descendants of Israel. These descendants of Japheth have not been the recipients of the promises made to the Fathers, as have the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples!

"The Anglo-Israelite Theory"—or Fact?

"Lost tribes, 10 Jewish tribes (not "Jewish" but "Israelitish") that, according to the Bible, were transported to Assyria by Tiglathpileser III or Shalmaneser after the conquest of Israel. Numerous conjectures have been

advanced as to the fate of these tribes: they have been identified with the people of *Arabia, India, Ethiopia, and America* (North Central, South) and with other groups, including the *Nestorians* of Mesopotamia, the *Afghans*, the high-caste *Hindus*, and the holy *Shindai* class of Japan. The *Anglo-Israelite theory*, still maintained by some, identifies the *English* people with the LOST TRIBES; it was, in the 17th cent., a factor in helping the Jews to reenter England. The identification of the *North American Indians* with the *10 lost tribes* figured in the writings of the early New England Christian theologians" (*The New Columbia Encyclopedia*, 3rd ed., art. "lost tribes").

Speaking of the Lost Ten Tribes, Josephus says: "the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country, wherefore there are but *two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans*, while *the ten tribes are beyond Euphrates* till now, and are *an immense multitude*, and not to be estimated by numbers" (*Ant. XI., v., sec. 2*).

Josephus shows the Ten Tribes were "an immense multitude" in his day, and were not subject to the Romans. Only "two tribes" were subject to Rome. The Ten Tribes had certainly not returned to Palestine in Josephus' time. He was born about A.D. 37 and died circa A.D. 100 (*Webster's Biographical Dictionary*, art., "Josephus," p. 795).

Keller proceeds to express a personal opinion more-or-less commonly held by people concerning this question of just what happened to the Lost Ten Tribes of the House of Israel. He says:

The people of *the Northern Kingdom* and their Kings with them *disappeared*, were absorbed into the population of these foreign lands, and never emerged again in history. *All investigation into what became of the ten tribes who had their home there has so far come to nothing* (*The Bible as History*, p. 247).

But is such a view tenable, even though it is accepted by countless millions—especially in the face of the overwhelming flood of archaeological and historical material which is at our disposal today?

Is it feasible to believe that this populous people of Israel lost their identity and became amalgamated among the nations where they went? Small nations such as Ethiopia, Libya, Greece, Syria, Arabia, and other have continued to maintain their national identities throughout the centuries to the very present time.

The Ten Tribes Never Returned

Jerome shows the Ten Tribes inhabited the cities and mountains of the Medes ("Opera," vi, 780). Kitto also mentions that the Ten Tribes never returned.

The captives of [the ten-tribed] *Israel* exiled beyond the *Euphrates* did not return as a whole to *Palestine* along with their brethren the captives of *Judah*; at least there is no mention made of this event in the documents at our disposal (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. I, p. 15).

In fact, *the return of the Ten Tribes was one of the great promises of the Prophets, and the advent of the Messiah is therefore necessarily identified with the epic of their redemption (ibid., p. 17).*

The hope of *the return of the Ten Tribes* has never ceased among the Jews in exile. . . . This hope has been connected with every Messianic rising (*ibid.*, p. 21).

Edersheim says it is of the "greatest importance" to remember that only a "minority of the Jews" (about 50,000) returned from Babylon—in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (*The Life and Time of Jesus the Messiah*, p. 8).

In what has been said, no notice has been taken of those wanderers of the *Ten Tribes*, whose trackless footsteps seem as mysterious as their after-fate. . . . Josephus describes them as *an innumerable multitude*, and vaguely locates them beyond the Euphrates Still *the great mass of the Ten Tribes was in the days of Christ*, as in our own, *lost to the Hebrew nation (ibid., pp. 14-16).*

These statements from leading Jewish and other authorities will suffice to show the utmost *confusion* in the minds of historians generally, whether they be of Jewish or Gentile origin, regarding the whereabouts of the "Lost Ten Tribes of Israel."

They are, however, pretty well agreed that Israel has been "irretrievably lost."

In the *Jewish Chronicle* of May 2nd, 1897, we read:

The Scriptures speak of a future restoration of Israel, which is clearly to include both Judah and Ephraim (or Israel). The problem, then, is reduced to its simplest form. *The Ten Tribes are certainly in existence. All that has to be done is to discover which people represent them.*

Josephus' Comments on the "Ten Tribes"

Flavius Josephus gives additional details concerning Israel's captivity by the Assyrians in 721 B.C.

"When Shalmaneser, the king of Assyria, had it told him, that [Hoshea] the king of Israel had sent privately to So, the king of Egypt, desiring his assistance against him, he was very angry, and made an expedition against Samaria, in the seventh year of the reign of Hoseha; but when he was not admitted [into the city] by the king, he besieged Samaria three years, and took it by force in the ninth year of the reign of Hoshea, and in the seventh year of Hezekiah, king of Jerusalem, and quite demolished the government of the Israelites, and transplanted all the people into *Media* and *Persia*, among whom he took king Hoshea alive; and when he had removed these people out of this land, he transplanted other nations out of Cuthah, a place so called, [for there is (still) a river of that name in Persia,] into Samaria, and into the country of the Israelites.

"So the *ten tribes* of the Israelites were removed out of Judea [the land

of Israel], nine hundred and forty-seven years after their forefathers were come out of the land of Egypt, and possessed themselves of this country, but eight hundred years after Joshua had been their leader, and, as I have already observed, two hundred and forty years, seven months, and seven days, after they had revolted from Rehoboam, the grandson of David, and had given the kingdom to Jeroboam. And such a conclusion overtook the Israelites, [of the "Ten Tribes"], when they had transgressed the laws, and would not hearken to the prophets, who foretold that this calamity would come upon them, if they would not leave off their evil doings."

(*Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, book IX, chap. XIV, para 1*).

Josephus also relates the circumstances of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Judah, of the destruction of the Temple and of the city of Jerusalem [in B.C. 586]. He tells us that a few Jews, the remnant including King Zedekiah's daughters and Jeremiah the prophet, were taken to Egypt by Johanan, governor of the remnant of the Jews living in the land of Judah, after Nebuchadnezzar destroyed that sinful kingdom.

The "Ten Tribes" vs. The "Two Tribes"

But when king Nebuchadnezzar invaded Egypt shortly afterward, "he took those Jews that were there captives, and led them away to Babylon; and such was the end of the nation of the Hebrews, as it hath been delivered down to us, it having *twice* gone beyond Euphrates; for the people of the *ten tribes* were carried out of Samaria by the Assyrians in the days of king Hosea; after which the people of the *two tribes* that remained after Jerusalem was taken [were carried away] by Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon and Chaldea. Now as to Shalmanezar, he *removed the Israelites* [the Ten Tribes] out of their country, and placed therein the nation of the Cutheans, who had formerly belonged to the inner parts of *Persia* and *Media*, but were then called *Samaritans*, by taking the name of the country to which they were removed; but the king of Babylon, who brought out the *two tribes*, placed no other nation in their country, by which means all *Judea* and Jerusalem, and the Temple, continued to be a desert for *seventy years*; but the entire interval of time which passed from the captivity of the Israelites to the carrying away of the *two tribes*, proved to be a hundred and thirty years, six months, and ten days."

(*Josephus, Ant. of the Jews, book IX par. 7*).

Writing in the last half of the first century A.D., *Josephus* revealed that the Lost "Ten Tribes" had not then returned to the "Promised Land."

"The Ten Tribes, forming an immense multitude, are located to this day beyond the river Euphrates" (*Ant. of the Jews, vol. II, chap. 5*).

Israel To Be Sifted Among The Nations

It is interesting to note how many different authors speak of the Ten Tribes as being swallowed up in the other nations—amalgamated among

them—so integrated, they think, among the Gentiles that they would be indistinguishable today. If this is true then God's Word definitely has failed.

Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord. For, lo, I will command, and I will *sift* the house of Israel among *all nations*, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, *yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth* (Amos 9:8, 9).

God revealed that He would *destroy the sinful kingdom of Israel, but He promised that He would not utterly destroy the people of the house of Jacob.*

It was merely the Kingdom of Israel as it was constituted in Palestine that God was going to destroy. But God could not destroy the people of Israel because He solemnly promised Abraham, Isaac and Jacob that their seed would become as the stars in the heavens in number. God prophesied that the House of Israel would be "*scattered,*" "*dispersed,*" or "*sifted*" among "*all nations*"; yet He promised that not the least grain would fall to the ground.

The Bible clearly shows that the Jews look upon the Promised Land as belonging solely to them; they do not wish to share this and the Patriarchal blessings with the Lost Tribes of Israel.

Notice how clearly this Jewish reluctance to share the blessings with Lost Israel is brought out in the following Scripture: "Son of man . . . all the house of Israel wholly [the Lost Ten Tribes], are they unto whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem [the Jews] have said, Get you far from the Lord: unto us is *this land* given in possession" (Ezek. 11:15).

But God's answer is very emphatic:

Therefore say, Thus saith the Lord God; Although I have cast them far off among the heathen, and although I have *scattered* them among the countries, yet . . . I will even gather you from the people, and assemble you out of the countries where ye have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel (vv. 16, 17).

Also compare this prophecy with the 48th chapter of Ezekiel which clearly shows that the Promised Land is yet to be divided among the Twelve Tribes of Israel.

When the true identity of the Lost Tribes of Israel is revealed, the Jews will at first be reluctant to acknowledge their long-lost brethren; and they will not wish to share the Holy Land with them—"Unto us is this land given," they will say. But God will reveal to them that they are only co-inheritors with the rest of the tribes of Israel.

Ezekiel 11:19, 20 and many other similar prophecies reveal that the time setting of this regathering of the tribes of Israel, and the redividing of the Promised Land, occurs at the Second Coming of Christ.

The House of Israel and the House of Judah (two distinct peoples) will

be joined in the not-too-distant future to become one forever-inseparable people (Ezek. 37: 15-23). This chapter deals with two sticks. One was in the hand of Joseph, who was the leading tribe of the northern Ten Tribes of Israel, and the other stick was in the hand of Judah, which was the leading tribe for the Southern Kingdom including the tribes of Benjamin, Judah and most of the Levites.

These two sticks, representing the entire Twelve Tribes of Israel, are to be joined or united in the land of Palestine once again. Many, many prophecies in the Bible relate this same thing. In Ezekiel 37:13-23, and also in Ezekiel 48:1-35, is given a description of the actual allotment or the re-apportioning of the land of Palestine among the Twelve Tribes of Israel after they are all gathered back to Palestine—in the time when the Messiah will be ruling not only over Israel but over all the earth!

The belief that the British peoples are the descendants of the Lost Israelites is not new. In the 1600s John Sadler espoused this view. Then in the 1700s, "Richard Brothers, wrote fifteen volumes on the descent of the British from the Hebrews . . . From 1840 onwards a number of writers, including C.P. Smyth, Astronomer Royal for Scotland, have developed the idea that the British are the descendants of the so-called *lost ten tribes*. In recent years an organized movement called the British-Israel World Federation [B.I.O.W.F.] has attracted a number of adherents, estimated at two million in all, including those on both sides of the Atlantic" (*Oxford Junior Encyclopaedia*, 1960 ed., vol. I, art. "British Israelite").

In more recent times, numerous churches and other organizations in the United States and Canada have espoused the belief that the peoples of Britain (and those of other Northwestern countries of Europe) are descendants of the so-called Lost Ten Tribes of Israel. Literally millions of books, booklets and articles on this subject have been disseminated in the United States and the British Commonwealth.

It is a great pity that Robert Ingersoll is said to have been led into atheism because he had seen in the Bible the staggering promises God had made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and their descendants—promises of material, physical and national greatness—promises which Ingersoll believed were never fulfilled. He certainly did not believe God kept His promises to Israel. (See *Some Mistakes of Moses*, pp. 183-189.)

Now let us seek out the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel from recorded secular history in order to see "which people represent them" today!

Chapter Five

Italics

Physical Characteristics of Early Israelites

If, in our search for the Lost Ten Tribes, we know what type or what kind of people to look for, then we are much more likely to succeed in our difficult task of finding these long-lost tribes.

Before we can trace the people of Israel from the land of their captivity to their present-day homelands, we need to answer this question— “Just what were the ancient Palestinian Israelites like?” Were they Nordics? Did they look like the “typical Jew” of today? In particular, we are concerned with the ten-tribed House of Israel, whose final captivity occurred, according to Ussher, in 721 B.C. Most people assume that the people of the Ten Tribes resembled the “typical Jew” of today.

Let us notice a few very significant remarks by Dr. Kephart. In his recently published book, *Races of Mankind, Their Origin and Migration*, we find these interesting statements:

In comparison with the most recent estimates of roughly 4.5 billion years as the age of this earth, man is a relatively late phenomenon of nature. The humanoid stem from which he sprang probably arose on the earth only one or two million years ago, although much higher estimates have appeared recently. . . . The leading authorities agree that all *the existing races of mankind had a common origin* (chap. 1, p. 1). [emphasis mine].

He says that man roamed over this earth for many thousands of years before the beginning of recorded history. Dr. Kephart points out that we cannot be certain as to what happened to man “in his evolution during those ages” (*ibid.*, p. 2).

He then makes a very profound and true statement: “What is legend today may be history tomorrow, just as what is history today may be legend tomorrow” (*ibid.*, pp. 2, 3).

One cannot build a house which will stand upon the shifting sands. Likewise those who try to build their theories on the origins of the races upon the shifting quicksands of Evolution are starting from a false basis and much (if not most) of what they believe, write and teach will be in error.

Again let it be firmly stated that the veracity of the Scriptures has been proven in so many ways, that there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that *the Bible is accurate historically*, as well as an infallible guide revealing to man what his ultimate destiny is to be.

The Scriptures as originally given (of course minor errors have crept into existing manuscripts, consequently no particular translation is 100 per cent accurate) were inspired by Almighty God (II Tim. 3:15, 16) and were, therefore, perfect. The Scripture cannot be broken (John 10:35); consequently if one bases his research and his beliefs upon the solid foundation of the Scripture, his work is sure to have at least an unshakable foundation.

"Lost Ten Tribes"—Were They Aryan Nordics?

Now we shall notice a flagrant error which the author of this book would have us believe—an error which is based on the theory of Evolution:

Variation of color of skin is dependent mainly on climatic conditions, the darkest races having become so by long habitation in low, moist, hot places near the equator and the lighter races having lost skin and eye pigmentation by long habitation in the rigorous dark or hazy climate of the north. . . . (Kephart, *Races of Mankind, Their Origin and Migration*, chap. I, p. 66).

Dr. Kephart does, however, realize the importance of the cephalic index in seeking to ascertain racial origins from skeletal remains. He speaks of the cephalic index as "one of the most useful methods of segregating people. . ." (ibid., p. 66).

Notice how many authors realize the importance of the cephalic index in determining racial affinities.

Now let us notice a statement of Kephart's regarding what the "original Hebrews" were like. Also note carefully what is said concerning the "lost Tribes of Israel":

Since the original Hebrews were Kassites of typically Turkic build, i.e., with tawny complexion, of medial height and stocky build, with prominent nose, and brachycephalous [broad-headed], all efforts to identify Aryan Nordic people of Europe as descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel are doomed to failure. A more futile task is inconceivable (ibid., fn., p. 150).

Were the Original Israelites Like the "Typical Jew"?

Where did Dr. Kephart learn that "the original Hebrews were Kassites," and of "Turkic build"? How did he come to the conclusion that the original Hebrews had a "tawny complexion," and were of a "medial height," and "stocky build," that they had "prominent nose," and "brachycephalous" (broad) type of head? Yes, just where did Dr. Kephart learn all of these fables?

Notice the author has already revealed his lack of understanding on a number of points and now he propounds the belief that seems to be common among so many people today, that the Lost Tribes of Israel could not be identified with the Aryan, Nordic people of Europe.

Kephart dogmatically states that the people of the Lost Tribes of Israel were people "with tawny complexion, of medial height and stocky build, with prominent nose, and brachycephalous." In other words, Dr. Kephart would have you believe "the original Hebrews" looked like the so-called "typical Jew" of today. But this is merely a human assumption which we shall see exploded from biblical and secular history!

"The peculiar notion advanced by some writers, chiefly religionists, that these dark-complexioned brachycephalic Turanian people were the ancestors of the blond mesocephalic Aryan Anglo-Saxons is too absurd physiologically to receive further notice" (*ibid.*, p. 155).

We shall soon see from the Bible, and also from secular history that the "original Hebrews" (by which Dr. Kephart meant the Israelites) were primarily an Aryan or Nordic type people after all!

Speaking of the modern Jews, Dr. Kephart admits that "Today there are Jews of widely different physical types, many largely Aryan in blood" (*ibid.*, p. 157).

Yes, Dr. Kephart admits that many European Jews are Aryan in type or race, but he is puzzled as to how they could be "Aryan in blood."

If you were to ask the average man on the street to give you a description of what he thinks the people of the Lost Ten Tribes looked like, he would be sure to give you a description of the typical modern Jew. Such an individual would probably say that the Israelites were *short*, and of stocky build, with dark or *olive-coloured complexions* and with very *dark* (if not black) *hair*. And he would probably also add that the Israelites must have had *prominent noses!* This is what a "Semite" is *supposed* to look like. But is such a conception a true picture of the original pre-captivity Israelite?

Before we begin to accurately form a picture of what the original Israelite looked like, we must thoroughly examine the "Jewish question."

Most who have studied the Jewish question will generally admit that the present-day Jews are the descendants of Israel, and are, therefore, Israelites.

Are Dr. Kephart and others right in assuming that the people of the twelve-tribed House of Israel were all like the present-day Ashkenazic Jews, that is, "with tawny complexion, of medial height and stocky build, with prominent nose, and brachycephalous head. . . .?"

In other words, were the people of the Twelve Tribes of Israel like the present-day Ashkenazim Jews? Or were they not more like the Sephardic, Aryan or Nordic type of Jews? Also recall Dr. Kephart's statement, "The peculiar notion advanced by some writers, chiefly religionists, that those dark-complexioned brachycephalic [broad-headed] Turanian people were the ancestors of the blond mesocephalic Aryan Anglo-Saxons is too absurd physiologically to receive further notice" (*Races of Mankind*, p. 155).

Ripley and many ethnologists and historians clearly point out that the Sephardic Jews are, in fact, Aryan or European in type!

Dr. Kephart seems to express the general notions of the average man-on-the-street in regard to the assumed appearance of the people of the ancient Kingdom of Israel. It seems that everybody automatically assumes that since many of the Jews today (the Ashkenazim) are in the main a dark-haired, dark-complexioned, broad-headed people; and since the Arabs are also a

very dark people, everyone automatically assumes that the people of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel must have been a dark-haired, dark-eyed, dark-complexioned, short type of people.

The Israelites Were Predominantly Nordics

Now let us go to history and also to the Scriptures to prove what the pre-captivity people of the Twelve Tribes of Israel were really like.

Professor Sayce makes the following significant comment concerning the racial type depicted on the walls of the temple of Amon at Karnak:

The names of the Jewish towns captured by the Egyptian King Soshenk . . . recorded on the walls of the temple of Karnak are each surmounted with the head and shoulders of a prisoner. Casts have been made of the heads by Sir Flinders Petrie, and *the racial type represented by them turns out to be Amorite and not Jewish* (Sayce, *Races of the Old Testament*, pp. 115, 116).

The Egyptian king who made these lifelike engravings of "Amorite" prisoners from the land of Israel was Pharaoh Soshenk!

What does Professor Sayce mean when he states that *these Palestinian prisoners turned out to be "Amorite"* and not Jews after all? By "Amorite" he means they were *a blond, Nordic type!* He further states that "David . . . was blond and red-haired" (*ibid.*)!

It is plain that *the Amorite belonged to the blond race*. His *blue eyes and light hair* prove this incontestably. So also does the colour of his skin, when compared with that of other races depicted by the Egyptian artists. At Medinet Habu, for example, where *the skin of the Amorite is pale pink*, that of the Lebu or Libyan and the Mashuash or Masyes is red like that of the Egyptians, though we know that the Libyans belonged to a distinctively fair-complexioned race. In a tomb (No. 34) of the Eighteenth Dynasty, at Thebes, *the Amorite chief of Kadesh has a white skin*, and light red-brown eyes and hair . . . (*ibid.*, pp. 167, 168).

Note carefully Professor Sayce's remarks, as they have a very important bearing upon the conclusions which will be drawn later. We shall see that *Sayce and others call the Israelites "Amorites"*—though the people of Israel were not Amorites in the true sense. *The original Amorites were descendants of Ham* (through his son, Canaan), *and were dark-complexioned like all of Ham's descendants* (Gen. 10:15-20).

Sayce then goes on to show that at that time a line of blonds extended all the way from the northern coast of Africa east to the corner of the Mediterranean, then north to Coele-Syria, and that this was only broken by the Delta of Egypt, where we know darker people have always lived.

Blond Israelites Called "Amorites"

These statements show clearly that these Israelitish "Amorites" were a blond race. Now let us go back and analyze the statement made by Professor

Sayce in regard to the campaign of Soshenk, the Egyptian Pharaoh. According to Professor Sayce (and many historians give similar accounts), the Pharaoh, in his campaign against Israel, took a number of prisoners. These so-called "Jewish" prisoners turn out to be "Amorite"—according to Professor Sayce! Also remember that a number of paintings, according to Professor Sayce and other sources, show that the Amorites were definitely a blond race. Their features were more like the northwest Europeans of today.

It should be pointed out, however, that some think the Pharaoh who took these Israelitish prisoners (called "Amorites") was the So mentioned in II Kings 17:4. They believe it was So, Pharaoh of Egypt, who recorded his conquests on the walls of the Temple at Karnak.

Whether these Israelitish prisoners were taken in the time of Rehoboam or at the later date (in the time of Hoshea—King of ten-tribed Israel), the fact remains that the prisoners were taken from the people of Israel. They were definitely a blond race!

This is just one more proof that the Israelites of the pre-captivity were a blond people!

Speaking of the busts of these "Jewish" prisoners, Professor Sayce says, "We must conclude, therefore, that even after the Revolt of The Ten Tribes, the bulk of the population in Southern Judah continued to be Amorite [that is, blond and Nordic] in race though not in name" (*ibid.*, p. 116). The "Jewish type" meaning the Ashkenazim, was so scantily represented that the Egyptian artist failed to depict it at all. And remember by this expression "Jewish type," Professor Sayce undoubtedly means the short-statured, dark-skinned, broad-headed, Ashkenazic Jew familiar to most of us today.

Notice Professor Sayce says that these Jewish prisoners were not actually "Jewish" at all, but were Amorites. He says the "Jewish type" was so scantily represented that the Egyptian artist passed it over when depicting the prisoners who had been brought from Judah (*ibid.*, p. 116).

But here is the real truth of the matter. After the ten-tribed northern Kingdom of Israel rejected the rulership of the throne of David, forming a separate kingdom, only the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and a portion of the Levites were left in the southern part of the land of Israel to form the kingdom thereafter known as the *Kingdom of Judah*.

Shishak's "Amorite" Israelite Prisoners

These representations or figures on the walls of the temple of Karnak which have been called "Amorite" were primarily from the Northern Kingdom of Israel, as the following source reveals:

"When Solomon began to rule in Palestine, the central government in Egypt was weak. In the Faiyum there was a powerful family descended from Libyan chieftains. A prince of this family, Sheshonk, whom the Bible calls *Shishak*, became strong enough to be received on equal terms by a reigning pharaoh at Thebes. Soon Shishak claimed the rule of all Egypt. . . . Our chief Egyptian source of information on his Asiatic campaign comes from his building at the *temple of Amon in Karnak* late in his reign.

WB

"Ca. 920 B.C. or shortly thereafter, in the fifth year of Solomon's successor Rehoboam, *Shishak* made a gesture to restore some of Egypt's old glory. He led an army of Egyptians, Libyan scouts, and Libyan and Ethiopian mercenaries into Palestine for a wide-sweeping campaign. Among the cities which he captured was Jerusalem, where he looted the temple and the palace of the treasures upon which Solomon has (sic.) laid out such great expenses. Some of Shishak's loot was later dedicated to the god Amon at Thebes.

"Evidence for this Shishak raid into Palestine has been found at Megiddo in the fragment of a triumphal stela which he erected there. *On the walls of the temple of Karnak he listed the towns which he 'captured.'* The list does not indicate that he went farther N than the foothills of Galilee. . . . The list of *conquered towns* runs to more than 150. Ca. two dozen identifications can be firmly made, *most of them in the N kingdom.* The section which apparently deals with localities in Judah is badly broken. . . ." (*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 4, art. "Shishak").

"In Rehoboam's fifth year *Shishak* (cf. 2 Chr. 12:2-4) invaded *Judah*, and *Israel* as well. Archaeology shows Shishak is *Sheshonk I* of Egypt (c. 945-924 B.C.), founder of the Twenty-second Dynasty, whose gold-masked body was discovered at Tanis in 1938-39. His triumphal Karnak (Thebes) inscription lists towns taken in Judah as well as in Israel and Gilead [E. of the Jordan River]. Part of his stele was excavated at Megiddo, showing that he actually took this city, as the Karnak relief shows" (*Unger's Bible Handbook*, Unger, p. 215).

It should be clear that Shishak's prisoners from the land of Palestine were not just *Jews* of the Southern Kingdom of Judah, but were primarily from among the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom. Yet they are called "Amorites" simply because their physical appearance does not conform rigidly to what many believe to be today's "typical Jew."

Men of Judah and Benjamin Were Nordics

These blond, long-headed prisoners taken captive by the Pharaoh of Egypt were undoubtedly typical of many of the Israelites.

It has already been clearly pointed out that many of the present-day Jews have a tendency towards blondism, and are of the long-headed type. These dolichocephalic Jews are found primarily among the Sephardic branch of the Jews, even though there are also quite a number of blond, long-headed Jews among the Ashkenazic Jews.

The non-biblical material has markedly increased our knowledge of the *Amorites*. . . Egyptian illustrations of the New Kingdom show the *Palestinian Amorites* to have been a race *much more like the northern Europeans* than the Semites: *long-headed, with blue eyes, straight nose and thin lips*. . . The *Amorites* were inhabitants of a territory lying west of Babylonia, and *the majority of them belonged* (as forerunners of the Aramaeans) *to the western Semitic race* (*Ency. Brit.*, 14th ed., Vol. I, art. "Amorites").

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EARLY ISRAELITES

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* points out that the *Amorites* were "headed." It also mentions that the Babylonians called the people of them "Amorites," meaning "Westerners." This term "Amorite" or "Westerner" was used by other peoples including the Egyptians speaking of the people living in the area of Palestine. The Babylonians distinguishing one people from another. The Egyptians and others undoubtedly did the same thing. Many modern-day scholars do the same. They fail to differentiate between the true, original Amorites, mentioned in Genesis 10, and the other "Westerners" who lived in Palestine and were also called "Amorite" by the Gentile nations.

"The profiles of the *Amorites*, as depicted on the monument of Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, are practically identical with the figures at Karnak, which surmount the names of the cities captured by Shishak [Soshenk] . . ." (Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, p. 107). This shows conclusively that the blond Israelites were called Amorites.

In Genesis chapter ten, verse fifteen, we read that Canaan begat Heth, and a Jebusite and an Amorite. The true, original Amorites (according to biblical usage) were descendants of Canaan, and were therefore descendants of Ham—and were in no sense of the word "blonds." But, as already mentioned, undoubtedly this name "Amorite" was used by the Babylonians, Egyptians and others to denote generally blond races which were living in the Palestinian area—races which had planted the original Amorites.

Let us notice a few interesting statements concerning the Palestinian Amorites, by Jessel. We shall presently see that he makes the grave mistake of thinking that the Jewish prisoners were Amorites.

Sargon I., King of Agade, and first king of the Babylonian Empire, describes Palestine on one of his monuments as a land of the *Amorites* (Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*), and at a later period we find portraits of Amorite prisoners on the wall sculptures of Egypt. *The Egyptians depict them as a fair people, with blond or reddish hair and blue eyes* (*The Unknown History of the Jews*, p. 107).

Again note carefully that the Egyptians depict the "Amorites" as "fair people" having "blond or reddish hair and blue eyes." This shows as we have seen proven that the Egyptians and others called the Israelite "Amorites."

Also remember that the true "Amorites" were Hamitic; and we know of no light-skinned, blond-haired, and blue-eyed descendants of Ham on this earth today, neither did such ever exist! All truly Hamitic peoples have dark skins, though this does not mean that they are all black or even dark brown.

A study of ethnology leads to the conclusion that these people were the blond or red-haired white race, of the *Amurra* or *Amurru* we hear of occasionally in the Egyptian campaigns in the direction of the Amanus mountains. That the Amorites were Caucasians in appearance and physique leaves no room for doubt, and some of their habits and forms of worship point to their being a Keltic sub-race (*ibid.*, p. 107).

The Celts are, in fact, part of the Lost Ten Tribes.

Did you notice that Jessel plainly says the Amorites (these "Amorites" being beyond question Israelites) were "Caucasian" in physique and appearance. He says there can be no doubt that these Amorites were "*a Keltic sub-race.*"

Keep this important point in mind, for later on we shall see irrefutable proof showing that there are many connecting links to verify that the *Kelts* are definitely some of the dispersed peoples of the "Lost Ten Tribes of Israel!"

In the accompanying illustrations [says Jessel] we reproduce, by permission of Professor W. Flinders Petrie, photographs of casts he has made from sculptures in the Egyptian tombs. These portraits of *Amorite* [referring to *Israelitish* captives] prisoners of war belong chiefly to the period of Seti I. . . . The shape of the head and the features generally *remind us of the fair type of modern Jew*, and have some resemblance to the *Scotch*, if we imagine a reddish colouring for the hair, and blue eyes. . . . In *Scotland*, *Sweden*, *Brittany*, and *Spain* superstitions still survive which can be traced to Amorite forms of belief, and even the type of the Amorite can be distinguished in the population. *These resemblances in Europe to certain forms of Jewish belief have led to the vague notions about the "Lost Tribes" which we sometimes hear* (ibid., pp. 107, 108).

Notice that Jessel says the customs of the so-called Amorites (which in this case were beyond question Israelites) in Britain and elsewhere, were such as to cause some to think that the Lost Tribes are today found in such countries as *Scotland*, *Sweden* and *Brittany*.

"Here, then, may be the origin of those settlements," Jessel says, "on the shores of even the British Isles which introduced Amorite forms of worship; and we see in the *cromiechs* of the *Druids* the very same arrangement of stones which is characteristic of the *Amorites of Palestine*" (ibid., p. 110).

Judah and Benjamin—Called "Amorites"

Note carefully the following statements made by Jessel regarding the Jews and Benjamites:

We find in the Bible many references to the fighting power of the *Benjamin*, and we find them also always in alliance with *Yahuds* [Jews]. *Together these white races* held in subjection the coloured people, the natives of *Canaan*.

Judah and Benjamin are the Amurra ["Amorites"] and the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments (ibid., p. 118).

Jessel thinks that the settlements in the British Isles which had built the *cromiechs* were the same people as the Palestinian Amorites. He plainly says that "*Judah and Benjamin are the Amurra*" whom the Egyptians had depicted. Also, did you notice that Jessel spoke of the "Yahuds" and the "Benjamin" as "*these white races*"? He also spoke of *the native Canaanites* as "*the Coloured people.*"

Truly, the native Canaanites were dark or colored in comparison with the people of the tribes of Judah (the Yahuds) and the Benjamin (Benjamites).

Furthermore, we have noticed that the Sephardic Jews are more "European" or "Nordic" than they are "Jewish"; and we have observed that there is a considerable degree of blondism among this branch of Jews. Many redheads are found among them. (For further verification of this, see the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, volume XII, art. "Types, Anthropological," pp. 291-95).

We have seen that a number of casts were made of the busts of Israelitish prisoners and we noted that these prisoners from the land of Israel turned out to be "Nordic" in type. They are called "Amorites" by Sayce and others. They just can't believe that these blond and Nordic Israelitish prisoners (mistakenly called Amorites), captured by Pharaoh could be Israelites. They, like most, assume all Israelites would have to be a short, dark-skinned, broad-headed people like most of the Ashkenazic Jews.

How Many Jewish "Races"?

A full discussion of various Jewish types is beyond the scope of this book. However, a few quotes from *The Myth of the Jewish Race*, by Wing, will be both interesting and thought-provoking.

According to this book, there are those who believe that "The Jews constitute one single race," "two distinct races or racial types," "three races or racial types," and some hold the view that the "Jews are not a separate racial group at all" (chap. 1, p. 21).

"In 1867 the Austrian physician Augustin Weisbach began anthropometric measurements, but it was not until 1878 that he published his results . . . [After taking a number of measurements], he concluded that 'the (European) Jews have a small stature, have mostly straight, but often also curly, hair, of predominantly dark, not rarely also red, color, usually grey and light brown eyes, and a lively pulse. They have a large, mesocephalic (more often dolicho- than brachycephalic) head, which is narrow at its base; a long face which is moderately wide between the cheeks, very narrow at the top, and narrow between the corners of the lower jaw, with a moderately high forehead . . . The nose starts out very narrow at its root, is in general very big and of considerable length and height, but at the same time very narrow. The mouth and ears are of medium size!

"While these generalizations were made by Weisbach on the basis of his own measurements" says Wing, "he also remarks that, in general, there are doubtless two cephalic types among the European Jews, one dolichocephalic, with a narrow, long face, a similar, on the whole big, nose, and thin lips; and a brachycephalic, with a broad face, low, broad, small nose and thick lips'" (*The Myth of the Jewish Race*, Wing, p. 26).

The Ancient Jewish Type

And the French psychologist Maurice Muret published his book, *L'Esprit Juif*, in 1901. Chapter two of this work is devoted to "The Israelite Race":

"Today the Israelite race," says Muret, "presents us with two very different aspects: the *Ashkenazim* and the *Sephardim*. These are, in effect, two very distinct types (of Jews). In the north of Russia and in Poland, in Germany, in Bohemia, one encounters a Jewish tribe with generally red hair, short beard, broad nose, grey, small, shrewd eyes, and stocky body. These are the *Ashkenazim* or Polish Jews or German Jews, or *Tedeschi*, thus named in contrast to the Spagnuoli or *Sephardim*, or Jews of Portugal and Spain. The latter are encountered in the Orient and in the Mediterranean Basin, principally in the Iberian Peninsula, from where they spread into The Netherlands. *The Sephardim are thought to have conserved the ancient Jewish type much more purely than their brothers* dispersed among the Central and Eastern Europeans. They are generally of a tall stature, occasionally beautiful. Their shoulders are narrow, the head well set, the face slightly prognathous. The nose is strong but narrow, often curved. The mouth is big, the hair abundant, and most frequently dark brown, occasionally red, very rarely blond. The eyes are brown, more rarely grey, very rarely blue" (*L'Esprit Juif*, chap. 2, art. "The Israelite Race").

"In the early 1940's, Carleton S. Coon likewise maintained that the *Sephardim* form one race and the *Ashkenazim* another. As to the former, 'there can be no reasonable doubt that the *Sephardim* form a single population in the racial sense, despite their geographical discontinuity,' and that they 'preserve with reasonable fidelity the racial character of their Palestinian ancestors. They are Mediterraneans, metrically of a central or generalized Mediterranean position, except that they have unusually narrow lateral dimensions of the face, including the distance between the eyes' " (*The Myth of the Jewish Race*, p. 29).

A Vulnerable Jewish Minority

"Throughout the period in question, the Jews in Europe generally constituted about 1 per cent of the total population. Since in modern times *European (Ashkenazi) Jews* have accounted for some *four-fifths* of the world Jewish population, their racial antecedents are more significant for the problem of the Jewish 'race' at present than those of the *Sephardi* and Oriental (Middle Eastern) divisions of Jewery. If, then, we consider only the *Ashkenazi* Jews, we find that in 1300 they numbered about 260,000 in the midst of 37.9 million Gentiles, or about 0.7 per cent of the total population; while in 1490 they numbered 270,000 among 50 million Gentiles, or 0.54 per cent of the total. The vulnerability of such a small minority to the genetic influence of a 150 to 190 times larger majority requires no elaboration" (*ibid.*, p. 49).

It is a fact, however, that during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, Pro-

testant Reformation and the (Catholic) Counter Reformation, many Jews did give up their Jewish religion and ethnic connections in order to avoid persecution, expulsion or even death. The offspring of most of those who did so eventually lost the knowledge of their ancient race and traditions. And there has always been a certain amount of voluntary interbreeding.

"In the fervently religious atmosphere of the Jewish communities of medieval Europe outside the Mediterranean area, *voluntary interbreeding* with Gentiles was rarely initiated by Jews. However *forcible violations* of Jewish women by Gentiles were more frequent, especially in localities where the few Jews could offer no resistance to even a small group of Gentile hooligans, and where there was no Jewish ghetto with walls and gates to protect them. The frequent recurrence of such incidents was the reason for rabbinical injunctions against settling in localities where no other Jews lived. The very presence of small and scattered splinter groups of outlandish Jews, differing in religion and mores, language and mannerisms, appearance, customs, and occupations, disliked at best and hated at worst, brought about the sexual violation of Jewish women among several other types of abuses.

"Whether violations and impregnations of Jewish women in a given locality actually occurred once in 5 or 10 years on the average we have, of course, no way of knowing. But there can be no doubt that the situation, the circumstances, the folk mores being what they were in the Middle Ages all over Europe, *forcible interbreeding* between Gentile males and Jewish females *did occur quite frequently*. It is here that we must seek a primary explanation for the often striking genetic and phenotypic similarity between Ashkenazi Jews and the Gentiles of the countries in which they have lived during and since the Middle Ages" (*The Myth of the Jewish Race*, pp. 49, 50).

Certainly, the unfortunate facts of such forced violations would have contributed somewhat to the non-Jewish admixture of genes which is patently the case in Europe and in other parts of the world where Jews have resided.

"A Common . . . Ancestry"

How valuable are Cephalic Index (C.I.) measurements in helping to determine racial connections?

"On the basis of the measurements of more than 5,000 individuals in the Middle East, Ariens Kappers concluded that *the cephalic index has hereditary value*. He also demonstrated that *the cephalic index of the Egyptians has remained unchanged for four to five thousand years*" (ibid., p. 184).

Do the Jews constitute one single race, two races, three or more races—or, do they constitute no race at all?

"Thus, all the traits examined so far—morphological traits, blood group genes, and red blood cell and serum proteins—show, on the one hand, *an extensive admixture of different non-Jewish populations with the Jews*, resulting in great *heterogeneity* (not, *homogeneity*!) among different Jewish

groups; and, on the other hand, *evidence for a common Mediterranean ancestry* for these diverse Jewish groups" (*The Myth of the Jewish Races*, p. 226).

What does all of this prove? Simply this. According to the portrait testimony recorded on the walls of the temple of Amon at Karnak, Egypt, the so-called blond or white peoples were called "Amorites" but were (according to the Bible) in fact taken as prisoners from the tribes of Israelites.

Those who argue that modern-day descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes would have to look like the "typical Jew" of today (short, olive complexioned, with a "Jewish nose") simply don't know what they are talking about.

The Jews, both in Bible times, and in more recent recorded history, have always mixed rather freely with other peoples. (See Gen. 38:1-30 | Ki. 11:1-9; Neh. 13:23-28; Ezra 9:12, 10:10-44) And though they have retained their essential "Jewishness," they have nonetheless absorbed many genes from other races. Also, bear in mind that the Sephardic Jews (who are less mixed than the Ashkenazic Jews) have a great deal of blondism, blue eyes, and other features which are very similar to the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic races of Northwest Europe. The Jews are, in fact, closely related to these peoples of Northwest Europe.

All of these points lead us unerringly to the inescapable conclusion that the original Israelites were more "Nordic" in type than "Jewish." The bulk of them resembled their present-day "Nordic" descendants who inhabit Northwest Europe!

We have seen abundant *historical evidence* proving that the original-type Israelites were not all short, olive-skinned, dark-haired, broad-headed people with prominent noses! *Now let us see what racial type the Israelites were according to the Bible!*

Laban—The Blond Syrian

Just before Abraham died, he told his trusted servant to go to the city of Nahor to get a wife for his son, Isaac (Gen. 24:1-10). "And he arose, and went to Mesopotamia, unto the city of Nahor" (*ibid.*, v. 10). "Mesopotamia" means "between the rivers"—Tigris and Euphrates.

Isaac did the same—before he died!

"And Isaac called Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan. Arise, go to Padan-aram, [the plain of Syria] to the house of Bethuel thy mother's father; and take thee a wife from thence of *the daughters of Laban* thy mother's brother" (Gen. 28:1, 2). If one will read the rest of the 28th chapter of Genesis, and also the 29th and 30th chapters, he will see that Jacob obeyed his father, Isaac, and went to Padan-aram, "the plain of Syria," to the home of his uncle, *Laban*. Here he met and married *Leah* and *Rachel*, two of Laban's daughters.

But *what does the name "Laban" signify?* In the Hebrew language in which the Old Testament was written, "*Laban*" means "*white*" (Strong, *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, under "*Laban*").

Any good Bible dictionary will show that the word "Laban" means "white" and comes from the same Hebrew stem as does the word "Lebanon"—meaning "white." Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance* defines the word "Lebanon" in the Hebrew as "(the) white mountain (from its snow)." So we see that the Lebanon Mountain was named Lebanon because *it was a white mountain.*

Why, then, would *Laban* have been called "white" unless he was a *fair, light-skinned* or "white" person? He must have been a very fair person in order to have been called by this name, Laban. Judging from his modern descendants, one would conclude the same thing. See Genesis 49:12, "*teeth white with milk,*" and Numbers 12:10, where we read that Miriam became "*white as snow.*" *The word "white" in both of the references just cited is the same word in the Hebrew as the name translated "Laban!"*

Names Always Had a Meaning

Also remember that in the time of the Hebrew Patriarchs, it was customary to *always* name a person with a significant name. There is hardly any example in the Hebrew Scriptures of the name of any individual being without some significance. Thus the name "Abraham" means "father of a multitude" (Gen. 12:1-5), "Isaac" means "laughter" (Gen. 21:1-6), "Jacob" means "heel catcher," i.e. "supplanter," or "deceiver" (Gen. 27:36), "Israel" means "overcomer with God" or "prevailer with God" (Gen. 32:28), and "Satan" means "adversary." These are just a few of many thousands of Hebrew words—all of which had a definite meaning. Laban, then, was named "Laban" or "white" because *he was a white, fair-skinned person.*

Jacob, also called Israel, went to the plain of Syria (Padan-aram) and married into his own family. He married two of his own cousins, Leah and Rachel. It was quite customary in Patriarchal times to marry a close relative. Even Abraham married his half-sister (Gen. 20:12); and Adam's children all had to marry their own brothers or sisters, since at that early stage in the development of "*homo sapiens*" there was no one else to marry.

Since Laban was a fair or "white" person, his two daughters, Leah and Rachel, whom Jacob married, must have also been very fair; and since Jacob was their cousin, he must have had some of the blond, "Syrian" features of his uncle, Laban. This is also borne out by the modern-day descendants of Jacob, who have many blonds among them. Remember, we have seen that the Sephardic Jews have a great deal of blondism among them. Here is a list of Jacob's sons:

The sons of Leah; Reuben, Jacob's firstborn, and Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Zebulun; the sons of Rachel; Joseph, and Benjamin; and the sons of Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid; Dan, and Naphtali; and the sons of Zilpah, Leah's handmaid; Gad and Asher; these are the sons of Jacob which were born to him in Padan-aram (Gen. 35:23-26).

Notice that these children were all born to Jacob while he was yet in Padan-aram, or the plain of Syria. Undoubtedly Leah and Rachel were quite fair-complexioned like their father, Laban.

Thus we see that the family of Abraham must have contained a considerable amount of blondism in their genes. This does not mean that there were no brunets in the people of Israel. Remember, the word "*blond*" is used today to denote various shades of brown hair as well as to refer to "pure blonds" and redheads. A "brunet" is one who has very dark brown or black hair.

Sarah Was "Very Fair"

Abraham says of his wife, Sarah, "Behold now, I know that thou art a *fair* woman to look upon" (Gen. 12:11). And in verse 14 we read, "And it came to pass, that, when [Abraham] came into Egypt the Egyptians beheld the woman that she was *very fair*." Sarah was Abraham's half-sister (Gen. 20:12). The Hebrew word here translated as "fair" is "yawfeh." It is from a Hebrew root meaning "to be bright." The context shows that this word refers to the physical appearance, and is not here associated with mental aptitudes. There is every reason to believe that this word is to be understood according to its literal sense in regard to Sarah. She was not a dark-skinned person, but was a bright- or light-skinned person. Since Abraham was half-brother to Sarah (Gen. 20:12), he must also have been a fair-skinned person.

Furthermore, there is historical and archaeological confirmation of the fact that Sarah—the mother of the peoples of Israel—was a "white" or "Caucasoid" type person:

"Archaeology sheds interesting light on Sarah's beauty. She was 'a fair woman to look upon' (Gen. 12:11,14), and a scroll found in a cave near the Dead Sea in 1947 gives us this description of Sarah: 'How fine is the hair of her head, how fair indeed, and her eyes, and how pleasing her nose and all the radiance of her face, how lovely all her *whiteness*. . . .'" (*Tells, Tombs and Treasure*, Robert T. Boyd, chap. 4, p. 81).

Rebekah was also "*very fair*" to look upon (Gen. 24:16; 26:7). The word used in this instance, however, is a different word and may not of itself prove that Rebekah was a light-skinned person. However, there is every reason to believe it is to be taken in this sense. The other many texts which we have cited show that Rebekah was from a family of fair-skinned people.

David Was Ruddy and Fair

We all know that David was a descendant of Judah, and was therefore a Jew. What did he look like? "For he [*David*] was but a youth, and *ruddy*, and of a *fair countenance*" (I Sam. 17:42). The word translated "fair" in this verse is the same word as was used in regard to Sarah. We have already noticed that this word in the Hebrew means "to be bright." It undoubtedly refers to the complexion of the individual.

Not only was *David a fair person*, but the Scripture shows that he was

"*ruddy*." What is the meaning of the Hebrew word from which the English word "ruddy" was translated? The Hebrew word is "admoniy" and it means "reddish." It is the same word as is used in Genesis 25:25. "And the first [Esau] came out *red*, all over like an hairy garment; and they called his name Esau." The word here translated as "*red*" is the same as is found in I Samuel 16:12, which is translated as "*ruddy*." "Now he [David] was *ruddy*, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to."

So there can be absolutely no doubt about it—David was not the dark-skinned Ashkenazic type of Jew. He was a fair-skinned, ruddy-complexioned Jew—just as *most blonds in northwestern Europe have both light skins and ruddy complexions*; and just as many Jews are, *red-haired*. They are, in fact, tribal relatives of King David, who was also "fair." This is the same word (yawfeh) as was used when describing Sarah; and means, in the Hebrew language "to be bright," and has to refer to a light or fair skin in David's case, for a "ruddy" complexioned individual is always a fair person.

Some Jews Are Ruddy, With Black Hair

In The Song of Solomon, chapter 5:10, 11, we read, "My beloved is *white and ruddy*, the chiefest amongst ten thousand. His head is as the most fine gold, his locks are bushy, and black as a raven."

To whom does this refer? Does it refer to King Solomon? Or does it refer to Christ as some believe. This person was "*white*" and "*ruddy*," but his hair was "as black as a raven." *Modern Jews* have both *red* and *black* hair. The word translated as "*ruddy*" in this verse is from the Hebrew word "*awdome*" meaning "*rosy*." It is the same word as is used in Isaiah 1:18, where it speaks of one's sins being "*red* like crimson." Also this is the same word used in a number of Scriptures when referring to "*red* wine."

Anyone who is "white and ruddy" is always a fair-skinned person.

There can be no question that this "Jewish type" referred to in the fifth chapter of The Song of Solomon was not an olive-skinned type of Ashkenazic Jew, but he must have been the Sephardic type of Jew, having a *light skin with a pinkish or reddish cast* to it.

The Jewess mentioned throughout this Song of Solomon is repeatedly called "*fair*" (Heb. "yawfeh") and indicates that the person alluded to here was a fair-skinned person.

Esther—a Fair Person

Now let us notice that Esther, who became Queen of the Persian Empire, was a light- or fair-skinned person. She was of the tribe of Benjamin (Esther 2:5).

"He [Mordecai] brought up . . . Esther . . . and the maid was *fair* and *beautiful*" (Esther 2:7). This word "*fair*" is the same word that was used when speaking of Sarah. It means "to be bright" and is the only place in all of the book of Esther where this word is used. We read that Vashti, the former haughty queen, was "*fair*" (*ibid.*, 1:11). But the Hebrew word used here is a different word, and does not mean "to be bright," but it means to be beautiful. We read also of "*fair* young virgins" (*ibid.*, 2:2, 3). But the

Hebrew word "yawfeh" is not used in regard to any of these women, but is used only in chapter 2, verse 7 in connection with Queen Esther. She had a "bright" or light skin. Esther was not only "fair," but she was also "beautiful." The Hebrew word translated as beautiful in verse 7 is "toar" and means "to delineate, outline, i.e. *figure* or appearance" (Strong, *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*). Not only was Esther a fair- or light-skinned person, but she was also a person with a very beautiful figure.

The following facts should be borne in mind: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and their children were all descendants of Shem through his son, Arphaxad (Gen. 10:21-24). The *people of Israel were, therefore, descendants of Arphaxad*. All of Shem's descendants were fair-skinned. There is not one scintilla of historical (biblical or secular) evidence to prove that any of the Semitic people were dark-skinned except by intermarriage.

People of Israel Were White and Ruddy

Here is another interesting quote showing what the people of Israel were like. Speaking of Israelitish Nazarites, we read, "Her Nazarites were purer than *snow*, they were *whiter than milk*, they were more *ruddy in body than rubies*, their polishing was of sapphire" (Lam. 4:7).

To whom does this refer? Verse six speaks of "the daughter of my people" and verse twenty-two says, "*The punishment of thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion.*" So the expression "her Nazarites" must refer to the Nazarites of the people of Zion—Israel. Whether this refers to the ten-tribed House of Israel or only to the Jews, or whether it is past, present, or a future prophecy is immaterial.

Notice, not only does it speak of her Nazarites being "purer than *snow*" and "*whiter than milk*," but it also says that "they were more *ruddy in body than rubies*."

This word "*ruddy*" is from the Hebrew word "*awdome*" and means "*rosy*." It is the same word used in The Song of Solomon 5:10 and Isaiah 1:18 ("*red like crimson*"). There can be no doubt that this word means ruddy, reddish, or rosy. This is another definite statement from God's inspired Word proving that the Israelites were a fair-skinned, ruddy-complexioned type of people.

Some think that this refers to the Church. But certainly no one can argue that the "spiritual Nazarites" are more ruddy in body than rubies. God's Church is made up of people of all racial types—white, black, yellow and brown. This verse shows that *Israel's Nazarites had fair skins with a ruddy tint to them. These Israelitish Nazarites were white and ruddy*. In fact, most fair- or white-skinned people, when in health, have ruddy skins; but when they are sick their skin becomes very white or pale as a result of a lack of red corpuscles.

These references should suffice to show any who are open-minded that the people of the ancient Twelve Tribes of Israel were not a dark- or olive-skinned people; but were primarily a light-skinned race, having a great element of blondism in their genes. This does not mean to imply that there were not some brown-, or even black-headed people among them. But judging by

some of the modern blond Jews, and also from the Scriptures (both of which indicate that the Israelites were fair) we conclude that they were not primarily a short, dark and broad-headed people with prominent noses. But they were "Nordic" (northwest European) in type.

There is, however, a biblical principle which should now be pointed out. The Bible does not say in most instances of what race of people the various wives of the twelve sons of Jacob were. We know that one of the three surviving sons of Judah (Shelah) was half-Canaanite since his mother was a Canaanite. We also know that of Simeon's six children, one of them was by a Canaanitish woman, and was therefore half-Canaanitish (Gen. 46:10).

It would appear that in every instance in the beginnings of the nation of Israel, *when an Israelite married outside of the general family-stock of Israel*, God always had it recorded in the Scripture for our benefit.

Here are the various instances of the Hebrew Patriarchs marrying outside of the family of Shem.

Abraham had a son by an Egyptian bond-woman named Hagar. This son, Ishmael, was half-Egyptian. Ishmael married an Egyptian wife (Gen. 21:21) which would mean that his descendants consequently would be three-fourths Egyptian. The Egyptians were relatively dark-skinned. Most of the present-day Arabs are the descendants of Abraham through Ishmael. They are about three-fourths Egyptian.

Later, Abraham's grandson, Esau, failed to marry into his own family and among his own people, but took a Canaanitish woman to be his wife. This proved to be a very great source of grief to his parents (Gen. 36:34-35). When Esau saw that his father, Isaac, was displeased because he had taken a Canaanitish wife, he then went to Ishmael, his uncle, and married one of that family. Remember, the people of Ishmael were now three-fourths Egyptian (Gen. 28:6-9; 27:46).

This shows that the descendants of Esau had mixed at an early period with the Canaanites and also with their Ishmaelitish kinsmen who were three-fourths Egyptian.

It would appear that *the Bible always mentions it when the founding-fathers of the nation of Israel married foreign or Canaanitish daughters.*

Remember, Canaan was under a great curse: "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (Gen. 9:25).

God did not wish "the Chosen People" to mix with the Canaanites, thereby coming under a curse. When we come to the twelve sons of Israel who founded the Twelve Tribes of Israel, the Bible only mentions that *Judah* and *Simeon* married Canaanitish daughters. Genesis 46:10, already mentioned, shows that one of Simeon's six children was by a Canaanitish woman—the inference being that the other five were *not* Canaanitish. The other five children must have been of the same race or people as the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Laban and the others.

They were from Padan-aram ("the plain of Syria") in Mesopotamia ("between the rivers") i.e., the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

We have now seen clearly demonstrated from *secular* and *sacred* history that *the original Israelites of old were not primarily a short, dark, broad-headed and prominent-nosed race!*

The Scriptures speak of the historic Israelites as a "very fair" people with "ruddy" complexions! Secular history also reveals the same thing. The Israelites of Old Testament, pre-captivity times were called "Amorites" by the Gentile nations--and the Palestinian "Amorites" were definitely a *blond, "Nordic" type of people.* The northwest European "Nordics" are descendants of these Palestinian "Amorites!" They are, in fact, the children of the dispersed ten-tribed Israel!

We need to keep these facts in mind as we continue our search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel.

Chapter Six

italics

Omri (Ghomri)

We have already examined a number of quotations in which we have seen that the Gentiles used different names for the people of Israel than were used by the Israelites themselves. Notice Dr. Schrader's comments on this subject:

ISRAEL . . . the usual term for the kingdom of Israel in the Assyrian inscriptions is not this, as we have already observed. The ordinary designation was rather . . . "Land of the House Omri," or "Land of Omri," or merely "Land Omri" (*The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. I, p. 177).

Dr. Schrader has shown very clearly that such names as "House of Omri," "Land of Omri" and "Land Omri" were the usual appellations which the Assyrians (and others) applied to the northern Kingdom of Israel.

Notice what the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* has to say regarding "Omri:."

The Dynasty of Omri.—Omri (q.v.), the founder of one of the greatest dynasties of Israel. . . . Although little is preserved of *Omri's history*, the fact that the Northern Kingdom long continued to be called by the Assyrians after his name is a significant indication of his great reputation (11th ed., vol. XV, Art. "Jews", p. 377).

The northern Kingdom of Israel continued to be called by Omri's name for over a century after the death of Omri, until after the final captivity of Israel in 721 B.C.

Dr. Unger, makes the following interesting comments concerning the 18th chapter of 1 Kings:

"Omri's reign (c. 880-874 B.C.) ushered in a new era of Israelite power. He was an astute politician, cementing ties with Phoenicia to offset Aramaean commercial monopoly. The result was a marriage of his son to Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians (18:18). The *Moabite Stone* from Dibon discloses that it was Omri who conquered N. Moab. Omri's brilliant capital, Samaria, has been excavated. Periods 1 and 2 belong to Omri and Ahab. The foundations of his palace and other evidences attest he was the founder of the city (cf. *The Harvard Excavations at Samaria 1908-10*, 2 vols., 1924, and *The Buildings at Samaria*, 1942).

"Omri's fame in the world of his day is attested by the Assyrians' reference to him on the *Black Obelisk* of Shalmaneser III over a century later in connection with King Jehu of Israel, who is styled 'son of (i.e., royal successor of) Omri,' although Jehu belonged to an entirely different dynasty. After Omri, Israel moreover is styled *Bit-Humri* ('house of Omri') in the Assyrian cuneiform texts" (*Unger's Bible Handbook*, Unger, p. 217).

The famous Black Obelisk is a victory monument, commissioned by the Assyrian king, Shalmaneser III, who was adversary of King Ahab of Israel. (Ahab was Omri's son.)

This Black Obelisk victory monument gives us some interesting information about the former ally of the king of Damascus, King Jehu of Israel: "The second row [on the Black Obelisk] of the relief shows a queue [line] of heavily laden envoys in richly ornamented tunics and peaked caps. The relevant text reads: 'Tribute of Jaua of Bit-Humri: Silver, gold, a golden bowl, golden goblets, a golden beaker, pitchers of gold, lead, sceptres for the king and balsam-wood I received from him.'

"'Jaua of Bit-Humri' is none other than King Jehu or Israel. The Assyrians called Israel 'Bit-Humri,' which means 'House of Omri.'" (*The Bible as History*, Keller, pp. 234, 235).

Shalmaneser III had conquest in mind—and Ahab of Israel and his people were part of the intended victim. "In sheepskin boats I crossed the Euphrates in flood," comments the cuneiform report of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria.

"In Syria he was met by an opposing coalition from Syria and Palestine, and he took careful note of how the army was made up. Apart from the troops of the Biblical Benhadad of Damascus and another Syrian prince, there were '2,000 chariots and 10,000 horses—belonging to *Ahabbu the Sirilaeen*.' Ahabbu the Sirilaeen, who provided the third strongest army, was king Ahab of Israel" (*ibid.*, p. 226).

But let us now return to Omri, wicked Ahab's father.

Bit-Khumri (The House of Omri)

Many historians have recognised that Omri, king of Israel, had founded a great dynasty in the northern Kingdom. He was known far and wide among the Assyrians, Moabites and other peoples as a great king.

The Scriptures also imply that he was a great legislator—not necessarily great in the scriptural sense, however. "The *statutes of Omri* are kept, and all the works of the house of Ahab . . ." (Micah 6:16).

Notice further what *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* says regarding Omri:

Omri, in the Bible, the first great king of Israel after the separation of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, who flourished in the early part of the 9th century B.C. . . . and the fact that *the land* [of Israel] *continued to be known to the Assyrians down to the time of Sargon* as "*House of Omri*" indicates the reputation which this little-known king enjoyed (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. XX, art. "Omri", p. 104).

The land of Israel continued to be known to the Assyrians, even down to the time of Sargon, as the "House of Omri"—indicating the reputation which the name of Omri had enjoyed.

Payment of tribute by Iaua (Jehu), the son of *Khumri (Omri)* who brought silver, gold, lead, and bowls, dishes, cups, and other vessels of gold. The description 'Son of Khumri' is thought merely to show that Jehu was an Israelite, because *Israelitish territory* was called 'Bit-Khumri' (Luckenbill, *The Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. I, p. 46).

Here is another translation of the same cuneiform inscription. Notice the spelling of "Omri" (Humri) is slightly different from the previous spelling as given by Luckenbill. "The tribute of Yaua (Jehu), son of *Humri (Omri)*" (Kinns, *Graven in the Rock*, p. 494).

But to whom did Jehu pay this tribute? This question is answered in the following quotation:

"Jehu. On the Black Obelisk 'Jehu' (= Yaua) 'son of Omri' (= *Khumri*), is represented as giving tribute to Shalmaneser II" (*Bible Students Handbook of Assyriology*, pp. 105, 106).

Following is an interesting statement, showing that the Assyrians became acquainted with the Northern Kingdom of Israel first in the time of Omri.

Omri seems to have been an able soldier and he subdued Moab to Israel. This is acknowledged by the Moabite King Mesha in an inscription which has come down to us The Assyrians first became acquainted with Israel in the time of Omri, and they call the country of the Ten Tribes of Israel 'the land of the house of Omri' even after the extinction of his dynasty (*Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. I, art., "Omri", p. 668).

Unscrupulous King Omri

Let us examine the life of Omri, King of the Northern Kingdom of Israel—to see what kind of a person he actually was.

"*Omri* The seventh king of Israel, originally commander of the armies of Elah, king of Israel, and engaged in the siege of Gibbethon when informed of the king's death and the usurpation of Zimri.

"*His kingship*. Proclaimed king by his army, Omri left Gibbethon and besieged Zimri in Tirzah, who in despair burned himself in his palace (I Kings 16:16), B.C. 886. Another competitor appeared in the person of Tibni, the son of Ginath. After a civil war of four years Omri was left *undisputed master of the throne* (vers. 21,22), B.C. c. 876). Having resided six years in Tirzah, he removed to the mountain Shomron (Samaria), which he bought from Shemer for two talents of silver. He seems to have been a *vigorous* and *unscrupulous* ruler, anxious to strengthen his dynasty by intercourse and alliances with foreign states. He made a treaty with Benhadad I, of Damascus, surrendering to him some foreign cities (I Kings 20:34), among them, pro-

bably, Ramoth-gilead (22:3), and admitted into Samaria a resident Syrian embassy, which is described by the expression 'he made streets in Samaria' for Benhadad.

"He united his son in marriage to the daughter of a principal Phoenician prince, which led to the introduction into Israel of *Baal worship*. Of Omri it is said: 'Omri wrought evil in the eyes of the Lord, and did worse than all that were before him. For he walked in all the ways of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and in his sin wherewith he made Israel to sin, to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger with their vanities' (20:25,26). This worldly and irreligious policy is denounced by Micah (6:16) under the name of 'statutes of Omri.' He died b B.C. c. 869, and was succeeded by his son *Ahab*. His daughter *Athaliah* was the mother of Ahaziah, king of Judah (II Kings 8:26).

"*Omri and archaeology*. The *Moabite Stone* attests the military prowess of Omri, mentioning his military successes over Moah, lines 4-9. 'Now Omri had taken possession of all the land of Medeba . . . ' Years later Mesha, a wealthy sheep-owning king of Moab, was paying wool tribute to Israel (II Kings 3:4f.). Assyrian records also attest the *political* and *military* importance of Omri *For a century after Omri's reign the Assyrians were still referring to Israel as 'the land of the House of Omri.'* Jehu, a later Israelite usurper, is styled 'mar Humri' ('son,' i.e., royal successor, of Omri). The Samaritan Ostraca unearthed at the 'ostraca house' in Samaria, bear the names of both *Yahweh* and *baal*, corroborating Omri's apostasy (II Kings 16:25f.)" (*Unger's Bible Dictionary*, Unger, art. "Omri").

The above biographical sketch of Omri, King of Ten-Tribed Israel, reveals a man of vigor, with few scruples—a man who was worldly-wise, but who turned his back on God. The Assyrians thought he was a great king, and so referred to the land of Israel as "the land of Omri" or "the House of Omri," over one hundred years after his death!

We shall later see that some of the *Kelts* were called by such names as "Ombri" and "Umbri."

God has not left us without historical proof to connect this name "Omri" (which we can definitely prove Israel bore before her captivity) with the present-day descendants of the House of Israel.

The most important key linking the House of Israel (Bit-Ghomri) with modern-day Israel is the famous Behistun Rock Inscriptions. These inscriptions, written in cuneiform characters, are of utmost importance in unravelling the history of Israel.

Behistun Rock Inscriptions—Key To Israel's Identity

Darius I had the famous Behistun Rock Inscriptions engraved (in cuneiform) on the steep face of a high rock beside the main road leading from Babylon (Baghdad) to Media. These important cuneiform inscriptions were written in three languages—Persian, Babylonian and Susian (or Elamite).

Above the inscription the picture of the king himself is graven. Nine rebel chiefs are led before him; the ninth is Skunka, the chief of the *Scythians (Sacae)* whom he defeated. . . . *The inscriptions are composed in the three languages* which are written with cuneiform signs, and were used in all official inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. III, art. "Behistun," pp. 656, 657).

It is interesting to note some of the particulars of the Behistun Rock Inscriptions. This *Scythian* chief "Skunka" is called "*Sacae*." The *Sacae* and the *Scythians* as we shall later prove, were basically the same people.

In 1835 the difficult and almost inaccessible cliff was first climbed by Sir Henry Rawlinson, who copied and deciphered the inscriptions (1835-1845), and thus completed the reading of the old cuneiform text and laid the foundation of the science of Assyriology (*ibid.*).

Here follows excerpts from a translation of the Behistun Rock Inscriptions by L. W. King and R. C. Thompson:

"Thus sayeth Darius, the king: 'these are the provinces which are subject unto me, and by the grace of Auramazda became I king of them' " (*The Inscriptions of Darius the Great of Behistun*).

This version translates all of the words on the Behistun Rock Inscriptions in three parallel columns. The first column contains the *Persian*, the second the *Susian* or the Elamite, the third contains the *Babylonian* translation.

These inscriptions mention twenty-two provinces. *The nineteenth province listed by all three of these parallel columns is called in the Persian language "Scythia (phonetic: Saka)"; in the second column this same province is called, in the Susian language "Scythia (phonetic: Sakka)"; and the third column, in the Babylonian language, it is translated: "in the land of the Cimmerians (phonetic: Gi-mi-ri)."*

In Persian
SCYTHIA
(phonetically:
SAKA)

In Susa
SCYTHIA
(phonetically:
SAKKA)

In Babylonian
The country of the
CIMMERIANS
(phonetically: GIMIRI)

The famous Inscriptions of Darius the Great at Behistun form an important link in tracing the footsteps of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel to their non-biblical names which they later bore. So this term "Saka" in the Persian language (Professor Rawlinson spells it "Sacae" in "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," p. 27), and the word "Gimiri" in the Babylonian tongue are synonymous.

The land of the *Cimmerians* (or, the *Gimiri*) was the same as the land of the *Saka (Sakka, or Sacae)*, which was the same as the vast territory (from the Danube in E. Europe to China) known as *Scythia*! Prof. Rawlinson translated this 19th province as "the *Sacae*." Keep this in mind, for *Saka (Sakka)* and *Sacae* all refer to the same people.

The next question confronting us is who were these Scythians, Saka (Sacae), Cimmerians and the Gi-mi-ri? These are the various names which were applied to a people mentioned by Darius I and listed as the nineteenth of the twenty-two provinces which were subject to him.

Variations of The Name "Omri"

The Ethnic name of *Gimiri* first occurs in the cuneiform records of the time of Darius Hystaspes, as the Semitic equivalent of the Arian name *Saka* (*Sakai*). . . . Whether at the same time these *Gimiri* or *Saka* are really CYMRIC CELTS we can not positively say . . . But . . . the Babylonian title of *Gimiri*, as applied to the *Sacae*, is not a vernacular but a foreign title, and . . . may simply mean "*the Tribes*" (Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus*, Bk. IV, appendix, note 1).

Notice Rawlinson appeared to believe that *these Saka or Gimiri were Cymric Celts*. Also note that he says "*Sacae*" may mean "*the tribes*." No nation or people have been spoken of so long and so consistently by the words "*the tribes*" as *the people of Israel*. One still hears about the Twelve Tribes of Israel, the Lost Tribes and similar expressions. Notice what Rawlinson says regarding these names:

As on the one hand, however, the termination of the name is certainly *miri* or *mirri*, while on the other, *the identification of the Persian Sacae or Scythians with the people named by the Greeks Kimmerioi* . . . would seem highly probable, I venture . . . to read the entire name *Gimiri* . . . (*The Royal Asiatic Society*, p. 21).

Following are some important comments by Dr. Pinches regarding the name "Omri:"

That *Jehu*, who destroyed the house of *Omri*, should be called "*son of Omri*" in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II of Assyria is strange, and needs explanation . . . That *Jehu* may have been in some way related with *Jehoram*, and therefore a descendant of *Omri*, is possible and even probable. That he was not descended from him in a direct line is certain (*The Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, 3rd ed., p. 339).

It is well to point out that the Hebrews and other Semitics commonly spoke of one as being a "son of"—not only of the person's immediate father, but this expression was also applied to one who was a grandson, or a great-grandson, or a great-great-grandson, and so on, to any number of generations. Thus, Christ was a "son of David." The word "father" was also applied to one's distant male parents as well as to one's own immediate father.

Omri—Pronounced as Ghomri

It is noteworthy that the Assyrian form of the name, *Yaua*, shows that the unpronounced *aleph* at the end called *him* Yahu (Jehu). Omri was likewise pronounced in accordance with the older system, before the *ghain* became *ayin*. *Humri* shows that they said at that time *Ghomri* (*ibid.*, p. 339).

The statement just made by Dr. Pinches is of utmost importance. Did you notice that the word "HUMRI" was pronounced, according to the older way of pronouncing the Hebrew, as "GHOMRI"? In other words the names "*Humri*" and "*Ghomri*" of the ancient historians, refer to the same people. This is a most important point to keep in mind. The names *Humri* and *Ghomri* are synonymous and consequently refer to the same people. According to the Behistun Rock Inscriptions the *Gimiri* (GHOMRI) were the same people as *the Sacae* or Scythians, *who gave birth to the Saxons, Celts, Cimmerians, Scots, Angles, Gauls, Cymri and other peoples who settled North-western Europe!*

It is also important to point out that *the Hebrew word "beth" means house. "Bethel" means "House of God," "Bethlehem" means "house of bread."*

The Assyrian language was also a Semitic language, closely related to Hebrew. But *the Assyrian word for "house" is "BIT"—not "beth" as in the Hebrew. The expressions "Bit-Omri" or "Bit-Humri," or "Bit-Humria," or "Bit-Ghomri," (all of which meant the "House of Omri") referred to the northern House of Israel, the house or kingdom over which Omri and his dynasty had ruled for many years.*

On the Behistun Rock Inscription we have seen that the words *Scythia, Saka (Sakka), Cimmerians, Gimiri, all refer to the same people.*

Later on we shall see a number of historical sources proving that the *Cymry, Khumri, and the Cimmerians* were all the same people and were generally placed by historians in the extreme *western* part of Europe.

Today we know *the Welsh still call themselves Kymry or Cymry!* In fact, the national party of Wales is called "*Plaid Cymru.*"

Notice how that, even to this very day, the ancient Cimmerian name for the Welsh people is still used by them:

"As in earlier days, a revived Welsh nationalism turned to education and the arts. The modern National Eisteddfod perpetuates interest in Welsh language, poetry, and choral music. Since 1944 primary and secondary schools have been established with Welsh as the sole language of instruction. Yet political nationalism survives and has been manifested in the *Plaid Cymru* party, which elected a member to Parliament in 1966" (*The New Columbia Ency.*, 1975 ed., art. "Wales").

The Cimmerians according to the ancient historians were located in the extreme western parts of Europe, including the British Isles.

For further proof that the Cimmerians (or Cimbri) dwelt in the extreme western parts of Europe, check the following references: Homer, *Odyssey* XI, 13-19; Herodotus I. 6, 15, 16, 103; and IV. 1, 11 *et seq*; Strabo, I. 20, 61; 309; XI 494.

65

Israel Called Cimmerians, Gimiri and Cymry

The importance of the dynastic name of Omri (Ghomri) in connection with the later history of the people of Israel has been clearly demonstrated. We have seen Omri and the *House of Omri (Bit-Humri)* and the *land of Omri (mat-Humri)* as mentioned by the Assyrians. It has also been pointed out from a number of historical sources that the Assyrians continued to call Israel by the name of Omri for centuries after he had died. They were, in fact, still speaking of the people of Omri and the territory of Northern Israel as "mat Bit-Humri" and as "mat Omri" at the time of the captivity of Israel in 721 B.C.

From the Behistun Rock Inscriptions, we have seen clearly pointed out that these inscriptions speak of the *Gimiri (Ghomri)* as being identical with the Cimmerians, who were also the same as the *Scythians* and the *Sacae (Saka)*.

Since the Cimmerians are the same people as the Gimiri, and these are the same as the people of Omri or Ghomri (according to Dr. Pinches), let us now trace these peoples from the land of their captivity in South-western Asia to their present lands.

Who were the Cimmerians, Gimiri and the Kymry?

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* gives the following account of the Cimmerians:

Cimmerii . . . Herodotus (iv. 11-13), in his account of *Scythia*, regards them as the early inhabitants of South Russia (after whom the Bosphorus Cimmerius q.v. and other places were named), driven by the Scyths along by the Caucasus into Asia Minor, where they maintained themselves for a century . . . Certainly it is that *in the middle of the 7th century B.C. (i.e. 650), Asia Minor was ravaged by northern nomads (Herod. iv. 12), one body of whom is called in Assyrian sources Gimirrai and is represented as coming through the Caucasus [the very region of Israel's captivity] . . . To the north of the Euxine (Black Sea) their main body was merged in the invading Scyths.* Later writers identified them with the *Cimbri* of Jutland, who were probably *Teutonized Celts* (11th ed., vol. VI, art. "Cimmerii," p. 368).

According to the above account, the *Cimmerii* lived anciently in the vicinity of the Black Sea. They early had an encounter with the Scyths. It was about 650 B.C.—100 years after Israel's captivity—that this occurred. Remember, some of the tribes of Israel went into captivity south of the Caucasus in 733-732 B.C.!

Also note carefully that at least one body of these *Cimmerii* were called by the Assyrians *Gimirrai*, and also that they are represented as "*coming through the CAUCASUS.*" This is the same general area where Israel was taken captive. We are informed by this article that their main body was *merged* to the north of the Black Sea (Euxine) in the invading Scyths. We shall later see some of the Scythians were called *Celto-Scythians*.

These Cimmerians were also later "identified with the *Cimbri of Jutland*" and we are further told that *they were "probably Teutonized CELTS."* Observe that the names of *Cimbri*, *Cimmerii* and *Celts* are all inextricably connected and are in turn closely allied to the Scythians whom we shall later study in much greater detail.

We are further informed by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that these Cimmerians or Cimbri wandered along the Danube for many years, and that the Cimbri later had an alliance with the Teutoni, and that they invaded northern Italy (*ibid.*, Vol. VI. Art. "Cimbri," p. 368).

Robert Owen says:

"South of the Caucasus"

In leaving the far east, they [the Kimmerians or Kymry] must have occupied a country south of the Caucasus, extending from the river Araxes to the Palus Maeotis or Sea of Azof, where Herodotus remarks on the many places yet bearing the name of Kimmerian in his time (The Kymry p. 11).

Did you notice that these Kimmerians had formerly occupied a country "south of the CAUCASUS"? This is the very territory to which Israel had been taken captive. So we see that *these people must have moved northwards through the Caucasus Mountains about one century after going into captivity!*

I have sought in the nomenclature of rivers and mountains some grounds for inferring the occupation of the *country east of the Euxine Sea* [Black Sea] by Kelts or traces of their presence, which any temporary irruption in later times will never suffice to explain (*ibid.*, p. 12).

Owen then shows that the Kymry had long occupied this territory. He mentions some tribal displacements, so common in barbaric Asia. The Massagetae invaded the Scythians, and they in turn threatened the Kimmerioi, who chose to avoid an unequal conflict by fleeing. Thus early began the inveterate duel between the *Kelts* and the *Teutons*, the *Kymry* and the *Saxons*. "This established historic event occurred B.C. 635" (*ibid.*, pp. 14, 15).

I avoid dwelling on France or Gallia, because its Keltic origin is incontestable; the proofs are abundant; and my aim is to illustrate only a portion of the race, the *Kymry*, as the *Welsh* still call themselves. To them their Armorican brethren are still Britons (Brython) (*ibid.*, p. 25).

He then mentions that "The account of themselves rendered by the *Kymry of Britain* makes them to consist of *three tribes of the same stock* . . ." (*ibid.*, p. 26). These three tribes were the (1) the Kymry, (2) the Lloegrwys, and (3) the Brython.

I cannot resist concluding that either the *Kimbri* were *Kymry*, or else that in remote times the tongues of Kelt and Goth agreed It is not impossible that some of the *Kimmerioi*, who retired from their Asiatic home before the onset of the *Scythians*, took a northern course, which the pursuers afterwards followed under the conduct of Odin from the Sea of Azov [the gulf of the Black Sea east of the Crimea] to the shores of the Baltic" (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 27).

Owen explains that before the Bretons reached England, they had invented or inherited the essentials of an earlier civilisation. "*Some of Their Traditions Resemble Semitic Records of Antediluvian Patriarchs*" (*ibid.*, p. 33). No wonder—since the Kelts (or Kymry) were in fact Semites!

He continues: "*Few of the modern Kelts, Kymry, Brezonet, and Gael, are aware that the apostle S. Paul addressed an epistle to a people of their blood and kindred*" (*ibid.*, p. 43). Yet such is indubitably substantiated by the facts. It will be more appropriate to cover this subject in greater detail in a later chapter, but it is interesting to note that Robert Owen, in the preceding statements, mentioned that the *Kelts, Kymry, Brezonet* and the Gael are all the same people!

British Celts Semites

Lysons makes this very interesting statement:

I confess but for the universal tradition which assigns our [BRITISH] descent to Japheth, *I should have been rather inclined to attribute to the British Celts a SEMITIC origin, which we find in Britain, and also on account of the language, the traces of which we find still attaching to the names of those places where they carried on their religious ceremonies* (*Our British Ancestors*, p. 18).

In other words, what Lysons admits is that the facts prove that the British are, after all, Semitic in origin, and not Japhetic as tradition would have us believe. Lysons remarks:

The *Cimmerians* seeming to be the same people with the *Gauls* or *Celts* under a different name; and it is observable that *the Welch, who are descended from the Gauls, still call themselves Cymri* or *Kymry* (*ibid.*, p. 23).

And on page 27 we read:

The identity of the *Cymri* of *Wales* with the *Cymbri* of the Romans, seems worthy of being accepted as an historic fact, upon the ground stated by Niebuhr and Arnold (*ibid.*, p. 27).

Notice how Lysons identifies all of the following peoples, and makes them come from *Armenia*—the very same general area where Israel was first taken into captivity. *Armenia* is located in the area just south of the *Caucasus Mountains*. Lysons says:

The chain of evidence seems to be complete. Appian (De Bell. Illyr., p. 758) says the *Cimbri were Celts*. Diodorus says that the *Cimbri were Gauls or Celts*; the Gauls were GALATAE *per syncope* GELTAE or KELTS: The names are synonymous (Cesar de Bell. Gall., lib. i). The way in which Mr. Rawlinson, in the Essay from which I have quoted, brings the Cymric Celts from Armenia to Britain is most masterly; it confirms all the traditions of the Welch, the views of Nennius and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles and all our earliest histories, and to anyone who has studied the question, seems most convincing (*ibid.*, p. 27).

Notice that Lysons shows that the name *Geltae* is the same as *Keltae*, and this name is related to *Galatai*, *Galli* and other cognate names. These points all show conclusively that these are all basically the same people.

Britons Came From Armenia

It is interesting to note that according to Lysons *the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle also shows that some of the early inhabitants of Britain had come from Armenia*.

Here is the actual wording of this as it is found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*:

The island Britain is 800 miles lon. and 200 miles broad, and there are in the island five nations; *English, Welsh (or British), Scottish, Pictish, and Latin*. The first inhabitants were *the Britons, who came from Armenia*, and first peopled Britain southward (p. 21, translated by James Ingram).

This statement clearly shows that the British (or the Britons) had their origin in Armenia. Bear in mind that the Lost Ten Tribes were deported from the land of Israel into the district immediately *south of the Caucasus Mountains*, or to the *vicinity of Armenia*.

Lysons also shows that the *Gimiri* were the same people as the *Cimmerii* (*Our British Ancestors*, p. 26).

Sharon Turner, in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, mentions the following points regarding the Kimmerians. He shows that the Keltic language was the same as the Kimmerian language (*ibid.* Vol. I, p. 23). He says the Kelts were the same people as the Kimmerians, and that they inhabited the far west of Europe (*ibid.*, p. 24). *The Kimmerians and Kelts* were the same as the *Kimbri*, or to be more exact, he says:

That the *Kimmerioi* of the Greeks were the *Kimbrioi* of the Greeks, and the *Cimbri* (Kimbri) of the Latin writers, was not only the opinion of Posidonius, whom Strabo quotes, Lib. VII, p. 293 . . . Diodorus Siculus expressly says, that to those who were called *Kimmerios*, the appellation of *Kimbrioi* was applied in the process of time . . . Plutarch, in his life of Marius, also identifies the *Kimbri* with the *Kimmerioi* (*ibid.*, fn. p. 28).

The Nordics [referring to *Cimmerians* etc.] also swept down through Thrace into Greece and Asia Minor, while other large and important groups entered Asia partly through the *Caucasus Mountains*, but in greater strength they migrated around the northern and EASTERN sides of the CASPIAN-ARAL SEA (*ibid.*, p. 214).

Notice how this indicates the very territory to which Israel had been deported about 100 years earlier.

When the Assyrian power was beginning to wane, these captive peoples availed themselves of the opportunity to flee from under the oppressive yoke of their Assyrian overlords.

The Cimmerians

The following account of the Cimmerians is given in *The New Columbia Encyclopedia*: "Cimmerians . . . ancient people of S. Russia of whom little is actually known. They are mentioned in Homer, but they emerge into history only in the 8th cent. B.C. when they were driven by the Scythians from their former home in the Crimea and came to the region around Lake Van (in present-day E. Turkey). Defeated (634 B.C.) by the Scythians, the Cimmerians swept across Asia Minor, plundering Lydia and breaking the power of Phrygia. The biblical GOMER may be the eponym of the Cimmerians, and they are mentioned in the inscriptions of the Assyrians, with whom they warred" (*The New Columbia Ency.*, 1975 ed., art. "Cimmerians"). The Cimmerians have not descended from "Gomer" but trace their origin to Shem, son of Noah.

The following quotes give us a fairly complete picture of the Celts: "The Celts were a group of tribes speaking Into-European dialects. Armed with iron weapons and mounted on horses, they spread rapidly over Europe, crossing into the British Isles, moving S. over France, Italy, and Spain, fighting the Macedonians, and penetrating into Asia Minor, where they raided Hellenistic centers. The Celts introduced the newly developed iron industries. Their wealth from trade and from raiding helped to maintain their dominance over Central Europe during the Iron Age. The LA TENE culture developed among the Celts. Greek influences that stimulated Celtic culture included the introduction of the chariot and of writing. Art flourished in richly ornamented styles. The Celts lived in semifortified villages, with a tribal organization that became increasingly hierarchial as wealth was acquired. Priests, nobles, craftsmen, and peasants were clearly distinguished, and the powers of the chief became kinglike. The Celts believed in a demonic universe and relied on the ministry of the DRUIDS. Much Western European folklore is derived from the Celts. By the 4th cent. B.C. they could no longer withstand the encroaching Germanic tribes, and they lost most of their holdings in the north and in W. Germany. From that time on, Celtic history becomes confused with that of the many unsettled tribes in Europe. Celtic language and culture were variously dispersed among peoples of little historical identity, and until the 20th cent. historians obscured the very important differences among these groups by naming them all Celts. Further

confusion has resulted from the designation of the Celts as a racial group. To the Greeks and Romans, the Celts were tall, muscular, and light-skinned, but it is believed that these were qualities of the Celt warriors rather than Celts in general" (*The New Columbia Ency.*, 1975 ed., art. "Celt").

"On the South Russian Steppes the first approximation of a mounted nomad power was that of people known in classical sources as the Cimmerians, who ruled north of the Caucasus and on the Pontic Steppes (north of the Black Sea), with an extension into Hungary The origin of the Cimmerians is hard to trace. They may have originated in the North Caucasin culture, advancing northwards to conquer the Pontic Steppes and part of the Danubian plain where new types of harness equipment of Koban style appear c. 800 B.C.

"In general history the Cimmerians are chiefly famous for their invasion of Asia Minor in 680-670 B.C. which, according to Herodotus, was the result of their flight from the Scythians. They left the Pontic Steppes and crossed the Caucasus, leaving a small remnant behind fortifications in the Taman Peninsula, east of the straits of Kerch, the ancient Cimmerian Bosphorus But at any rate he [Herodotus] must be correct in saying that they crossed the mountains farther west than the Scythians, who went by the Caspian coast to Media. An alternative route would lead them into Armenia, and it is there that they appear late in the eighth century on the northern border of the kingdom of Urartu as the Gimirrai or Gamir of Assyrian records. The crown prince Sennacherib reports to his father Sargon (721-705 B.C.), at war with Urartu, that its king Rusas has been heavily defeated by the Cimmerians.

"The Cimmerians, while occupying northern Urartu, appear finally as allies of the Urartians against Assyria and then advance westward. In 695 B.C. they destroyed the kingdom of Phrygia and afterwards dominated central Anatolia in the time of Sennacherib (704-681 B.C.). They overran Lydia, devastated the Greek cities of the coast, such as Ephesus, Magnesia and Smyrna, and finally turned south against Cilicia, then an Assyrian province. The remnant of the Cimmerians in Anatolia eventually settled west of Armenia in Cappadocia. Others, who had passed along the eastern border of Assyria, reached the Zagros mountains where they may have been absorbed by the Medes" (*The Royal Hordes*, Phillips, pp. 51-53).

Remember, it was "late in the eighth century" that God caused the people of the Ten Tribes of Israel (whom the Assyrians called the Gimirrai or Gamir) to be deported into Assyria and Media—into the area adjacent to "Armenia." And it is easy to see how these "Cimmerians (or Gimirrai) . . . appear finally as allies of the Urartians against Assyria." It would be only natural for the conquered and ravaged tribes of Israel to turn on their conquerors as soon as they had a chance.

That the Cimbrî and the Cimmerii were identical is also clear from the following statements:

"*Cimbrî*, A Celtic people, probably of the same race as the *Cymry* They appeared to have inhabited the peninsula which was called after them Chersonesus Cimbrica" (Smith, *Smaller Classical Dictionary*, Art. "Cimbrî," p. 150).

Speaking of these people, Smith says: "Cimmerii . . . The historical Cimmerii dwelt on the Palus Maeotis (Sea of Azov), in the Tauric Chersonesus, and in Asiatic Sarmatia" (*ibid.*, Art. "Cimmerii," p. 150, 151). In this instance, the Cimmerii are mentioned as living north of the Black Sea.

From where did the Cimbri originate—before they migrated into Jutland, and other parts of Northwest Europe from the vicinity of the Black Sea? "The earliest writer who makes mention of these *Kimbri* is Philemon, contemporary of Aristotle: according to him, they called their ocean *Mori-Marusa*, or the Dead Sea, up to the promontory of Rubeas . . ." (*Histoire des Gaulois*, Thierry, Introd., p. 56). Remember, the Dead Sea is found only in the Promised Land.

"It is the last of the landmarks which links the Kimerii of the Black Sea to the Cimbri of Jutland, to the Belgians of Gaul, to the Bretons of Albion [i.e. Britain], and we go on . . . to recognize that in this vast people remained the nucleus of the second of the Gaulic races, and that its name, so ancient, so renowned, so well known, was none other than the very name of this race" (*Histoire des Gaulois*, Thierry, p. 70, Introd.).

"There was among the ancients an opinion, or better said, a fact accepted as nearly incontestable, that the inhabitants of the British archipelago and Gaul were peoples originating from the same race" (*ibid.*, Thierry, p. 8).

Furthermore, we are told that "The name given to the Celtic tribe of the Gauls, taken from the German form *Walah*, applies to the *Valaques*, or *Wallons*, or *Gallois*, to the *Gauls* themselves. The Germans derived *Walah* from a name that they mispronounced . . . Also derived from *Walah* is the term *Welsh*" (*The Origins*, Brentano, pp. 31-32).

"Gaul is the same as the old German *Walah*; *Wales* [French: *Galles*] is derived from *Weath*" (*The First Inhabitants of Europe*, p. 420).

Pelloutier says that "*Waller*, *Galler* and *Galli*," signify "stranger" or "wanderer," and he adds that these people had given themselves this name because of having to leave their country in a voluntary exile (*Histoire de Celtes*).

"It appears that the Celts . . . giving themselves the name *Waller* or *Galler* thus indicated that they had been *chased from their ancient home* or that they had voluntarily condemned themselves to exile" (*Thoughts on the Gael*, Grant, p. 156).

Anciently the Celtic or Gallic language was spoken over much of Northwestern Europe: "Today one applies it especially to the races who spoke a language whose dialects existed in *Britain*, in the country of the *Gauls*, in the mountains of the *Scots* and in *Ireland*, races more or less homogeneous, who . . . peopled not only Gaul, but most of Switzerland and the British Isles" (*Gaul and the Gauls*, Zeller, pp. 11, 12).

If we carefully piece together all of the various points which are clearly brought out by the different historians concerning the Cimmerians, the Gimiri and the Kymry, we are brought to the following conclusions:

(1) The Cimmerians appear in history in the same general vicinity to which Israel had been taken captive.

(2) They appear about one century after the first tribes of Israel were deported into the regions south of the Caucasus Mountains, near the Black and Caspian Seas—about 733-732 B.C.

(3) All of these peoples are closely related i.e. the Cimmerians, Gimiri, and the Kymry.

(4) They leave the area of Armenia, or the Caucasus regions, and arrive in Northwest Europe. In fact, as we will see later, branches of these Cimmerians penetrated into Central Europe, North Italy, Spain, and into many countries of Europe, as well as into Britain and Scandinavia.

(5) We have also observed that these Cimmerian or Kymric peoples are closely related to the Gauls and Kelts, but this particular phase will be covered more thoroughly in a later chapter.

(6) All of these peoples were sprung from the Scythian hoard, and mixed freely with them. The fact that they fought with the Scythians does not mean they were not close relatives of the Scyths. We have previously observed that the tribes of Israel even while still living in the Promised Land were continually warring among themselves, as is also mentioned in James 1:1; 4:1.

(7) The *Cimmerians* were the same as the *Gimiri* who were also the same as the *Ghomri* or the people of *Omri*. These peoples were different branches of Dispersed Israel.

BOOK II — WANDERINGS

Chapter Seven

Italy

The Physical Characteristics of the Celts

Our search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel among the peoples of Northwest Europe brings us into close scrutiny of the Celts (Kelts).

Before concluding our study of the *Cimmerian branch* of the dispersed Israelites, let us examine more closely the people who were known in history as the "Celts." We have already seen that the *Gauls*, *Cimmerians*, *Cymry* and the *Celts* are all simply different offshoots of the *Cimmerian branch of the great Scythian people*.

The subject of the physical composition of the Celtic peoples is one of the most controversial on the study of European history (Coon, *Races of Europe*, p. 186). Some have argued that the Celts were tall and blond; others have maintained that they were dark and short. The truth of the matter, as we shall soon see, is that the Celtic peoples contained both blond and brunette elements.

We are informed in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* that the ancient writers never applied the term "Celt" to any dark-complexioned person. They always spoke of the Celts as having (1) great stature, (2) fair hair, and (3) blue or grey eyes. The Greeks spoke of all fair-haired people north of the Alps as Kelts or Kelttoi (11th ed., Vol. V, Art. "Celt").

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* mentions that the Celts were of two types:

(1) *N. W. European*—with its chief seat in Scandinavia. This type of Celt has a long head, long face, narrow nose, blue eyes, very light hair and great stature. They are also known as *Teutons*.

(2) *Alpines*—who inhabit the mountainous districts of Europe. They have a broad head, broad face, heavy, broad nose, hazel-grey eyes, light chestnut hair, medium height, and thick-set body.

There is every reason to believe that the original Celts, like the early Teutons and Germani, were primarily of "Nordic" racial type even though a number of round- or broad-headed Alpine type were undoubtedly included among them. This name "Celt" has certainly been applied in later times to some Alpine types.

The *Teutons* are universally held to the *Celts* (*Ency. Brit.*, vol. V, art. "Celt"). *All of the Celtae or Galatae in France had come across the Rhine. The Belgic tribes in Northern France were Cimbri* who had crossed the Rhine. We are also informed that the *Umbrians* were *Alpine Celts*. This article mentions that the *Cimmerians* were the same as the *Gimirri* mentioned in the Assyrian monuments (*ibid.*).

The ancient writers spoke of all the GAULS as CIMBRI and identified them with the CIMMERIANS of earlier date. The CELTS mixed freely with the SCYTHIANS and were called Celto-Scythians (ibid.).

The Celts had continued to move westward from the Black Sea and Caucasus region. We have already shown that all of *these Celtic or Cimbric peoples had their origin in the vicinity of the Caucasus Mountains*—the very same general area to which Israel was deported (*ibid.*). We are informed in this same article that *the Belgae were of Cimbric origin.*

When did the Celts begin their period of expansion? According to the article just referred to in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, we are told that the "general Celtic unrest" occurred in the 6th century B.C. This was about two centuries after the Ten Tribes were deported to the Caucasus Mountain region!

Dr. Guest mentions the following points regarding the Celts: He says that *the early Greeks employed Kimmerioi as a general name for the Celtic races (Origines Celticae, Vol. I, p. 7).* These *Kimmerioi* lived "to the furthest limit of the deeply flowing Ocean" (*ibid.*, p. 8). By that, he meant that they lived in the *western part of Europe* near the Atlantic Ocean. He mentions that the *Celts or Kimmerioi* lived in Spain and named a town there "*Kimmeris*" (*ibid.*, p. 10). The *Celts* also lived in the countries lying along the Mediterranean (*ibid.*, p. 17). Dr. Guest says that Herodotus stated the *Kimmerioi* were living *formerly in the Crimea and in the steppes, stretching from the Don to the Dnieper (ibid.*, p. 17). He then shows that the *Kimmerioi* were *invaded by the Skuthai*; and he says this took place in the 6th century B.C. (*ibid.*, p. 17). And remember that this would have been about two centuries after Northern Ten-tribed Israel was taken captive by Assyria to the Caucasus regions.

"Our most trustworthy authorities," says Dr. Guest, "agree in fixing these events in the latter part of the sixth century B.C." (*ibid.*, p. 17).

Celts Also Called Gauls

The Romans called the Celtic race by the name *Galli (ibid.*, p. 38). The *Kimbri* (Kelts) were supposed to have emigrated, according to Dr. Guest, from the *Pontic Scythia (Scythia north of the Black Sea)* into Europe over a period of many years (*ibid.*, p. 43). He also mentions that these Kelts were known as *Kelto-Skuthai*, or *Kelto-Scythians*. Dr. Guest says that Plutarch's *Marius II* employs this phrase "*Kelto-Skuthai*" to designate the *Kimbric* migration which had early passed from the *Pontic Scythia* to the Western Ocean—to the territory of *Jutland* which we now call *Denmark*. He also informs us that the words "*Volcae*," "*Bolcae*," and "*Belgae*," all refer to the

same people (*ibid.*, p. 378). The GAELS were the same people as the GALLI, and the *Belgae* were a *Gaelic* race (*ibid.*, p. 385).

Other points worth noting are mentioned by Dinan in his *Monumenta Historica Celtica*, Volume I. He states that the *Adriatic Celts* came to Alexander the Great for the purpose of establishing a treaty of good will and "guest friendship." Alexander asked them what they feared most, supposing they would answer that he was the chief object of their dread. They replied that they feared most that the sky might fall upon them. Alexander made a treaty with them, but thought they were a bit arrogant.

It is interesting to observe that *one of the Celtic tribes was called by the name "BRETTII"* (*ibid.*, p. 91). This tribe was undoubtedly related to the "BRYTHON" and other similar peoples who later came to the *British Isles* and gave their name to *Britain*.

There was a Celtic tribe, according to Dinan, called the "OMBRI"—"*The land of the OMBRI*" (*ibid.*, p. 33); he mentions also a Celtic people known as the "UMBRI" who were supposed to have led a luxurious life (*ibid.*, pp. 35, 53).

The "UMBRI" and the "OMBRI" were part of the Celtic division of the dispersed "land of Omri" or *House of Omri* or *people of Omri* (pronounced as *Ghomri*). They lived in North and Central Italy. One can easily see how these words are very similar in pronunciation. The Celts who lived in the far west (*ibid.*, 43), were great admirers of the Greeks (pp. 45, 51), and were on the most friendly terms with them.

Another point mentioned by Dinan proving the affinity of the *Cimbri* and the *Celts* is that Pytheas discovered that *the Cimbri spoke a Celtic tongue* (*ibid.*, p. 54).

Dinan says that according to Poseidonius of Apamea, the Galatae were of tall stature, had soft flesh and white skin, and naturally blond hair, which they often bleached still further (*ibid.*, p. 313). Speaking of the women of Galatae, Dinan says: "Their children at birth are generally of fair hair, but as they grow up it assumes the colour of their fathers" (*ibid.*, p. 323).

The Galatae (Celts) were famed for their courage (*ibid.*, pp. 323, 325). He also mentions that these Galatae were formerly known as Cimmerians, Cimbri, and as Gallo-Graecians (*ibid.*).

"Celts . . . From Armenia"

Lysons says that "*The Celts had an unvarying tradition that they came from the east*" (*Our British Ancestors*, p. 27). We observed earlier that these *Cymbric Celts came from Armenia to Britain* (*ibid.*, p. 27). Some think "Armenia" should read "Armorica," but we have seen from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that it plainly says "Armenia," and that is exactly what it means! *These Cymric Celts and Gauls came from Armenia in the area of the Caucasus.*

"In addition to the Keltic invaders of Anatolia . . . other tribes, such as the UMBRI, began about the same time to overrun Italy along with the *Kelts* from Noricum" (Kephart, *Races of Mankind*, p. 284). And on page 302 we read ". . . other Keltic intruders, the UMBRI from Illyria, entered the Po

2
UMBRIANS

MB

River valley and pushed earlier arrivals ahead of them down the eastern coast and the Apennines." We also read of the Etruscans invading Northern Italy from Tyre and "driving the UMBRI to Central Italy" (*ibid.*, p. 302). We are further informed that "... the *Volsci* were a branch of the UMBRI in Central Italy . . . (*ibid.*, p. 304).

Who were these Celtic "Umbri" or "Ombri"? Why, there can be no doubt whatsoever—they were people of *Cymric* or *Cimmerian* origin; and remember the *Cimmerians* were the same people as the *Gimirri*, mentioned in the Babylonian language on the Behistun Rock Inscriptions.

Sharon Turner, in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I, mentions the following important points regarding the Celts. Firstly, he equates the Celts (or Kelts) with the following peoples—Keltai, Kimmerians (Cimmerians), and Kimmerii, Kimbri, Cymry, Kymry, Kumri, Galatai, Galli (pp. 23-41). Secondly, he shows that the Keltai were "one of the branches of the Kimmerian stock" (*ibid.*, p. 36). Thirdly, he mentions that the home-base of the Celts was France (*ibid.*, p. 41), and from *France* and *Belgium*, they spread themselves virtually over the whole of Europe, including the *British Isles*. Fourthly, he shows that these Kymry (or Celtae) had come from the *eastern part of Europe, from Constantinople*. Fifthly, he mentions that the Celtic language was identical with the Kimmerian language, proving still further that the Celts and the Cymry were all the same people. They were all branches of the great Cimmerian stock which came from the Caucasus regions in the vicinity of present-day Armenia.

Celtic Expansion

It should be noted that the Celts did not come onto the world scene until quite some time after the Ten-Tribed Northern Kingdom of Israel was deported into Assyria and Media (south of the Caucasus-Caspia Sea area) in 721 B.C.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica has the following interesting comments regarding the Celts, their appearance and expansion during ancient times.

"From the 5th century B.C. on, the Celts became well known throughout the contemporary world, and their culture at the time of the zenith of their power (5th-1st centuries B.C.) has been exhaustively studied by archaeologists But *the history of the Celts before the 5th century remains very uncertain*" (*Ency. Brit.*, 1974 ed., art. "Celts, ancient").

Why is this so, when they later became so populous and wealthy? "The wealth of the Celtic princes seems to have been very great, some of the barrows (mound graves) being particularly richly furnished for their size" (*ibid.*).

"Celtic Expansion. During the Hallstatt period, the Celts expanded through France to the Iberian Peninsula, to the British Isles, and also to some extent eastward into central Europe Celtic bands also entered Italy, groups such as the Boii, the Insubres, the Lingones, and the Senones first attacking Etruria, while later groups reached the Adriatic coast and about the year 387 B.C. (the conventional date is 390) raided and plundered

Rome, also penetrating into southern Italy. The Romans later recovered and drove the Celts back to the Alpine foothills, whence some of them withdrew, probably into central Europe.

"In the second stream of expansion their raids reached central Europe, the Carpathians, and the Balkans. This expansion was later described by the Roman historian Livy, who recounts how two branches of the Bituriges settled near the Hercynian Forest, a range of mountains of southern and central Germany (under their ruler Sigovesus) and in Italy (under Bellovesus). Literary sources suggest that the Celts reached the Carpathians [in E. Europe] in the 4th century, later moving into present-day Bulgaria, Romania, Thrace, and Macedonia; they raided the shrine at Delphi, Greece, in 279. One group reached Anatolia, where they settled and gave their name to *Galatia*. In the 3rd century Celts were serving as mercenaries in Greece, Anatolia, and Egypt" (ibid.).

It is clear from this source, that the Celts were both widespread and feared—a terror unto the Romans, Greeks and others of the so-called civilized world.

What kind of people were they?

"In the eyes of Greeks and Romans, the Celts were remarkable for their height, muscularity, and fair colouring. These are the characteristics of the warrior class rather than of the whole population, and skeletal remains point to considerable variation in stature and head form. Strabo describes them as a people who love war and adventure, pleasure and feasts" (ibid.).

Notice further historical evidence:

The *Celts* were described by the ancient writers as men of *large stature*, of *fair complexion*, and with *flaxen* or *red hair*. They were long the terror of the Romans: *once they took Rome*, and laid it in ashes (B.C. 390) (Smith, *A Smaller Classical Dictionary*, art. "Celtae," p. 137).

"Compared with Mediterranean peoples they [Celts] had lighter colouring and were tall and strongly built; it is thought they were dolichocephalic [long-headed] or mesocephalic [medium-headed] . . ." (*Chambers Encyclopaedia*, 1959 ed., art. "Celts").

Widespread Celtic Influence

Note that they occupied the western parts of Europe a few centuries before Christ. "*Celtae*, [were] a mighty race, which *occupied the greater part of western Europe* in ancient times" (ibid., p. 137).

After mentioning that the *Celtae*, *Galatae*, and the *Galli* were all the same people, Turner shows that the Celts had spread themselves over much of Europe.

Besides the *Celts of Gaul*, we are informed that there were eight other different settlements of these Celtic peoples. There were:

(1) *Iberian Celts* who crossed the Pyrenees and settled in *Spain*. They were known as the *Celtiberi*.

(2) The *British Celts* who were the most ancient inhabitants of *Britain*, or *Britannia*.

- (3) The *Belgic Celts*. They were the earliest inhabitants of *Gallia Belgica*.
 (4) The *Italian Celts*. They had crossed the Alps at a fairly early period and settled in *Northern Italy* which was called after them, *Gallia Cisalpina*.
 (5) There were *Celts* in the *Alps* and on the *Danube* who were known as the *Helvetii*, the *Gothini*, and a number of other tribes.
 (6) The *Illyrian Celts*.
 (7) The *Macedonian* and the *Thracian Celts*. They had remained behind in Macedonia while their Celtic brethren had invaded Greece, and
 (8) The *Asiatic Celts*. They were known as the *Tolistobogi*, *Troceni*, and *Tectosages*, who founded the kingdom of GALATIA (Smith, *A Smaller Classical Dictionary*, Art. "Celtae," p. 137).

Deniker mentions that the *Trans-Alpine Celts* or *Galatians* invaded JUTLAND in the 5th century B.C. under the name of *Celto-Belgae*. Also, at this same time they invaded North Germany, the Low Countries and England. (*The Races of Man*, pp. 321, 322). He says that:

The Roman conquest of Trans-Alpine Europe, effected in the 1st century B.C. and A.D. imposed the language of Latium on the majority of Celts, Iberians and Italo-Celts, and maintained the population within almost the same bounds during three centuries (*ibid.*, p. 322).

This shows when and how these Celts or Gauls came to speak a Latin tongue.

Dr. Wylie says:

The new-comers brought with them the tradition of their descent. They called themselves *Cymry* or *Kymbry*. They are the GIMIRRAI of the Assyrian monuments. The Greeks, adopting their own designation, styled them *Kimmerioi*, and the Latins *Cimbri*" (*History of the Scottish Nation*, p. 15).

We have already seen that the "Gimirrai of the Assyrian monuments" are the same people as "Bit Humri"—the house of Omri, and we have also seen that Omri was a prominent king of Ten-Tribed Northern Israel!

Speaking of the *Celts*, Dr. Wylie says:

They are known in history by three names—the CELTAE, the GALATAE, and the GALLI. Their irruption from their primeval home in Central Asia was the terror of the age in which it took place. In the fourth century before Christ, after some considerable halt, they resumed their migrations westwards in overwhelming numbers and resistless force. They scaled the barrier of the Alps, rushed down on Italy, gave the towns of Etruria to sack, defeated the Roman armies in battle, and pursued their victorious march to the gates of Rome, where they butchered the Senators in the Capital, and had well nigh strangled the Great Republic in its infancy" (*ibid.*, Chap. 5, pp. 47, 48).

The one Cimric family was divided into the northern and southern branches. The northern branch inhabiting "from the shores of the German Ocean to the confines of Asia, and beyond, are known by the general name of

79

Scythians. The southern, who dwell in Belgium and France, and overflow—for their lands were fertile—into the mountains of Switzerland and the north of Spain, were the Gauls. Both peoples, as Tacitus informs us, spoke the same language, though differing slightly in dialect, and that language was the Gallic or Celtic.

“*In process of time, the memory of their common parentage was lost, and the tribes or nations of later formation, of the Scythians and the Gauls, began to weigh heavily upon the earlier Kimbriic races, by whom the various countries of Europe—empty until their arrival—had been peopled*” (*ibid.* Chap. XX, p. 165).

Celts—“From the Same Stock”

The earliest population of Britain was *Cimric*, according to Dr. Wylie, but three new varieties, the Pict, the Scot and the Gaul finally all made their way to the British Isles where they settled. “There exists abundant evidence,” he says, “to show that *all the inhabitants of Britain, from this early period onward, were all sprung from the same stock, though they arrived in our island by different routes, and are known by different names*” (*ibid.*, p. 265).

He then mentions that the *Bretons* (or *Cimri*) and the *Picts* (the *Caledonian Picts*), the *Belgae* (or *Gauls*), and the *Scots* “*were but four several branches from the same root, and that root was Gallic or Celtic*” (*ibid.*, pp. 265, 266).

Thus it is clear that all of the various tribes who have entered the British Isles at one time or another have all been of the great *Scythian* or *Cimmerian* branches of the human race; and that branch was composed almost completely of *dispersed Israelites*, who had *lost their identity* long before arriving in Northwestern Europe.

The Brut, or The Chronicles of the Kings of Britain also shows the same thing. *Celtae, Galatai, Gaul* and *Gael* are all considered as one people (p. 250).

There can be no doubt that the *Celts*, the *Cimbri*, the Britons and the *Cymri* are identical (Mallet, *Northern Antiquities*. fn., p. 68).

Haddon says that the *Belgae* who occupied Northeast Gaul and Southeast Britain about the first century B.C. were not distinguished by Roman authors from *pure Nordics* (*The Races of Man*, p. 59).

We have noticed that the *Belgae*, and the *Celts* were mainly *fair and Nordic in type*. Now let us see what archaeology can do to enlighten us as to the racial affinities of these Celtic peoples.

We have earlier noted that *Coon* mentioned the confusion which exists over the subject of the Celts. He speaks of the *Celtic Expansion which began about 500 B.C.*; he mentions that it was a rapid and extensive one (*Races of Europe*, p. 187), including Italy, Spain, Asia Minor and most of Continental Europe. The center of dispersion was Belgium and Northern France (*ibid.*, p. 187).

The Kelts introduced trousers into Western Europe. This garment, he

says, was Central Asiatic in origin and was typical of the Scyths (*ibid.*, p. 187). This is just another link showing that the Celts and the Cymry were all sprung from the Scythian people.

Were the Celts long-headed, or round-headed? Coon says that both types were represented in the Celts (*ibid.*, p. 188).

In Bohemia, out of 27 crania, we are told that *most were "dolichocephalic"* (long-headed), but that there was a "significant minority of brachycephals" (*ibid.*, 188). It is well to bear in mind that the *Keltic Boii*, who once lived in Bohemia and who gave their name to it, are no longer found there in any great numbers. He says that the skulls from the Swiss and other series were primarily a long-headed type (*ibid.*, p. 189).

The well-known "Dying Gaul" and similar statues are of mesocephalic or brachycephalic head form (*ibid.*, p. 190). It may be well to add that some present-day Israelites living in the Low Countries, the Benelux countries, and in France and Switzerland are mesocephalic (medium-headed) or low brachycephalic (broad-headed).

The original Israelites must have been both round-headed as well as long-headed though modern day descendants of Ten-Tribed Israel have far more long-heads than broad-heads.

Only the northern part of France, says Coon, *received any great amount of Keltic blood* in the early populations of what later became the French nation (*ibid.*, p. 191).

Were the Celts a blond or a brunette race?

Blondism was by no means characteristic of the Kelts as a whole. Rufosity was common, and the hair color was essentially mixed. Caesar himself noted the contrast between the ordinary Gauls and the partly Germanic Belgae, to whom he had to turn to find real blondes, for his triumph. Furthermore, the Romans noted that Keltic practice of bleaching the hair to simulate a blonde ideal, as in Greece" (ibid., p. 192).

According to this statement, we can see that it is not accurate to speak of all of the Celts as either blond or brunet. They were "mixed," but all historical references show that they tended more toward blondism.

When we consider all of the points which we have seen mentioned by all of the different authors, here is the picture which emerges: The *Celts, Cymry, Cimmerians, Gauls, Galatians, Gaels* and other peoples who ravaged and who finally populated much of Europe in past centuries were definitely a closely related people. *They were all just different branches of the same Cimmerian stock; and we have seen that, though there were brunets among them, yet most historical sources show that blondism must have been predominant just as it is today in the countries which were finally settled by these Cymric or Celtic peoples.* (Remember, the word "blond" also denotes varying shades of brown, whereas brunet simply means very dark brown or black hair.)

We have also noticed a number of references showing a very close racial connection between the *Cimmerian* and the *Scythian* branches of these peoples. They were, as we have had clearly pointed out, all of the same type or "race" of people. We have also noticed that *all of these peoples trace*

their origin back to the region of the *Caucasus Mountains*—the very place to which Israel was taken in 733-732 and 721 B.C. Most of these Celto-Scythians were just different segments of Israel in exile.

We have seen the origin of the Celtic peoples, but we have not gone into the origin of the word "Celt" or "Kelt" in this chapter.

Let us again notice an interesting statement by Lysons regarding the Celts.

The chain of evidence seems to be complete. Appian . . . says the *Cimbri were Celts*. Diodorus says that the *Cimbri were Gauls or Celts; the Gauls were Galatae per syncope Geltae or Keltae*: The names are synonymous The way in which Mr. Rawlinson, in the Essay from which I have quoted brings the *Cymric Celts from ARMENIA TO BRITAIN* is most masterly."

According to the above statement, the word "Galatae" was also spelled as "Geltae" or "Keltae." This is seemingly, according to Lysons, the derivation of the word Celt or Kelt.

Is it possible that this name "Kelt" is derived from the name of a rivulet or a brook just northeast of Jerusalem, very near Jericho? The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* speaks of this brook and calls it "Wadi Kelt" (11th ed., vol. XIX, art. "Palestine," o. 602).

This same Wadi is mentioned a number of times in the *Rand McNally Bible Atlas*, but it speaks of it as the "Wadi el Qelt" (Chap. XIX, p. 395).

It is highly possible that this name comes from "Wadi Kelt." The Ten Tribes of Israel would have been familiar with this Wadi since many of them from Northern Israel would have passed near it on their way to observing the annual festivals in Jerusalem.

Kelts have never in modern times lived in the area of Jericho, but it is now abundantly evident that the ancestors of the present-day Kelts did once live in the vicinity of the "Wadi Kelt."

Many Gauls (And Some Galatians) Were Israelites

No search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel would be complete without a close look at the "Gauls." Who were they? From where did they come—before arriving in Western Europe?

What is the origin of such words as "Gaul," "Gael," "Galatian"? These and other related words are connected directly with the people of Israel from the time of their captivity!

The tribes of Reuben, Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, lying east of the Jordan River, in the lands of Bashan and Gilead, were among the first of the Israelites (the Bit-Humri or Bit-Ghomri) to go into captivity in the years 733-732 B.C.*

In the territory inhabited by the half tribe of Manasseh lying east of the Jordan, there was a city named "Golan." The word Golan is a Hebrew word and means "exile" or "captive." (Strong, *The Exhaustive Concordance*).

Dispersed Israelites Were "Golah" Or "Gaulah"

Spier mentions the name by which the exiles of Israel were known, at the time of the Second Temple. He says: "The second holidays were adopted by the entire GOLAH, *the communities living beyond the confines of Israel* [meaning the exiled Ten Tribes]" (*The Comprehensive Hebrew Calendar*, p. 11).

This Jewish author uses the word "Golah" when referring to the dispersed Israelites who were living beyond the confines of the Promised Land. Note the similar pronunciation of the words "Golah" and "Gaul." Speaking of the territory east of the Jordan River and the Sea of Galilee, Hurlbut says, "Decapolis . . . embraced no less than five sections as may be seen upon the map: (1) Gaulonities, the ancient Golan now Jaulan, east of the Jordan" (*A Bible Atlas*, p. 94).

This is speaking of New Testament Palestine. The city which was anciently called "Golan" had by New Testament times given its name to the district called "Gaulonities." (*Ency. Biblica*, art. "Golan," pp. 1747, 1748).

The word "Golan" had been slightly changed in spelling to Gaulon-itis, the land of the Gaulon, meaning the land of the dispersed. On pages 100, 101, 104 and 105 of Hurlbut's *A Bible Atlas* are maps illustrating this area lying immediately to the east of the Sea of Galilee.

The celebrated Jewish historian, Josephus, speaks of a territory in the inheritance of Israel known as Gaulonitis. "He also gave Gaulonitis . . . to Philip, who was his son . . ." (*At. Bk. XVIII, Chap. VIII par. I*). See map IX.

We now know that the people of Israel who lived in the area of GAULON-ITIS or Golan went into their captivity in 733-732 B.C. These "Gaulonites" from Gaulonitis were the first to be dispersed among the nations. Since they spoke Hebrew at the time of their exile, they must have called themselves "Golah" or Gauls meaning "exiles" or "Captives." These East-Jordanic Gauls, the exiles, or captives, who had been taken out of their land by the Assyrians, had probably ceased to pronounce the "h" sound by this time.

We shall see later on that these same people afterward bore the name "Gauls" in Europe and some of their kindred brethren also bore the name "Galatians," and lived in Central Asia Minor—in the heart of modern-day Turkey. The true Galatians (or Gauls) only comprised about one-tenth of the population of the territory of "Galatia."

The reader will search in vain, however, to find one historian who will give the true derivation of the word "Gaul" though there are different conjectures. The reason why seemingly nobody has understood the derivation of this word is that Israel was to be *lost* and *scattered* among the nations. Their identity was not to be revealed until these last days.

Who Were The Gauls?

Speaking of the Gauls and Kelts, Funck-Brentano in his work, *The Earliest Times*, states that the Celts came from the north—from Jutland,

Friesland and from the coasts of the Baltic. He says: "They were the Normans of the century before our era" (*ibid.*, p. 27).

They called themselves "CELTS," but they were also known by the name of "GALATES," and the Romans called them "GALLI." To the ancients, the designations, *Galli*, *Galates* and *Celts* were synonymous. But he says that these three names may have designated three different branches of the same race originally (*ibid.*, pp. 27, 28).

A fourth branch was the *Volcae*—*Walah*, *Wallachians*, *Wallons*, and *Welsh*, all being derived from this Celtic name *Volcae*. *The Celtic branch were tall and fair with pink and white skin*. The Greek artists in the third century B.C. used the Gauls or Kelts as their ideal in sculpture and paintings (*ibid.*, pp. 27, 28).

The *Gauls conquered Rome* in 390 B.C. They conquered *Great Britain*, *France* except the Rhone basin, the whole of *Spain* except its Mediterranean coast, *north Italy*, parts of *Germany*, *Russia*, *Switzerland*, *Hungary*, *Romania*, and *Silesia*. *Their empire was greater than either that of Charlemagne or of Napoleon—reaching from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Black Sea* at the time when Alexander the Great was engaged in his conquest of Asia in 334 B.C. (*ibid.*, 46, 47).

"They [the Gauls] loved bright and variegated colours in their clothes, coloured stripes and checks" (*ibid.*, p. 67). Here we can see the tartan or "Scotch Plaid" which is still used by some of the present-day descendants of the Kelts who now live in Scotland.

There were two Roman Gauls: (1) *Gallia Cisalpina* (Hither), included *North Italy* between the Alps and Apennines. (2) *Gallia Transalpina* (Further), encompassed modern *France*, *Belgium*, and parts of *Holland*, *Germany*, and *Switzerland*.

"The Greek form of GALLIA was GALATIA, but Galatia in Latin denoted another Celtic region in Central Asia Minor, sometimes styled Gallograecia" (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., Vol. XI, Art. Gaul p. 532).

It is interesting to note that *Livy* and the elder and younger *Pliny* were *Celts*.

Julius Caesar in his *Commentaries* says that Gaul in his day was divided into three peoples—(1) Aquitani, (2) Gauls or Celts and (3) Belgae.

The Origin of The Galatians

Who were the Galatians? All history shows that they were a Gaulish tribe who had come from European Gaul, and had gone to Asia Minor where they finally settled. The territory in which they settled was known as Galatia. This territory was an inland district in Asia Minor, occupied by these Gaulish tribes in the 3rd century B.C. The 20,000 invading Gauls who finally settled this district were divided into three tribes: (1) *Trocmi*, (2) *Tolistobogii* and (3) *Tectosages*.

This was one of the peoples and the territories with which the Apostle Paul was directly connected. But how many of the people living in Galatia were of Gaulish or Keltic descent?

The *Galatian* (or Gaulish) *overlords* were actually *very few in number*, and hardly lived in the towns at all (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed., Vol. II, Art., "Galatia," pp. 393, 394).

"According to the majority of scholars, it [the term *Galatins*] denotes the people of Galatia Proper, a mixed population, consisting of a minority descended from the three Gaulish tribes . . ." (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II, Art. "Galatians").

We are informed that in the large cities such as Ancyra, the Phrygians and others probably constituted the great majority of the population, "while Gauls were found there only as *a small aristocratic caste*"; but in the rural districts the Gauls were more numerous. They were a "*small conquering caste of barbarians*" among a more numerous population.

"It is doubtful whether so much as five per cent of the total population was of Gallic origin, and it is practically certain that in the great cities, an even smaller proportion of the population was of Gallic descent" (*ibid.*).

These dispersed Israelitish peoples who were living in Galatia in New Testament times, constituted an aristocratic, ruling caste, and were in the minority. The main bulk of the Galatians (probably about 95 per cent) were of Gentile descent!

A highly developed religious system reigned over the country . . . Thus the government was a theocracy and *the whole system*, with its prophets, priests, religion, law, punishments . . . *presented a remarkable and real resemblance in external type to the old Jewish ceremonial and religious rule*" (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II, art. "Galatians").

The Keltic Gauls told Caesar that the *Belgians* were of "German" descent, but Dr. Beddoe shows that this was not true (*The Races of Britain*, p. 20). He says that those who came to Britain were not, in the strict sense, "Germans" (*ibid.*, p. 25).

He also says that at the time of the Roman conquest: "No Germans, recognisable as such by speech as well as person had as yet entered Britain" (*ibid.*, p. 29).

For a masterly discussion of the ethnology of the Gauls, Celts, Cymry, the Belgae and related peoples, study carefully *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, Part II, Sec. II—The Ethnology of Gaul, pp. 245-322, written by T. Rice Holmes.

Holmes quotes many historians and ethnologists on the subject of the racial background of these peoples. He points out that though there have always been *brunet elements* among the *Celts*, *Cymry*, *Belgae*, and the Gauls, yet *most of these peoples have tended more toward blondism*. Where these peoples have mixed with Mediterraneans and other dark-haired peoples, they have tended to introduce more brunet elements into their midst.

He then produces a number of statements from foremost ethnologists which tend to show that *the typical Celtic head form was long-headed*, though there were medium- or broad-headed elements among them.

Another thing which is clear from his numerous quotations and statements is that the ancient "Germans" definitely had more of a long-headed element among them than they possess today. The dolichocephalic elements of ancient Germany have crossed over the Rhine and have in most instances moved into northern France, Belgium, and the Low Countries or have gone to Scandinavia or to the British Isles. Holmes also mentions the matter that the ancient Germans were known as very tall and had a lot of redheads among them. This rufosity is almost totally lacking in Germany today, except among the Sephardic Jews; and since World War II, there are probably very few of these still remaining in Germany. Most of the redheads who had lived at one time in Germany have moved to the countries of Scandinavia, the British Isles, or to other parts of northwest Europe. Some of the North Germans are quite blond, however, and may still represent the true Teutonic and Celtic element which has never left Germany. The dominant type in Germany today is the round- or broad-headed Alpine.

Dr. Beddoe also mentioned that the "*Volcae Tectosages of Tolosa* appear to have been the same people with the *Tectosages of Galatia*. . ." (*ibid.*, p. 28). Many historians show a definite connection between these Gaulish peoples of France and those of Galatia, and they also show that their languages were similar if not identical.

The *Kelts, Gauls, Galatians* (as well as the *Gaels*) are, racially speaking, closely related. They are, in fact, a segment of the *Golah* or *Gaulah—the exiles of Israel!*

Origin of The Franks

And from where did the Salian Franks originate?

We have already observed that a number of the peoples of France had come from "Mori-Marusa, or the "Dead Sea" (*Histoire des Gaulois*, Thierry). It is also interesting to note that the Salian Franks came from "the shores of the Salt Sea." The Palestinian *Dead Sea* is referred to as the *Salt Sea*. It is far saltier than the oceans. Many do not realize that the Dead Sea is 24 percent saline. It is so salty that it is impossible for a person to sink in its briny waters.

Since some of the tribes of Northwest Europe trace their origins back to *Asia*—and some even back to *Palestine*—is it not possible that the *Salian Franks* came from the Salt Sea of Palestine, i.e. the Dead Sea or Mori Marusa? Anciently, the Israelitish tribe of Reuben was located east of the Dead Sea.

"Of all these Frankish tribes one especially was to become prominent, the tribe of the *Saliens* As to the origin of the name, it was long held to be derived from the River Yssel or Saal. It is more probable, however, that it arose from the fact that *the Saliens for a long period occupied the shores of the salt sea*" (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. "Franks").

This same article then mentions that "The Saliens inhabited the sea-coast . . ." But is it not possible that these tribes had once inhabited the

85

shores of the "Salt Sea" or the "Dead Sea" in ancient times, and were driven into captivity by Shalmaneser in 733-32 B.C.—finally losing their language and their historical connections, but still remembering that they had once "occupied the shores of the salt sea"?

"The Dead Sea, actually not a sea at all but a landlocked lake between Israel and Jordan, is the lowest body of water on earth, at approximately 1,296 feet . . . below sea level . . . The Dead Sea, Hebrew *Yam ha-Melah* ("Salt Sea"), Arabic *al-Bahr al-Mayyit* ("Sea of Death") or *Buhayrat Lut* ("Sea of Lot"), lies between the hills of Judaea to the west and the Transjordanic plateaus to the east. The Jordan River flows from the north into the Dead Sea, which is 50 miles long and attains a width of 11 miles . . ." (*Ency. Brit.*, 1974 ed., art. "Dead Sea").

"Next to Lake Van, Turkey, the Dead Sea is the most saline lake (24 percent) in the world . . . Mineral salts amount to 4 percent in ordinary sea water . . ." (*Colliers Ency.*, 1959 ed., art. "Dead Sea").

Chapter Eight

Who Were the Germans?

Any search for the Lost Tribes of Israel in Europe will of necessity bring us into contact with the German tribes. Just who are (or were) the "Germans," and where did they come from? Do they comprise a portion of these long-lost tribes of Israel?

Before the racial affinities of the peoples of Europe can be untangled, there is one more name which must be looked into, and properly understood. That is the name "*Germani*" (the Germans).

While studying the origin and movements of the Celts, Gauls, Kymry, and the other tribes who have passed at one time or another through Central Europe, a certain amount of confusion at times arises regarding the differences between *Scythians*, *Kelts*, *Gauls* and *Cimmerian* tribes on the one hand and the proper or true Germans on the other.

There can be no doubt that most of the peoples of present-day Germany (except in the north) and Austria, from an ethnological and historical point of view, have no close blood ties with the peoples of Scandinavia and the British Isles. There are many striking differences between the peoples of the Scandinavian countries, the British Isles, and the Lowland countries when contrasted with the peoples of southern Germany, Austria and the eastern and southern Europeans.

It is necessary to show that the majority of the present-day Germans are quite different from the British and Scandinavian types. Here are some points to keep in mind:

(1) The *Saxon* and other tribes who invaded Britain had at one time or another lived in Germania, and were therefore, prior to their invasion of England, known as Germans. (2) Some of the Kelts who formerly lived east of the Rhine, and who were known as Germans, later emigrated to England, Belgium, France, etc. (3) The Caledonians and others were called Germans. (4) The Goths and Teutons are often equated with the Germans, but many of them were not "German" if by that word we mean to imply the present-day Alpine type of German.

All history attests that the *Keltic*, *Cymric* or *Scythian* peoples who passed through Germany en route to Britain, Scandinavia, the Lowlands, and northern France were, racially speaking, different from the Alpine and "Slavic" types which today mainly constitute the German people.

It would appear that some of the north Germans of the "Nordic" variety are fairly closely related to British and Scandinavian types.

Here are some interesting excerpts from an article entitled "Are We Cousin to the German"? by Sir Arthur Keith:

In the standard atlases and school geographies the Germans colour *Great Britain, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden* with the same tint as their own empire, to indicate that all those lands are inhabited by branches of the great *Teutonic family* . . . It is an historical fact that the Anglo-Saxons came from lands lying on the western shores of the present German Empire. Those, however, who have studied the modern population of Britain, and Germany, have reached a very definite and very different conclusion, namely, that *the Briton and German represent contrasted and opposite types of humanity* (*The Graphic*, Dec. 1915, p. 720).

In the same issue of *The Graphic*, Sir Arthur Keith illustrated prevalent British and German forms of skulls. He pointed out the marked difference between the typical British skull when contrasted with that of the average German. Speaking of the typical British and German skull form, he says:

The radical difference in the two forms leaps to the eye. In the majority of BRITON—*English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish—the hinder part of the head, the occiput, projects prominently backwards behind the line of the neck; the British head is long in comparison with its width* (*ibid.*, p. 720).

How Germans and Britons Differ

Sir Arthur Keith says that "in the vast majority of Germans" the hinder part of the head is "flattened." He mentions, however, that this "peculiarity of the German skull" is not due to "artificial means."

We know that the prominent occiput and flattened occiput are characters that breed true over thousands of years, and that they are characters which indicate a profound racial difference. Even in the sixteenth century, Vesalius, who is universally regarded as the 'father of Anatomy,' regarded the flat occiput as a German characteristic . . . He came, rather unwillingly, to the conclusion that *the vast majority of modern German people differed from the British, Dutch, Dane and Scandinavian in head form* (*ibid.*, p. 720).

It is important to keep these points in mind. There is no close affinity, judging from skeletal observations and measurements, between the "vast majority of the German people" who are different, according to Sir Arthur Keith, from the "British, Dutch, Dane and Scandinavian in head form."

The typical German head is quite round, says Keith in comparison to the British, Scandinavian, Dutch and Dane head form. The German occiput is not nearly as pronounced as that of the northwest Europeans just mentioned.

This is another important point to bear in mind, as we shall note later that the Scythians, the *Sacae* and many of the Kelts who formerly inhabited the steppes of south Russia, were in headshape like the long-headed northwest Europeans. The Alpine and "Slavic" elements in Germany, Austria and in Eastern Europe are not the same in head form as were the predominantly long-headed Scythians, and *Sacae*.

It is undeniable, from an anthropologist's point of view, that *British* and *Germans* belong to opposite European types. The explanation is easy. With the exodus of the *Franks* to France and the *Anglo-Saxons* to Britain in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries of our era, Germany was almost denuded of her long-headed elements in her population When the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons were moving into France and England the great area now covered by the German Empire had been invaded from the east—from the regions now occupied by Russians, Poles, and Czechs—by swarms of people with flat occiputs and round heads—men of the Hindenburg type. History relates that by the end of the sixth century this type had overrun all the area of modern Germany, except the lands along the western shores (*ibid.*, p. 720).

All history shows the general trend has been that northwest European long-headed peoples have continually advanced westward from the area of the Caucasus, and have invariably been succeeded by the broad-headed Alpine type who were continually pressing them from the east. These "Nordics" have also been pressed northward by the Mediterraneans of south Europe; or to put it more accurately the Nordics have made many incursions into the Mediterranean lands, but have never effected any permanent settlements there. Another interesting fact worth noting is the aptitude of the dolichocephals (long-heads) for the sea, and the absence of this sea-faring proclivity among the brachycephals.

Yet there can be no doubt that certain aptitudes do belong to certain races and breed true from generation to generation. The flat occiput has never shown any aptitude for the sea. *All the races which have commanded the sea—the Portuguese, Spaniards, Dutch, Norwegians and British—have long heads with prominent occiputs.* It is remarkable that even at the present day the German navy recruits its crews from the western shores, where a long-headed element still manages to survive (*ibid.*, p. 720).

Ripley says that the ancient peoples who commanded the seas—Phoenicians, Greeks, and others, were also of the long-headed type (*Races of Europe*, p. 387).

The modern-day Ossetes, are racially speaking almost identical with present day Germans. Many of their customs, manners, their physical appearance and other things prove this beyond question. Many writers have held this opinion.

. . . a small and decreasing minority of blond traits among the Ossetes, a tribe whose Aryan speech is related to that of the Armenians, and who while mainly brachycephalic [broad-headed] still retain some blond and dolichocephalic [long-headed] elements which apparently are fading fast (*Grant, The Passing of the Great Race*, p. 66).

Notice, the Ossetes, who are close relatives of the German people, are also primarily a brachycephalic or a broad-headed type of people, even though they include certain minor elements of long-headedness, just as does modern Germany.

Later, we shall notice that the *Sarmatians* were a broad-headed people, and they are the ancestors of many of the Germans and Slavs.

Notice, Grant shows that the true Alpine type of skull is almost totally absent in Britain.

"In the study of European populations the great and fundamental fact about the British Isles is the almost total absence there today of true Alpine round skulls" (*ibid.*, p. 137).

What is the average cephalic index in England?

"The cephalic index in England is rather low, about 78" (*ibid.*, p. 137).

The Alpine Germans

In fact, from the time of the Thirty Year's war the purely Teutonic race in Germany has been largely replaced by the Alpine types in the south and by the Wendish and Polish types in the east. This change of race in Germany has gone so far that it has been computed that out of 70,000,000 inhabitants of the German Empire, only 9,000,000 are purely Teutonic in coloration, stature, and skull characters (Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race*, p. 185).

It is indisputable from both history and personal observation that the dominant type of German is today that of the "Alpine" variety.

There formerly lived in Germany certain Keltic and Scythic tribes who were not Alpines, but very few of these remained in Germany. Most of them settled in the coastlands of northwest Europe, or else in the British Isles. We shall see more corroborative proof of this later.

The eastern half of Germany has a Slavic Alpine substratum which represents the descendants of the Wends, who first appear about the commencement of the Christian era and who by the sixth century had penetrated as far west as the Elbe, occupying the lands left vacant by the Teutonic tribes which had migrated southward (*ibid.*, p. 72).

One of the reasons why many fail to differentiate between the true or proper Germans and the peoples who passed through "Germania" and who were consequently called "Germani," is that the ancient historians did not make a distinction between the so-called, and the real Germans.

The Keltic Germani

Notice that Tacitus failed to draw a clear line of demarcation between the true Germans, as we think of them today, and those who were Germans in name only.

Huxley and Haddon make the following interesting remarks regarding Tacitus' comments on the "Germani:"

Fourthly, he [Tacitus] makes no distinction between the inhabitants of Gaul and the tribes east of the Rhine. Both are for him "Germani" . . . Fifthly, the tribes that he describes were all or most of them driven across the

AC

Rhine by later westward movements of peoples to the east of them. Thus they cannot be the ancestors of the modern Germans (*We Europeans*, p. 34).

Fleure also says that "the dominant broad-headedness of the Alpine" race has been spread over most of modern Germany. He shows that the broad-headedness has permeated from the south toward the north of Germany. He mentions that this has occurred in ancient as well as in modern times (Fleure, *The Peoples of Europe*, p. 42).

Huxley and Haddon mention that "in the Germans there is a very large Eurasiatic element which includes the Slavonic, and genes from the Mongoloid peoples have crept in via Russia" (*We Europeans*, p. 278).

Dr. Guest says that certain of the Germanic tribes were called Kelts (*Origines Celticae*, p. 27, 37), but we have, however, already seen that some Kelts had formerly lived east of the Rhine. They were very red haired and were totally different from the typical present-day Germans. Dr. Guest mentions that the Keltic Belgae were sprung from the "Germans" (*ibid.*, p. 390). He further states:

It would appear, then, that as early as the third century B.C. there were certain races called *Germani* settled north of the Alps and in the upper district drained by the Saone. . . . *These Germani were undoubtedly Celts.* In the first century after Christ there were also Germani in Spain, and there can be little doubt, that *they were descended from the [Keltic] Cimbri* who invaded the Peninsula in the second century B.C. (*ibid.*, p. 392).

Again we read of certain people called "Germani" who were of Cimbric descent. Dr. Guest was of the definite conviction "these Germani were undoubtedly Celts." There can be no question that the Cimbri were a Celtic people. This shows that there were certain peoples who were called Germani, (meaning "war men"), who were settled not only east of the Rhine, but even in Spain.

One can easily see this word "German" was anciently applied to many different peoples whose modern descendants are not (in most instances) closely related to the present day proper Germans.

Dr. Dinan says there was a *Celtic tribe* who were called "Germara" (*Monumenta Historica Celticae*, p. 81).

Coon says, "The excessive brachycephalization which swept over central Europe in the Middle Ages, affecting especially southern Germany and Bohemia, followed the same pattern as the stature change" (*The Races of Europe*, vol. I, p. 10). He again mentions the "South German Brachycephaly" (*ibid.*, p. 538).

This broad-headed element crept into Germany both during and since the Middle Ages.

The Germans Came from the Caucasus

"The Germans were a branch of the great Indo-Germanic race, who, along with the Celts, migrated into Europe from the CAUCASUS and the

countries around the Black and Caspian Seas" (Smith, *A Smaller Classical Dictionary*, p. 231).

Notice carefully that the Germans were a branch of the different peoples who migrated "along with the Celts" into Europe from the Caucasus regions in the vicinity of the Black and Caspian Seas—the very area of Israel's captivity! Remember, Israel had been taken to ASSYRIA!

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to prove that the present-day Germanic peoples are at least in great part descended from the ancient peoples of Assyria. There is, however, much historical material which clearly proves that many of the present-day Germanic peoples were included in the great horde of people called by the name of "Sarmatians."

In regard to the Alpine broad-headedness which is today found in most of Germany, Professor Ripley says:

Northwestern Germany—Hanover, Schleswig-Holstein, Westphalia—is distinctly allied to the physical type of the Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes. All the remainder of the Empire—no, not even excluding Prussia, east of the Elbe—is less Teutonic in type; until finally in the essentially Alpine broad-headed populations of Baden, Wurttemberg, and Bavaria in the south, the Teutonic race passes from view (*The Races of Europe*, p. 214).

According to Ripley, the people of northwestern Germany are related in physical type to the Scandinavian.

Let us notice another statement showing that the English are dolichocephalic, in sharp contrast to the typical broad-headedness of the German.

The most remarkable trait of the population of the *British Isles* is its head form; and especially the uniformity in this respect which is everywhere manifested. The prevailing type is that of the *long and narrow cranium*, accompanied by an oval rather than broad or round face (*ibid.*, p. 303).

He then mentions that the average cephalic indexes in the British Isles lie between 77 and 79.

What is the meaning of the word "German?" According to Kephart, the word "German" means "warrior" (*Races of Mankind*, p. 280).

Gauls and Belgic Tribes Were Called "Germani"

Here is a very significant excerpt from *The Encyclopedia Britannica*:

Of the Gaulish tribes west of the Rhine, the most important was the Treveri . . . the Treveri claimed to be of German origin, and the same claim was made by a number of tribes in *Belgium*, the most powerful of which were the Nervii. The meaning of this claim is not quite clear, as *there is some obscurity concerning the origin of the name Germani. It appears to be a Gaulish term, and there is NO EVIDENCE THAT IT WAS EVER USED BY THE GERMANS THEMSELVES.* According to Tacitus it was first applied to the *Tungri*, whereas Caesar records that *four Belgic tribes*, namely the *Con-*

drusi, Eburones, Caeraesi, and Paemani, were collectively known as *Germani*. There is no doubt that these tribes were all linguistically Celtic, and it is now the prevailing opinion that *they were not of German origin ethnologically*, but that the ground for their claim was that they had come from over the Rhine (Caesar de Bello Gallico ii 4). It would therefore seem that the name *Germani* originally denoted certain Celtic tribes to the east of the Rhine (11th ed., art. "Germany," p. 830).

Notice the points which were just mentioned. The origin of "GERMANI" is uncertain, but it is apparently a "Gaulish term." This name "Germani" was anciently not used by the Germans themselves. Julius Caesar records the name of four "Belgic tribes who were collectively known as Germani" in his time. Did you notice that the language of these tribes was Celtic. This article then shows that "it is now the prevailing opinion" that these Belgic tribes "were not of German origin ethnologically."

These and many other historical sources have proven that it is wrong to speak of the bulk of the present-day Germans as close relatives to the British, the Scandinavians and related peoples. *The true Germans were not Celts.*

This same article then explains that in Caesar's time the Menapii, a Gaulish tribe, lived east of the Rhine. It also says that a Celtic tribe, called *Boii* was expelled from Bohemia (*ibid.*, p. 830).

Augustus Caesar mentions a number of Gaulish tribes living east of the Rhine: "There is therefore great probability that a large part of Western Germany east of the Rhine had formerly been occupied by Celtic peoples" (*ibid.*, p. 830). We are told that the *Volcae* in the south of France and the *Tectosages* of Galatia were off-shoots of this people (*ibid.*, p. 830).

The first Teutonic peoples whom the Romans are said to have encountered are the *Cimbri* and the *Teutoni*, probably from Denmark, who invaded Illyria, Gaul and Italy towards the end of the 2nd century B.C. When Caesar arrived in Gaul the westernmost part of what is now Germany was in the possession of *Gaulish tribes*. The Rhine practically formed the boundary between Gauls and Germans, though *one Gaulish tribe*, the *Menapii*, is said to have been living beyond the Rhine at its mouth (*ibid.*, p. 831).

Bear in mind that the Kelts and the Gauls were different in race from the present-day proper Germans.

Mallet informs us that the Germans and Gauls were two distinct people (*Northern Antiquities*, p. 7):

It is true the Gauls and ancient Germans resembled each other in complexion, and perhaps in some other respects, as might be expected from their living under the same climate, and nearly in the same manner—yet that they differed sufficiently in their persons, appears from Tacitus, who says that the inhabitants of Caledonia resembled the Germans in features, whereas the Silures were rather like the Spaniards, as *the inhabitants of South Britain bore a great resemblance to the Gauls* (*ibid.*, p. 9).

123

It is hoped that the numerous reference cited will give the reader a sufficient knowledge of the "Germani" to enable him to see that many peoples in northwest Europe are today spoken of as though they were of "German" or "Teutonic" descent who are quite different ethnologically from the true Germans who now inhabit central Europe.

We have observed that the name "Germani" was never applied by the Germans to themselves, but was first used by Gaulish (Keltic) tribes. Also we have seen clearly pointed out that many different peoples once inhabited territories in "Germania" and were, therefore, called Germans, who are not proper Germans as we think of them today.

"The Patriarchal Square-Heads"

Robert Graves makes an interesting comment:

Arianrhod's giving of arms to her son is common *Celtic* form: that women had this prerogative is mentioned by Tacitus in his work of the Germans—the Germany of his day being *Celtic Germany, not yet invaded by the patriarchal square-heads whom we call Germans nowadays* (*The White Goddess*, p. 318).

This statement that "Celtic Germany" in the time of Tacitus had not as yet been invaded by the "patriarchal square-heads whom we call Germans nowadays" shows that Germany was once inhabited by a Celtic population, which has long ago been supplanted by the Alpine brachycephals.

Here is one final quotation on the subject of the "Germani" from Huxley and Haddon: . . . *the Keltic tribes that he [Tacitus] describes were all or most of them driven across the Rhine by later western movements of peoples to the east of them. Thus they cannot be the ancestors of the modern Germans*" (*We Europeans*, p. 34). They conclude:

Hence their physique, despite their vast numbers, is identical: fierce blue eyes, *red hair* (*rutilae comae*), tall frames. . . . Historical and archeological investigation, however, has failed to support Tacitus. It may be noted that *red hair is rare among modern Germans, save among those of Jewish origin* (*ibid.*, p. 36).

One must continually bear in mind that many peoples (especially certain non-Germanic Kelts, Gauls, Belgae and Scythians) have been called Germans who are not proper or true Germans as this term is used today.

If one does not continually bear this in mind when studying the ancient histories mentioning the various "German" tribes, he will never be able to properly understand the racial connections between all of the various people who have at one time or another been called "Germans."

104

italics

90

Chapter Nine

The Vikings

We have considered the backgrounds of most of the peoples of northwest Europe. It has been pointed out that, generally speaking, all of these peoples were related to one another.

Here are some of the names which these bore when they arrived in Europe: (1) *Cimmerians, Cymri, and Cimbri.* (2) *Kelts, Gauls, and Gaels.* (3) *Scythians, Teutons and Goeths.* (4) *Angles and Saxons.* (5) *Tuatha de Danaan, Danes* etc. (6) Other names such as *Belgians, Fir-Bolgs* etc. have been considered.

It has been proven that many of the early Germans were of Celtic or Cimbric origin and were not therefore closely related to the proper Germans of today.

We have also seen clearly demonstrated that all of the afore-mentioned peoples are related, and are all from the great Scythian people or nation.

What is the origin of the peoples of Scandinavia? Did they also come from Scythia as the other northwest Europeans whom we have previously considered?

We shall but briefly consider Scandinavian history, but we shall examine it thoroughly enough to show that these Scandinavians were merely another branch of the Scythian peoples, and were therefore descended from the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel.

The following quotation supports the belief that *Denmark*, one of the countries of Scandinavia, was of Scythian origin:

It is very probable, that the first *Danes*, were like all the other Teutonic nations *a colony of Scythians*, who spread themselves at different times over the countries which lay towards the west. The resemblance of names might induce us to believe that it was from among the *Cimmerian Scythians* (whom the ancients placed to the north of the Euxine Sea) that the first colonies were sent into Denmark; and that from this people they inherited the name of *Cimbri*, which they bore so long before they assumed that of *Danes* (Mallet, *Northern Antiquities*, p. 60).

All Saendinavian literature records the acts of a celebrated person by the name of ODIN. The traditions and chronicles of all the northern nations inform us that this extraordinary person formerly reigned in the north. He made great changes in the government, manners and religion of all of those northern countries.

125

The Great Odin

His [Odin's] true name was Sigge son of Friculph; but *he assumed that of Odin, who was the Supreme God among the Teutonic nations*: either in order to pass among his followers for a man inspired by the Gods, or because he was chief priest, and presided over the worship paid to the deity (*ibid.*, p. 79, 80).

From what country did Odin and his people come? Odin and his followers, the Aesir, were from a country which was situated between the Pontus Euwinus (*Black Sea*), and the *Caspian Sea* (*ibid.*, pp. 79, 80). The principal city of this former country was Agsard. Odin united the youth of the neighboring nations and marched towards the north and west of Europe, subjugating all the people he found in his passage, and giving them to one or the other of his sons to govern. Many regal families of the north are said to be descended from these princes. Thus Hengist and Horsa and the other Anglo-Saxon chiefs, who conquered Britain in the fifth century, considered Odin, or Wodin as their illustrious ancestor. This word Odin signified, as seen above, the Supreme God of the Teutonic nations.

A number of points in the foregoing quotation need to be emphasized. Firstly, it was mentioned that *Odin and his followers came from a territory between the Black and Caspian Seas*. Remember, this is in the general vicinity to which the Ten-Tribed House of Israel had been deported. Secondly, notice that the Anglo-Saxon British princes, Horsa and Hengist, were descendants of Odin. In a later chapter, we shall see historical proof that the *Anglo-Saxons were the descendants of Scaef or Shem*. Odin must have been a descendant of Shem likewise since he was the ancestor of so many of the Anglo-Saxon kings!

After having conquered many territories between the Black and the Baltic Seas, Odin directed his final energies in subduing all of Scandinavia. "After having disposed of so many countries, and confirmed and settled his new governments, Odin directed his course towards Scandinavia, passing through Cimbria, at present Holstein and Jutland" (*ibid.*, p. 80).

He then subdued the rest of Denmark and Sweden. He extended his conquests over all the north, and governed all of this territory with absolute dominion. He enacted new laws, and introduced the customs of his own country, and established at Sigtuna (not far from Stockholm) a *supreme council or tribunal*, composed of *twelve judges or pontiffs*. All of the petty kings among whom Sweden was then divided were quick to acknowledge him as a sovereign and a god. He levied a poll-tax or impost upon every person through the whole country.

"The desire for extending farther his religion, his authority and his glory, caused him to undertake the conquest of Norway" (*ibid.*, pp. 81, 82). He had great success in his campaigns against Norway and this kingdom quickly obeyed a son of Odin named Saeming. We are told that Odin was "the most persuasive" of men.

After subduing the whole of Scandinavia, Odin retired into Sweden where he assembled his friends and companions and gave himself a mortal wound which resulted in his death. This suicidal act was brought about by a

lingering disease which had overtaken him. He had bravely hazarded his life on the battlefield countless times, and could not bare the thought of falling victim to disease.

What had fired Odin with this unquenchable ambition to conquer such a vast territory?

Driven from his country by those enemies [the Romans] of universal liberty; his resentment, say they, was so much the more violent as the *Teutonic tribes* esteemed it a sacred duty to avenge all injuries, especially those offered to their relations and country (*ibid.*, pp. 82, 83).

Odin's chief aim was to stir up the Northmen of Scandinavia so that Rome's injustices could be avenged.

It was these hardy northern barbarians (if we may call them that) who later did more than any other people to overrun the Roman Empire and lay it in the dust.

The men of the North who settled and conquered part of Gaul and Britain, whose might the power of Rome could not destroy, and whose depredations it could not prevent, were not savages; the Romans did not dare attack these men at home with their fleet or with their armies. Nay, they even had allowed these northmen to settle peacefully in their provinces of *Gaul and Britain* (du Chaillu, *The Viking Age*, Vol. 1, p. 3).

The above statement shows that even Rome knew that these Northmen were powerful enough to prevent her assault on their homeland. Were these men of the north savages or barbarians in the true sense of the word?

Know, the people who were then spread over a great part of the present Russia, who overran Germania, who knew the art of writing, who led their conquering hosts to Spain, into the Mediterranean, to Italy, Sicily, Greece, the Black Sea, Palestine, Africa, and even across the broad Atlantic to America, who were undisputed masters of the sea for more than twelve centuries, were not barbarians (*ibid.*).

Du Chaillu mentions that the facts show both Britain and Gaul were conquered by the Romans and later by the Northmen. It is also interesting to see that these Northmen had come from Southern Russia, had advanced to the Baltic, and finally to Scandinavia.

Northmen Came From Black Sea

The manly civilisation the Northmen possessed was their own; from their records, corroborated by finds in Southern Russia, it seems to have advanced north from about the shores of the Black Sea . . . (*ibid.*, p. 4)

127

We have noted earlier that many (if not most) of the Franks who settled in France were of Celtic, Cimbric or Scythian Origin. They were a totally different people from the Germanic Franks who remained east of the Rhine. The Anglo-Saxons were also a different type from the Old Saxons who remained in Saxony.

Many of the northern tribes swarmed into England under such names as Angles, Saxons, Danes, Vikings etc.

A few years after the time fixed as that of their first supposed appearance we find these very *Danes* swarming everywhere with their fleets and warriors, not only in *England*, but in *Gaul*, in *Brittany*, up the *Seine*, the *Garonne*, the *Rhine*, the *Elbe*, on the coast of *Spain*, and further eastward in the Mediterranean (*ibid.*, p. 21).

The Swedes as well as the Danes were called Northmen, as were also the people of Norway: "The Sueones, or Swedes, reappear at the close of the eighth and commencement of the ninth centuries by this side of the Danes, and both call themselves Northmen" (*ibid.*) ✓

We have earlier noted, according to Mallet, that the people of the North came from the regions of the Black and Caspian Seas—the general vicinity to which Israel was first deported. Now let us notice that such an origin is also corroborated by du Chaillu:

The mythological literature of the North bears evidence of a belief prevalent among the people, that *their ancestors migrated at a remote period from the shores of the Black Sea, through South-western Russia to the Baltic.* This belief seems to be supported by a variety of evidence" (du Chaillu, *The Viking Age*, Vol. I, pp. 25, 26). 92

Du Chaillu then mentions that archaeological data in the graves in the neighborhood of the Black Sea contain similar material to Frankish, Russian, English, and Arabic records, showing that the Viking Age must have lasted from about the second century to about the middle of the twelfth century A.D.

In *The Viking Age* is also given an account of the life of Odin. He is called "the predecessor of the Norsemen" and is supposed to have come from the south or southeast of Europe, from the shores of the Black Sea. He, as we have already noted, extended his sovereignty over all of the North.

Some have asked if Odin was a real man, or a mythological figure, or was he a god?

The Normans who had settled in Northern France during the Dark Ages were also Norsemen—i.e. men of the north. Under William the Conqueror, they successfully invaded England in A.D. 1066, defeated the British, and established the wise rule of Norman law in England—under the direct rulership of about 20,000 Normans. ✓

Putting all the historical evidence together, there must have been a real person by the name of Odin, or according to some historical sources, he assumed this name Odin as a title to inspire fear, reverence, and loyalty in his subjects.

Odin And Adon

What is the origin of this word "Odin"?

"*Adon* is one of the three titles (*Adon, Adonai, Adonim*), all generally rendered Lord; but each has its own peculiar usage and association. They all denote *headship* in various aspects. They have to do with God as over-lord" (Bullinger, *The Companion Bible*, app. IV). Dr. Bullinger then proceeds to give a more lengthy explanation of these three words as found in the Hebrew.

One of the names of God in the Hebrew language is "Adon." This word is usually translated as "Lord" in the authorised version.

Since the people of Scandinavia are today known to be some of the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel, need we be amazed if we find this name of God still being used by the cast-off people of God? Remember in the Hebrew language all of the words were written with the consonants only. The vowels were added or supplied by the reader. Thus we see that the basic sound of the word "Adon" and "Odin" is exactly the same. The vowels could be varied considerably and still not change the meaning or the basic sound of this word.

There must have existed, then, a real personage by the name of Odin, who assumed the name of Odin in order to secure the awe, respect, and obedience of his followers.

The Origin of The Goths

In this chapter on Scandinavia, it is fitting that we briefly consider the Goths. Who were the Goths, and what was their origin?

Many historians equate the *Goths* with the *Getae*. In a later chapter we shall see that *the Getae* (and their various branches) *were of Scythian origin*.

Goths, a Germanic people whose original homeland may have been in Scandinavia. At the beginning of the Christian era, however, the Goths were living on the south shore of the Baltic just east of the Vistula River. Subsequently they moved southward to the Black Sea area where in the third century A.D. they held territory stretching from the mouth of the Danube to the Dnieper (*Ency. Brit.*, 1960 ed. Vol. XIII, art. "Goths").

In A.D. 272 the Emperor Aurelian surrendered to the Goths the whole of Dacia. It was about this same time that the Goths were divided into two divisions—the Ostrogoths or East Goths, and the Visigoths or West Goths. The Visigoths remained for some time north of the Danube, but under Alaric they invaded Italy and plundered Rome in A.D. 410. Not long afterward they settled permanently in Southwest Gaul, and founded a kingdom of which Tolosa was its capital. From this kingdom which they had established in South-west Gaul, they invaded Spain and founded a kingdom in that country which lasted for over two centuries, until it was overthrown by the Arabs.

The Ostrogoths settled in Moesia and Pannonia; but they later extended their dominions very nearly to the gates of Constantinople. Under their king,

Theodoric the Great, they occupied the whole of Italy in A.D. 493. See *A Smaller Classical Dictionary* for a brief resume of the history of the Goths.

Turner says: "*That the Getae were Goths cannot be doubted*" (*History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I, p. 95).

The Goths were also called Scythians: "In the war which followed, the *Goths*, whom the historians would with characteristic pedantry call *Scythians*, used boats to harry the coast not merely of the Euxine . . ." (Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 126).

Professor Coon asserts that the Goths were from Sweden. "The Goths claimed to have crossed the Baltic from Sweden not from the Island of Gotland) to the mouth of the Vistula. The Vandals and the Gepidae presumably had the same origin" (*The Races of Europe*, p. 205). Some of these Goths, according to Coon, established "an important kingdom on the north shore of the Black Sea."

Gothic Racial Characteristics

What were the characteristics of the Goths?

A series of Goths from the Chersonese north of the Black Sea, dated between 100 B.C. and 100 A.D. includes three male and eight female skeletons. *All of these are long headed, and they belong to a large powerful Nordic type which reflects their Swedish origin . . .* (ibid., p. 206).

He then points out: "The same conclusion results when one examines the Visigothic skulls from northern Spain which date from the sixth century A.D." (ibid.).

Many historical sources can be produced showing that different peoples in the British Isles as well as in Scandinavia were called Teutons and Goths.

It would appear that *many* (if not most) of the Goths were not, *racially speaking, true Germans as we think of them today*, but were more "Nordic" in type than are most Germans. It is indisputable that the Goths were certainly not of the Alpine or "Savic" type of German stock.

It thus becomes clear that the Scandinavian peoples had their origin in the vicinity of the Black and Caspian Seas—the very place where we find the dispersed people of Israel living shortly after their final captivity of 721 B.C. They must have lived in this area for at least a few centuries before migrating into the countries of present-day Scandinavia.

We have previously noticed that the modern typical German is not of the same general racial type as the Scandinavian and British peoples, but there is great resemblance between these latter peoples (Keith, *The Graphic*, Dec. 1915, *Are we Cousins to the Germans*, p. 720).

Some of the North Germans are closely allied to the Danes, Dutch and other North-western Europeans. The exact racial affinity of the northern Germanic type to certain other Nordics of North-west Europe yet remains to be clearly demonstrated. But many North Germans have mixed to some extent with their neighbors, thus producing a people closely related to the racial type of Scandinavia, the British Isles, and the Low Countries.

Widespread Norman Conquests

"NORMANS, Scandinavian invaders who settled Normandy (France) from about 820, then conquered England, southern Italy and Sicily The Normans soon adopted the French language, customs and religion, and identified themselves with their new home, but retained their Scandinavian vigor and warlike proclivities. Although nominally subject to the French king, the Norman dukes remained semi-independent.

"In 1066, Duke William of Normandy, an illegitimate son of Robert I, the fifth duke, and descendant of Rollo, invaded England, defeated and killed King Harold at Hastings, and was crowned king

"About the beginning of the eleventh century, a band of Normans came to *southern Italy* as mercenary soldiers fighting against the Arabs at Salerno. Others arrived and soon began to establish themselves in small principalities which they won from their former employers and neighbors by the sword By 1071, *all southern Italy* had fallen to the Normans, and under Duke Robert Guiscard, one of the sons of Tancred, they supported the Pope against Emperor Henry IV. Robert's brother, Roger I, undertook the conquest of *Sicily* from the Arabs. Messina fell in 1061, but the island was not completely under Norman control until thirty years later. Roger II united the Norman possessions in southern Italy and Sicily, and secured the title of king of Sicily in 1130. Here, as elsewhere, the Normans demonstrated their powers of adaptation and assimilation. They merged with the native population and assimilation. They merged with the native population and disappeared as a separate element. They left their mark on the people, although much less so than in England and Normandy. The Normans were prominent in the crusading movement, and in the latin kingdoms in the East" (*Coillier's Encyclopedia*, 1959 ed., vol. 14, art. "Normans").

Now that we have learned to differentiate between the original Keltic-Scythian "Germans" and the present day "Alpine" and "Slavic" Germans, as well as the Normans, we are better able to understand the racial connections of the different waves of *peoples who have passed through (and temporarily inhabited) parts of Germany, Northern France, etc.* at one time or another!

With this knowledge kept firmly in mind we need never confuse the "Nordic" Northwestern type Europeans with the Latin, Alpine or Slavic types!

But . . . let not our search for the Lost Tribes of Israel end with the Vikings and Goths.

italics

Chapter Ten

The Serpent's Trail

96

Our intriguing search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel now focuses on one of the not-so-well-known tribes of this ancient people. There is still one other name by which a portion of the Israelites were known after they left the Promised Land. This is a name which connects them directly with *one* of the tribes of Israel.

Bilhah, the handmaid of Rachel, one of Jacob's two wives, bare unto Jacob two sons, *Dan* and Naphtali (Gen. 35:25). The meaning of "Dan" in Hebrew is "judge."

Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel. Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse heels, so that his rider shall fall backward. I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord (Gen. 49:16-18).

Notice three points about these verses. First, *Dan* was to *judge* his people. This is definitely being fulfilled today. Many of the people of the tribe of Dan are scattered in the British Commonwealth, America and other nations, serving as *policemen*, as *judges*, and as *priests*—all in a capacity of judging!

Secondly, *Dan* was to be *'a serpent by the way,'* i.e. just as a serpent leaves a trail or a path in the sand or dirt over which it crawls, so was Dan to leave his mark or name behind him wherever he went.

Thirdly, Dan would have to wait for his salvation (v. 18). If you will check Revelation 7:5-8, you will notice that the only tribe of Israel which is not mentioned is that of Dan. At the time of the Second Coming of Christ, as the Messiah of Israel and the Saviour of the whole world, Dan will not, as a tribe, be reckoned among those who receive their salvation. He must wait for his salvation.

The people of Dan today are so steeped in "religious" paganism and superstition, and are so blinded that they are not, as a tribe, receiving their salvation at this time. Another important prophecy is found in Deuteronomy 33:22:

"And of Dan he said, '*Dan* is a lion's whelp: He shall leap from Bashan!'"

What does it mean to leap from Bashan?

In Joshua 19:40-48, we read the account of Joshua dividing to the Danites their allotted portion among the tribes of Israel. The inheritance of the tribe of Dan lay on the Mediterranean coast (v. 41).

133

A Peculiar Danite Custom

And the coast of the children of *Dan* went too little for them: therefore the children of *Dan* went out to fight against Leshem and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it, and dwelt there, and called Leshem [Laish, Judges 18:29] *Dan*, after the name of their father (Josh. 19:47).

Early in their history, the Danites began the peculiar habit of naming towns after their ancestor "Dan."

In the eighteenth chapter of Judges is another account of the expansion of the tribe of Dan.

"In those days there was no king in Israel: in those days the tribe of the Danites sought them an inheritance to dwell in; for unto that day all their inheritance had not fallen unto them among the tribes of Israel" (Judges 18:1). The rest of this chapter is an account of some scouts being sent out from the tribe of Dan to the far northern border of Israel, to a city called Laish (v. 7). Later on, these Danites conquered Laish.

"And they called the name of the city (*Laish*) *Dan*, after the name of *E'an* their father, who was born unto Israel: howbeit the name of the city was *Laish* at the first" (Judges 18:29).

We have now seen two accounts of the people of Dan changing the name of the city and naming it after their ancestral father, Dan. Remember, Dan was to be a serpent by the way—that is, he was to leave his name along the trail wherever he would go. History produces an abundance of evidence showing that these sons of Dan (Danites) have left their name on the rivers and coastlands all along their route from Palestine to North-west Europe.

Certain prophecies in the Bible show that Dan (as a serpent) was to leave a trail behind him, and it has been observed that the children of this tribe did, in fact, leave their mark in Palestine early in their history. These Danites began the habit of naming cities and rivers after the name of their father, Dan.

"And there went from thence of the family of the Danites . . . six hundred men . . . and pitched . . . in Judah: wherefore they called that place *Mahanehdan* unto this day" (Judges 18:11, 12). One other city in the land of Israel includes the name "Dan"—Danjaan (2 Sam. 24:6).

Now let us observe that the sons of Dan have continued to do this same thing ever since. Remember, we have noticed that the people of this tribe were a great seafaring people. "*Why did Dan remain in ships?*"—the inspired prophetess Deborah had asked. Even at that early date, many of the Danites were sailing the Mediterranean, looking for treasure and adventure.

Have the children of Dan left their mark or trail on their route from the Promised Land to the country which they now inhabit?

There is ample evidence to prove that these adventuresome *Danites* had early exerted quite an influence *in the regions of the Black Sea*.

In order for one to get to the Black Sea by ship, he must first pass from the Mediterranean into the Aegean Sea; from the Aegean, he must pass through the *DarDANelles* in order to reach the Black Sea. If one were to

walk counterclockwise from the east end of the Black Sea, he would pass by the mouths of the following rivers by the time he got completely around to the west side of the Black Sea: (1) *Don*, (2) *Donets*, (3) *Dnieper*, (4) *Dniester*, and (5) *Danube* Rivers.

Minns reveals that "the occurrence of *Dan* in river names just coincides with the extension of the Iranians [white, caucasoid peoples] of South Russia" (*Scythians and Greeks*, Minns, p. 38). Remember, the Scyths were definitely classed as "Iranians."

If one will follow the *DANube* River in its westerly or north-westerly course, it will take him upstream into the heart of Europe. From here, if one leaves the Danube and takes a somewhat northerly direction when he gets to the point where the Danube flows through Vienna, Austria, he will come to *DANzig*, a city situated on the Baltic coast of North-central Poland. If one continues to follow the coast of the Baltic Sea, in a westward direction, he will soon come to *DEnmark* (meaning *Dan's mark*). Following the coastline still further west-to-southwest from *DEnmark*, one soon arrives at a city in Northern France called *DUNkirk* (meaning *Dan's Church*). From *Dunkirk* one can cross the English Channel to the British Isles where he will encounter many scores of cities, rivers and bays with the name of *Dan*, *Den*, *Din*, *Don*, or *Dun* somewhere included in them. All over the British Isles, one will find this name, showing that these Danites had traversed the Britis Isles at a very early date. In some instances this root word "Dan" may be used as a prefix, or as a suffix, or it may even occur in the middle of the word.

It is in Ireland, however, where one will notice the largest number of these words with some form of the word "Dan" in them. *DUNgaven* is the name of a town not far from Belfast, North Ireland.

There is also another very interesting thing about this name of *Dan*. It is found almost exclusively on *rivers*, and *lakes* or along the *coastlines* of Europe. This is again evidence that the people of *Dan* were, as the Bible indicates, a seafaring people. They have never been the mountaineering or Alpine type. They are always found near a river, lake or sea.

Bear in mind that there were no vowels written in the Hebrew language. The basic part of this word when the vowel is dropped is *DN*. In different European languages one will find a different vowel inserted in the word "Dan" between the letters "d" and "n."

Some languages will use one vowel and some another when speaking or writing the word "Dan." Any of the vowels inserted in this word will not alter its basic sound.

These are just a very few of the many ways in which this name of *DAN* is found near the coastlands of numerous countries of Europe, where these adventuresome Danites have gone. In fact, as we noticed, one country in Europe is named after *Dan* i.e. *Denmark (Dan's Mark)*. Truly, *Dan* has left his trail or mark wherever he has gone. The city of *DUN Laoghaire* is near Dublin.

Another important point in the 18th chapter of *Judges* is that of the vivid account of the idolatry into which the people of *Dan* had already sunk, at this very early date in the history of Israel. In fact, this is the first recorded instance of any of the people of Israel sinking into idolatry, after the episod.

of the golden calf mentioned in Exodus 32:1-4.

Later we shall see that the modern descendants of Dan are among the most superstitious and idolatrous in all the world. They still reverence and bow before their images and idols of every description. They tremble at the thought of the leprechauns and the "wee folk."

Dan—a Great Seafaring People

The prophetess, Deborah, in reference to the then-recent struggle between Israel and the Canaanites, said of Dan, "Why did *Dan remain in ships?*" (Judges 5:17).

In other words, at the time when the Israelites were fighting for their freedom from under the oppression of the Canaanitish Sisera, undoubtedly the main body of the Danites was even then remaining in their ships, plying the waters of the Mediterranean with their Phoenician neighbors.

Both the Scriptures and early secular history make it very clear that the people of Dan were a great seafaring people. The city of Joppa, in Dan's inheritance, must have been a seaport of some importance. It was at Joppa that Jonah boarded a ship for Tarshish (or Spain) (Jonah 1:3).

If you will look at a map of the land of Palestine in the time of the Judges, you will notice that the tribe of Dan had a very small territory allotted to it along the Mediterranean Sea coast to the west and north-west of Jerusalem. Their territory only comprised about 500 square miles (Hurlbut, *A Bible Atlas*, p. 44). This allotment of land was not great enough for the people of Dan, so they had to push out northward and migrate to a new location.

We have already seen that a colony of Danites left their southern inheritance and went up to Laish, or Dan, at the extreme northern part of Palestine. This city was within the tribal inheritance of Naphtali, but the Naphtalites had not possessed the city of Laish, so Dan conquered and possessed it. If you consult a map of this period in Israelitish history, you will notice that Laish lay only twenty-five miles due east of the city of Tyre. Remember that the ancient city of Tyre was soon afterwards to become the most important maritime city in all the Mediterranean, and the whole world!

Tyre has often been called the "New York" of the ancient world. So the people of Dan were very close to this great seafaring city.

At the time of the division of Israel into two nations (Israel and Judah), there must have been few Danites living in their original territory, because most of Dan's inheritance was included in the Southern Kingdom of Judah (Hurlbut, *A Bible Atlas*, p. 80). The people of the tribe of Dan, however, were never included among the people of the Kingdom of Judah.

According to secular history, some of these adventurous, seafaring Danites left Egypt even before the Exodus of the people of Israel, and migrated to Greece. They settled in the extreme southern part of Greece, and were later known as the Lacedaemon (or Spartan) Greeks.

They were also known as Dorians or people from "Dor." Dor was a prominent city (in the tribe of Manasseh), on the Mediterranean coast

136

(Hurlbut, *A Bible Atlas*, p. 45). It was from this city that many Israelites left the Promised Land at a later time in order to settle in the southern part of Greece as Dorians!

Diodorus Siculus (Circa 50 B.C.), who quoted Hecataeus of Abdera of the 6th century B.C., says that the most distinguished of the expelled foreigners (from Egypt) followed Cadmus and Danaus into Greece; but the greater number were supposed to have been led by Moses into the Promised Land (See *Diodorus of Sicily*, Book V). A number of other historians refer to this same incident.

The tribe of Dan is not mentioned in the genealogical list as given in I Chronicles 5:6-8. If you will turn to the accounts of the captivity of Israel as found in II Kings, chapters 15 and 17, you will see that the name of Dan is not mentioned a single time among those peoples who were carried into the captivities of 733-732 and 721 B.C.

Dan and Naphtali had mixed with the Phoenicians of Tyre (Josephus, *Ant.*, iii, 4; I Kings vii. 14; 2 Chron. 11, 14).

In fact, you will search in vain to find the Danites mentioned any more as a tribe in any of the Bible accounts of the people of Israel, from the time of the Judges to the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities.

What happened to Dan?

We have already seen a prophecy of the tribe of Dan which says that "Dan shall leap from Bashan." The people of Dan migrated to the northern part of Palestine, and settled in the city of Laish, naming it after their father, Dan. This northern colony of Danites, living in the city of Dan, was located in the edge of the territory called Bashan. The Bible shows that these Danites were to *leap* from this territory—from Bashan.

What does it mean to "leap from Bashan?" The word *leap* means: "To spring or move suddenly as if by a jump" (*Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, p. 478).

A leap is a quick or sudden jump. It would appear, then, that this northern colony of Danites (perhaps because of the rumblings of the Assyrian armies about to invade Israel) emigrated hastily from their city of Dan.

Where did Dan go from here? The Bible does not specifically say. Did the Danites leave hastily, migrating *by land* into the area of the Black Sea where we find the name of Dan on many of the rivers in that area? Or does the word "leap" mean that they went *by ships* (perhaps from the city of Tyre), and fled by this means to the area of the Black Sea? Or, perhaps some of them went on directly to Ireland!

Later we shall have occasion to meet in Ireland these roving tribesmen of Dan, under the appellation "Tuatha de Danaan."

The Lacedemonian Greeks Were Danites

Herodorus, called "the father of history," who wrote in the fifth century B.C., also reveals the "Egyptian" origin of some of the Greeks. He says "If we ascend from *Danae* the daughter of Acrisus, we shall find that the ancestors of the Dorian princes were of *Egyptian* origin. Such is the Grecian account of the descent" (*Herod.*, Bk. VI, l. iii).

Remember these "Greek" Dorians were Israelites who had once lived in Egypt before they lived in Palestine.

The tribal emblem or ensign of Dan contained the image of a snake (*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Art. "Flag," p. 405).

Fuller says that the emblem of Dan was an "adder biting horse heels." He also quotes the Jewish writer, Aben Ezra, a learned Jewish scholar of the time of Oliver Cromwell, as saying that the emblem of Dan was an "eagle with a dragon [serpent] in its claws" (*Pisgah Sight of Palestine*).

*Jewish High Priest Acknowledges Kinship
To The Lacedemonian Greeks*

From these sources we learn that the tribal emblems used on the national ensign of Dan were those of the SERPENT and the EAGLE. We have seen from Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, a letter written by the Lacedemonian Greeks, to the Jews in which these "Greeks" claimed to be the brethren of the Jews. They wrote an epistle to the Jewish High Priest relating their kinship to them. Their seal, which was affixed to the letter was that of "an eagle with a dragon [serpent] in its claws."

Excerpts from the reply to this epistle written by the Jewish High Priest to the Israelitish Greeks of South Greece is here given. As the Jewish ambassadors were returning from Rome they delivered this letter to the Spartan Greeks.

Jonathan the high priest of the Jewish nation . . . to the ephori and senate and the people of the Lacedemonians, send greeting:

When in former times an epistle was brought to Onias, who was then our high priest . . . concerning the KINDRED that was between US and YOU, a copy of which is here subjoined, we both joyfully received the epistle . . . because we were well satisfied about it from the sacred writings, yet did not we think fit, first to begin the claim of this relation to you, the glory which is now given us by you. It is a long time since this relation of ours to you hath been renewed, and when we, upon holy and festival days, offer sacrifices to God, we pray to Him for your preservation and victory . . . You will, therefore, do well yourselves to write to us, and send us an account of what you stand in need of from us, since we are in all things disposed to act according to your desires" (*Ant.*, Bk. XIII, Chap. 5, Sec. 8, p. 318).

Josephus says that the Lacedemonians kindly received the ambassadors, and "made a decree for friendship and mutual assistance." They then dispatched the letter to their Lacedemonian kinsmen (*Ant.*, bk. XIII, Chap. 5, sec. 8, p. 318).

Stephanus Byzantium shows that Alexander Polyhistor and Claudius Jölaus also affirm a direct kinship between the ancient Spartans and the Jews (*Bryant, Ancient Mythology*, vol. 5, pp. 51, 52, 60).

The Jews of Christ's day knew some of the dispersed Israelites were

among the Greeks. Notice the proper translation of John 7:35 as given in the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. "Does He intend to go to the *dispersion* [Gk. *diaspara*] among the *Greeks* and teach the Greeks?" The Moffatt and other translations also properly translate this verse.

These historical references are sufficient to show that some of the Danites were living in Southern Greece centuries before Christ.

From Greece many of these Israelites went to Ireland many centuries before Christ's time, and settled in that country. In a later chapter on Scotch-Irish history, we shall go into this subject more thoroughly.

Thus we have seen Dan's trail in Greece and throughout Europe. It was to Ireland (and Denmark), that these Danites called the "Tuatha de Danaan" finally migrated and settled, making it their home. It is in Denmark and Ireland that they finally established their permanent homeland; and it is in Eire that their name is the most widely diffused. The Dans and Daniels are *common in Ireland and who has never heard "The Londonderry Air,"* also called "Danny Boy"?

Early Scotch-Irish History

In previous chapters we have noticed many links connecting the people of England and Wales directly with the Holy Land. It has been clearly pointed out that the Anglo-Saxons are definitely descendants of Shem and are, therefore, Semitic (Shemitic). We have also seen according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that some of the early immigrants to England were from Armenia—the very land to which Israel was taken in the captivities of 733-732 and 721 B.C.

Now let us examine early Scotch-Irish history to notice the many links directly connecting the people of Scotland and Ireland with the Promised Land, and consequently with the people of the Lost ten-tribed House of Israel in exile.

Ireland is reputed to possess genuine history several centuries more ancient than any other European nation possesses in its present spoken language. Having perused a number of Irish histories, it was finally decided that *The History of Ireland* by Moore would best convey the most important points of Irish history. Most Irish historians mention the same events and arrive at the same general conclusions as those expressed by Moore.

The Five Colonies

The five colonies who are said to have inhabited Ireland, are as follows: The *first colony* known to have settled in Ireland was supposed to have been of the "race of Japhet." They are said to have gone to Ireland about the beginning of the fourth century after the Flood. The chief of this colony was named Partholan. After possessing Ireland for about 300 years (from *circa* 2069-1769 B.C.), all of *the race of Partholan* were "swept away by a plague" (Moore, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 59).

"To this colony succeeded another [the 2nd colony] about the time, it is

said, of the patriarch, Jacob, who were called, from the name of their leader, NEMEDIANS, and are said to have come from the shores of the Euxine [Black] Sea" (ibid., p. 63).

The derivation of *this* NEMEDIAN Scythian colony from the vicinity of the Black Sea agrees with the generally accepted European tradition which regards "the regions in the neighborhood of the Caucasian Mountains . . . as the main source of the population of the West" (ibid., p. 63).

This agrees completely with the scriptural account which shows that the Israelites were dispersed into the regions just south of the Caucasus Mountains; and all history is crystal clear in showing that all of the North-west European peoples came from this general area. This is one more proof that the peoples of North-western Europe are, in fact, different branches of dispersed Israel.

Fierce wars were waged between these *Nemedians* and some *African searovers* called *Fomorians*. The African Fomorian mariners were joined by men and fresh supplies, and a battle ensued in which the Africans were victorious. The Nemedian colony (named after Nemedith, their leader) was dispersed and destroyed. They had dwelt in Ireland for about 217 years (1709-1492 B.C.). Because of oppression and enslavement under the fierce Fomorians, a colony of these Nemedians fled to Greece; but they later on returned to Ireland about 217 years after the first Nemedian Colony had first gone there. When they returned to Ireland, they bore a new name (FIR-BOLGS) which they had received while in Greece. Ireland was once more left to the mercy of the African foreign marauders and became a desolate wilderness for about 200 years.

These Fir-Bolgs were the *third colony* who settled Ireland—though they were descended from the Scythian Nemedian colony. They were the first people to establish regal authority over Ireland. Having divided Ireland into five parts or provinces, they established a Pentarchal form of government which continued, except for a few interruptions, until the beginning of the 15th century B.C.

The Tribe of DAN

Ireland was ruled by the Fir-Bolgs for only 30 or 40 years before they were conquered by a *fourth colony*—the "Tuatha-de-DANAAN."

Their (Fir-bolgs) tenure of royalty, however, was but short: for, not more than thirty or forty years had this quintuple sovereignty remained in their hands, when they were dispossessed by the TUATHA-DE-DANAAN, a people famed for necromancy, who after sojourning for some time in Greece, where they had learned this mysterious art, proceeded from thence to Denmark and Norway (ibid., p. 60).

From those lands they went to Ireland and overpowered the "alarmed Belgians," meaning the Fir-Bolgs, after which these Tuatha-de-Danaan became sole masters of the country.

THE SERPENT'S TRAIL

143

The first contingent of the Tuatha-De-Danaan appear to have gone to Ireland about 1456 B.C.—during Israel's 40-year wanderings in the desert under Moses.

A second contingent of this tribe of Dan probably went to Ireland in the time of the Prophetess Deborah—*circa* 1213 B.C.

Who were these "Tuatha-de-Danaan"?

Let us first see what the definition of the word "TUATH" is. "TUATH (Tū'ah). Irish History . . . A 'tribe' or 'people' in Ireland" (*A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, vol. X, part I, def. Tuath, p. 441).

Dr. Robert Gordon Latham, well-known nineteenth century ethnologist, definitely believed the Greek Danaans were the descendants of Dan. He says:

Neither do I think that the eponymus [ancestral name] of the Argive Danaï was other than that of the Israelite tribe of Dan; only we are so used to confine ourselves to the soil of Palestine in our consideration of the history of the Israelites (*Ethnology of Europe*, p. 137).

Dr. Latham then goes on to show that the people of Dan must have had close connections with the peoples of Southern Greece, and he concludes by saying: "Yet with Danaï and the tribe of Dan this is the case, and no one connects them" (*ibid.*).

There can be no doubt that the people who were called by such names as Dan, Danaï, and Danaans were all the same people. The histories of Ireland are replete with references to people of the tribe of Dan (Tuatha-de-Danaan) who had early come to Ireland from Greece.

Muller, commenting on some of the fragments of the Greek manuscripts of Hecateus of Abdera says:

Hecateus therefore, tells us that the Egyptians, formerly being troubled by cammides, [referring to the Ten Plagues at the time of the Israelitish Exodus] in order that the divine wrath might be averted, expelled all the aliens gathered together in Egypt. Of these, some, under their leaders DANUS and CADMUS, migrated into GREECE; others into other regions. THE GREATER PART INTO SYRIA [meaning Palestine]. THEIR LEADER IS SAID TO HAVE BEEN MOSES, a man renowned for wisdom and courage, founder and legislator of the state. Afterwards many Mosiac institutes followed. (*Fragmenia Historicorum Graecorum*, vol. II, p. 385).

Both Hecateus of Abdera (3rd century B.C.) and Diodorus of Sicily mention that the people of Danaï, under their leader Danus, came from Egypt, but Hecateus says that the greater part of the Danites went into Syria or Palestine under the leadership of Moses.

Notice the following interesting comments from Diodorus:

141

They say also that *those who set forth with Danaus, likewise from Egypt, settled what is practically the oldest city of Greece, Argos, and that the nations of the Colchi in Pontus and that of the Jews, which lies between Arabia and Syria, were founded as colonies by certain emigrants from their country; and this is the reason why it is a long-established institution among these two peoples to circumcise their male children . . . the custom having been brought over from Egypt. (Diodorus of Sicily, book 1, sec. xxviii, 1-5).*

Putting all of these historical bits of information (and this is only a small portion of such information) together, it becomes quite clear that the people who settled Ireland by the name of "Tuatha-de-Danaan" were some of the descendants of the Israelitish tribe of Dan!

We have already observed that the Tuatha-de-Danaan were the fourth Colony to settle in Ireland after the Flood. What happened to these Tuatha-de-Danaan?

The Milesian Scots

In process of time, the Tuatha-de-Danaan were themselves dispossessed of their sway; *a successful invasion from the coast of Spain having put an end to the Danaanian dynasty, and transferred the sceptre into the hands of that Milesian or SCOTIC race, which through so long a series of succeeding ages, supplied Ireland with her kings. This celebrated colony, though coming directly from Spain, was originally, we are told, of Scythic race (Moore, The History of Ireland, p. 60).*

This Milesian or "Scotic race," arrived in Ireland in 1016 B.C. and remained the ruling people in Ireland for many hundreds of years. It was these Scythian Scots who finally settled the northern part of England, calling it Scotland.

Centuries later, descendants of this Scythic or Scotic people settled in Canada, naming the province in which they had settled "Nova Scotia."

This Fifth Colony to invade Ireland, called MILESIAANS or SCOTS, *nan come from Scythia, as nearly all historians agree, and they definitely connected themselves with the people of Israel, the heroes of Israel, and the Holy Land!*

Speaking of the Milesian Scots, Moore says:

Tracing *this chosen race* in their migrations to different countries, and connecting them, by marriage or friendship, during their long sojourn in Egypt, with most of the heroes of Scripture history, our [Scotch-Irish] Bards conduct them at length, by a route not very intelligible, to Spain (*ibid.*, p. 60).

There can be no doubt about the colony of the "Tuatha-de-Danaan" being Israelitish Danites, and the Milesian Scots were definitely also Israelites, but were of the tribe of Judah—through his son Zarah.

It appears that some of these Zarah-Judah Israelitish colonists were—at least later—mixed with a portion of the sons of Joseph.

We have just seen in the above quotation that *the Scots* connected their people with "most of the heroes of Scripture history," and we have also noticed that they had experienced a "long sojourn in Egypt." We know that this could only refer to people of the tribes of Israel, for it was only they who had resided a long time in Egypt, and who were also connected with "most of the heroes of Scripture history."

I shall now proceed to the consideration of that latest and most important of all her settlements, the *Scythic*, or *Scotic*, from whence the whole of her people in the course of time received the name of Scots, and retained it exclusively to so late a period as the tenth century of our era (*ibid.*, p. 69).

According to the preceding quotation, *Ireland retained the name of "Scotia" until so late a period as the tenth century!* If one will consult the older maps of Ireland, he will soon discover the truth of the above statement. It was at a later period that some of the Milesian Scots from Northern Ireland crossed the Irish Sea and established their rule in the northern part of England, naming their new country Scotland, meaning the land of the Scots.

Dr. Wylie mentions that when the early historians speak of Scotland, it is always "the Irish Dalriada" or the country of "Antrim" in Northern Ireland which they refer to.

The name *Scotia* began to be of more general application, and to be given to the whole of Ireland. It was not until the *tenth century* that the name of Scotland was applied to the country on this side of the Channel, that is, to Scotland of today (*History of the Scottish Nation*, vol. 1, p. 298).

According to the oldest Irish chronicles, Abbot Tighernac, descendant of the Scotic king of Ulster, led a colony of Milesian Scots (Dalriada) from Antrim to the northern part of England. After a number of conflicts with the Picts, they were finally victorious, and gained complete control of the northern part of England, naming it after themselves, Scotland.

Scotch-Irish Ancestors and Moses

Moore further shows that these Milesian Scots traced themselves all the way back to some of the people of Israel. Speaking of their Scottish descent, he says:

A scheme of descent which traces the ancestors of the Irish (referring to the Scotch-Irish) through a direct series of generation, not merely to the first founders of Phoenician arts and enterprise, but even to chieftains connected by friendship with the prophet Moses himself (History of Ireland, p. 71).

Many historians look upon these historical accounts as fables, but there is ample scriptural and historical evidence to prove that this is not fable, but is fact of the most important significance!

1-13

It is indeed evident [says Moore] that those persons to whom St. Patrick applies the name *Scots*, were all of the high and dominant class; whereas, when speaking of the great bulk of the people, he calls them *Hiberionaces*,—from the name *Hibertone*, which is always applied by him to the island itself (*ibid.*, p. 72).

Dr. Wylie mentions that there were two different peoples dwelling in Ireland—*Hiberni* and *Scoti*. There was a marked distinction between the two. "The *Scots* are the military class; they are the *nobles* The latter [the *Hiberni*] are spoken of as the *commonalty*, the sons of the soil" (*History of the Scottish Nation*, Vol. I, p. 281).

The main difference between these peoples is that the *Hiberni* are descendants of Dan by Jacob and his concubine Bilhah. The people of *Scoti* are descendants of Judah by Jacob and his wife, Leah. Many *Scots* today contain tribal elements of Zarah-Judah as well as of a certain mixture of Joseph. The majority of *Scots* appear, however, to be descendants of Joseph. It was only the descendants of Joseph who were to be blessed with the birthright blessings (I Chr. 5:2). Judah was to be the regal tribe.

"St. Patrick often uses *Scoti* and *Reguli* as equivalent terms. To the term *Scottus* he adds often the word *Nobilis*; whereas he has no other appellative for the native Irish but *Hyberione*, or *Hiberni genae*, the common people" (*ibid.*, fn. p. 282).

Remember that such names as Iber, Eber, Heber, Ebornes, Hiberones, etc. are all words referring to the ancestor "Heber" from whom the Hebrews have all descended. The *Scots*, Irish, English and other branches of the so-called "Nordic" race are all descendants of Eber or Heber.

"In considering the *Scots* to have been a *Scythian* extraction, all parties are agreed" (*ibid.*, p. 73).

Moore then mentions that the Bards sang of the Milesian *Scots* as having come from the East through Spain. He says:

The *Celto-Scythae*, who founded a part of the mixed people of Spain, having come originally from the neighborhood of the *Euxine Sea* [Black Sea] and therefore combining in themselves all the peculiarities attributed to the Milesian colony, of being at once *Scythic*, *Oriental*, and *direct from Spain* (*ibid.*, p. 73).

He then mentions that, of the actual settlement of a number of Spanish (meaning *Celto-Scythian*) tribes in the Emerald Isle (Ireland), there is no reason to doubt. Moore shows that the European *Scythians* had come from Persia: "That the *Scyths* of Europe came from the northern parts of Persia, seems to be the opinion of most enquirers on the subject" (*ibid.*, fn. p. 73). The above quotation tallies completely with the scriptural account which shows that Israel was taken into captivity to *Assyria* and *Media* which was in the vicinity of *Persia*.

It is also interesting to note that, according to the Bards, all of the colonies who settled in Ireland (excepting the earliest colony which was destroyed with a plague) were all of the same race. They were, in fact, all descendants of Israel!

The Bardic historians themselves, who represent the *Scoti to have been of Scythic descent* and to have from thence derived their distinctive appellation . . . and to confirm still further the origin of the Scots from that quarter, it is added by the Bards that they *were of the same race with the three colonies that had preceded them; namely, the Nemedians, the Tuatha-de-Danaans, and the firbolgs or Belgae* (*ibid.*, p. 74).

It is also interesting to note that, according to Dr. Wylie, the *Scots, Caledonians, Belgae* (Firbolgs), Gauls, PICTS and Cimric or Celtic settlers of the British Isles were all of the same race (*The History of the Scottish Nation*, Vol. I. pp. 264, 265).

The Problem of the Picts

Before we continue our study of Scotch-Irish history, let us briefly examine the enigma of the Picts.

The problem of the Picts has baffled many historians. There is hardly any subject which is shrouded in more mystery (Moore, *The History of Ireland*, vol. I, p. 85). Also there is virtually no subject on which there is more disagreement by the so-called authorities. A number of the histories imply that some of the Picts were Celts; others, judging from their social customs, must have contained a racial element with close affinities to some of the North American Indians.

Here are facts which have caused some to equate the original Picts with certain American Indian tribes: (1) the practice of matriarchy; (2) the use of canoes made from skins; and (3) the fact that their huts or tents resembled the tepees of the American Indians, might lead one to agree with those proponents of the "Indian theory" of origin for at least some of the Picts.

There is, however, abundant material to show that at least a great part of the later "Picts" must have been of "Celtic" descent.

On one occasion the Milesian Scots gave their daughters to the Picts for wives. This is a strong indication that these Picts must not have been an Indian type.

In a work entitled *History of the Scottish Nation* by Wylie, page 306, we are told St. Columba (an Irish missionary—7th cent. A.D.) went from Ireland to Scotland where "he obtained an interview with the *Pictish king*, Bruidi, son of Malcolm, at his Dun or castle, on the banks of the Ness, near where the river issues from its parent Loch." After this interview Bruidi declared himself a convert to Christianity.

Here we note the Pictish king living in a castle! The American Indians never lived in castles! Neither did the Indian-type "Picts," who inhabited northern England at one time, ever dwell in proper houses or castles.

Ancient Irish History

No search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel in Northwest Europe should fail to focus in on the ancient history of Ireland.

145

Dr. Guest points out very clearly that the people in Ireland called "Scoti" were distinct from that great body of the Irish people, who were named Hiberiones.

He then quotes Nennius, on the primitive populations of Ireland:

If any here would know at what time Hibernia [Ireland] was uninhabited and waste, this was the information the learned among the Scots gave me . . . when the sons of Israel passed through the Red Sea the Egyptians followed them and were drowned as is read in the Law. But there was among the Egyptians a nobleman from Scythia with a great retinue, who had been before driven from his kingdom, and was there when the Egyptians were drowned, and who did not go out to pursue the people of God. But they who survived took counsel and expelled him, lest he should overspread their country, as their princes were drowned in the Red Sea (*Origines Celtae*, vol. II, p.24).

Nennius then shows that these Scythians who witnessed the drowning of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, left Egypt and sailed through the Mediterranean to the Columns of Hercules (Straits of Gibraltar) and went to Spain where they dwelt many years. After increasing greatly in numbers "they came to Hibernia, a thousand and two years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea. The Britons came to Britain in the *third age* of the world, and the Scots got possession of Hibernia in the *fourth*" (*ibid.*, pp. 22-26).

Did you notice that Nennius mentioned the "sons of Israel" and their passing "through the Red Sea"? He also mentioned "a nobleman from Scythia with a great retinue" who, he says, had been driven from his kingdom, and was there when the Egyptians were drowned at the Red Sea (at the Exodus), but that he did not go out to pursue the people of God. Also, the people of this nobleman later came through the Mediterranean to Spain. Afterwards they left Spain and came to Ireland a thousand and two years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea.

This is undoubtedly a somewhat garbled account of the Israelites, who were the progenitors of the Scots and the Irish.

In the library of the Royal Irish Academy is a poem on "the kings of the race of Eibhair" (Heber—the ancestor of Abraham). Here is the introduction to this poem:

The Use of Armes and Escouchions is anciently observed by the Irishry, in imitation of *ve Children of Israel*, who began to use them in Egypt (at which time *the Ancestor of all the Irishry*, called Gaoidhil, or Gathelus, there lived), which Armes, *The Israelites at their passing through ve Redd Seas, under the conduct of Moyses*, did carry in their severall Banners. They were in all *Twelve Tribes*, and each Tribe had a certaine number of men under his own command with Distinct Banners and Armes.

From a work entitled "*Leabhar Gabhala*," or the *Book of the Conquest of Ireland* is the following account: "Now Nel lived southward in Egypt, in Capachirunt [Pihahiroth] Exodus xiv. 2, on the shores of the Red Sea, which

is called the Mare Rubrum. That was the time when the Children of Israel escaped from the Egyptian bondage wherein they were with Pharaoh" (O'Cleirigh, *Leabhar Gabhala*, p. 127).

A considerable amount of material is given describing the conversation and the relationship of this nobleman, named Nel, with Moses and Aaron. Then follows an account of the land of Scythia being mentioned a number of times.

We are told of "THIRTY SHIPS" with three score in each ship (*ibid.*, p. 137). The *Caspian Sea* is also mentioned in this history on numerous occasions. This account also speaks of the "Graecian Scythia" and relates a number of instances of contacts between the Scythian people and the Egyptians. The Scythian nobleman, Golamb, later is given Scotia, the daughter of Pharaoh, in marriage.

From here they or their descendants traveled through the Mediterranean Sea to Spain and finally arrived in Ireland. They had to subdue the people of the tribe of Dan on their arrival.

The *Tuatha de Danuan* did not suffer them to come to land there, for they had not held a parley with them. . . . They encircled Ireland three times, till Thursday, so far as the day of the week, on the day before the Calendes of May, the 17th day of the moon: *Anno Mundi 3500 (ibid., p. 122).*

Irish Memories of Assyria

In the *Annals of Clonmacnoise* we read of the patriarch Abraham, and also mention is made "of the Raigne of Semiramis then monarche of the world in Assiria." This account also mentions "Nibroth [Nimrod] Sonne of Chus, [Cush] who was son of Cham [Ham], who was sonne of Noeh."

We next read of some "Ffirvolge" (Fir-Bolgs) who were in Ireland, but who were continually molested and harassed by Carthaginian African sea rovers and who, because of this, finally went back to Greece. Later these same people returned to Ireland where they finally settled.

Upon them [Fir-bolgs] came in the people called *Twathv De Danaan* out of Greece too. Being a Branch of the same stock that ffirvolge [Fir-Bolgs] were of and were kinsmen. Dureinge the time of Ffirvolge which was 37 yeares, there Raigned in Assiria 3 monarchs. . . . *Twany de Danaan* after they had spent much tyme abroad in learneinge nigromancy, *Magicke*, and other Diabolicall artes wherein they were exceedingly well skilled, and in these Dayes accounted the cheefest in the world in that profession. Landed in the west part of Connaught. ffirvolge hearinge of there comeing made towards them, and meeting them in a greate plaine called Moytoyrey in Connaught, fought with them, where ffirvolge was overthroned and one Hundred thousand of them slaine with there said King Eochy Me Eirche, which was the greatest slaughter that was hard of in Ireland in one meeting (*Annals of Clonmacnoise From the Creation to A.D. 1408*, 1627 ed.).

Detailed accounts are then given of the history of the Israelites, and mention is made of the "Twathy De Danaan" (Tribe of Dan) and of the "Egiptians" and of the "Raigne of Daud King of Israel and Judea" and of "Pharao" and also of "Solomon," King of Jerusalem.

The nation or kingdom of "Assiria" and of the "Assirians" are mentioned repeatedly as well as the "Twathy de Danaan." It is interesting to note that the historians who wrote or compiled this history continually sought to harmonize the events in the history of Ireland with those of Egypt, but more especially with "Assiria."

Since a colony of Danites had lived in the extreme northern part of the land of Israel, they must have been well acquainted with the Assyrians and their monarchs, especially since the frontier of Israel had been extended on occasions all the way to the Euphrates which would have bordered on the land of the Assyrians. At this period, a segment of the people of Israel must have been next door neighbours of the Assyrians. This would undoubtedly account for the many references to the Assyrians and their monarchs in the ancient chronicles of Ireland.

We notice similar accounts of the Irish history in a work entitled *The History of Ireland From the Earliest Period to The English Invasion*, by Geoffrey Keating.

In this work we read of the confounding of the languages in the time of Nimrod. Keating also mentions a Scythian nobleman called "Niul" who went to Egypt with his family, and who was dwelling in Egypt at the time of the Exodus of the children of Israel.

We are informed by Keating that Niul (Nel) showed kindness to Moses and Aaron and the children of Israel, for which he incurred the enmity of Pharaoh.

Pharaoh Intur and the Egyptians, in time, remembered their old grudge to the descendants of Niul and the family of Gaedal, namely, their resentment for the friendship the latter had formed with the children of Israel. They, then, made war upon the GAËLS, who were thereby compelled to exile themselves from Egypt (Keating, *History of Ireland From the Earliest Period to The English Invasion*, pp. 153-156).

With this account Thomas Walsingham agrees, in the book called *Hypodeigma*, where he states that

When the Egyptians had been drowned in the Red Sea, those of their countrymen who survived, drove out a certain chieftain of the Scythian nation, who lived among them, that he might not assume sovereignty over them. Banished with his tribe, he came to Spain where he resided many years, and where his posterity grew numerous, and that thence he came at last to Ireland (*ibid.*).

These are only a very few of the many references in ancient Irish history to the people of Israel. Irish history is replete with statements showing a direct connection between Ireland and the Holy Land.

Chapter Eleven

Jeremiah—Ollamh Fodhla

Among the famous persons who have illuminated the pages of Irish history, the Royal Sage, Ollamh Fodhla (pronounced Ollav Folla) stands out preeminently as "a being of historical substance and truth" (Moore, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I. p. 86). He was the "celebrated personage" who was known as a great legislator in Ireland.

There are different conjectures as to when this Sage ruled in Ireland. Moore quotes the author of *Dissertations* (Sect. 4) as showing that this *Royal Sage held sway in Ireland about 600 B.C.* There are, of course, other conjectures as to when this Royal personage lived in Ireland; but according to scriptural history and prophecy, we know it must have been about 600 B.C. or shortly thereafter when this Royal Sage exercised his powerful influence in Ireland.

Let us consider the background leading up to the arrival of this Royal Personage in Ireland.

Judah—The Regal Tribe

Speaking of Judah and his descendant, Genesis 49:10 says: "*The Sceptre [the king's royal staff of authority] shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.*" This prophecy shows very clearly that the sceptre would not depart from the tribe of Judah until the coming of Shiloh (Christ), and the establishment of Messianic rule over all the earth.

It is well to remember that *regal authority* was vested in the tribe of Judah, though the great material birthright blessings were to devolve upon the tribe of Joseph. "For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birthright was Joseph's" (I Chr. 5:2).

God solemnly promised David that He would establish forever the throne of his seed after his death! As long as human beings were being begotten, David's throne was to be ruling somewhere on this earth (II Sam. 5:13,29).

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto *David*. *His seed shall endure for ever, and HIS THRONE as the sun before me*" (vv. 34,36).

In Jeremiah 33:17. God solemnly declares: "For thus saith the Lord, **DAVID SHALL NEVER WANT [lack] A MAN to sit upon the throne of**

the house of Israel." Most people don't believe God meant what He said regarding David always having a son ruling somewhere on this earth! They think that when the Jewish throne was overthrown in Jerusalem *circa* 586 B.C., that this brought an end to the throne of David. But "God cannot lie" (Titus 1:2). "The scripture cannot be broken" (Jn. 10:35).

In Jeremiah 1:10, we read: "See, I have this day set thee [Jeremiah] over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant."

What was Jeremiah to pull down and throw down, and what was he to build and to plant?

God, through the prophet Jeremiah, had predicted that the Babylonish King Nebuchadnezzar, would invade the land of Judah and destroy the Jewish kingdom. For this prophecy Jeremiah was looked upon as a traitor, and was imprisoned (Jer. 38:1-10).

But later, as Jeremiah had prophesied, Nebuchadnezzar *did* march against Judah, and destroyed the city of Jerusalem and the Jewish kingdom. This occurred in the eleventh year of the reign of King Zedekiah *circa* 586 B.C. All of Zedekiah's sons (royal seed) were slain before his very eyes; then his own eyes were put out; afterward he was carried to Babylon—where he died in bonds (II Ki. 25; II Chr. 26; Jer. 39 and Jer. 52).

God had used Nebuchadnezzar to punish the Jewish people for their sins and to bring about this punishment upon His people. Jeremiah was released from his imprisonment by the Babylonians (Jer. 40:1-5). In fact, he obtained such favor in the sight of the captain of the guard that "the captain of the guard gave him victuals and a reward, and let him go" (v. 5).

Jewish Princesses in Egypt

Without attempting to give all of the scriptures showing all the movements of Jeremiah, let us next turn to Jeremiah chapter 43, verses 1 through 7 to pick up the main thread of this story.

In the first few verses of this chapter, we see Jeremiah and his scribe, Baruch, had a controversy with the chief leaders of the remnant of the Jews regarding whether or not they ought to flee to Egypt for protection.

But Johanan the son of Kareah, and all the captains of the forces, took all the remnant of Judah, that returned from all nations, whither they had been driven, to dwell in the land of Judah; even men, and women, and children, and the *king's daughters* . . . and *Jeremiah the prophet*, and *Baruch the son of Neriah*. So that they came into the land of Egypt: for they obeyed not the voice of the Lord: *thus came they even to Tahpanhes* (vv. 5-7).

Notice, Jeremiah and his scribe Baruch and "the king's daughters" all "came into the land of Egypt . . . even to Tahpanhes."

This same city is referred to as a garrison of the Egyptians (Jer. 2:16).

In a work entitled *Egypt and Israel*, by Sir. W. M. Flinders Petrie, we find archaeological confirmation of the visit of Jeremiah and the royal

daughters to Tahpanhes. In reference to a prophecy uttered in Ezekiel 30:14-18, Sir Flinders Petrie says:

These references show that Tahpanhes was an important garrison, and as the Jews fled there it must have been close to the frontier. *It is thus clear that it was the Greek Daphnae, the modern Tell Defneh, which is on the road to Palestine Of this an echo comes across the long ages; the fortress mound is known as the Qasr Bint el Yehudi, the palace of the Jew's daughter.* It is named Qasr, as a palace, not Qala, a fortress. It is not named Tell Bint el Yehudi, as it would be if it were called so after it were a ruinous heap. Qasr is a name which shows its descent from the time of habitation and *habitation for nobility* and not merely for troops. So through the long ages of Greek and Roman and Arab there has come down the memory of the royal residence for the king's daughters from the wreck of Jerusalem (Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, pp. 85, 86).

Thus we have indisputable archaeological proof verifying the biblical account that *Jeremiah and the "king's daughters" did go down to Tahpanhes* (Gk. Daphnae), being carried there by Johanan and all the captains of the forces of the remnant of Judah who were fleeing from the wrath of the Chaldeans.

What happened to Jeremiah and the king's daughters? Remember, Jeremiah was also commissioned to *build* and to *plant*. But *what* was he to build and to plant? Was he not to build and plant that which he had also torn down—the *throne of David*?

We know that Jeremiah, his scribe Baruch, and some of these fugitive Jews later left Egypt and went to the far west, to an island called Ireland, where they settled, living out the remainder of their lives in the "Emerald Isle."

Throne Overturned in Jerusalem

Isaiah 37:31, 32 gives another link which explains this mystery.

And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward: for out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of Mount Zion: the zeal of the Lord of hosts shall do this.

This clearly shows that the royal seed of Judah would again be established on a throne.

Now read Ezekiel 21:18-27.

And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. *I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more [overturned] until He come whose right it is;* and I will give it Him (vv. 25-27).

157

Verse 25 refers to the profane and wicked king, *Zedekiah*, who was going to be humbled and abased. The diadem or crown was to be taken from his head, and put on the head of one who had been of low rank. There is nothing in the Bible or in history to show that the Davidic crown passed to any one other than to the sovereigns ruling in Ireland!

The throne was *first* overturned at Jerusalem. The crown of the Jewish kings was thrown to the ground. (1) From here this crown was transferred to Ireland where its possessors ruled for many centuries. (2) From Ireland it was transferred to Scotland where the Scottish sovereigns all wore this crown. (3) From Scotland it was transferred to London, England (the third overturning); and it shall be overturned no more until the Second Coming of Christ—until Shiloh come.

The expression "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more" cannot possibly mean that the throne would cease after the third overturning, because we have seen a number of scriptures in which God solemnly promised David that he would have a descendant sitting upon this throne throughout every generation as long as the sun, the moon and the stars continued to exist!

Neither can this mean, as some would have us believe, that this throne (after being thrice overturned) would forever thereafter remain in London, England. The Bible shows that it would not be overturned any more after arriving in London, *until* the Second Coming of Christ, when it will once more be overturned and taken back to Jerusalem never again to be overturned. Here in Jerusalem, Shiloh shall sit (Jer. 3:17), ruling for 1,000 years (Rev. 20:4-6).

Now notice Ezekiel 17:1-24. This riddle or parable pertains to God's throwing down the Jewish nation and the Jewish throne in Jerusalem (the high tree). It also depicts the exalting of the "loa tree" (the dry tree) which God had determined to make to flourish.

Thus saith the Lord God: I will also take of *the highest branch* of the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his *young twigs* a TENDER ONE, and will plant it upon a high mountain and eminent (v. 22).

There can be no doubt that the "tender one" refers to *a daughter* from the *high twig* (the *royal family*) of the Davidic line who had been ruling in Judah. "In the mountain of the *height of ISRAEL* will I plant it." God showed that in Israel, it would become a mighty tree, and would bear much fruit. This is exactly what happened when the Jewish throne was overturned. The king's daughters were taken by Jeremiah from the land of Palestine to Egypt; and from there to Ireland. Their descendants have ruled over the British Isles, in the mountains (nations) of Britain and her Commonwealth ever since. Queen Elizabeth II possesses a chart showing her descent all the way back to King David and through him on back to Adam!

We have already seen, according to Moore, that one of the dates when the *Royal Sage, Ollamh Fodhla*, came to Ireland was given as about 600 B.C. From the biblical account we know that this prophet or *Royal Sage* was none other than Jeremiah himself!

“Some of the most useful institutions of Ollamh Fodhla are said to have but a short time survived himself” (Moore, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 87).

Among the important offices transmitted hereditarily in Ireland were those of heralds, practitioners in physics, bards, and musicians. To the professors of these arts Ollamh Fodhla assigned lands for their use; and also instituted a school of general instruction at Tara, which became afterwards celebrated under the name of the Mur-ollam-ham, or College of the Learned (*ibid.*, p. 88).

The ancient histories of Ireland also show that when this Royal Sage came to Ireland, he was accompanied by a scribe called *Baruch* or *Brec*.

This Royal Sage brought a Royal Princess from the east. A marriage between this Royal Eastern Princess and Prince Heremon of Ulster (Northern Ireland) was effected and soon thereafter Heremon became king.

Jeremiah in Ireland

Even to this very day a very strong tradition prevails in Ireland showing that many centuries ago a prophet by the name of *Jeremiah* had come to the “*Sacred Isle*.”

The writer, while touring Ireland a few years ago, was passing through a town called *Enniskillen*. *The local inhabitants informed him that the burial place of the prophet Jeremiah was supposed to be nearby*. Thereupon the writer and a friend with whom he was travelling hired a guide to take them to “*Jeremiah’s Tomb*.” The traditional Tomb of Jeremiah is located on Devenish Isle, Lough Erne, North Ireland!

Some may discount this as mere tradition, but remember that tradition often contains kernels of truth buried beneath some chaff.

We know, especially from the Bible (as well as from history) that Jeremiah *did* journey to Northern Ireland bringing the royal seed—the daughters of King Zedekiah—with him.

One of these daughters, *Tea Tephi*, married Prince Heremon, a descendant of Zarah a son of Judah. Princess Tea Tephi was a descendant of Pharez, whose descendants had been reigning in Jerusalem, Palestine. This marriage united the Pharez and the Zarah line, and the “breach” (Pharez means “breach”) was at last mended.

But how do we know that the descendants of Zarah were in North Ireland?

The Red Hand of Ulster

From time immemorial *the people of Northern Ireland (Ulster) have used the “RED HAND” as an emblem on their heraldry*. This “red hand” goes back to the time of Zarah’s birth, when a red or scarlet thread was tied around his hand, signifying Zarah’s right to a regal position (Gen. 38:28, 29). His brother, Pharez, was born first, causing a breach.

Some of the "Scotic" people of North Ireland were descendants of the Zarah line of Judah!

"The St. George's Cross with the ancient regional emblem, the blood-red right hand of Ulster, at its center surmounted by the Royal Crown, forms the flag of Northern Ireland. A shield bearing the similar emblem and surrounded by a wreath at the center of the Union forms the flag of the Governor of Ireland" (Evans, *The Observer's Book of Flags*, p. 28).

On page 27 of this book is illustrated the flag of Northern Ireland. The flag has a white background with a red cross. In the center is a SIX POINTED STAR, and in the center of this white star is "the BLOOD-RED RIGHT HAND OF ULSTER." Above the six-pointed "star of David" is the Royal crown. This six-pointed star, called "the star of David," does not appear to be of Davidic origin but ante-dates King David by many centuries. The fact remains that *the Jews have used this star from time immemorial*. Why does Ulster use this star if it is not connected with Judah through the Zarah line?

On page 194 of this same book is a display of a number of the flags of Yacht clubs. The "Royal Ulster" flag consists of a purple flag with a Union Jack in the upper left hand corner, but in the lower right hand corner of the flag, there is a white shield, on which is superimposed *the Red Right Hand of Ulster*. Above the shield and hand is the Royal crown.

It is also interesting to observe that the people of Ulster (the Milesian Scots) not only ruled all of Ireland and imposed their name upon the island until so late a date as the tenth century A.D., but later many of these Scythian Scots crossed the Irish Sea and settled in the northern part of the island of England, which they named "Scotia." Scotia was later called "Scotland" (land of the Scots).

From a book entitled *The Scottish Tartans*, illustrated by William Semple, we are informed that there are about ten or twelve of the clans of Scotland, whose coats of arms to this very day still include the "*blood-red Right Hand of Ulster*." On page 103 of this book he mentions the Matheson clan (called Mac-mhathan or Mac-mhagan in Gaelic), which has on its coat of arms a white shield with *three of the blood-red Right Hands of Ulster*.

Thus we can easily see the influence of the Zarah line of Judah in Ulster. This does not mean that all of the people of Ulster are descendants of the Zarah branch of Judah. Most of the Northern Irish are undoubtedly descendants of Joseph. But these Israelitish sons of Joseph arrived in Ireland under the name of "Scythian" (Skuthes or Scots, etc.).

We have already noted that these Milesian Scots from Scythia gave their name both to Ireland and to Scotland. Ireland retained the name of Scotia even until the tenth century A.D.

Scotch-Irish Settlers—"From Israel"

In one of the oldest histories in the English language we are informed that Britain was formerly called the "White Island" or "Albion" and that it was situated in the Western Ocean between Ireland and Gaul. Britain,

according to this ancient history, was inhabited by five different nations—Britons, Saxons, Romans, Picts, and SCOTS (Roberts, *The Brut* or *The Chronicles of the Kings of Briton*).

In *The Brut*, we are informed of Gwrgant, son of Beli, King of Britain, who went to Denmark to persuade the king of Denmark (by force of arms if necessary) to resume payment of tribute to him. Notice how clearly the following quotes reveal the Israelitish origin of the Scotch-Irish!

On his return [meaning Gwrgant's return to England] as he was passing through the Orkney Isles, he came up with *thirty ships*, which were full of men and women; and finding them there, he seized their chief, whose name was *Barthlome*. Thereupon this chief prayed for protection, telling him that they "were called *Barclenses*," had been *driven from Spain*, and were roving on the seas to find a place of settlement; and that he therefore entreated Gwrgant to grant them permission to abide in some part of the island [of England] as they had been at sea for a year and a half. Gwrgant [King of England] having thus learned hence they were, and what was their purpose, directed them with his goodwill to go to Ireland, which at that time lay waste and uninhabited. Thither therefore they went, and there they settled, and peopled the country; and their descendants are to this day in Ireland (*ibid.*, p. 60).

A very interesting footnote referring to this Israelitish Chief, "BARTHLOME" says:

"He [*Barthlome* the chief of the 30 ships] had his name from a river of Spain called *Eirinnal*, on the banks of which they had lived. *This chief related to the king the whole of their adventures, from the time they had been driven fro Israel (Palestine) their original country, and the manner and circumstances in which their ancestors dwelt in a retired part of Spain, near the Eirnia, from whence the Spaniards drove them to sea to seek another abode*" (*ibid.*, fn., p. 60).

Notice here were *thirty shiploads* of people, who according to their chief, *Barthlome* (a good Hebrew name) *had come from ISRAEL*, their original country, and had first gone to Spain. After having been driven from Spain, they came to the Orkney Islands, and were there directed by Gwrgant, the King of England, to go on to Ireland, where they permanently settled!

This is one more vital link of historical proof, connecting some of the ancient people of Ireland (who, in other accounts are called "Milesian Scots") *directly with their original homeland of Israel in Palestine!*

Some people would treat this very old historical reference to the early British settlers of these islands as mere fable; but a number of prophecies reveal that many of the Israelites would settle in the isles in Northwest Europe.

Significance of the Declaration of Arbroath

Perhaps the most prized historical document in possession of the Scottish nation is their historic "Declaration of Arbroath," otherwise called

"The Scottish Declaration of Independence" (written in 1320 A.D.). This document is proudly displayed at the Register House, Edinburgh, Scotland.

In the years preceding 1320 A.D. there had been continual wars between England and Scotland. Under Robert Bruce, king of the Scots, the English were on many occasions defeated in battle.

By 1313 only the castle of Stirling remained in the hands of the English. Edward II set out (1314) to relieve the castle; Lancaster and the baronichal party refused to support the expedition. At Bannockburn (1314) Edward was overwhelmingly defeated, and *Scottish independence won* (Langer, *An Ency. of World History*, p. 264).

But wars continued between England and Scotland. Edward II finally appealed to the Pope at Rome, the international arbiter during the Middle Ages, to support him against Robert Bruce, King of Scotland. Edward asked the Pope to persuade Robert the Bruce to acknowledge the sovereignty of the King of England.

The Pontiff sent a letter with special representatives from the "Holy See" to persuade Robert Bruce to acknowledge the overlordship of Edward II, king of England. Following are some excerpts from the reply of Robert Bruce and his barons to the Pope:

We know and gather from ancient Acts and the Records, that in every famous nation, this of *Scotland* hath been celebrated with many praises. *This nation, having come from Scythia* the Greater, through the Tuscan Sea and the Hercules Pillars, and having for many ages taken its *residence in Spain* in the midst of most fierce people, could never be brought in subjection by any people how barbarous soever; and having removed from these parts, above 1200 years after the coming of the *Israelites out of Egypt*, did by many victories and much toil obtain these parts in the West which they still possess, having expelled the British and entirely rooted out the Picts, notwithstanding the frequent assaults and invasions they met with from the Norwegians, Danes, and English (*Scottish Declaration of Independence*).

The foregoing excerpts from the Declaration of Arbroath were taken from a translation printed by Gordon Wilson, Edinburgh, second edition, February, 1951. Another similar translation of this historic document may be found in *Scots Magazine*, April, 1934, pp. 16-18.

There are a number of important points worth noting in regard to this document. First, this document was addressed to Pope John XXII, and signed by the Scottish barons and ecclesiastics of Robert Bruce in Parliament at Arbroath Abey, April 1320.

Secondly, the Declaration of Arbroath shows conclusively that the Scots came from Scythia through Spain and finally to Scotland. Their arrival in Scotland, according to this Declaration, was 291 B.C. or 1,200 years after the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt. The Exodus occurred, according to Archbishop Usher's Chronology, circa 1491 B.C. Subtract 1,200 years from that date, and it will bring you to about 291 B.C. when the Scots, according to their own records, must have first gone to Scotland. They had, however, lived in Ireland for some time before going to Scotland.

Thirdly, notice the Scots mention directly the *Exodus of the people of Israel*. Why did they mention this Exodus unless they were part of the people of Israel who had taken part in this Exodus? They mentioned the Exodus because it was a memorable occasion in their national history.

We have already seen that *these Milesian Scots* who first went to Ireland definitely claimed that their "chieftans (were) connected by friendship with the prophet Moses himself" (Moore, *History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 71).

Who were the only chieftans connected by friendship with the prophet Moses? This can only refer to the Princes or chieftans of the tribes of Israel with whom Moses continually dealt in the long trek from Egypt to the wilderness of Sinai! Yes, Moses had dealt with these self-willed and stiff-necked ancestors of the Scots, who were at the time of the Exodus included under the banners of Joseph and perhaps some of them under the tribal banner of Judah.

We noticed that these Milesian Scots were not only connected with the prophet Moses, but they were connected "by marriage or friendship . . . with most of the heroes of Scripture history."

From thence [the plain of Shenaar] tracing this chosen race in their migrations to different countries, and connecting them, by marriage or friendship, during their long sojourn in Egypt, with most of the heroes of Scripture history (Moore, *History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 61).

These "heroes" of Scripture can only refer to such leaders as Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Samson, David, and others. These "Milesian Scots" knew their past history had been directly connected with the Bible heroes already mentioned.

Were these Milesian Scots descendants from Japheth, as many misguided historians would have us believe?

I confess that but for the universal tradition which assigns our descent to Japheth, I should have been rather inclined to attribute to *the British Celts a Semitic origin* (Lysons, *Our British Ancestors*, p. 18).

Remember the Milesian Scots were "Scythians" and also bear in mind that the Celts were merely a branch of the Scythian people.

Origin of the Tartan

In the reign of Achy, who succeeded Tighernmas in Ireland, a law was passed regulating the number of colours by which the garments of the different classes of society were to be distinguished. Plebeians and soldiers were to have but one colour in their dress; military officers of an inferior rank, two; commanders of battalions, three; the keepers of houses of hospitality, four; the nobility and military knights, five; and the Bards and Ollamhs, who were distinguished for learning, six; being but one colour less than the number (seven) worn by the reigning princes!

These regulations are curious; not only as showing the high station allotted to learning and talent, among the qualifications, for distinction, but as presenting a coincidence rather remarkable with that custom of patriarchal times which made a garment of many colours the appropriate dress of kings' daughters and princes. . . . From the party-coloured garments worn by the ancient Scots, or Irish, is derived the national fashion of the plaid, still prevailing among their descendants in Scotland (Moore, *History of Ireland*, pp. 85, 86).

There existed also among the Celts of Gaul a fancy for garments with all varieties of colour. Their braccæ, or breeches were so named because of their plaided pattern; the Celtic word 'brac' denoting anything speckled or "party-coloured."

The historian, Tacitus, describes the Gaulish dress as including breeches and a plaid mantle (*ibid.*, fn. p. 85).

Thus Jacob made a coat of many colours for his son, Joseph (Gen. 37:3) and Tamar, one of David's daughters, wore a garment of diverse colours as was customary for kings' daughters that were virgins (II Sam. 13:18).

It is interesting to note that, to this very day, the Scots have a "Jacobite Tartan" which may be worn by anyone not having a clan tartan of his own (Bain, *The Clans and Tartans of Scotland*, pp. 286, 287).

It is not by coincidence that the tartan is still a garment of pride among some of the descendants of Joseph—the present-day Scots!

Chapter Twelve

The Origin of The Saxons

In our dogged search for the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel, we come into contact with another ancient, but important, people of Northwest Europe.

What is the name of that famous people?

There is another name mentioned on the *Behistun Rock Inscriptions*—the name *Saka* (in the Persian language), or according to Professor Rawlinson, *Sacae*, (in the Susian language *Sakka*). Is this name "Saka" connected with the people of Israel? It certainly is!

We are informed by the Bible that the descendants of Israel were known as Israelites. The suffix "ite" means "son of." The descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob were likewise called after the names of the twelve patriarchal Fathers. The sons of Levi were called Levites, the descendants of Benjamin were called Benjamites and the children of Dan were called Danites, and so on.

The Sons of Isaac

Were the descendants of Isaac never called after his name? "And God said unto Abraham. Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad [Ishmael—Abraham's first-born son], and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah has said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; because in ISAAC shall thy seed be called" (Gen. 21:12).

Notice also that this same statement is repeated twice in the New Testament. See Romans 9:7 and Hebrews 11:18. Why did God solemnly declare in three different places in the Bible that Abraham's seed would be called after the name of Isaac, if he did not mean exactly what He said? Where (and how) in history were the progeny of Abraham and Isaac ever called after the name of ISAAC?

The names "Saxon," "Saksun," "Sakaisuna," and "sons of Sacae" all definitely refer to the "sons of Isaac."

The "I" Has Been Dropped

It is quite common in some languages to drop the initial syllable from a word. Dr. Schrader points out that *the Assyrians dropped the "I" when they spoke of an Israelite*. Also, it was quite common to sometimes add a new

final syllable to a name. "Ahab is called by Shalmanassar II A-HA-AB-BU SIR-'LAI, i.e. 'Ahab of Israel' in an inscription discovered on the banks of pp. 137, 138).

This is undoubtedly what has happened in regard to the Isaac-sons (Saxons). The "i" has been dropped and the basic part of the word "sak" or "sac" has been retained. "Son" simply means son of. So the word "Saxons" means "sons of (I)SAC" or "sons of Isaac." Later, we shall see quotations from reliable historical sources proving that "Saxon" derives from "sons of Sac" or "sons of Sak" (meaning "sons of Isaac").

In the days of the Judges, the Ephraimites could not sound the "h" in the word "Shibboleth."

During a struggle between Israelitish factions, the inability of the Ephraimites to pronounce the "h" cost many of them their lives. Speaking of fugitive Ephraimites we read: "Then said they unto him, Say now *Shibboleth*: and he said *Sibboleth*: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites *forty and two thousand*" (Judges 12:6).

Many Hebrew-speaking Jews have difficulty pronouncing their "h's" to this day. Why do we all say "Semitic" instead of "Shemitic"? Is it not because the "h" has been dropped in this word?

It is quite common among many of the people of the British Isles even today, to drop an initial letter in some words. This is especially true of the letter "h", which is often dropped by many English-speaking people who live in Great Britain.

"Where did I 'ang me' at?", a Welsh friend of mine once asked. And a British plumber told me one day, that it was "air" which had stopped up my drain. He had to repeat himself several times before I realised that he meant "hair" instead of "air."

The Anglo-Saxons Descendants of Shem

Before we pursue further the derivation of the word "Sacaë," we will consider historical evidence proving that the Anglo-Saxon peoples have descended from Shem.

We have already noted that Lysons made this confession:

I confess that but for the universal tradition which assigns our [the British] descend to Japhet, *I should have been rather inclined to attribute to the British Celts a Semitic origin*, both on account of the relics of worship which we find in Britain, and also on account of the language. . ." (*Our British Ancestors*, p. 18).

Lysons then shows that there are literally thousands of words in the English language which come from the Hebrew language (*Ibid.*, p. 21 ff.). He says:

Thus I proposed to show in the course of these pages when we come to the relics of British worship remaining in the country, and retaining with lit-

the variation or corruption their aboriginal names, the *remarkable similarity* between those names and the HEBREW and CHALDEE languages" (*ibid.*, p. 21).

He then points out that many of the "old British families" have Hebrew names. "Now, whatever may be the historical value of the *Welsh* poems, it is undoubted that Taliesin in his *Angar Cyfyndawd*, says that *his lore had been Declared in Hebrew, Hebraig . . .*" (*ibid.*, p. 22).

On page 93 of this same work, Lysons says:

Yet this we gather from the names attaching to the British monuments still remaining among us, when divested of modern corruptions, that *there is a strong affinity between these British names and that language of which Hebrew is either the original or one of its earliest offshoots*; and that therefore HEBREW, CHALDEE or some other very near cognate, *must have been the language of the first inhabitants in this island*" (*ibid.*, p. 93).

Lysons then proceeds to show the similarity between many ancient British and Hebrew words, and between the corrupted religion of the Palestinian Israelites and that of the ancient British people. Lysons finally makes this startling statement:

We cannot avoid the conclusion that our British ancestors were devoted to that kind of worship which they brought with them from the East, whence they came at a very early period, even close upon the Patriarchal times of Holy Writ (*ibid.*, pp. 93, 94).

It has already been clearly pointed out that the early British ancestors said they came from Armenia in the area of the Caucasus Mountains; and we know that many of them arrived in the British Isles centuries before Christ's birth.

Welsh and Hebrew

Robert Owen also substantiates this view by the following statement:

Most Welsh scholars have employed their time on the production of grammars and dictionaries. The Hebrew learning of Dr. John Davies of Mallwyd seems to have influenced his countrymen to accept the Puritan atavism of referring *Welsh to the language of Moses as its fountain* (*The Kymry*, pref. v., vi.).

For any who still might have any lingering doubts regarding the similarity between the Hebrew and the early British languages which were used by its ancient peoples, one need only *study the present-day Welsh language*. There are many strong similarities between modern Welsh and Hebrew. Even one who is unskilled in the science of languages cannot fail to detect a close similarity between the spoken *Hebrew* language when contrasted with modern *Welsh*. Many Welsh words are almost devoid of any vowels whatsoever, just as the ancient Hebrew language was written without any vowels.

A number of books have been written besides the ones mentioned here which show the close affinity between the languages as spoken by some of the early British peoples and the Hebrew language.

As an example of some modern Welsh names with few written vowels, here is part of the address of a friend of mine. The name is fictitious, however. Nathan Evans, Tyddyn Valley, Llanddoget, Llanrwst, Denbighshire. Notice that the anglicized words have far more vowels written in them than do such words as "Llanrwst."

We have already observed that it has been commonly taught that the British have descended from Japheth. *Nothing could be farther from the truth!*

Here is proof that the British have descended from Shem, and are therefore Semitic (Shemitic):

Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, was born in the year of our Lord's incarnation eight hundred and forty-nine . . . King Alfred was the son of Geata . . . The Geata was the son of . . . Heremod . . . the son of Sem (Church Historians of England, Annals of Exploits of Alfred the Great, vol. II, pp. 443-44).

We have noticed that Alfred the Great, king of the Anglo-Saxons was a descendant of "Sem." This same quotation continues as follows: "Heremod . . . the son of Sem, the son of Noe, the son of Lamech, the son of Methusalem, the son of Enoch, the son of Malaleel, the son of Cainan, the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam" (*ibid.*).

Alfred the Great, who was himself a Saxon (son of Isaac) traced his genealogy right back to "Sem" (or Shem) and on back to Adam.

So the Anglo-Saxons may well have had records of the ancestry of their kings, beginning with Scaef . . . and calling Scaef the son of Noe, born in the ark, or even identifying him with the patriarch Shem (Haigh, The Conquest of Britain by the Saxons, Chapter III, p. 115).

Haigh makes the grave mistake that many others do. Many simply cannot believe the plain records of the ancient peoples who came to the British Isles! They just can't possibly believe that these peoples could really have been descendants of *Shem*. We shall notice the same tendency for critics of early Scotch-Irish history. They think the early history (which they call folklore) of these peoples cannot be true when it connects such peoples directly with the lands and peoples mentioned in the Bible.

We shall see in a later chapter that the Scythians, who were the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons, spoke a language that had a strong similarity with Hebrew. Should this fact amaze us? It should not cause any alarm, especially when one sees that these Scythian peoples came from the regions of the

Caucasus Mountains not long after they were taken as captives to that general area by the Assyrian kings in 733-732 and 721 B.C.

Time does not permit us to give the innumerable similarities between the early British words and the Hebrew: but consider the words "British" (Heb. "covenant man"), and "Britain" (Heb. "covenant land"). All of the early British languages had many points in common with the Hebrew language.

Who Were The Sacae?

The Bible had prophesied, as we have already observed, "*In ISAAC shall thy seed be called*" (Gen. 21:12).

Have you ever known of any people being called after Isaac?

It might be well to point out here that the Persians spoke of all the people of *Scythia* as the *Sacae* or *Sakka*, because the Sacae were a branch of the Scythian people who dwelt nearest to them. Modern research confirms conclusively that the Sacae were a very important branch of the people who were called by the name of Scythians.

Before quoting from Sharon Turner, one of the most eminent authorities on the Anglo-Saxons, let us take a biographical glance at this well-known historian:

"TURNER, SHARON (1768-1847), English historian, was born in Pentonville, London, on the 24th of September 1768 . . . He was educated at a private school kept by Dr. Davis in Pentonville, and was articled to a solicitor in the Temple in 1783.

"In early boyhood he had been attracted by a translation of the 'Death Song of Ragnar Lodbrok,' and was led by this boyish interest to make a study of early English history in *Anglo-Saxon* and *Icelandic* sources. He devoted all the time he could spare from his business to the study of *Anglo-Saxon documents* in the British Museum. The material was abundant and had hitherto been neglected. When the first volume of his *History of England from the Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest* appeared in 1799, it was at once recognized as a work of equal novelty and value. The fourth volume appeared in 1805" (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. Turner, Sharon).

According to the French dictionary by *Larousse*, Sharon Turner was an "attorney by profession, (who) spent his leisure time doing research relating to Anglo-Saxon and Irish scripts" (*Larousse*, art. "Sharon Turner").

A very reliable historical account of the Anglo-Saxons, by Sharon Turner, gives a number of salient points regarding the Anglo-Saxons. It is so important that it is here given verbatim:

The Saxons were a . . . Scythian tribe; and of the various Scythian nations which have been recorded, the Sakai, or Sacae, are the people from whom the descent of the Saxons may be inferred with the least violation of probability. Sakai-suna or the sons of Sakai, abbreviated into Saksun, which is the same sound as Saxon, seems a reasonable etymology of the word Saxon. The Sakai, who in Latin are called Sacae, were an important branch of the Scythian nation. They were so celebrated, that the Persians called all the

Scythians by the name of *Sacae*; and Pliny, who mentions this, speaks of them as among the most distinguished people of Scythia (Pliny, lib. vi. c. 19). *Strabo places them eastward of the Caspian . . . (The History of The Anglo-Saxons, vol. I, p. 87).*

Note that Turner shows *the Sacae were an important branch of the Scythian nation*. They lived to the *east of the Caspian Sea*. According to Turner, these Scyths (*Sacae*) seized the most fertile part of *Armenia*! Also observe that this was the same general area (*Armenia*) to which Israel had been deported:

This important fact of a part of *ARMENIA* having been named *Sakasina*, is mentioned by Strabo in another place (Strabo, p. 124), and *seems to give a geographical locality to our primeval ancestors*, and to account for the Persian words that occur in the Saxon language; as *they must have come into Armenia from the northern regions of Persia (ibid., p. 87).*

Turner says that "our primeval [Saxon] ancestors" went into Armenia from northern Persia. This again was the precise area of Israel's dispersion.

The following quote from Turner is so significant that it must be given *in toto*:

That some of the divisions of this people were really called *SAKASUNA*, is obvious from Pliny; for he says that the *SAKAI*, who settled in *Armenia*, were named *SACASSANI* (Pliny, lib. vi. c. 11); which is but *SAKA-SUNA* spelt by a person unacquainted with the meaning of the combined words. And the name *SACASENA* (Strabo, lib. xi. pp. 776, 778), which they gave to the part of *Armenia* they occupied, is nearly the same sound as *SAXONIA*. It is also important to remark, that Ptolemy mentions a Scythian people sprung from the *Sakai*, by the name of *SAXONES*. If the *Sakai* who reached Armenia ("from the northern regions of Persia") were called *Saca-sani*, they may have traversed Europe with the same appellation; which being pronounced by the Romans from them, and then reduced to writing from their pronunciation, may have been spelt with the *x* instead of the *ks*, and thus *SAXONS* would not be a greater variation from *SACASSANI* or *SAKSUNA* than we find between *French, François, Franci*, and their Greek name, *Phraggi*; or between *Spain, Espagne, Hispania (ibid., p. 88).*

Turner is undoubtedly correct in saying that the "ks" was changed to an "x." These variations of the word *Sacae* (or *Saka*) are not any greater, says Turner, than the variations of names for such modern nations as France and Spain (*ibid., pp. 87, 88, 95).*

Origin of the Saxons

He then says that Ptolemy placed another people, the *Sasones*, north of the *Sacae*. "These have been selected as our ancestors . . . *Sasones, Sacaesons, Saxonos*" (*ibid., fn., p. 95).*

Turner then mentions that some of these marauding *Sakai* or *Saca-sana* were, in all probability, gradually propelled to the west coast of Europe, on

THE ORIGIN OF THE SAXONS

which they were found by Ptolemy, and from which they made incursions into the Roman Empire, in the third century A.D. A people known as the Saxoi, lived on the Black Sea, according to Stephanus (Stephanus de urb. et Pop. p. 657).

"We may," says Turner, "consider these, also, as a nation of the same parentage." These Sakai wandered far and wide from Asia to the German Ocean. He also points out the traditional descent of Odin as preserved by Snorre in the *Edda* and his history which represents the Saxon and Scandinavian chieftains as having migrated from a city, east of the Tanais, called Asgard, located in a country called Asaland, meaning the city and the land of the Asae or Asians (Snorre Ynlinga Saga, c. 2. and 5).

Thus, we see that Turner equated the Sacae with Odin and his people, the Asae, from Asgard, north of the Black Sea—the very area where we find many of the Israelites located shortly after their exile (*ibid.*, pp. 88, 89).

But that of the most learned German seems most probable and worthy to be embraced, which makes the *Saxons* descend from the *Sacae*, the most considerable people of Asia, and to be so called *quasi Sacasones*, q.d. *sons of the Sacae*, and to have gradually overspread Europe from Scythia or Sarmatia Asiatica, with the *Getae*, *Suevi*, *Daci* and others. Nor is their opinion ill-founded, which brings the Saxons out of Asia, in which the human race had both its rise and increase. . . (Camden, *Britannia*, vol. I, p. 151).

Camden seems to completely agree with Turner in identifying such peoples as: Saxons, Sacae, Sacasones, ("sons of the Sacae"), Saci, q.d. Sassones, Sacasena. Note that they came "from Scythia." He says that "these people kept almost as near to one another in Europe" as they had before in Asia.

The Sacae, who are *Scythians*, had on their heads caps, which came to a point and stood erect: they wore loose trousers, and carried bows peculiar to their country. . . . These, though they are Amyrgian Scythians, they call *Sacae*, for the *Persians* call all the *Scythians Sacae* (*Herod. Polymnia*, bo. VII, par. 64).

From Herodotus' statements, we can see that the Sacae were actually a Scythian tribe. Herodotus called them "Amyrgian Scythians."

According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, the *Angli* or *Angles* were merely a branch of the Saxons. The Anglo-Saxons invaded England in the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries A.D. (*Ency. Brit.* 11th ed., vol. XXIV, art. "Saxons," pp. 264, 265).

We shall later have occasion to refer to the Sacae or Saxons as we study the Scythian and other tribes.

Here is a final quotation which clearly shows that "Saxon" is derived from "sons of Sacae." Milton says that the Saxons were a heathen and a barbarous nation, famous for their robberies and cruelties done to all their neighbours, both by land and sea: