

---

# JUST WHO IS

THIS PATRIARCH,

# JUDAH?

---

CLIFTON A. EMAHISER



CLIFTON A. EMAHISER  
TEACHING MINISTRIES  
1012 NORTH VINE STREET  
FOSTORIA, OH 44830

PHONE (419) 435-2836





# CONTENTS

---

<b>1 Letter 1</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Judah's intercession for Joseph . . . . .	13
1.2 Judah's story gets complex . . . . .	14
<b>2 Letter 2</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Be careful when you are reading the so-called pseudepigrapha books! . .	18
2.2 More about the mandrakes . . . . .	20
2.3 Scott Vaught's twisted theology . . . . .	23
2.4 Tamar was not a Canaanite! . . . . .	24
<b>3 Letter 3</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 What's in a name? . . . . .	29
3.2 Now let's tell the story the way it really was . . . . .	35
3.3 What is the plot of Satan, then? . . . . .	35
3.4 Tamar puts her life on the line for her true children! . . . . .	40

<b>4 Letter 4</b>	<b>43</b>
4.1 Judah becomes both a blessing and a curse . . . . .	43
4.2 The doctrine of No Satan . . . . .	47
4.3 Charles Weisman dispels Satan . . . . .	49
4.4 Let's take the confusion out of identifying Satan! . . . . .	49
4.5 Everything hinges on the article! . . . . .	51
4.6 All is not lost! . . . . .	52
 <b>5 Letter 5</b>	 <b>59</b>
5.1 Why Judah? . . . . .	59
5.2 Judah receives the blessing of chief ruler . . . . .	64
5.3 Joseph receives the blessing . . . . .	64
5.4 With the birthright of a double portion came some responsibility! . . . .	65
5.5 Tormented by the Egyptian woman . . . . .	66
5.6 Joseph refused to put his brothers to shame . . . . .	67
5.7 The selling of Joseph and his non-retaliation to his brothers . . . . .	68
5.8 The KJV On Levi . . . . .	73
 <b>6 Letter 6</b>	 <b>75</b>
6.1 A general view of the Khazars . . . . .	75
 <b>7 Lesson 7</b>	 <b>89</b>
7.1 Judah becomes a curse . . . . .	89
7.2 Shelah in Nehemiah 11:5 . . . . .	98
7.3 Some Canaanites not Canaanites! . . . . .	102

<b>8 Lesson 8</b>	<b>105</b>
8.1 An overview of history behind Ezra and Nehemiah . . . . .	105
8.2 Five hundred years Judea and Jerusalem had no rightful king . . . . .	108
<b>9 Letter 9</b>	<b>119</b>
9.1 Judah becomes divided . . . . .	120
9.2 Judah under the Assyrians . . . . .	121
9.3 Nehemiah returns a second time to Jerusalem . . . . .	131
<b>10 Letter 10</b>	<b>135</b>
10.1 A definition of the term, “Jew” . . . . .	136
10.2 Samaritans under John Hyrcanus . . . . .	137
10.3 The division of the good figs and the bad figs of Judah . . . . .	139
10.4 Bad blood gets into the king line of the house of David . . . . .	140
10.5 Zedekiah was not a “bad fig” in the sense of being from Cain . . . . .	144
10.6 The biblical history for the period of Zedekiah and the good and bad figs	146
<b>11 Letter 11</b>	<b>151</b>
11.1 The true meaning of Ezekiel chapter 16 . . . . .	157
11.2 But, where did the good figs go? . . . . .	161
11.3 One other sin of Judah, a reason for captivity . . . . .	162
<b>12 Letter 12</b>	<b>165</b>
12.1 Justinian’s maritime law . . . . .	175

<b>13 Letter 13</b>	<b>179</b>
13.1 Britain's laws . . . . .	182
13.2 Britain's religion . . . . .	184
13.3 The True Church, Britain vs. the false church, Rome . . . . .	186
<b>14 Letter 14</b>	<b>193</b>
14.1 Edict of emperor Claudius, A.D. 43 "to exterminate Christian Britain" . .	195
14.2 How and when the British Church was finally romanized . . . . .	202
<b>15 Letter 15</b>	<b>207</b>
15.1 Paul and Pudens . . . . .	209
15.2 Good king Lucius nationalizes the faith . . . . .	212
15.3 Constantine the Great . . . . .	215
<b>16 Letter 16</b>	<b>221</b>
16.1 What moved Constantine to his decisions? . . . . .	225
16.2 A "jewish" look at Constantine . . . . .	226
16.3 Constantine's personal life . . . . .	231
<b>17 Letter 17</b>	<b>235</b>
17.1 Constantine's actions had far-reaching effects in Babylon . . . . .	235
17.2 Constantine's conversion a death-knell to Marcionism . . . . .	236
17.3 Constantine issues general reforms . . . . .	236
17.4 Constantine forbids jews to live in Jerusalem or to convert slaves . . . .	237
17.5 Constantine was a pure-blood of the tribe of Judah . . . . .	238
17.6 Beware of Gibbon's account of Helena, Constantine's mother! . . . . .	239
17.7 One encyclopedia gets it right . . . . .	240
17.8 Where rome went wrong! . . . . .	244
17.9 More information on the city of Zara in Dalmatia . . . . .	246

<b>18 Letter 18</b>	<b>249</b>
18.1 King Henry II sells out the Celtic Church to Rome . . . . .	249
18.2 The British Celtic Church rebounds to life again . . . . .	260
<b>19 Letter 19</b>	<b>263</b>
19.1 Two St. Patricks, the true one was not Roman Catholic . . . . .	263
19.2 Augustine converts the southern Saxons to Roman Catholicism . . . . .	268
19.3 More perspective on Augustine . . . . .	271
19.4 What caused Gregory to send Augustine to England? . . . . .	272
<b>20 Letter 20</b>	<b>275</b>
20.1 Judah and Two Seedline doctrine . . . . .	275
20.2 Who killed who? . . . . .	281
20.3 Cain the murderer . . . . .	285
20.4 The house of David . . . . .	285
<b>21 Letter 21</b>	<b>289</b>
21.1 Why the nation of Judah was to pass out of existence forever . . . . .	289
21.2 Jeremiah's commission . . . . .	293







## LETTER 1

---

The story of Judah starts in Genesis 29:35 where it says:

And she (Leah) conceived again, and bare a son: and she said, Now will I praise the LORD: therefore she called his name Judah, and left bearing.

Before we go very far, there is a side subject in this section of Scripture which we need to consider. Now I know that most of you who are reading this know this story well and for those who do not know it well, I will just have to go around you on this one, Sorry. We are aware that in verse 30 of this same chapter of the fact that Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah. Well this set up a contest of sorts to see which one of Jacob's wives could bare him the most children. Of course Leah with the birth of Judah was way out in front of Rachel. It seems that Rachel had a conception problem and it wasn't because Jacob wasn't giving her her share of attention. It must have been known in those days that a problem with conception was because the wife did not relax during intercourse. It seems that Reuben came to Rachel's aid in Genesis 30:14-15 which says:

<sup>14</sup> And Reuben went in the days of wheat harvest, and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them unto his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me, I pray thee, of thy son's mandrakes.

<sup>15</sup> And she (Leah) said unto her, Is it a small matter that thou hast taken my husband? and wouldest thou take away my son's mandrakes also? And Rachel said, Therefore he (Jacob) shall lie with thee to night for thy son's mandrakes.

We can tell by this that Rachel wanted quite badly the mandrakes that Reuben had found in the field. Now I don't see Rachel giving up a night with Jacob unless she had something in mind with the mandrakes. Therefore let's see for what mandrakes are used. Here is what the Nelson's New Bible Dictionary has to say about mandrakes, page 1006:

**“Mandrake.** A fruit-producing plant with dark green leaves and small bluish-purple flowers. The mandrake grew abundantly throughout Palestine and the Mediterranean region. The yellow fruit of the mandrake was small, sweet-tasting, and fragrant. **It had narcotic qualities** and may have been used medicinally. The fruit of the mandrake was also referred to as the ‘love apple.’ It was considered a love potion (Gen. 30:16).”

The alleged “abundance” is disputed by most others who claim it was rare, the variety being nearer the reason since it was avidly sought after, and treasured, e.g. Rachel’s purchase of it for a night with Jacob and Leah. *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume K-Q, pages 256-7 also indicates “The fruit ripens to a bright yellow in May, about the time of the wheat harvest.” (Gen. 30:14) I know that Genesis 30:22 says that Yahweh opened Rachel’s womb, but was it with the mandrakes that He did this? Scripture, being inspired by Yahweh, we must consider that every part of it is for a specific relevant, and important reason relative to the whole of the Scriptural message.

This whole question of the mandrakes brings up a lot of questions, but before we start asking these questions, there is another source which I would like to quote from. This source is: *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia*, volume 4, page 66:

**“Mandrake.** Mentioned 5 times in Genesis 30, and once in Song of Solomon 7:13. Mandrake is generally accepted to be the ‘love apple.’ The mandrake was obviously rare, and was supposed to have aphrodisiac properties. The old-fashioned name of the tomato (*Solanum esculentum*) was love apple. It is thought that the mandrake is *Atropa mandragora*, which is like the deadly nightshade, and therefore a member of the same family. This plant bears yellow fruits, somewhat smaller than the tomato, and has an ‘acquired’ pleasant taste. Because of its ‘sex’ reputation, it is called by Arabs ‘a devil’s apple.’ The description in Genesis of Rachel’s conversation with Leah certainly gives the impression that the mandrake was thought to be a love potion. Its near relation, *Atropa belladonna*, is, of course, the source of Atropine, an important medicinal drug. The Royal Horticultural Society’s dictionary names the plant *Mandragora officinarum*, and describes the fruit as a globose berry. It gives the alternative name as ‘devil’s apple.’ This plant has a large tap root; it produces leaves like a primrose, and blue or greenish-white flowers similar to those of the potato. The yellow plum-like fruits invariably lie in the middle of the rosette of leaves, rather like the eggs of some bird in a nest. There is little doubt that its amorous properties are pure superstition, but the plant is certainly found in Palestine. . . .

“Its ‘amorous properties’ may be ‘pure superstition’, nevertheless the mandrake is a narcotic. The first question that I would like to ask is this: What did Reuben, a five and a half to six year old boy at the time, want with the mandrakes? Maybe he wanted

to smell them or use them to play marbles with. I would rather think that Leah had been using them all along and that is why she was getting pregnant so often; and that she had instructed Reuben to bring them to her if he found any. She probably was out in the field about six weeks before the mandrakes were ripe and said to Reuben something like this: *‘Reuben, here is a plant that is known as mandrake — they are not ripe yet, but when you see the berries turn yellow, pick some and bring them to me like mother’s good little boy’.*”

Please note verse 14 again as it definitely states that Reuben *brought them to his mother*. It is obvious from the Scripture that when Rachel saw Reuben bringing Leah the mandrakes, she immediately recognized how Leah was getting pregnant so often. This likely explains why Rachel was so willing to give up a night with Jacob in order to obtain the mandrakes from Reuben. Or is it possible that Leah, really loving her sister but not showing it outwardly, had instructed Reuben to pick the mandrakes so she could offer them to Rachel for her conception problem?

Well, probably, at this point, you are asking: What does all this have to do with Judah? — It has everything to do with Judah! Well, while we are on the subject of the mandrakes, let’s go back to the garden of Eden and the seduction of Eve. Is it possible that the serpent (Satan) offered Eve a narcotic mandrake or a narcotic potion made from the mandrake to intoxicate Eve so her normal instinct to resist sexual advances would be diminished while at the same time her normal sexual desires would be aroused? Let me explain, for a moment, what causes the sexual instinct in both men and women to be aroused and probably in all other creatures. In a study made in recent years, (I remember reading about it, but can’t remember where), it stated that the body makes small amounts of opium and during intercourse this opium is released to produce the pleasurable sensation one gets during this time. Actually there are opium receptors in the brain that receive this opium. You can see why, then, when someone takes a large amount of opium, there is such an over-sensation of ecstasy with a violent withdrawal. You might say that anyone who likes sex is an opium addict of sorts. Maybe Eve did partake of an apple, the “devils apple!”

While we are considering this “devil’s apple”, let’s consider another reference to the mandrake. What I have in mind is the comic strip series known as “Mandrake the Magician.” I am not sure if it is a person character by the name of “Mandrake” who is a “magician” or if it is a “magician” with a “mandrake.” This is a very unusual name for a comic strip series and I will tell you why. The word for “serpent” used in Genesis 3:1, 2, 4, 13, and 17 is 5175. When you go to the Strong’s Concordance it will tell you it is from 5172. When you check 5172 it means whisper, magic spell, generally to prognosticate, an idiom for certainly, an idiom for divine, an idiom for enchanter or one who uses enchantment, to learn by experience, idiom for indeed and diligently observe. In other words the “serpent” was a “magician.” Another form of magic is

to hypnotize. Did the serpent of Genesis 3 have this power and did he use it on Eve? These are good questions for under hypnosis there is a powerful control by suggestion. As a matter of fact, people are mass hypnotized by television everyday — its called subliminal suggestion. This is the definition for subliminal: *“below the threshold of consciousness or apprehension; specifically involving or using stimuli that become effective subconsciously by repetition.”* I would say that any method of suggesting something to someone to their subconscious without the subject person’s conscious knowing about it would be a form of hypnotism. There are many many forms of hypnotism. Did the “serpent” (Satan) use a form of hypnotism on Eve? If we can just picture this master magician in our minds using a narcotic drug and hypnotism to overcome Eve’s resistance along with deceptive words, then we can begin to understand the mental and physical seduction of Eve. And, What does this have to do with Judah? It has everything to do with Judah!

Now let’s review Genesis 3:15 again for it is the main theme of Scripture. As a matter of fact, without an understanding of Genesis 3:15, it is impossible to understand the Bible and it is impossible to understand the monetary, political, religious and racial war that is going on today.

And I will put enmity (hatred) between thee (Satan) and the woman, and between thy seed (offspring) and her seed (offspring); it (the woman’s offspring) shall bruise thy (Satan’s offspring’s head), and thou (Satan’s offspring) shall bruise his (the woman’s offspring’s) heel.

Today this enmity (hatred) is evidenced by the “Jew’s” hatred for the true White Israel peoples inasmuch as they are doing everything they can to kill in wars, crossbreeding with the other races and whatever, while at the same time, there is a hatred among many true White Israelites aimed toward the “Jews” exactly as Genesis 3:15 prophesied. This enmity (hatred) is especially evident being directed by the “Jews” toward Germany, and likewise the German people in turn hating the “Jews.” If you are not aware of it, the German people just happen to be of the tribe of Judah. This is what it has to do with Judah!!!! Why, then, is there enmity in the “Jews” toward Germany? Its simple; Judah holds the SCEPTRE!!!! THE JEWS WANT TO USURP THE **SCEPTRE**. Now you know what World Wars I and II were all about. “One Seed-liners” totally miss this important fact, and most other important facts of history as far as that goes! It should be mentioned here that the Irish and Scots are also of the tribe of Judah! Let’s read Genesis 49:10:

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be.

Now if there ever was a Scripture taken out of context, this is one of them! Most interpret this as meaning when “Christ” (Yahshua) came the first time. There could be

no greater mistake than interpreting this passage in this manner! Let's check out the word "Shiloh", Hebrew word #7886 in the Gesenius' *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, page 818:

(1) ***Tranquillity, rest***; . . . This power of the word seems to be that which it has in the much discussed passage, Gen. 49:10, "the scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until tranquillity shall come, and the peoples shall obey him (Judah). Then let him bind," etc.; i.e. Judah shall not lay down the scepter of the ruler, until his **enemies be subdued**, and he shall rule over many people; an expectation belonging to the kingdom of the Messiah, who was to spring from the tribe of Judah . . .

(2) ("place of rest"), [*Shiloh*], pr. n. of a town of the Ephraimites, situated on the mountain to the north of Bethel, where the holy tabernacle was set for some time . . .

The implications here are: there will be no rest for Ephriam (the ten northern tribes which comprise White America and other related peoples today) until "Messiah" comes and the "enemy" is destroyed and His peaceful Kingdom is set up. This means that Judah will rule until Messiah comes the second time. Watch the Royal Line in England — because of race-mixing among the Royal Line, it can't last much longer! This is something else "One Seed-liners" cannot understand because the Royal Line is polluted with "Cain's Satanic seed" and the Royal Line is of Judah! Now we know more about Judah. This passage has nothing to do with the first coming of Yahshua except He was of the House of David of the Line of Judah. He didn't establish peace at His first coming, but He will the next time, but only after the enemy has been totally destroyed to the last man, woman and child (Malachi 4:1 . . . "*shall leave neither root nor branch.*") — and only the "Two Seed-liners" know who that enemy is!

## JUDAH'S INTERCESSION FOR JOSEPH

The next time we find Judah is when he and his brothers were conspiring against Joseph to kill him. Actually both Reuben and Judah took action which prevented the murder of Joseph. Reuben suggested that they throw Joseph into a pit and let him starve to death. No doubt, Reuben was thinking that he would go back later and free Joseph from the pit. Judah made a really brilliant move at this point and started to show his superior quality for leadership and decision making. Judah knew the other brothers wouldn't buy Reuben's plan knowing Reuben would just go back and free Joseph. Judah's plan was much superior to Reuben's. Judah realized there was a very deep rift developing in the family and the only way to save Joseph's life was to get him clear out of the country away from his brothers. Here is how Judah handled it, Genesis 37:26-27

- <sup>26</sup> And Judah said unto his brethren, What profit is it if we slay our brother?  
<sup>27</sup> Come and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him;  
 for he is our brother and our flesh, and the brethren were content.

Now if that wasn't making the best of a bad situation, I don't know what could be. Judah, though, not liking Joseph's dreams, the coat of many colours and Joseph being a stool pigeon informing on his brothers, yet brought out the basic instinct of our people reminding his brothers that Joseph was "our brother and our flesh." You can say whatever you want to about Judah, but you have to admit, when the chips were down, Judah had a very keen sense for leadership and understood what kind of action to take. It goes on to tell that they sold Joseph for twenty pieces of silver. Being that Benjamin was too young to be in on this conspiracy, at this time, that left 10 brothers to divide the money between. That would be two pieces of silver each. Do you ever wonder what they might have spent it on? Some might single Judah out for selling Joseph for twenty pieces of silver comparing him to Judas Iscariot and how he sold Yahshua for thirty pieces of silver, but there is no comparison here. This was a family matter and the ten brothers shared in it equally. There are some people who like to point a finger at Judah and call him a Jew — how absurd.

### JUDAH'S STORY GETS COMPLEX

Now we come to the most complex part of Judah's life. It is found in the 38<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis. Unless we understand this portion of Judah's life, it confuses our outlook on the whole Bible. In fact, all of the details of this portion of Judah's life are not found in our Catholic (Universal) canonized so-called "Bible", so I will be quoting from some other sources. Let's read Genesis 38:1-26:

- <sup>1</sup> And it came to pass at that time, that Judah went down from his brethren, and turned in to a certain Adullamite, whose name was Hirah.  
<sup>2</sup> And Judah saw there a daughter of a certain Canaanite, whose name was Shuah; and he took her, and went in unto her.  
<sup>3</sup> And she conceived and bare a son; and he called his name Er.  
<sup>4</sup> And she conceived again, and bare a son; and she called his name Onan.  
<sup>5</sup> And she yet again conceived, and bare a son; and called his name Shelah: and he was at Chezib, when she bare him.  
<sup>6</sup> And Judah took a wife for Er his firstborn, whose name was Tamar.  
<sup>7</sup> And Er, Judah's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the LORD; and the LORD slew him.  
<sup>8</sup> And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother.

<sup>9</sup> And Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother.

<sup>10</sup> And the thing which he did displeased the LORD: wherefore he slew him also.

<sup>11</sup> Then said Judah to Tamar his daughter in law, Remain a widow at thy father's house, till Shelah my son be grown: for he said, Lest peradventure he die also, as his brethren did. And Tamar went and dwelt in her father's house.

<sup>12</sup> And in the process of time the daughter of Shuah Judah's wife died; and Judah was comforted, and went up unto his sheepshearers to Timnath, he and his friend Hirah the Adullamite.

<sup>13</sup> And it was told Tamar, saying, Behold thy father in law goeth up to Timnath to shear his sheep.

<sup>14</sup> And she put her widow's garments off from her, and covered her with a vail, and wrapped herself, and sat in an open place, which is by the way to Timnath; for she saw that Shelah was grown, and she was not given unto him to wife.

<sup>15</sup> When Judah saw her, he thought her to be an harlot; because she had covered her face.

<sup>16</sup> And he turned unto her by the way, and said, Go to, I pray thee, let me come in unto thee; (for he knew not that she was his daughter in law.)

<sup>17</sup> And he said, I will send thee a kid from the flock. And she said, Wilt thou give me a pledge, till thou send it?

<sup>18</sup> And he said, What pledge shall I give thee? And she said, Thy signet, and thy bracelets, and thy staff that is in thine hand. And he gave it her, and came in unto her, and she conceived by him.

<sup>19</sup> And she arose, and went away, and laid by her vail from her, and put on the garments of her widowhood.

<sup>20</sup> And Judah sent the kid by the hand of his friend the Adullamite, to receive his pledge from the woman's hand: but he found her not.

<sup>21</sup> Then he asked the men of the place, saying, Where is the harlot, that was openly by the way side? And they said, There was no harlot in this place.

<sup>22</sup> And he returned to Judah and said, I cannot find her; and also the men of the place said, that there was no harlot in this place.

<sup>23</sup> And Judah said, Let her take it to her, lest we be shamed: behold, I sent this kid, and thou hast not found her.

<sup>24</sup> And it came to pass about three months after, that it was told Judah, saying, Tamar thy daughter in law hath played the harlot; and also, behold, she is with child by whoredom. And Judah said, Bring her forth, and let her be burnt.

<sup>25</sup> When she was brought forth, she sent to her father in law, saying, By the man, whose these are, am I with child: and she said, Discern, I pray thee, whose are these, the signet, and bracelets and staff.

<sup>26</sup> And Judah acknowledged them, and said, She hath been more righteous (lawful) than I; because that I gave her not to Shelah my son, And he knew her again no more.







## LETTER 2

---

On page 7 of my Teaching Letter #1, I was telling how the ten brothers, after they had sold Joseph for twenty pieces of silver, divided it between them making two pieces of silver for each one. I also mentioned and asked what they might have purchased with this money. Well in further research on this I found that the money wasn't divided evenly among the ten brothers and I also found what the brothers spent the money for. In The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden, in "The Testament Of Zebulun", chapter 1, verses 17 to 20, pages 244-5, we read this:

<sup>17</sup> For in his (Joseph's) price I had no share, my children.

<sup>18</sup> But Simeon and Gad and six other of our brethren took the price of Joseph, and bought sandals for themselves, and their wives, and their children, saying:

<sup>19</sup> We will not eat of it, for it is the price of our brother's blood, but we will assuredly tread it under foot, because he said that he would be king over us, and so let us see what will become of his dreams.

<sup>20</sup> Therefore it is written in the writing of the law of Moses, that whosoever will not raise up seed to his brother, his sandal should be unloosed, and they (the dead brother's widow) should spit in his face.

Now that we are on the subject of the levirate law, let's look into it further as it has everything to do with the story of Judah too! If we want to know more about the levirate law, we will have to read Deuteronomy 25:5-9, and we will do that shortly. After we read this passage in Deuteronomy, you will begin to see just how important the passage from "The Testament Of Zebulun" is to make Deuteronomy understandable. This will prove beyond all reasonable doubt that "The Testament Of Zebulun" should have been in our present Bibles today! Now Deuteronomy 25:5-9:

<sup>5</sup> If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger (strange Israelite): her husband's

brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her.

<sup>6</sup> And it shall be, that the firstborn which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

<sup>7</sup> And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let the brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.

<sup>8</sup> Then the elders of the city shall call him, and speak unto him: and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;

<sup>9</sup> Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.

Now we can understand when we read in Ruth 4:8 which says:

Therefore the kinsman said unto Boaz, Buy it for thee. So he drew off his shoe.

By the way, it should be mentioned that Seth raised up seed to his murdered brother, Abel. Seth's very name means "substitute", #8352 "in the stead of another." It should be pointed out that Seth was a "substitute" for Abel, not Cain! Only Seth was a true blood brother to Abel, therefore a "substitute!" Only Seth could raise up seed to Abel! Here we are again, right back to "Two Seed-line!" Anyway I thought I would clear up the matter of how the twenty pieces of silver were divided between the brothers and how the money was used to buy sandals (and the symbolic meaning of the sandals). As I told you before, this is not going to be just the run-of-the-mill Teaching Letter, and you will be able to see this as we continue on.

### BE CAREFUL WHEN YOU ARE READING THE SO-CALLED PSEUDEPIGRAHA BOOKS!

The same holds true for The King James or any other version of the Bible. The only way you can get the true message is by going back to the original languages. If you are reading everything it says in the English and taking it literally, I guarantee you are not getting the true meanings. For an example of how you might get the wrong meaning from the *Pseudepigrapha* books let's take a passage out of *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, "Testament Of Levi", chapter 1, verse 14:

And by thee (Levi) and Judah shall the LORD appear among men, saving every race of men.

This is obviously a mistranslation of the text for we know that Yahshua came to redeem His kinsmen only. I went into this in depth in my booklet *Universalism Or Racism, A Critical Review Of James Bruggeman's History of the Doctrine of Universalism*. To prove that this passage is not saying “*saving every race of men*”, we are going to go to the *Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies*, page 337 under the word “race” which says:

”... com. a way, path, road; the course of the sun: Ps. xix. 5.”

“... m. a race, running: Eccles ix. 11.”

You can turn to your Strong's Concordance and look up the word “race” and it is only found in the Bible four times: Psalm 19:5; Ecclesiastes 9:11; 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 9:24 and Hebrews 12:1 and it is never used in a racial sense as a race of people! Not even once! Therefore the translator(s) of *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden* didn't have a Hebrew or Greek word for “race” meaning people to translate from. I don't have an original manuscript, so I can only guess what it should have been. This one thing I know, though, it shouldn't have been: “*saving every race of men*.” (More on the word race in future lessons.) I would say that this verse should read something like this and its just an educated guess:

And by thee (Levi) and Judah shall the LORD appear among men, saving every seed of Adam.

The translator(s) make this same mistake several times in the “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs” and this should be considered when reading them! The term “race” is used once again in “The Testament of Levi”, chapter 3, verses 37-38, page 230:

<sup>37</sup> Beware of the spirit of fornication; for this shall continue and shall by thy seed pollute the holy place.

<sup>38</sup> Take therefore to thyself (Levi) a wife without blemish or pollution, while yet thou are young, **and not of the race of strange nations**.

Here the translator did a little bit better, but, again, probably shouldn't have used the term “race.” It probably should have been translated “**and not of the seed of strange nations**,” I don't know about you, but I think this last verse 37 is outstandingly good. Probably, though, Weisman, Stephen Jones, Weiland, Bruggeman and Peters would object to this, mamzer baptizers that they are! Well, you might say: What does this have to do with Judah? It has everything to do with Judah! Just hang on and in a little while we will be getting back to Judah.

### MORE ABOUT THE MANDRAKES

In the last teaching letter, I got on the subject of “mandrakes.” Before we go back to the subject of Judah, let’s consider another passage in "The Testament Of Issachar", chapter 1, pages 241-2:

Verses 3-11:

- <sup>3</sup> I (Issachar) was born the fifth son to Jacob, by way of hire for the mandrakes.  
<sup>4</sup> For Reuben my brother brought in mandrakes from the field, and Rachel met him and took them.  
<sup>5</sup> And Reuben wept, and at his voice Leah my mother came forth.  
<sup>6</sup> Now these mandrakes were sweet-smelling apples which were produced in the land of Haran below the ravine of water.  
<sup>7</sup> And Rachel said: I will not give them to thee, but they shall be to me instead of children.  
<sup>8</sup> For the LORD hath despised me, and I have not borne children to Jacob.  
<sup>9</sup> Now there were two apples; and Leah said to Rachel: Let it suffice thee that thou hast taken my husband: wilt thou take these also?  
<sup>10</sup> And Rachel said to her: Thou shalt have Jacob this night for the mandrakes of thy son.  
<sup>11</sup> And Leah said to her: Jacob is mine, for I am the wife of his youth.

Verses 16-19:

- <sup>16</sup> Nevertheless for the mandrakes I am hiring Jacob to thee for one night.  
<sup>17</sup> And Jacob knew Leah, and she conceived and bare me, and on account of the hire I was called Issachar.  
<sup>18</sup> Then appeared to Jacob an angel of the LORD, saying, Two children shall Rachel bear, inasmuch as she hath refused company with her husband, and hath chosen continency (self-restraint in sexual activity).  
<sup>19</sup> And had not Leah my mother paid the two apples for the sake of his company, she would have borne eight sons; for this reason she bare six, and Rachel bare the two: for on account of the mandrakes the LORD visited her.

Verses 22-23:

- <sup>22</sup> Because of the mandrakes, therefore, the LORD harkened to Rachel.  
<sup>23</sup> For though she desired them, she eat them not, but offered them in the house of the LORD, presenting them to the priest of the Most High who was at that time.

Well, this puts a lot more light on this matter of the mandrakes. I think that after all these considerations of the matter (at least it is my viewpoint) that Leah had been

using the mandrakes all along. I believe further that Rachel, seeing the mandrakes being brought by Reuben to his mother Leah, envied Leah of them whereupon Rachel offered a night with Jacob to Leah for the mandrakes. I believe that Rachel pondered for some time considering the use of them, but changed her mind and gave them as an offering to Yahweh with a prayer that if He didn't intercede for her barrenness, she simply would never have any children whereupon Yahweh opened her womb. The main point I wanted to get out of this mandrake story was the possibility that Satan may have used a narcotic drug like the mandrake to seduce Eve. Now there are some that don't believe that a fallen angel like Satan could have the ability to have sexual intercourse. Let's read another passage in "The Testament Of Reuben" in *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, chapter 2, verses 18-19, page 223:

<sup>18</sup> For thus they allured the Watchers (fallen angels) who were before the flood; for as these continually beheld them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; **for they changed themselves into the shape of men**, and appeared to them when they were with their husbands.

<sup>19</sup> And the women lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven.

No doubt, we might have some translation problems here as I would rather believe that the "Watchers" appeared to the women when they were not with their husbands. You can see from this that it would have been no problem, then, for Satan to have had changed himself into the "shape" of a man and had sexual intercourse with Eve. By the way, if you want to know more about the Watchers, read the *Book of Enoch*. The *Book of Jude* (Jude 14) speaks of Enoch as an authentic prophetic writer; therefore, Why isn't the *Book of Enoch* a part of our Bible today?

There has been a lot of controversy about the *Book of Enoch*, whether it is authentic or not. The *Book of Enoch* was well known to the New Testament writers. It was well known by Jews and Christians alike during that period of time. However, from the second century A.D. on, it was rarely mentioned in Jewish sources. Then in the fourth century it fell into disfavor in the West, being stigmatized by Jerome as apocryphal. My source on this is: *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 104. The pagan Council of Nicaea with half pagan Constantine the Great followed later by a so-called (Saint) Jerome appropriated the *Book of Enoch* to the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha types of books (false or hidden) and that has been the position of the "Church" as a whole ever since. Well with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the late 1940's and the early 1950's, it put a bright new shining light on the Book of Enoch. I will now quote from the *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 2, page 310 about this:

"... Until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the text of I Enoch was best preserved in the Ethiopic Manuscripts, twenty-nine of which are known. Most of these

contain the complete work, sometimes together with certain Biblical or Apocryphal books. Within this group of Manuscripts, two text types are distinguishable. The Ethiopic Manuscripts are late, however, the earliest belong probably to the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

“Portions of the book have also been preserved in Greek. Two Manuscripts dating from the 8<sup>th</sup> century or later were discovered in 1886-1887 in a Christian grave at Akhmim, Egypt, and preserve chapters 1-32:6 and 19:3-21:9. Syncellus (c. A.D. 800) preserves 6:1-10:14; 15:8-16:1 and 8:4-9:4 in duplicate form. The Vatican Manuscripts preserves 89:42-49 and Egyptian papyri containing chapters 97-104 and 106-108 were published by Bonner in 1937. Some quotations from Enoch, especially from 106:1-18 are preserved in Latin.

“The Scrolls from Qumran now appear to provide the best representatives of the original text of the Book of Enoch, however. About ten fragmentary Manuscripts of the work in Aramaic were found in Cave IV. Five of these correspond roughly to Book I and Book IV of the work. It appears that these sections together with the last chapters of the book once formed a separate work. Book III, the astronomical section, is represented by four Aramaic Manuscripts which provide a more intelligible text than any others available to this time. The beginning of Book V is represented by one Manuscript. It may have circulated as a separate work as well. Support for the suggestion comes from a fragmentary Greek Manuscript found among the Chester Beatty-Michigan papyri. The fact that there are no fragments of Book II may be due to accident or it may be that this too was a separate composition not known to the Qumran community.

**“It seems probable that the continued study of the evidence from Qumran will alter our estimates of the Book of Enoch somewhat.”**

**What an understatement this last paragraph is!** With the *Book of Enoch*, we can understand how angel beings can change themselves into the form of men and seduce women. Now I am sure that Ted R. Weiland, Charles Weisman, Stephen E. Jones, James Bruggeman and Pete Peters has told you all about this; Right? — No they have NOT!!!! And you may ask: What does this have to do with Judah? — It has everything to do with Judah!

While we are still on this subject of seduction, I would like to quote you one more passage from *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, Fourth Book of Maccabees, chapter 8, verses 8; 22-23, pages 196-7:

<sup>8</sup> And indeed it were fitting to inscribe these words over their resting-place, speaking for a memorial to future generations of our people:

HERE LIE AN AGED PRIEST AND A WOMAN FULL OF YEARS AND HER SEVEN SONS  
THROUGH THE VIOLENCE OF A TYRANT DESIRING TO DESTROY THE HEBREW NATION  
THEY VINDICATED THE RIGHTS OF OUR PEOPLE LOOKING UNTO GOD AND ENDURING  
THE TORMENTS EVEN UNTO DEATH.

...

<sup>22</sup> I was a pure maiden, and I strayed not from my father's house, and I kept guard over the rib that was builded into Eve.

<sup>23</sup> No seducer of the desert, no deceiver in the field, corrupted me; nor did the false, beguiling Serpent sully (soil, stain, tarnish, disgrace, defile) the purity of my maidenhood; I lived with my husband all the days of my youth; but when these my sons were grown up, their father died.

The name of Scott Vaught and this was his credentials: "Constitutional Delegate of Arkansas, student, teacher, and researcher of Paleo Hebrew, our ancestral native tongue It sounds here like this elderly lady of Israel understood the physical seduction of Eve! Sully meaning: to soil, stain, tarnish, disgrace and defile cannot get much more physical than that! Nonsense to the Weiland's, Weisman's, Stephen Jones', Bruggeman's and Peters' concept of mental seduction of Eve! And, What does this have to do with Judah? **It has everything to do with Judah!**

In the next part of this Judah story, I am going to take from another article I wrote previously about this Judah matter. I will be cutting and pasting part of that article into this one. Some of you may have read some of this before, but it needs to be gone over again if we really want a comprehensive understanding of Judah. So you can understand what this next part is all about, I will give you a short story of how all of it got started. On October 4, 1996, I went to Loudon, Tennessee at the Piney Ruritan Community Center for the Feast Of Tabernacles. There were four speakers scheduled to speak: James P. Wickstrom, Richard Hoskins, Paul Burnham, and a fellow by the name of Scott Vaught. All the speakers did quite well except this Scott Vaught who was supposed to be an expert in Paleo Hebrew. Listed third on the billing was this person by, for over 15 years." As I was to learn later, Scott Vaught was a fountain of misinformation of a monumental degree. As I listened in amazement, he spewed out one vial of poison after another.

### SCOTT VAUGHT'S TWISTED THEOLOGY

When Scott Vaught started his presentation, I noticed that he started to talk about two different Jerusalems and two different Bethlehems. He wasn't talking about an old Jerusalem and a new Jerusalem but two Jerusalems and two Bethlehems in Palestine. As he continued to lecture, he pointed to a map of that area which was set up and pointed out where these two Jerusalems and Bethlehems were (or at least used to be). I was later to discover he had a motive for the two sets of cities. He said that the present day Jerusalem was an old Canaanite city and was never a part of Israel or that Israel never occupied it. He further stated that there was never a person which

existed as David. His main thrust was to exclude Judah from being part of Israel. He further explained that Judah's wife, Tamar, was a Canaanite whore and therefore was in the bloodline of Yahshua (Christ). He further stated that Ruth was a Moabite and therefore that would also make Judah's bloodline impure. His postulation was that Yahshua was of the house of Joseph, not of the house of Judah. He said that he had worn out either four or five Bibles finding out all of this and that he sat on this great "revelation" for a year before he decided to announce it to the world. He further said that David and Jonathan were homosexuals because the Scriptures said that David loved Jonathan. He indicated that all of Judah turned out bad and that they are now the Jews of today. He further indicated he could prove all of this with Paleo Hebrew. I believe the older style Paleo Hebrew is great, but I wonder where he found these old ancient manuscripts from which to read the Paleo Hebrew. I would rather believe that he is using the same old corrupted Masoretic and Septuagint texts and trying to convert them into Paleo Hebrew. If this is what he is doing, I recommend that he set on his findings a lot longer than one year; like maybe forever would be better! Well I am one half German plus Scottish and Irish and all of these came from Judah and Tamar. **Scott Vaught was then therefore calling my grandmother a Canaanite whore!** I couldn't just sit idly by and let him get away with that, Could I? — and I didn't! So I wrote an article and exposed him for what he was! What we are going to do here is take each one of these teachings of Scott Vaught one at a time and prove what he is saying is false. You say, "Why don't you take this to Scott Vaught and tell him to his face?" I already have! The first one that we are going to work on is proving that Tamar Was Not A Canaanite! Before we do this we really should read the entire 38<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis. We did this in the Teaching Letter #1; 5-98. If you don't have a copy of Teaching Letter #1, review Genesis chapter 38 now and then return back to this point.

### [TAMAR WAS NOT A CANAANITE!](#)

At this time we are going to quote from chapter 1 of a book entitled "All Of The Women Of The Bible" by Edith Deen published by Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, Copyright, 1955. We will be quoting pages 41 to and including 44. This will also be a critical review of this section of chapter 1 entitled, "Tamar"— "She Hath Been More Righteous Than I." This will also serve to get us acquainted with the story of Tamar. Scott Vaught's accusation was that Tamar was a Canaanite whore. With the help of this article from this book we can get started on that charge of offense:

"TAMAR, SHE HATH BEEN MORE RIGHTEOUS THAN I"

"Though events centering around Tamar's life are quite confused and intolerable, according to today's moral standards, her actions were consistent with the standards of morality prevailing in the primitive era in which she lived.



“The Genesis account of Tamar serves a dual purpose. First, it is one of the Bible’s best examples of the **levirate** marriage law. This was the ancient custom of marriage between a man and the widow of his brother required by the Mosaic law when there was no male issue and when the two brothers had been residing on the same family property. The law, of course, takes its name from the noun levir, meaning a husband’s brother. Second, this Genesis account of Tamar gives us the Bible’s most graphic picture of how a quick-witted widow of early Israel **protected herself and her family rights**.

“Tamar, not a wicked woman at all, plays a meaningful role in Old Testament history as the mother of Pharez, ancestor of King David. When she had lost two husbands, both of whom were brothers, and was refused the remaining young brother, she still had the courage to demand her **rights to motherhood by law**. What did she do? After her mother-in-law’s death, she turned to the father of her husband. The legitimacy and courage of her action are implied in every move she makes.

“Scripture does not mention Tamar’s parentage or place of birth but proceeds to introduce her by saying that her first husband Er ‘was wicked in the sight of the LORD; and the LORD slew him’ (Gen. 38:7). Next she became the wife of his brother Onan, who ‘displeased the LORD: wherefore he slew him also’ (Gen. 38:10).

“This union of Tamar with Onan shows the perfect working of the levirate law, devised to retain the ownership of property within the family as well as to prevent the extinction of the family line. After her second husband’s death, Judah advised his daughter-in-law Tamar to remain a widow at her father’s house until his third son Shelah came of age. But fearing that Tamar possessed a sinister power, and that Shelah might die too, Judah delayed this third son’s marriage with Tamar.

“A considerable time elapsed and then Judah’s wife died. The love of offspring, still deep in the heart of Tamar, caused her to plan how she might seek her rights in motherhood from her father-in-law Judah. Since he had denied her his third son, Shelah, she sought a way to force him to accept his responsibility as guaranteed to her by the levirate law.

“When Tamar heard that Judah was soon to be in the hills of Timnath with his friend Hirah, the Adullamite, at great personal risk she set upon a plan of her own. It was sheep-shearing season, and many guests would come from the surrounding country. Tamar planned to be there, too, but under a disguise, so that Judah would not recognize her as the widow of his sons.

“She removed her garments of widowhood, put on a veil to hide her face, and ‘wrapped herself,’ probably in a colorful and becoming festival robe.

“Since Tamar’s name was the same as that of the stately tropical tree of Bible lands, we can assume that she was a tall, sturdy woman with a graceful carriage, one who would command attention wherever she went. This time she chose to stand by the side of the road where Judah would pass by.

“Not recognizing this woman with the veil-covered face as the widow of his two

sons and thinking she was a harlot, Judah made advances to her and said, ‘Go to, I pray thee, let me come in unto thee’ (Gen.. 38:16).

“Clever woman that she was, she said, ‘What wilt thou give me, that thou mayest come in unto me?’” (Gen.. 38:16).

“And he said, ‘I will send thee a kid from the flock.’ And she said, ‘Wilt thou give me a pledge, till thou send it?’ And he said, ‘What pledge shall I give thee?’ And she said, ‘thy signet, and thy bracelets, and thy staff that is in thine hand.’ And he gave it her, and came in unto her, and she conceived by him (Gen.. 38:17-18).

“The unscrupulous actions of Judah, with whom Tamar was here involved, and the noble actions of Joseph, whom Potiphar’s wife tried to involve, present a striking contrast. Some commentators conjecture that is why the story of Potiphar’s wife immediately follows that of Tamar.

“Tamar now turned homeward, carrying with her the signet, bracelet, and staff that had belonged to Judah. Then she removed her veil and put on again the garment of widowhood. A short time afterward Judah sent the kid by his friend Hirah, who had been with him at Timnath for the sheep-shearing. And Judah requested that his more personal possessions be returned when the kid was delivered.

“When Hirah entered the town where Tamar lived, carrying with him the kid, he asked for the harlot who had been by the side of the road, but the men told him there was no harlot in the place. **This is the best evidence we have that Tamar was not a prostitute but a self-respecting woman**, determined to outwit a man and **demand her right to children, according to the laws** of the time.

“About three months later (Gen.. 38:24), Judah received word that his daughter-in-law was ‘with child by whoredom.’ This phrase suggest the malicious gossip who had carried tales to Judah. Angered at this report, he ordered that his daughter-in-law be brought forth and burned, for that would have been the penalty if the report were true (Lev. 20:14). But when Tamar came before Judah, holding his signet, bracelets, and staff, she asked, ‘Discern, I pray thee, whose are these?’ (Gen. 38:25).

“Judah could not deny their ownership and admitted, ‘She hath been more righteous than I; because that I gave her not to Shelah my son. And he knew her again no more’ (Gen.. 38:26). **The last phrase is evidence enough that Tamar was not a promiscuous woman. She had merely acted according to the laws** and rather heroically at that; and we can be confident she had exonerated herself, and that Judah had absolved her of all guilt.

“Trice denied a child by a rightful husband, Tamar now gave birth to twins by Judah. Like the twins of Rebekah, there is a detailed account of the appearance of the elder Pharez, who became inheritor of the family birthright. Afterward his brother Zarah was born with the ‘scarlet thread upon his hand’ that the midwife had tied there. The story of the birth of Tamar’s sons depicts clearly a woman in travail and the birth of twins.

“In the story of Ruth, another widow who also came to motherhood through the

levirate law, we find worthy mention made of Tamar, who bore a child to Judah. Other Tamars follow her, one the ‘fair sister’ (II Sam. 13:1) of Absalom and the other the woman of ‘fair countenance’ (II Sam. 14:27) who was the daughter of Absalom. Could it be that they were namesakes of their courageous ancestress, who would not be deprived of her rights of motherhood?” (emphasis mine)

While the above quotations from the book, *All Of The Women Of The Bible*, are good, I believe that they can be improved upon. I will be doing this in the next lesson. This is not the end of this story of Judah by far — we will be spending quite some time on it. I promise you, we are not going to complete this story of Judah in just a few lessons as it is a long and complicated story.







## LETTER 3

---

With this issue, I would like to present a study in connection with Tamar: “What’s In A Name?”, (meaning Tamar’s name).

### WHAT’S IN A NAME?

At this time, let’s go into the falsity of calling Tamar a “Canaanite”, let alone a “Canaanite whore”, for she was neither a “Canaanite” nor a “whore.” There is more to studying than pointing to a geographic area on a map and saying that all the people in that area are Canaanites. This is what Scott Vaught did, and this is what many unqualified teachers like him do. As you know, people are portable, and you simply cannot pin them down to a point on the map. This is how many people pretending to be qualified Bible teachers make the mistake of claiming that Ruth was a Moabite. We will also be going into this thing about Ruth being an alleged Moabite later. It is therefore necessary to realize that people migrate from area to area because of weather changes or they are displaced by wars and many other reasons. You can see, then, it is necessary to take time frames and migration into account. This is something which Scott Vaught and others like him do not do. This is an example of how we are getting so many false teachings in Israel Identity today. This is an example of some of the same kind of reasoning we are getting from people like Ted R. Weiland, Stephen E. Jones, James W. Bruggeman, Charles Weisman etc. At this time, let’s check the Scriptures and determine Tamar’s origin once and for all. It is found in the *Book of Jasher*, chapter 45, verse 23 and it reads thus:

And in those days Judah went to the house of Shem and took Tamar the daughter of Elam, the son of Shem, for a wife for his first born, Er.

But first here, in the case of Tamar, we are going to consider the meaning of her name. Tamar is #8559 in the *Strong's Concordance*:

“8559 Tââmâr, taw-mawr ’; the same as 8558; Tamar, the name of three women and a place:- Tamar.”

It is also necessary to consider #8558 as it also refers to her:

“8558 tââmâr, taw-mawr’; from an unused root meaning to be erect; a palm tree:- palm (tree).”

This meaning “erect” or “palm tree” may not seem like much of a portrayal of this name, Tamar, when we first think of it, but let’s take what we have here and go to a good thesaurus and look up all of the synonyms we can find in English to see what all this can mean. One of the first synonyms we find is “upright.” Can we then say that Tamar was an “upright” woman? “Erect” means not leaning or laying down, not inclined or bent, but “upright.” It can also mean “exalted”, to rank high in character and honor. Is not the idea of being elevated in rank or character a good attribute? It appears that this lady, Tamar, had something going for her, that she was not just another run-of-the-mill ordinary person, she was something special! It appears that the term “exalted” is not out of line for this lady Tamar. Another word for “erect” can be “dignified.” “Dignified” means stateliness and nobility of manner, serenity of demeanor and gravity (solemnity of manner or behavior; dignified reserve). Are we starting to develop a portrayal in our minds of what kind of a lady this Tamar was? That she was a common whore is absurd! It appears that this lady, Tamar, was a woman to be looked up to, not down on!

Another word for “erect” is “distinguished” which means conspicuous for qualities of excellence, celebrated, eminent and famous. It is starting to look like we have quite a lady in this Tamar. Another meaning for “erect” can be “ennoble”, which means to make honorable, having or indicative of excellence or dignity and characterized by or displaying superior moral qualities. It appears that we have no ordinary lady in this woman. Another synonym is “honorable” which means worthy of honor or respect, having eminence or high rank; illustrious (brilliantly outstanding). Are you beginning to see that these Hebrew words have a lot more meaning than it would first appear? “Honorable” can also mean a strong sense of what is right, high standards of conduct including “chastity” in women. “Well”, you say, “This woman Tamar proved that she was of low moral character!” However, I believe, after we have reexamine her story very carefully, we will find otherwise!

Now to go on with these synonyms: Another word for “erect” is “honest.” “Honest” means not given to lying, cheating and stealing, acting honorably and justly, being

trustworthy, also characterized by openness, sincerity, being frank and having integrity. I don't know about you, but what I am beginning to see in this Tamar, I like. Another quality for this "erect" woman is being "conscientious", which means being scrupulous (careful, thorough and painstaking). It seems that Tamar was a "meticulous" lady, a stickler for details. Do you know any ladies like that? **I'll bet they AIN'T Hottentots or Canaanites!** (And I don't apologize as Messiah called non-Israelites "dogs", Mark 7:27.) Also the word "erect" suggests "just", a word which means adhering to a high moral standard, upright, honest, equitable, well-founded, substantial, fitting and proper. I think we are getting to know this "erect" woman, Tamar, a little better. You say: "This was a terribly immoral thing she did with Judah!" Let's examine her story further, since the significance of her true role has been ignored.

Another word for this woman is "scrupulous" which means cautious in action because of a wish to do right. This woman, Tamar, had "scruples." Another word to describe "erect" is "true." Being "true" means faithful to friends, promises or principles; loyal and steadfast. Nothing false or erroneous about this Tamar! Another word here for "erect" could be "glorious" or full of or deserving glory, renowned or illustrious, also resplendent or beautiful. One can almost envision this beautiful woman, Tamar. Another word here for "erect" is "grand" which means noble or dignified in character or manner, majestic, stately. Another synonym for the word "erect" would be "elevated." **And Scott Vaught has the audacity to claim that "Tamar" was a common Canaanite whore!**

Another word for "erect" could be "lofty" which means elevated in character, quality and style. We're not talking about a two bit whore here! Another word is "sublime" meaning characterized by elevation, nobility, grand, solemn (highly serious). Another description is "superb" meaning very good, supremely fine or outstanding. This lady, Tamar, stands head and shoulders like a palm tree above other women. Another "erect" term could be "inspired" which means to influence by example or be an inspiration for other women to follow. This lady Tamar was really a woman to be looked up to, a woman perceived as different, set apart, outstanding.

Another term that could be used for "erect" is "eminent" which means high in station, merit or esteem; distinguished; prominent. "Prestigious" is another term that could be used for "erect" meaning having a high estimation in the eyes of people. "Integrity" is another word that might be used for "erect" meaning uprightness of character; unimpaired or sound. It can also mean the state of being whole; entire (nothing lacking). I don't know about you, but I think we have a real true Adamic woman here, not a hook nosed slimy Canaanite kike. Another word for an "erect" or "upright" person could be "illustrious" meaning notably or brilliantly outstanding; greatly distinguished; renowned. When we get into the final story, you will understand why Tamar is all of these things.

I could go on and on with this thing about Tamar's name but I will mention some of the other words, terms and synonyms I found and then go on to other things. These are: "illustrious", "notable", "great", "prominent", "renowned", "proper", "faithful", "appropriate", "suitable", "fitting", "worthy", "pure", "meticulous", "resolute", "steady", "ardent", "loyal", "genuine", "constant", "right", "veracious", "legitimate", "majestic", "royal", "stately", "magnificent", "splendid", "towering", "lofty", "gorgeous", "impressive", "sound", "salient", "remarkable", "confident", "sincere", "superior", "reliable", "trustworthy", "admirable", "commendable", "meritorious", "virtuous", "beneficial", "mannerly", "neat", "unadulterated", "undiluted", "unmixed", "principled", "righteous", "chaste", "intelligent", "authentic", "certain", "consistent", "staunch", "immovable", "precise", "determined", "resolute", "fervent", "glowing", "keen", "reliable", "capable", "competent", "qualified", "comely", "decent", "respectable", "clean", "presentable", "apt", "delicate", "refined", "pleasant", and "stunning". Do you think this lady, Tamar, was something special?

To sum up the situation, we can say that Tamar was a person of good character, of superior rank, worthy of respect inasmuch as she was correct and proper being legally and morally right. She was a woman of scruples being ethical and of a noble and spiritual nature. She was a woman of completeness adherent to a code of values, and a woman of perfection widely known and honored. She was a woman having a fixed purpose, firm in position and sure of movement. A woman worthy of esteem, an entire woman, healthy and fit, free from foreign matter (racial contamination or corruption). A woman neat and orderly conforming to a standard of right behavior, devoted to right principles, acting or being in accord with what is just or moral, extremely careful in attending to details being very meticulous. She was a heedful woman understanding the situation at all times, conscientious and aware of the Law of what was right or wrong to Yahweh, dependable and reliable to do the right thing when necessary. She was a loyal woman in fact as in appearance, a genuine woman tried and true. She was unchangeable (immutable), strict and exacting, firmly fixed and settled and in agreement with fact and reality. She was unyielding in purpose, truthful when necessary, mentally alert, well-balanced, and took authority of her actions. She was characterized by warmth of feeling, ardent and filled with passion, fair in complexion, attractive in appearance and like a palm tree, standing "erect" and "upright" in impressive dignity above the other trees. I would like Mr. Scott Vaught to know right here and now, **Tamar was no Canaanite whore as he has alleged!!!!!!**

Now for another version of the story of Tamar. This is from a book, *Far Above Rubies*, by Isabel Hill Elder. I highly recommend this book to anyone who is studying the **Israel Identity** truth. A copy of this book should be in every racially conscious Israel home. This would have been a good book for Scott Vaught to read, for if he would have read it, he may not have made so many stupid statements. I am going to quote pages 32



to 35 of chapter 5. This will give us, again, more insight into the story of Judah and Tamar. This is not the end though, for later I am going to go into each facet of this story, and when we have examined it thoroughly, I believe you will be amazed at the end result.

### **TAMAR (Gen. 38)**

“Judah, fourth son of Jacob and Leah, in direct disobedience to the Hebrew unwritten law of marrying within their own race — as so signally demonstrated in the cases of Isaac and Jacob in obtaining wives of their kindred in Haran — **married a woman of Canaan**. [This racial law is written.]

“Three sons were born to them, and as the mother in those ancient times had entire charge of the children, these sons were brought up in the ways of the Canaanites and without the respect for morality which ever marks the worshipper of the true God.

“**Judah had long since realized his mistake in marrying a woman of Canaan, and determined that his sons should have wives of his own race.** A Hebrew lady with a **Hebrew name**, TAMAR, the **daughter of Aram** (signifying **palm tree**), was chosen by Judah for his eldest son, Er, who was the nephew of Abraham.

“These sons appear to have been addicted to all the sins and wickednesses of the Canaanites. First, Er died shortly after his marriage, and the next son, Onan, refused to obey the Hebrew Law of the next eldest son by marrying his brother’s widow.

“Judah became alarmed when Onan died; we are told that the LORD ‘slew him also’. Judah now feared to give Tamar to his youngest son, Shelah, ‘lest peradventure he die also, as his brethren did’. Judah returned Tamar to her father’s house, there to await his pleasure; in the meantime his Canaanite wife, Bathshua, died.

“Tamar, in the belief that her father-in-law, Judah, would marry a second time a woman of Canaan, determined to remedy the racial descent problem in her own person. A relative of the Jacob household, and well aware of the necessity for racial purity in that House, Tamar embarked upon a course which would prevent Judah’s immediate descendants being other than Hebrew, and a very self-sacrificing course it was.

“It was masterly strategy which brought about the meeting of Judah with his daughter-in-law by the wayside, as recorded in the 38<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis, and the pledges given by Judah, with which he was later confronted, put all denial beyond peradventure.

“Thus by Tamar’s self-sacrificing action, the royal enclosure within the House of Judah was saved from contamination by forbidden blood stock. Tamar was well aware that in taking the course she did to preserve the purity of her race in the House of Judah she ran the risk of being burnt by fire, and it was not until she was brought forth to receive this punishment by her unsuspecting father-in-law’s command that she revealed the true state of affairs. ‘Discern, I pray thee, whose are these, the signet, the bracelets, and staff.’ The signet, or ring, was the emblem

of power and authority; the bracelet was the cord, usually of gold, from which the signet was suspended, and the staff, which also signified the sceptre, emblem of authority as head of the tribe.

“In the family records which were handed down from father to son, Tamar would learn of the care exercised to preserve purity of race; she would learn that her great ancestor, Noah, ‘was a just man and perfect in his generations’ from Seth. The word Tamar means whole, flawless.

“Twin sons were born to Tamar and named Pharez and Zarah. Pharez became an ancestor of our LORD.

“Shelah, the youngest son of Judah and Bathshua, became quite an important House in Israel, **but was disqualified by Divine intervention because of his spurious birth**, from becoming an ancestor of the Redeemer of Israel.

“Judah, in his ‘Story of Tamar’, states that he lived a good and pure life until he met Bathshua, the Canaanite. ‘I said to my father-in-law, I will take counsel with my father, and so will I take thy daughter. And he was unwilling, but he showed me a boundless store of gold in his daughter’s behalf; for he was a king. And he adorned her with gold and pearls and caused her to pour out wine for us at the feast. **And the wine turned aside my eyes, and pleasure blinded my heart.** And I became enamoured of her **and I transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and the commandment of my fathers**, and I took her to wife. And the LORD rewarded me according to the imagination of my heart, inasmuch **as I had no joy in her children** . . . I turned aside to Tamar, and I wrought a great sin . . . for I gave my staff, that is the stay of my tribe; and my girdle, that is, my power, and, my diadem, that is, the glory of my kingdom.

“And indeed I repented of these things. Wine revealeth the mysteries of God and men, even as I also revealed the commandments of God and the mysteries of Jacob my father to the Canaanitish woman, Bathshua, which God bade me not to reveal. . . . For the sake of money and beauty I was led astray to Bathshua the Canaanite . . . For even wise men among my sons shall they mar, and shall cause the kingdom of Judah to be diminished, which the LORD gave me because of my obedience to my father. For I never caused grief to Jacob my father; for all things whatsoever he commanded I did. And Isaac, the father of my father, blessed me to be king of Israel, and Jacob further blesses me in like manner. And I know that from me shall the kingdom be established.’ . . .

”For the sake of money I lost my children, and had not my repentance, and my humiliation, and the prayers of my father been accepted I should have died childless. But the God of my fathers had mercy on me because I did it in ignorance . . . And I learnt my own weakness while thinking myself invincible.’

“Of the four women mentioned in connection with the ancestry of our LORD: Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and Bathsheba, **Tamar is the first to have the honour of taking a definite step for racial purity**, and it was indeed a great tribute which Judah paid in his pronouncement, ‘She hath been more righteous than I’ (Gen.. 38:26). (emphasis mine.)

Now wasn't this quote from the book *Far Above Rubies* by Isabel Hill Elder about Tamar better than *All Of The Women Of The Bible* by Edith Deen in lesson #2? While both articles had something to contribute, this later one was much the better of the two. While both articles had something to contribute, there is still more to be said about this story. The only way we are going to completely understand this story is break it down into its component parts and analyze it as the story develops. As the story develops, we will have to take every aspect of the Law into account as this story is guided much by the Laws of Yahweh.

### NOW LET'S TELL THE STORY THE WAY IT REALLY WAS

It mentions in Genesis 38:1, "*Judah went down from his brethren.*" Now this was a very serious mistake on the part of Judah to leave his own kind. Any time we go slumming with the Hottentots or cat and dog eaters, it is going to lead to problems! (Again I don't apologize, Mark 7:27). Anyway, here is Judah and he goes down to this Canaanite slum to the house of one Hirah, an Adullamite. There Judah meets an enticing female (we really can't call her a lady), *the daughter of a certain Canaanite, whose name was Shuah*, Genesis 38:2. Now before we go any farther with this story it is mandatory that we identify what a Canaanite is or we will miss the whole point of the story. Here is where people like Ted R. Weiland, Stephen E. Jones, James W. Bruggeman, Charles Weisman etc. get into trouble, as they just do not identify the subject they are talking about! It is absolutely necessary, therefore, to identify the origin of the Canaanite at this time. If you will go to Genesis 15:19-21, you will find they were made up of "Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Hittites, Perizzites Rephaims, Amorites, Canaanites, Girgashites and Jebusites." These were all intermixed and generally called "Canaanites." The first mentioned are the "Kenites", who are the descendants of Cain #7014 & #7017. The Kenizzites are the descendants of Esau Edom. The Rephaims are descendants of fallen angels. From this you can begin to see what a bastard race these Canaanites were and are. With the Kenites, these people had the bloodline of Cain who was fathered by Satan himself. Well, this Canaanite wife of Judah had the Satanic blood of Cain in her, and she was related to the serpent of Genesis 3:13-15. Once we understand this fact, we can begin to comprehend the plot of the story.

### WHAT IS THE PLOT OF SATAN, THEN?

The story all started in ages past in the heavens when Lucifer and a third of the angels followed him in rebellion against Yahweh. Then Yahweh placed his own son and

daughter in the Garden of Eden. At this point, Lucifer decided he must destroy the sons and daughters of Yahweh before they could grow great in the earth. Lucifer decided also that he must plant seed (children) of his own in the earth to counter the children of Yahweh. Therefore he (Satan) must seduce Eve and cause her to have children by him. Lust played only secondarily in this matter, as to produce progeny of himself was his main goal. Ever since that time he has been breeding up his own kind, while at the same time, trying to kill or crossbreed down the children of Yahweh. This is why, at every critical period of history, Satan's children are right there ready to do Satan's bidding. That is why Herod (an Edomite-Canaanite) descendant of Cain and Esau was Johnny-on-the-spot to kill all the little boy children in order to kill the promised Messiah. Remember? — it was Rachel who was weeping for her children, not Leah. Herod wanted to kill the heir to the house of David who would have been of Judah who was mothered by Leah, but he ended up killing a lot of Benjamite children instead. Remember? — Rachel had two sons: Joseph and Benjamin? When you come to understand that there is a war between Yahweh's children and Satan's children, then, the events of history become evident. Right now Satan's children are trying to crossbreed Yahweh's children out of existence and you don't have to look very far to see it (and you have to be blind if you don't see it). Well. the story of Judah, here, is one of those stories that happened at a critical time in history.

Knowing that this Bathshua was a Canaanite Satanic descendant of Cain and what her motives naturally would be because of her Satanic nature, let's see how the story develops as we continue. From what I have been able to find, Judah was only about 15 to 16 years old when he meets this daughter of the Canaanite (although the Testament of Judah 1:51 says that he was 20). It may have been a four year process of acquaintance. Anyway, at this age he would have the body of a man and the mind of a child. He was live bait for this Canaanite bitch (and a bitch she proved to be)! Think of this story in the reverse of Satan seducing Eve — in this case it is Bathshua seducing Judah! This is a critical point in history as Judah was to be the seed-line from which the Messiah would come and one of Satan's children (Bathshua) was right there to try to defile that seed-line. That is why Yahshua told the Scribes and Pharisees, John 8:44:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

Let's now take a look at the trap that was set for Judah by these Satanic people. It was more than Bathshua, as her father was in on it too. We will read from the "Testament of Judah" of the *Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, chapter 1 verses 51-53:

<sup>51</sup> I was twenty years old when this war befell. And the Canaanites feared me and my brethren.

<sup>52</sup> And I had much cattle, and I had for chief herdsman Iram the Adullamite.

<sup>53</sup> And when I went to him I saw Parsaba, king of Adullam; and he spake unto us, and he made a feast; and when I was heated (drunk and sexually excited) he gave me his daughter Bathshua to wife.

And then chapter 2, verses 17-18:

<sup>17</sup> And I knew that the race of the Canaanite was wicked, but the impulse of youth blinded my mind.

<sup>18</sup> And when I saw her pouring out wine, owing to the intoxication of the wine I was deceived and took her although my father had not counselled it.

Again we have more in the “Testament of Judah” 3:3-10:

<sup>3</sup> Since I also gloried that in wars no comely woman’s face ever enticed me, and reproved Reuben my brother concerning Bilhah the wife of my father, the spirits of jealousy and of fornication arrayed themselves against me, until I lay with Bathshua the Canaanite, and Tamar who was espoused to my sons.

<sup>4</sup> For I said to my father-in-law: I will take counsel with my father, and so will I take thy daughter.

<sup>5</sup> And he was unwilling, but he showed me a boundless store of gold in his daughter’s behalf; for he was a king.

<sup>6</sup> And he adorned her with gold and pearls, and caused her to pour out wine for us at the feast with the beauty of women.

<sup>7</sup> And the wine turned aside my eyes, and pleasure blinded my heart.

<sup>8</sup> And I became enamored of and I lay with her, and transgressed the commandment of the Lord and the commandment of my fathers, and I took her to wife.

<sup>9</sup> And the Lord rewarded me according to the imagination of my heart, inasmuch as I had no joy in her children.

<sup>10</sup> And now, my children, I say unto you, be not drunk with wine; for wine turneth the mind away from the truth, and inspires the passion of lust, and leadeth the eyes into error.

You can see here that it was not only Bathshua, but her father also who was in on this conspiracy. Had this conspiracy worked, there would have been no Messiah. And if we don’t see this last point, we miss the whole story. What we have, in this instance, is one more case where the children of Satan are doing the work of their father to destroy the children of Yahweh. This war has been going on now for about 7500 years. You will also notice, like all Canaanites, this father of Bathshua had plenty of gold like a typical Canaanite merchant “Jew.” Now that’s a good start, but there is more.

Well Judah ended up having three children by this Canaanite Bathshua: Er, Onan and Shelah. Just to show you how much of a bitch this Bathshua was, Genesis 38:3 tells us that Judah named the first child Er and when the next child (Onan) was born, Bathshua named it, Genesis 38:4. This tells us that she was taking over the head of the household and usurping Judah's rightful place as priest of the family. From this point on, this Canaanite bitch was running the show, and we will see just how she manipulated it.

Well, these three sons grew up and it came time for them to find a wife. Judah knew the rules, but in spite of this he went to the house of Shem to find a pure White woman for his half-breed son Er. That sounds like the problems we are running into today — Where are we going to find wives and husbands for all of these half breeds of today? Of course, like Judah, we will try to find a nice White girl for them, Right? And if we oppose that idea we will be politically incorrect, Right? I'll bet that Judah never told Elam (Tamar's father) the whole story or Elam would have never given his pure White daughter, Tamar, for Judah's half-breed son Er. Because the Canaanites were some relation to Ham, the White son of Noah, maybe he passed Er off as being White (you know, one of those almost white Canaanite "Jews").

Now what we have to know next in this story is the fact that Bathshua (Judah's wife) wanted her sons to marry among her race and this explains a lot of what happened later in this story. The Canaanites were a very low moral people and Bathshua taught her sons the lowest forms of immorality. At last, the day came for Tamar to become Er's wife and we will pick up the story in the Book of Jasher, chapter 45:24-27 (this gives a better description than in the KJV):

<sup>24</sup> And Er came to his wife Tamar, and she became his wife, and when he came to her he outwardly destroyed his seed, and his work was evil in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord slew him.

<sup>25</sup> And it was after the death of Er, Judah's first born, that Judah said unto Onan, go to thy brother's wife and marry her as the next of kin, and raise up seed to thy brother.

<sup>26</sup> And Onan took Tamar for a wife and came to her, and Onan also did like the work of his brother, and his work was evil in the sight of the Lord, and he slew him also.

<sup>27</sup> And when Onan died, Judah said unto Tamar, remain in thy father's house until my son Shiloh (Shelah) shall have grown up, and Judah did no more delight in Tamar, to give her unto Shiloh (Shelah), for he said, peradventure he will also die like his brothers.

Let's take this same passage from the *King James Version* for comparison. It would be Genesis 38:6-10:

<sup>6</sup> And Judah took a wife for Er his firstborn, whose name was Tamar.

<sup>7</sup> And Er, Judah's firstborn, was wicked in the sight of the LORD, and the LORD slew him.

<sup>8</sup> And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother.

<sup>9</sup> And Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother.

<sup>10</sup> And the thing which he did displeased the LORD: wherefore he slew him also.

If this is true, consummation of the marriage was never completed meaning that Er did not legally become Tamar's husband. Judah not knowing about Er (verse 8) "*said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brothers wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother.*" Well this is what is supposed to be done under the Law. Every move that is done here is according to the Law. You cannot understand Tamar's position unless you understand the Law. Then in verse 8 Onan objects because he wants his own seed rather than his brother's. Why? Because Onan wanted the birthright so that the inheritance would pass through him. This half-breed Canaanite "Jew" had his eye on the money. Now Onan was so adamant about this situation that he withdrew himself before completing consummation (*coitus interruptus*), thus Yahweh killed him too. Onan, a half-breed, because of his Cain-Satanic-Canaanite nature, had no respect for the laws of his father's Mighty One. To this day, this act is called "onanism." Be this as it may, I would rather believe Yahweh killed Er and Onan to protect Tamar. Now this is getting interesting as neither Er nor Onan could be considered Tamar's rightful husband before Yahweh. She was never really married to either one because there was no consummation in either case. Now this sets the stage for the rest of the story. We are simply told here that Judah sent Tamar back to her father's house until Shelah would be grown up. When Shelah was grown, Bathshua wanting all of her sons to marry Canaanites took charge and married Shelah off to a Canaanite and then she died. "The Testament of Judah" bares this out, chapter 2, verse 19 when Judah says:

And while I (Judah) was away she (Bathshua) went and took for Shelah a wife from Canaan.

You can tell from this act alone what kind of a bitch Bathshua was. We have to give Bathshua, Judah's Canaanite wife, credit here for two things though: (1) she married Shelah off to another Canaanite and (2) she died. After this the *King James Version* says, Genesis 38:12:

And in the process of time the daughter of Shuah (Bathshua) Judah's wife died; and Judah was comforted, and went up unto his sheepshearers to Timnath, he and his friend Hirah the Adullamite.

Well, this brings up some very interesting situations about this story that most Bible students have never considered. They are:

- ▷ The contract to furnish seed from one of the son's of Judah for Tamar to have children was a total breach of contract on Judah's part!
- ▷ Through the death of Bathshua, Judah's wife, Judah was a free at large eligible widower.
- ▷ As neither Er nor Onan properly consummated their marriages with Tamar, she was still in essence a virgin!!!!

### TAMAR PUTS HER LIFE ON THE LINE FOR HER TRUE CHILDREN!

The first thing we must understand is that Tamar knew Yahweh's Law. Therefore, it is important to consider her behavior from the viewpoint of her knowledge of the Law. At this point, in her life, Tamar realized she had no future without Judah's children to carry on his kingly line. Nevertheless, she was just as happy not to have children by any of these half-breed Canaanites. Tamar, no doubt, breathed a sigh of relief when Shelah, last half-breed son of Judah, was married off by Bathshua to her own kind. But now that was all over, and if she were going to act, it would have to be now or never. At this point, there was only one way that Judah could live up to his promise, and that would be if Judah himself were to father Tamar's children, thereby acting in accordance with the Law. Now she considered, if she were to have children by Judah, it would be in accordance with the Law inasmuch as they were both pureblooded eligible spouses for marriage, and the most important thing, the children would be of pure blood. Thus, Tamar very quickly embarked upon a very dangerous plan of action, for if her bold plan didn't work, Tamar was a dead daughter-in-law by the very Law she acknowledged. How would you like to face being burned at the stake? This took a woman with real guts to take the action she did. In reality, Tamar was no ordinary woman. Where are today's Tamars whose only purpose in life is to beget and raise children of their own kind.

Tamar knew that Judah had been deprived of his sex life for some time as a result of Bathshua's death and knew of Judah's drinking problem when he got together with the boys, especially during sheep shearing season with his old Canaanite friend Hirah the Adullamite. Tamar took everything into account, especially the Law and then she took action. I believe the rest of the story here is very beautiful how she handled each detail — how she obtained his signet, bracelets and staff as pledge to keep her position safe.



I am real proud of Tamar as she is my Grandmother, I don't know how many times removed, but had she not done what she did, I wouldn't be here and I also wouldn't be writing this Watchman's Teaching Letter. I am especially proud to share Tamar, my Grandmother, with Yahshua Himself as we both have a common ancestor in her. Everyone who is of German, Scottish or Irish descent have Tamar for a Grandmother. I am not a bit ashamed of Tamar for what she did. It is only regrettable that she was forced to cohabit twice with those half-breed Canaanites, and I thank Yahweh that He slew both of them forthwith. Actually, Tamar is one of the most exalted women in Scripture, and one of my favorites.

There is one more thing we should take into account with the story of the birth of Pharez and Zerah. Now with the birth of Pharez and Zerah in Genesis 38:29-30, Pharez is counted as Judah's firstborn and Zerah as Judah's second in line. It is obvious that the first two Canaanite children by Judah were not counted. In other words, Er was not counted as the firstborn nor was Onan counted as second, for in Genesis 38:29-30, Pharez is counted as Judah's firstborn and Zerah as Judah's second born. For some reason, Shelah continued to be counted as third-born. Evidently, with the death of Er and Onan, it left open the first and second positions for Pharez and Zerah.

I believe, with this Watchman's Teaching Letter, you will never look at the story of Judah and Tamar in the same light again. If you listen to most of nominal Christianity, they will hypothesize what they consider to be Tamar's immorality. I am here to tell you it was just the opposite! The reason most people come to the conclusion that Tamar's action was immoral is because they don't study deep enough or just listen to someone else and their opinion.

In the next teaching letter I will go farther into the story of Judah. It will not only be the story of Judah and his personal life alone, but the life of his descendants. There are a lot of twist and turns with Judah, so there will be a lot to talk about. But what we know for now is: Judah was and is a very important tribe in Israel, as it is the tribe from which our Redeemer came! Without the Tribe of Judah, there would be no Salvation for Israel! — Without Tamar there would be no Tribe of Judah!

Now, how many Bible teachers are bringing you truths you need to know such as you have just read? Can you now see why I claim my teachings are an extension of Bible researcher and former attorney Bertrand L. Comparet and Dr. Wesley A. Swift?







## LETTER 4

---

In the first three issues, we learned much about Judah's personal life. Judah had a very complex entangled and complicated life. There are few who have ever really mastered the subject of Judah and some of the statements by different commentators about his life and tribe (especially his relation with Tamar) are spurious and totally out of order. With this issue, we are going to turn from Judah's personal life and direct our attention to his descendants, the Tribe of Judah. If you thought Judah's personal life was complicated in the previous studies, you haven't seen anything yet! From Judah we get the highest and most wonderful of blessings, and at the same time, a terrible and vexing curse.

### JUDAH BECOMES BOTH A BLESSING AND A CURSE

Like the old saying, we have good news and we have bad news. Let's take up the good news first. To do this we will have to go to the 49<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis where Jacob, just before he dies, prophesies the destinies of each of the tribes of his family. For Judah, Jacob prophesied this, Genesis 49:8-12:

<sup>8</sup> Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee.

<sup>9</sup> 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?

<sup>10</sup> The scepter 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.

<sup>11</sup> Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes.

<sup>12</sup> His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk.

There is enough in this passage to fill several books, but for now I want you to notice the prophecy of both the first and second comings of Yahshua the Messiah. In His first coming our Redemption is accomplished — In His second coming, we will be redeemed from our enemy along with many other things. What I wanted to do here is to point out how, in Judah, there is great blessing. While in Judah there is great blessing, on the other hand, Judah represents a great curse.

As I have pointed out before, Satan and his children intrude (that is: horn in, butt in, chisel in, cut in) at every critical era of history. Because the Messiah was to come through Judah, Satan and his children **intrude** or direct their attack at Judah. Satan made his first attack in seducing Eve, trying to adulterate Yahweh's pure Seed-line. Bathshua, in her Satanic inbred nature, attacked Judah personally by seducing him to corrupt the pure Seed-line of the promised Redeemer. If you don't understand the war of the seed-lines, you miss the whole theme of the Scriptures. Well, the Satanic forces, through the descendants of Cain, would once again attack Judah. This attack came and can be found in 11<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 2:55 which reads thusly:

And the families of the scribes which dwelt at Jabez; the Tirathites, the Shimeathites, and Suchathites. These are the Kenites that came from Hemath, the father of the house of Rechab.

At first sight this may not appear much like an attack on the Tribe of Judah, but let's take a good look at it. What do we have here? The entire 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter of 11<sup>st</sup> Chronicles from the end of verse 3, starting with verse 4 is the pure genealogy of Judah with one exception. Everything from the end of verse 3 to and including verse 54 is a genealogy of the true descendants of Judah. Then in verse 55 we have added on to Judah's genealogy some descendants of Cain! How do we know this? The word Kenite in verse 55 above is #7017 in the Strong's Concordance and means descendants of Cain. Well, why are Cain's descendants listed here under Judah's genealogy? Its the same old story, they are trying to horn in and pollute the Seed-line of Judah so they can destroy the bloodline of the Messiah. If you don't understand the two seed-lines, you just cannot understand the Bible and what it is all about. I will now prove who these Kenites were and where they came from. To clear up this situation, I will quote some of the research I did on this in my booklet, *Research Papers Proving Two-Seedline Seduction Of Eve*. These are references out of standard commentaries and I didn't use all the references that I have on this. I will use bullets to indicate what I lifted from my booklet:

- ▷ At this time, quoting from The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, volume 3, page 782:

“KENITES ... meaning (metalworkers, smiths). Clan or tribal name of semi-nomadic peoples of South Palestine and Sinai. The Aramaic and Arabic etymologies of the root *gyn* show that it has to do with metal and metal work (thus the Hebrew word from this root, ‘lance’). This probably indicates that the Kenites were metal workers, especially since Sinai and Wadi ‘Arabah were rich in highgrade copper ore. W. F. Albright has pointed to the Beni Hassan mural in Egypt (19<sup>th</sup> century B.C.) as an illustration of such a **wandering group of smiths**. This mural depicts thirty-six men, women and children in characteristic Semitic dress leading along with other **animals**, donkeys laden with **musical instruments**, weapons and an item which Albright has identified as a **bellows**. He has further noted that Lamech’s three children (Genesis 4:19-22) were responsible for **herds** (Jabal), **musical instruments** (Jubal), and **metal work** (Tubal-Cain, or Tubal, **the smith**), the three occupations which seem most evident in the mural.”

- ▷ 2<sup>nd</sup> quote from the same article:

“**The early monarchy.** During this period a significant concentration of Kenites was located in the southern Judean territory. This is clear from 1 Samuel 15:6 cited above and also from David’s relations with them.”

- ▷ 3<sup>rd</sup> quote from the same article:

“**Postexilic references.** In 1 Chronicles 2:55 the **families of the scribes** living at Jabaz are said to be Kenites. Apparently, during the kingdom and exile periods, certain Kenites had given up **nomadic smithing** and had taken on a more sedentary, but equally honorable **profession of scribe**.”

- ▷ *Peake’s Commentary on the Bible*, page 114, has this to say about the name of the Kenites:

“The etymology of the name suggests **that they were smiths or artificers**, a theory which is supported by their association with the Wadi ‘Arabah, where there were copper deposits which had been worked by the Egyptians since the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium.”

- ▷ *Peake’s Commentary on the Bible*, page 181, we have more on the name of the Kenites:

“The name **Cain** is generally taken by Semitic philologists to mean ‘smith’, and regarded as the patronymic of the **Kenite clan of smiths**.”

- ▷ *The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible* has this to say on Kenite, page 293:

**“The families of the SCRIBES** — either civil or ecclesiastical officers of the Kenite origin, **who are here classed with the tribe of Judah, not as being descended from it**, but as dwellers within its territory, and in a measure **incorporated** with its people.”

- ▷ The *Matthew Pool's Commentary On The Holy Bible* has this to say on the Kenites, volume 1, page 778:

**“The SCRIBES**; either civil, who were public notaries, **who wrote and signed legal instruments; or ecclesiastical . . .** and are here mentioned not as if they were of the tribe of Judah, but because they dwelt among them, and probably were allied to them by marriages, and so in a manner incorporated with them. Which dwelt, or rather, dwelt; Hebrew, were dwellers. For the other translation, which dwelt, **may seem to insinuate that these were descendants of Judah, which they were not**; but this translation **only signifies their cohabitation with them**, for which cause they are here named with them.”

Here is where these Pharisees, Sadducees and SCRIBES which Yahshua pointed out as being of their father the devil came from. When He said to them in Matthew 23:35 and John 8:44:

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. (Matthew 23:35)

Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. (John 8:44)

Now that we have proved that the scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees of Yahshua's time were descendants of Cain fathered by Satan himself (except for a few proselytes), we are faced with another problem. That problem being there are many in the Identity message who are proclaiming there is no Satan or devil! This is a very serious teaching and needs to be exposed. Those people teaching the “Jews” are a religion rather than a race are aiding and abetting these Satanic “Jews”. The “Jews” just love to be identified as a religion rather than a race. The “Jews” are made up of many races, but they have one common denominator, and that is they all have the race of Cain's Satanic blood in them. I will now quote from *The Hidden Tyranny* which is called “The Rosenthal Document.” Harold Wallace Rosenthal, in a lengthy interview opened up and bragged about the Jewish position. At one point he said this:

“We can live among other nations and states only as long as we succeed in persuading them that the Jews **are not a distinct people**, but are the **representatives of a religious faith** who, therefore, constitute a ‘**religious community**,’ though this be of a peculiar character. As a matter of fact, **this is the greatest of our falsehoods.**”

So you just keep telling everybody that the “Jews” are a religion rather than a generation, (race) of vipers, and you will be helping their Satanic cause. Believe me, Ted R. Weiland, Stephen E. Jones, James W. Bruggeman and Charles Weisman are helping the “Jew’s” cause. Well, just keep sending them your money and they can continue to help the “Jews” some more! Don’t forget Pete Peters too! We will address this very serious false doctrine of no Satan at this time.

### THE DOCTRINE OF NO SATAN

There was a booklet entitled *Satan Dispelled* by a person with a pen name of Kalamos. This 46 page booklet was widely distributed by Sheldon Emry of America’s Promise of Phoenix, Arizona. Probably many of you have this booklet in your library. I am not going to dwell on this booklet very long, but I want to give you an example of how phony it is. We will go to the first unnumbered page entitled “Publisher’s Comment” and quote a small section as follows:

“I was particularly interested in a study of ‘the devil’ in Jude 9, which was a problem to me. A few hours of reading, studying, and discussion not only cleared the passage for me, but gave me the joy and delight of a better understanding of the Scripture and of God Himself, so greatly needed today. See Appendix A.”

Well, let’s go to Appendix A, on page 40:

“APPENDIX A: THE BODY OF MOSES . . .

“Yet Michael, the archangel [chief messenger] when contending with the devil [adversary] he disputed about the body of Moses durst not bring against him a railing accusation but said. The Lord [Yahweh] rebuke thee [Jude 9].

“This is not to be taken as having reference to the physical body of Moses any more than the physical body of Christ is referred to in 1 Cor. 12:27-30. Moses’ ‘body’ here was the selected group of men ‘of ability’ (Ex. 18:21) serving as judges over the people under the supervision of their chief messenger (agent), Moses. Verse 9 of Jude obviously refers to Num. 16, where Korah disputed with Moses regarding Moses’ authority. Korah was the ‘devil-adversary’ of Jude 9.”

Here is a good example of a person getting a brainstorm and setting up a false premise. This passage (Jude 9) has nothing to do with 11<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 12:27-30, Exodus 18:21 or the person of Korah named above.. To show you what Jude 9 is really all about, I am going to quote from two commentaries on the subject:

▷ Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, Commentary On The Whole Bible, page 1519:

“**9, Michael, the archangel** — Nowhere in the Scripture is the plural used, ‘arch-angels’; but only ONE, ‘archangel.’ The only other passage in the New Testament where it occurs, is 1 Thessalonians 4:16, where Christ is distinguished from the archangel, with whose voice He shall descend to raise the dead; they therefore err who confound Christ and Michael. The name means *Who is like God?* In *Daniel 10:13* he is called ‘One (Margin, the first) of the chief princes.’ He is the champion angel of Israel. In Revelation 12:7 the conflict between Michael and Satan is again alluded to, **about the body of Moses** — his literal body. Satan, as having the power of death, opposed the raising of it again, on the ground of Moses’ sin at Meribah, and his murder (execution) of the Egyptian. That Moses’ body was raised, appears from his presence with Elijah and Jesus (who were in the body) at the Transfiguration: the sample and earnest of the coming resurrection-kingdom, to be ushered in by Michael’s standing up for God’s people.”

▷ The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, page 1488:

“9. Jude amplifies his plea for reverence by citing the apocryphal story of Michael and the devil, taken from the pseudepigraphical **Assumption of Moses**. Although Jude quoted both this book and Enoch, it is not a supportable inference that he ascribed canonical status or historicity to them.”

What this last statement is saying is: because the pagans at The First Ecumenical Or General Council Of Nicaea, A.D. 325 didn’t approve of the above mentioned books they were not included in their “Canon.” Anyway, the person who wrote this “Publisher’s Comment” didn’t know what they were talking about on the subject of Jude 9 as it has nothing to do with 1 Cor. 12:27-30, Ex. 18:21 or the person of Korah. The rest of the book is in the same vein and not worth any more comment, but I can assure you it has a lot of holes of the same nature in it. Of course, she mentions that Pastor Sheldon Emry of Phoenix, Arizona, had some influence on her thought. It is also interesting, on the last page (46) is advertised for sale at \$4.00 a “Concordant Literal New Testament” translation. This is where Stephen E. Jones and Micheal Wark got their Universalism from! The full name of that outfit was the Concordant Publishing Concern, 15570 West Knochaven Drive, Saugus, California, 91350. So we know, at this point, that Sheldon Emry along with Stephen E. Jones were not only one seed-liners, Universalists, but also no Satan proponents. This should give you a pretty good idea where all the garbage is coming from.



## CHARLES WEISMAN DISPELS SATAN

I am now going to quote a short passage from Charles Weisman's lecture which he gave to "disprove" the Two Seed-line doctrine. Weisman gave this lecture at a Pete Peters' camp retreat, so we can know just where Peters stands on this issue as he praised the work of Weisman very highly. When you listen to the words of Charles Weisman on this subject, you are hearing the same words of Stephen E. Jones, Ted R. Weiland and James Bruggeman for they can all be lumped into one basket, if you have heard one of them on this subject, you have heard them all. That is why James W. Bruggeman printed Ted R. Weiland's disgusting article, "Eve: Did She? or Didn't She", in Bruggeman's *Kingdom Journal* in the Spring issue, 1998. This is what Charles Weisman had to say about Satan:

"... Now the identifying of this serpent with the term Satan or devil can be somewhat confusing since these terms can be ascribed to many different things. First, such as the angel of God was a Satan against Balaam, Numbers 22:22. David was a Satan or adversary to the Philistines, 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel 29:4. People are called devils who are slanderers, 1<sup>st</sup> Timothy 3:11. And people are called devils who are called false accusers, Titus 2:3. Judas was called a devil. Peter was called a Satan. The terms devil and Satan are used to refer to evil in general, or to sin, or to the enemy. Corrupt political religious systems or authorities are called Satan. Man's lust or carnal nature can be called the devil. Thus these words, devil and Satan, are not given one singular meaning in usage throughout Scripture; nor is the word serpent. But that is how Christendom has always treated them and interpreted them. So, even though these words, devil and Satan, were applied to this serpent of Genesis 3:15, which is now destroyed, they are applied to many other things as well. Thus the terms, devil and Satan, are still used, and still can be used as well as the term serpent. But they cannot be used in reference to the serpent of Genesis 3:15 still existing. So whatever this serpent was, it is at an end; or at least its power is certainly at an end. ..."

## LET'S TAKE THE CONFUSION OUT OF IDENTIFYING SATAN!

To clear up just what these terms, Satan, devil, serpent and old dragon mean, I am going first to *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 5 Q-Z, and quote from their article on Satan on page 282:

**"1. References to Satan. 1. In the Old Testament. WITHOUT THE ARTICLE** the Hebrew term Satan has the general meaning of 'an adversary,' 'an enemy.' Thus in 1 Samuel 29:4 it is used of David as a possible enemy in battle; in 1<sup>st</sup> Kings

11:14, 23, 25 it designates political adversaries to Solomon; in Numbers 22:22 it is applied to the angel of the Lord who opposed Balaam. In Psalm 109:6 it is used of a human accuser. **With the article**, ‘the Adversary,’ it becomes a proper name and **denotes the personal Satan.**”

I will next quote from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 866, published by “Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society.” On this particular subject, they do a good job — they do have a few areas where they know what they are talking about and this is one of them because there are many other sources that agree:

“**SATAN** [Resister] In many places in the Hebrew Scriptures, the word *sa-tan*’ appears without **the definite article**. Used in this way, it applies in its first appearance to the angel that stood in the road to resist Balaam as he set out with the objective of cursing the Israelites. (Nu 22:22, 32). In other instances it refers to individuals as resisters of other men. (1Sa 29:4; 2 Sa 19:21, 22; 1 Ki 5:4; 11:14, 23, 25). But it is used with the **definite article** *ha* to refer to Satan the devil, the chief Adversary of God. (Job 1:6; ftn; 2:1-7; Zec 3:1.2). In the Greek Scriptures the word *sa-ta-nas*’ applies to Satan the Devil in nearly all of its occurrences and is usually accompanied by the **definite article**, *ho*.”

Now I will quote another witness on this from *The Pictorial Bible Dictionary* published by Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, page 755:

“**SATAN** (satan; Hebrew *satan*, Greek *Satán* or *Satanás*, *an adversary*), the chief of the fallen spirits, the grand adversary of God and man. Without the article the Hebrew word is used in a general sense to denote some one who is an opponent, an adversary; thus, the angel who stood in Balaam’s way (Num. 22:22); David as a possible opponent in battle (1 Sam. 29:4); a political adversary (1 Kings 11:14). **With the definite article prefixed it is a proper noun** in Job 1-2, Zechariah 3:1-2, **designating Satan as a personality**. In Psalm 109:6 **the article** is lacking, and reference may be to a human adversary (cf. AVS ‘an adversary’), but it is generally conceded that in 1 Chronicles 21:1 the word is a proper name **without the article**. The teaching concerning evil and a personal devil finds its full presentation only in the New Testament. In the New Testament the term Satan, translated from the Hebrew, always designates **the personal Satan** (but cf. Matt. 16:23; Mark 8:33). The malignant foe is known in the New Testament by a number of other names and descriptive designations. He is frequently called ‘the devil’ (Greek *diábolos*), meaning the slanderer (Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:2; John 8:44; Eph. 6:11; Rev. 12:12 etc.). (‘Devils’: in KJV and ERV is properly ‘demons’). Other titles or descriptive designations applied to him are ‘Abaddon’ or ‘Apollyon’ (Rev. 9:11); ‘Accuser of the brethren’ (Rev. 12:10); ‘Adversary,’ Greek *antídikos* (1 Pet. 5:8); ‘Beelzebub’ (Matt 12:24); ‘Belial’ (II Cor. 6:15); ‘the deceiver of the whole world’ (Rev. 12:9); ‘the great dragon’ (Rev. 12:9) ‘the evil one’ (Matt. 13:19, 38; 1 John 2:13; 5:19); ‘the

father of lies' (John 8:44); 'the god of this world' (II Cor. 4:4); 'a murderer' (John 8:44); 'the old serpent' (Rev. 12:9); 'the prince of this world' (John 12:31; 14:30); 'the prince of the powers of the air' (Eph. 2:2); 'the tempter' (Matt. 4:5; 1 Thess. 3:5)."

### EVERYTHING HINGES ON THE ARTICLE!

You can see from all of this, we have to know if the article is there or if the article isn't there to understand if it is speaking of Satan himself, or if, it is just used as a figure of speech. This brings us back to our high school days and those long dull exercises of the English language. To refresh your memory on what an article is, I am going to quote from a set of books entitled *Practical English* published by Career Institute, Volume 1, section 2, page 6:

"The words *a*, *an* and *the* are adjectives although in grammar they are called **articles**. The word *the* is called the **definite article**. The words *a* and *an* are called the **indefinite articles**. When we say, *the book on the table*, we are pointing out a particular book on a particular table. When we say, *I have a book*, no specific or particular book is indicated."

The *World Scope Encyclopedia*, volume 1, under Article says:

"**Article** . . . , in grammar, one of a class of limiting adjectives, which embrace the adjective elements, *a*, *an* and *the*. *A* is used before consonant sounds and *an* before vowel sounds; both are called **indefinite articles**, because they refer to any one of two or more objects. *The* is called the **definite article**."

The *Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary*, page 1933, has this to say about what an **article** is:

"**article** A special form of adjective. 'The' is called the **definite article**. 'A' and 'an' are **indefinite articles**."

The *Encyclopedia Americana*, 1948 edition, volume 1, page 357, says this of **Article**:

"**Article**, in grammar, a part of speech used before nouns to limit or define their application. In the English language *a* or *an* is the **indefinite article** (the latter form being used before a vowel sound) and *the* the **definite article**. The English **indefinite article** is really a modified form of the numeral adjective *one*; so the German *ein* and the French *un* stand for the numeral and the **article**. There are traces in various languages showing that the **definite article** was **originally a**

**pronoun**; thus *the* English *the* is closely akin to both *this* and *that*. The Latin language has **neither the definite nor the indefinite article**; the Greek has the **definite**; the Hebrew and Arabic **definite article** was **prefixed to its noun**, while on the other hand, in the Syriac and Chaldee it was affixed to the noun, as it is in the Icelandic. In the Scandinavian language the **definite article** is appended to the end of the word as *hus-et*, the house. There is no article in Russian.”

Why is it so necessary to stress the use of the article, when we study the Scriptures? For one reason, if we don’t know about the use of the article, whether it is **there** or **absent**, we cannot know what the Scriptures are saying. Not only do we have to know what the article means in English, but we have to understand the article in Hebrew and Greek. With the definite article, the Scriptures are speaking of a genuine personal devil or Satan. Now there is one language which the Bible was translated into which doesn’t have an article and that is Latin. Does this create problems? — you bet it creates problems. In the book, *Latin For Americans*, First Book, published by The Macmillan Company, page 413, says this:

“**Article** — definite (the), indefinite (a, an). There is no word in Latin for ‘the’ or ‘a’.”

It is now a pretty well known fact that the New Testament was originally written in Aramaic (a form of Hebrew), then translated into Greek, then Latin, then German and English. Question: how did the German and English translators know where to include the article and what kind of an article to use if they were coming directly off the Latin? Are you beginning to see how important it is to go back to the original languages? And one of the most important things we have to do when we go back to the original languages is to recognize the article and we have the article in both the Hebrew and the Greek. The difference can be the difference between a real genuine personal devil or someone who is acting like a devil. This is exactly how Charles Weisman, Stephen E. Jones, Ted R. Weiland and James W. Bruggeman are confusing the issue and promoting a no devil doctrine. In all of their teachings (what I have heard and read of them), I have never heard them mention the word article one time or even try to explain what it means in the Scriptures. I think they really don’t know — they all probably missed school the days that the English teacher was explaining articles.

## ALL IS NOT LOST!

I am now going to show you how you can quickly recognize an article in the Scriptures (especially the Old Testament), but first I must tell you a story. Everything in history

has a reason and Yahweh has worked out history for the advantage of His people. I am going to talk here just a little bit about the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. After the exploits of Alexander the Great, most of the territory he conquered became a Greek speaking people. In Alexandria, Egypt there was a faction of Greek speaking “Jews.” These Greek speaking “Jews” decided they needed a Greek translation of the Old Parchments. I will not go into the details here how they finally accomplished their Greek translation, but when it was finished, it became known as the Septuagint (the seventy or LXX). Here is the important part: when they translated from the Hebrew and Chaldee into Greek, they changed the Hebrew and Chaldee articles into Greek articles and we still have them that way in our Bibles today! I don’t know whether you are aware of it or not, but many of the words in our Old Testament are in Greek and the definite article is part of those Greek words. The definite article word “the” is the same in the Old Testament as it is in the New Testament — it is the Greek word #3588. In fact every word “the” in the Old Testament is this Greek word — you can check it in the appendix of the Strong’s Concordance and you will find it to be so. So when you read the serpent in Genesis 3:1, 3, 4, 13, 14, you can know that it is the definite article with the exception of passages like “the serpent of brass” in Numbers 21:9 as an example.

Let’s take a look at this Greek word #3588 in the Strong’s Concordance:

3588. ὁ *ho*, *ho*; (masculine) *including the feminine*, ὁ *he*, *hay*; and the neuter, τὸ *to*, *to*, in all their inflections; the **definite article**; *the* (sometimes to be supplied, at others omitted in English idiom): *the*, *this*, *that*, *one*, *he*, *she*, *it*, etc.

You can see, here, sometimes the definite article can also be *this*, *that*, *one*, *he*, *she* and *it*. Most often, though, the definite article from the Greek is the word *the* in the English. It seems that we always have to have some exceptions to the rule. You will also notice that the definite article is sometimes there without the word *the*.

I hope I don’t lose you at this point, but we have to go a step farther when speaking of an article. Articles are a type of adjective that changes or modifies the meaning of a noun (name of an object or person). The next thing we must consider is that there are two kinds of nouns: (1) a common noun and (2) a proper noun. Common nouns are like book, chair, table, desk, city, ocean, lily, tiger etc. Proper nouns are like John Adams, Daniel Morgan, Lake Michigan, Lake Louise and Satan in the Scripture. As a general rule, proper nouns are capitalized and common nouns are not. In English, proper nouns (which include personal names), do not need word “the”, (the definite article), in front of the noun to make it mean a **definite** particular **person**, place or thing. A personal name is a proper noun and is already definite in the English, and is capitalized to indicate it is a proper noun. But in Greek, the proper noun can have the definite article before the proper noun. Such examples are the Michael, the Isaac, the

Tamar, the Herod, the John, and when translated into English is just simply Michael, Isaac, Tamar, Herod or John. That is why, in the Bible, it will say: **the** devil, **the** serpent or **Satan** in English.

Now Let's read Revelation 12:9 in English, and I will put the Greek article in bold type:

And **the** great dragon was cast out, **that** old serpent, called **the** Devil, and **Satan**, (**the** adversary) which deceiveth **the** whole world: he was cast out into **the** earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

In the Greek, it reads a little differently and the article is a little different than in English (this is from the *Emphatic Diaglott* — Green's Interlinear reads very similar.) — let's take a look at it:

"And was cast **the** dragon **the** great, **the** serpent **the** old, **the** one being called accuser, and [**the**] adversary, **the** one deceiving the habitable whole, was cast into the earth, and the messengers of him with him were cast."

Actually there are twenty four forms of the Greek article. The forms we are most interested in here are the basic ò, Ú and Jò shown in the Greek word #3588 from the *Strong's Concordance* above. The Ò is *Masculine*, the o is *Feminine* and the JÒ *Neuter*. In Greek you will find the ò with the name of a man, the Ú with the name of a woman and the Jò with the name of a place or object other than man or woman. Our purpose, in this lesson, is to prove with the Greek definite article there is a genuine person known as Satan. At this time, it should be pointed out that in the Greek there is **no indefinite article**, only the **definite article**. In the book, *New Testament Greek Study Aids* by Walter Jerry Clark, it is explained like this:

**"The Article.** Also closely related to the noun is **the article**. 'If it is desired to represent the thing designated by the noun as particular or known, we may use the **article**' (Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*). In English we have both the **definite article** ('the') and an **indefinite article** ('a' or 'an'). **Greek, however has only the definite article** and is therefore referred to simply as '**the article**.' There are two general rules which it will be helpful for us to know when dealing with **the article**. These are: **the presence of the article denotes the noun as a definite or particular in some sense, and the absence of the article indicates the noun as either indefinite or qualitative**. There are exceptions and qualifying circumstances to these rules, but these are the simplest and most common uses of **the article**."

Charles Weisman, in his tirade, tried to make it appear that all passages with the word devil or Satan were just a figure of speech. The only way you are going to be able to

determine if it is a real person or a figure of speech is to go to the original language. You are not going to get it wholly out of the KJV or any other Bible. I am not an expert in the Greek language, but with the aid of the Emphatic Diaglot, Green's Interlinear and the Greek to English Interlinear by George Ricker Berry, I can read the Greek definite article wherever it is in the New Testament in its twenty four forms . And for the New Testament, at least, I have to admit that the Emphatic Diaglott is the better of the three even if it is published by the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. Maybe you could find one in a used book store if you want to start studying the article in the Greek language. I really recommend the Emphatic Diaglott to get started.

Now, we will look at a few Scriptures to determine if the definite article is there or not. We already did Revelation 12:9. We will next look at John 8:44 and I will put the definite article from the Greek in bold type:

Ye are of your father (**the** father **the** accuser) **the** devil, and **the** lust of your father (of **the** father of you) ye will do. He was a murder from the beginning, and abode not in **the** truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie (**the** falsehood), he speaketh of his own (of **the** own): for he is a liar, and **the** father of it.

Jude 9:

Yet (**the**) Michael **the** archangel, when contending with **the** devil he disputed about **the** body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The LORD rebuke thee.

Luke 10:18:

And he said unto them, I beheld Satan (**the** adversary) as lightning fall from (**the**) heaven.

Matthew 12:26:

And if (**the**) Satan cast out (**the**) Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his (feminine **the**) kingdom stand?

Isn't that interesting? Satan's kingdom is a feminine kingdom!

Matthew 4:1:

Then was (**the**) Jesus led up of **the** Spirit into **the** wilderness to be tempted of **the** devil.

I could go on and on and give you thousands of examples of where the Greek article is and where the Greek article isn't, but now I will give you a couple of examples where there is an absence of the Greek article. This will be an example of the word Satan. Because the Greek article is not present in the following passages when speaking of Satan, the word Satan should not be capitalized. In almost every Bible I found (and I have about 50 of them) in every case Satan was capitalized. I did find, though, two Bibles which did not capitalize the word (in this case) "satan". These translators understood the significance the **absence** of the Greek article.

*The New American Bible* by Thomas Nelson Publishers © 1976, Matthew 16:23:

Jesus turned on Peter and said, 'Get out of my sight, you **satan**! You are trying to make me trip and fall. You are not judging by God's standards but by man's'.

*The Saint Joseph Edition of the Holy Bible*, OT, (Confraternity-Douay, & NT, (Confraternity Version — a Catholic Bible) © 1950, 1952, 1954 and 1963, Matthew 16:23 and Mark 8:33:

Matthew 16:23:

He turned and said to Peter, 'Get behind me **satan**, thou art a scandal to me; for thou dost not mind the things of God, but those of men'.

Mark 8:33:

But he, turning and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, saying, 'Get behind me, **satan** for thou dost not mind the things of God, but those of men'."

But you may ask: "What does this have to do with Judah?" — It has everything to do with Judah! We can know from this lesson that there is a real and personal Satan — that Satan seduced Eve in the Garden and produced Cain — that the descendants of Cain are literally devils in shoe leather. As a result, we have Satan himself and his children, the "Jews!" We can know this for certain by understanding the article! Not only this, but we can know that these devils attached themselves to the Tribe of Judah and thank Yahweh that only a small fraction of Judah mixed with these Canaanite devils. Thus we have the good figs of Judah and the rotten figs of Judah! This story of Judah is getting more complicated as we continue.

For those who want to get started right away on the Greek article, I am going to include the following chart to make it easier to recognize it in all of its forms. You will want to hang on to this chart as all the Greek interlinears do not give you this information on how to recognize the article. With this chart, you will not only be able to recognize



the article, but what form the article is in. Once you learn about and how to read the article, it's going to be a little harder for some of these religious shysters to put something over on you. There may be some of you who might want to go on to learn to read and speak the Greek language. Learning the Greek article is a good place to get started. If, though, you never get beyond the stage of recognizing the article, you will have mastered much of your Bible.

Note: The chart was only included with the original lesson. There are many Greek study books where this information can be found.







## LETTER 5

---

In the last issue, I explained how Judah became a great blessing and also a vexing curse. In this issue we are going to consider the blessing of Judah. To do this, we will have to again read Genesis 49:8-12:

<sup>8</sup> Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee.

<sup>9</sup> 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?

<sup>10</sup> The scepter 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.

<sup>11</sup> Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes.

<sup>12</sup> His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk."

As I said in the last issue, there is enough in this passage to fill several books. I am not going to attempt to write several books on this passage, but I hope to cover some of the main points with this lesson. I am not sure I can get it all finished in one lesson, but however many lessons it will take, I will do it. This passage simply cannot be passed up without some extensive comment.

### WHY JUDAH?

Why is Judah singled out for this particular position in Jacob's family? After all, the first born male is supposed to receive the position of ruler, priest and the inheritance or the birthright. Then why is Judah, the fourth born of Leah, chosen as the ruling

tribe? When we run into problems like this, we must go to the basic law that governs the situation. The Law on this is found in:

Exodus 13:1, 2, 11-13:

<sup>1</sup> And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

<sup>2</sup> Sanctify (set apart) unto me all the firstborn whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine.

...

<sup>11</sup> And it shall be when the LORD shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, as he sware unto thee and to thy fathers, and shall give it here.

<sup>12</sup> That thou shalt **set apart** unto the LORD all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh out of a beast which thou hast; the males shall be the Lord's.

<sup>13</sup> And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck: **and all the firstborn of man among thy children shalt thou redeem.**

Exodus 22:29:

Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: **the first born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me.**

Numbers 3:13:

Because all the firstborn are mine; for on the day that I smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt I hallowed unto me **all the firstborn in Israel, both man and beast: mine shall they be;** I am the LORD.

Luke 2:23:

(As it is written in the law of the LORD, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the LORD.)

To give you some idea of the importance of the meaning of “firstborn” from the Scripture, I am going quote from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 2, page 540:

**“First-Born . . .** (meaning *first in sequence to be born* or, figuratively, first in rank, preeminent). Normally the word means the older son (Exod. 6:14; 11:5). He enjoyed prerogatives over his brothers, like receiving the father's blessing (Gen 27:1-4, 35-37), preferential treatment by the father (43:33), respect as leader among the brothers, (37:22), and a double portion of the inheritance, twice what any other son received (Deut 21:17). The first-born might barter away his rights, as

Esau (Gen 25:29-34), or forfeit them for misconduct as Reuben, by incest (35:22; 49:3, 4; 1 Chron 5:1). The Lord claimed first-born of men and animals for Himself (Exod 13:1-16). Such animals were sacrificed and such sons redeemed, since God did not tolerate child sacrifice as in heathen customs (13:11-15). Levites as a group were designated for special service to the Lord in lieu of the first-born (Num 3:12, 13; 8:16-18). In the New Testament, Jesus is called the first-born son of Mary (Luke 2:7), who was a virgin before His birth but who had other sons after Him (Mark 6:3 cf. John 7:5).” (There are two schools of thought whether Mary had “other” children later.)

I would like to further quote on this subject of “first-born” from *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 271:

“... As the first strength of the father, he became the next head of the family (or clan or tribe), and embodied the soul and character of the social group, becoming responsible for its continuance and welfare. As such he acted with a certain authority, felt a greater responsibility (cf. Reuben; Gen. 37:22), and received a preferential treatment (cf. Gen. 43:33). As his BIRTHRIGHT he had claims on the family BLESSING (cf. Gen. 27:1-4, 35-37) and received a double portion of the family inheritance.”

From all of this, we should see there are three key positions of the first-born. They are in this order:

- (a) The ruler of the family after the father dies.
- (b) The priest of the family after the father dies.
- (c) The double portion of inheritance to keep the family members together and see to their needs (especially the mother if still living) after the father dies.

Since we have some basic ideas about how the Hebrew family functions, let’s take a look at Jacob’s family and how the inheritance was distributed accordingly. Reuben, the first born of Leah was in line as ruler of the family, priest of the family and the double portion of inheritance. But Reuben completely disqualified himself for all three of these benefits of being firstborn. Consider what this man lost in the space of a few moments of uncontrolled lust. Reuben could have been the ruling tribe from which the Redeemer would come. Reuben could have been the high priest with all of his children holding the offices thereof. Just consider the blessings that went to Joseph with all the riches of the earth which could have been Reuben’s also. Let’s read what Jacob had to say of Reuben in Genesis 49:3-4:

<sup>3</sup> Reuben, thou art my firstborn, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power.

<sup>4</sup> Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel; because thou wentest up to thy father's bed; then defiledst thou it: he went up to my couch.

Here is the story of Reuben's sin against his father as recorded in the "Testament Of Reuben", *The Lost Books of The Bible and the Forgotten Books of Eden*, pages 221-222: chapter 1, verses 6-8, 37-40:

<sup>6</sup> And behold I call to witness against you this day the God of heaven, that ye walk not in the sins of youth and fornication, wherein I was poured out, and defiled the bed of my father Jacob.

<sup>7</sup> And I tell you that he smote me with a sore plague in my loins for seven months; and had not my father Jacob prayed for me to the LORD, the LORD would have destroyed me.

<sup>8</sup> For I was thirty years old when I wrought the evil thing before the LORD, and for seven months I was sick unto death.

...

<sup>37</sup> For had I not seen Bilhah bathing in a covered place, I had not fallen into this great iniquity.

<sup>38</sup> For my mind taking in the thought of the woman's nakedness, suffered me not to sleep until I had wrought the abominable thing.

<sup>39</sup> For while Jacob our father had gone to Isaac his father, when we were in Eber, near to Ephrath in Bethlehem, Bilhah became drunk and was asleep uncovered in her chamber.

<sup>40</sup> Having therefore gone in and beheld her nakedness, I wrought the impiety without her perceiving it, and leaving her sleeping I departed.

You can plainly see, here, that Reuben was totally disqualified for the positions of ruler, priest or to receive the blessing. It was necessary, therefore, to appoint others of Jacob's sons for these positions. Let's take a look and see how this process worked and how Judah was chosen for the position of ruler. As a general rule, once the first-born is disqualified the position would go to the second son and on down the line. Since Reuben was no longer qualified as first-born, the position of chief ruler of the family would pass to the second born of Leah, or Simeon. Lets now see what Jacob had to say about Simeon. We are really going to have to include Levi along with Simeon as Jacob treated them both equally in his prophetic destiny of his children. We will now read Genesis 49:5-7:

<sup>5</sup> Simeon and Levi are brethren; instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.

<sup>6</sup> O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour be not thou united: for in their anger they slew a man, and in their selfwill they digged down a wall.

<sup>7</sup> Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel; I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.

You can see from this that Jacob didn't consider Simeon or Levi as good candidates for the important position of chief ruler of the family. They simply didn't possess the cool head it takes to properly make qualified decisions at critical times. For more on Simeon, let's read from the "Testament of Simeon", *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, page 224, chapter 1, verses 5, 7-15:

<sup>5</sup> Moreover, I became strong exceedingly; I shrank from no achievement, nor was I afraid of ought. For my heart was hard, my liver was immovable, and my bowels without compassion.

...

<sup>7</sup> For in the time of my youth I was jealous in many things of Joseph, because my father loved him beyond all.

<sup>8</sup> And I set my mind against him to destroy him, because the prince of deceit sent forth the spirit of jealousy and blinded my mind, so that I regarded him not as a brother, nor did I spare even Jacob my father.

<sup>9</sup> But his God and the God of his fathers sent forth His angel, and delivered him out of my hands.

<sup>10</sup> For when I went to Shechem to bring ointment for the flocks, and Reuben to Dothan, where were our necessities and all our stores, Judah my brother sold him to the Ishmaelites.

<sup>11</sup> And when Reuben heard these things he was grieved, for he wished to restore him to his father.

<sup>12</sup> But on hearing this I was exceedingly wroth against Judah in that he let him go away alive, and for five months I continued wrathful against him.

<sup>13</sup> But the Lord restrained me, and withheld from me the power of my hands; for my right hand was half withered for seven days.

<sup>14</sup> And I knew, my children, that because of Joseph this had befallen me, and I repented and wept; and I besought the Lord God that my hand might be restored, and that I might hold aloof from all pollution and envy and from all folly.

<sup>15</sup> For I knew I had devised an evil thing before the Lord and Jacob my father, on account of Joseph my brother, in that I envied him.

There are three passages in the next chapter of the "Testament Of Simeon" worth quoting, page 225. chapter 2, verses 4, 10, 13-15:

<sup>4</sup> Now Joseph was a good man, and had the Spirit of God within him: being compassionate and pitiful, he bore no malice against me; but loved me even as the rest of his brethren.

...

<sup>10</sup> Therefore was Joseph comely in appearance, and goodly to look upon, because

no wickedness dwelt in him; for some of the trouble of the spirit the face manifested.

...

<sup>13</sup> For I have seen it inscribed in the writing of Enoch that your sons shall be corrupted in fornication, and shall do harm to the sons of Levi with the sword.

<sup>14</sup> But they shall not be able to withstand Levi; for he shall wage the war of the Lord, and shall conquer all your hosts.

<sup>15</sup> And they shall be few in number, divided in Levi and Judah, **and there shall be none of you for sovereignty, even as also our father prophesied in his blessing.**

### JUDAH RECEIVES THE BLESSING OF CHIEF RULER

At this point, in this lesson, we know that Simeon is out of the picture as a successor for Reuben as ruler, priest, or receiving the double blessing. We also know, at this point, that Levi is ruled out, at least as a ruling tribe. We will get back to Levi later. You can see here that this story gets more complicated as we go along, but it will all make sense in the end. The main point to realize is: Judah was next in the line of birth for the position of chief ruler and he had all the necessary qualities needed for the position, thus Jacob gave him his blessing in that regard. We now have the position of sovereignty solved but the positions of priest and the double blessing of inheritance still remain.

### JOSEPH RECEIVES THE BLESSING

I think it is generally understood, in Israel Identity, that Joseph received the blessing (the double portion of inheritance). But, why Joseph? — he was the 11th born of Jacob. While Joseph was the 11th of Jacob, he was first-born of Jacob by Rachel. Now we know that Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah, so it would seem that this would be the reason for Jacob giving Joseph the blessing. It would be a logical and proper move on Jacob's part, but I think there was more to it than that. Let's see what all Joseph got as a result of receiving the blessing, Genesis 49:22-26:

<sup>22</sup> Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall.

<sup>23</sup> The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him:

<sup>24</sup> But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of



Israel:)

<sup>25</sup> Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breast, and of the womb:

<sup>26</sup> The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren.

Another passage which helps clear up the matter of Joseph getting the blessing is found in 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 5:1-2:

<sup>1</sup> Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, (for he was the firstborn; but forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel: and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright.

<sup>2</sup> For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birthright was Joseph's:)

### WITH THE BIRTHRIGHT OF A DOUBLE PORTION CAME SOME RESPONSIBILITY!

Just because one was the firstborn and was eligible for the double portion inheritance didn't mean that this inheritance was all scot-free. By getting the double portion meant some responsibility along with it. To show you this, I am going to quote from *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary* by Ronald F. Youngblood, page 598:

**“INHERITANCE . . .** In ancient Israel the property of a deceased person was usually distributed according to law or tribal custom. Written wills were rarely used. The real and personal property of a father was normally divided among his sons. A larger amount, usually a double portion, went to the eldest son, **who assumed the care of his mother and unmarried sisters.** The birthright of the firstborn son could be denied only because of a serious offense against the father, as in the case of Reuben (Deut. 21:15-17; 1 Chr. 5:1). The sons of concubines normally received presents of personal property. If there were no surviving sons, the inheritance went to daughters. The daughters had to marry within the tribe, however, or lose their inheritance. If a man died childless, his estate was received by his brothers or his father's brothers (Num. 27:9-11).”

The reason I say Joseph earned the double blessing of inheritance is because he took care of the entire family, brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers along with nephews and nieces, besides his immediate personal responsibility for his own wife and children, and you can't get any more responsible than that!

While Joseph was doing all of this for his family, remember how his brothers had treated him by becoming jealous and plotting to murder him? Remember how they sold him into slavery? I would like to read to you some excerpts from the “Testament Of Joseph” out of *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, to show you some of the other trials Joseph had to go through, starting with page 259, chapter 1, verse 4:

- <sup>4</sup> I have seen in my life envy and death, yet I went not astray, but persevered in the truth of the Lord.
- <sup>5</sup> These my brothers hated me, but the Lord loved me:
- <sup>6</sup> They wished to slay me, but the God of my fathers guarded me.
- <sup>7</sup> They let me down into a pit and the Most High brought me up again.
- <sup>8</sup> I was sold into slavery, and the Lord of all made me free:
- <sup>9</sup> I was taken into captivity, and His strong hand succoured me.
- <sup>10</sup> I was beset with hunger, and the Lord Himself nourished me.
- <sup>11</sup> I was alone, and God comforted me.
- <sup>12</sup> I was sick, and the Lord visited me:
- <sup>13</sup> I was in prison, and my God showed favour unto me;
- <sup>14</sup> In bonds, and He released me;
- <sup>15</sup> Slandered, and He pleaded my cause;
- <sup>16</sup> Bitterly spoken against by the Egyptians, and He delivered me;
- <sup>17</sup> Envied by my fellow-slaves, and He exalted me.
- <sup>18</sup> And this chief captain of Pharaoh entrusted to me his house.
- <sup>19</sup> And I struggled against a shameless woman, urging me to transgress with her; but the God of Israel my father delivered me from the burning flame.
- <sup>20</sup> I was cast into prison, I was beaten, I was mocked; but the Lord granted me to find mercy in the sight of the keeper of the prison . . .

### TORMENTED BY THE EGYPTIAN WOMAN

- <sup>25</sup> How often did the Egyptian woman threaten me with death!
- <sup>26</sup> How often did she give me over to punishment, and then call me back and threaten me, and when I was unwilling to company with her, she said to me:
- <sup>27</sup> Thou shalt be lord of me, and all that is in my house, if thou wilt give thyself unto me, and thou shalt be as our master.
- ...
- <sup>31</sup> And I sought the Lord early, and I wept for the Egyptian woman of Memphis, for very unceasingly did she trouble me, for also at night she came to me under pretence of visiting me.
- ...
- <sup>33</sup> And for a time she embraced me as a son, and I knew it not; but later she sought

to draw me into fornication.

...

<sup>44</sup> And again, at another time she said unto me: If thou wilt not commit adultery, I will kill my husband by poison; and take thee to be my husband.

...

<sup>49</sup> And afterward she sent me food mingled with enchantments.

<sup>50</sup> And when the eunuch who brought it came, I looked up and beheld the terrible man giving me with the dish a sword, and I perceived that her scheme was to beguile me.

...

<sup>62</sup> Then, accordingly seizing an opportunity, she rushed unto me while her husband was yet without, and said unto me: I will hang myself or cast myself over a cliff, if thou wilt not lie with me.

...

<sup>70</sup> At last, then she laid hold of my garments, forcibly dragging me to have connexion with her.

<sup>71</sup> When, therefore, I saw that in her madness she was holding fast to my garment, I left it behind, and fled away naked.

<sup>72</sup> And holding fast to the garment she falsely accused me, and when her husband came he cast me into prison in his house; and on the morrow he scourged me and sent me into Pharaoh's prison.

...

<sup>74</sup> And often hath she sent unto me saying: Consent to fulfil my desire, and I will release thee from thy bonds, and I will free thee from the darkness.

...

<sup>80</sup> For when I was in her house she was wont to bare her arms, and breast, and legs, that I might lie with her; for she was very beautiful, splendidly adorned in order to beguile me.

## JOSEPH REFUSED TO PUT HIS BROTHERS TO SHAME

Chap II, v5:

<sup>5</sup> My brethren knew how my father loved me, and yet I did not exalt myself in my mind: although I was a child, I had the fear of God in my heart; for I knew that all things would pass away.

<sup>6</sup> And I did not raise myself against them with evil intent, but I honoured my brethren; and out of respect for them, even when I was being sold, I refrained from telling the Ishmaelites that I was a son of Jacob, a great man and a mighty.

...

<sup>9</sup> And when I came to the Indocolpitae with the Ishmaelites, they asked me, saying:

<sup>10</sup> Art thou a slave? And I said I was a home-born slave, **that I might not put my brethren to shame.**

<sup>11</sup> And the eldest of them said unto me: Thou art not a slave, for even thy appearance doth make it manifest.

<sup>12</sup> But I said that I was their slave.

...

<sup>43</sup> Now after four and twenty days came the Ishmaelites; for they had heard that Jacob my father was mourning much concerning me.

<sup>44</sup> And they came and said unto me: How is it that thou saidst that thou was a slave? and lo, we have learnt that thou art the son of a mighty man in the land of Canaan, and thy father still mourneth for thee in sackcloth and ashes.

<sup>45</sup> When I heard this my bowels were dissolved and my heart melted, and I desired greatly to weep, but I restrained myself **that I should not put my brethren to shame . . .**

#### THE SELLING OF JOSEPH AND HIS NON-RETALIATION TO HIS BROTHERS

<sup>53</sup> And straightway she sent a eunuch to the Ishmaelites, and asked them to sell me.

<sup>54</sup> But since the eunuch would not agree to buy me at their price he returned having made trial of them, and he made known to the mistress that they asked a large price for their slave.

<sup>55</sup> And she sent another eunuch saying: Even though they demand two minas, give them, do not spare the gold; only buy the boy, and bring him to me.

<sup>56</sup> The eunuch therefore went and gave them **eighty pieces of gold**, and he received me; but to the Egyptian woman he said: **I have given a hundred.**

<sup>57</sup> And though I knew this I held my peace, **lest the eunuch should be put to shame.**

<sup>58</sup> Ye see, therefore, my children, what great things I endured **that I should not put my brethren to shame.**

...

<sup>61</sup> And when my brethren came into Egypt they learnt that I had returned their money unto them, and upbraided them not, and comforted them.

<sup>62</sup> And after the death of Jacob my father, I loved them more abundantly, and all things whatsoever he commanded I did very abundantly for them.

<sup>63</sup> And I suffered them not to be afflicted in the smallest matter; and all that was in my hand I gave unto them.

<sup>64</sup> And their children were my children, and my children were their servants; and their life was my life, and all their suffering was my suffering, and all their sickness was my infirmity.

<sup>65</sup> My land was their land, and their counsel my counsel.

<sup>66</sup> And I exalted not myself among them in arrogance because of my worldly glory, but I was among them as one of the least.

After Jacob's death, the brothers of Joseph thought that maybe Joseph would try to get even for all that they had done to him. After all, with Jacob gone, there would be no longer a father's influence over the family. The brothers knew that if Joseph had any wrath saved up for them, this was the time it was going to be made manifest. At this time, the brothers well knew what they rightfully had coming to them. To understand this, let's read Genesis 50:15-21:

<sup>15</sup> And when Joseph's brethren saw that their father was dead, they said, Joseph will peradventure hate us, and will certainly require us all the evil which we did unto him.

<sup>16</sup> And they sent messengers unto Joseph, saying, Thy father did command before he died, saying,

<sup>17</sup> So shall ye say unto Joseph, Forgive, I pray thee now, the trespass of thy brethren, and their sin; for they did unto thee evil: and now we pray thee, forgive the trespass of the servants of the God of thy father. And Joseph wept when they spake unto him.

<sup>18</sup> And his brethren also went and fell down before his face; and they said, Behold we be thy servants.

<sup>19</sup> And Joseph said unto them, Fear not: for am I in the place of God?

<sup>20</sup> But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive.

<sup>21</sup> Now therefore fear ye not: I will nourish you, and your little ones. And comforted them, and spake kindly unto them.

At this point, we can understand that the position of chief ruler went to Judah and the blessing went to Joseph. Now we have to investigate what happened to the priesthood. I am sure most of you know that Levi received the priesthood, but let's see how it happened. Remember that Jacob said of Levi, Genesis 49:7, *I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel?* This prophecy was fulfilled, exactly as described, with the Tribe of Levi. Because there is more information in the "Testament of Levi" in *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, than there is in the KJV, I am going to quote excerpts from it starting on, page 226, chapter 1, verse 5:

<sup>5</sup> And I was young, about twenty years of age, when with Simeon. I wrought vengeance on Hamor, for our sister Dinah.

<sup>6</sup> And when I was feeding the flocks in Abel-Maul, the spirit of understanding of the Lord came upon me, and I saw all men corrupting their way, and that unrighteousness had built for itself walls, and lawlessness sat upon towers.

<sup>7</sup> And I was grieving **for the race of the sons of men**, and I prayed to the Lord that I might be saved.

- <sup>8</sup> Then there fell upon me a sleep, and I beheld a high mountain, and I was upon it.
- <sup>9</sup> And behold the heavens were opened, and an angel of God said to me, enter.
- <sup>10</sup> And I entered from the first heaven, and I saw there a great sea hanging.
- <sup>11</sup> And further I saw a second heaven brighter and more brilliant, for there was a boundless light therein.
- <sup>12</sup> And I said to the angel, Why is this so? And the angel said to me, Marvel not at this, for thou shalt see another heaven more brilliant and incomparable.
- <sup>13</sup> And when thou hast ascended thither, Thou shalt stand near the Lord, **and shalt be His minister, and shalt declare His mysteries** to men. and shalt proclaim concerning Him that shall redeem Israel.
- <sup>14</sup> **And by thee and Judah shall the Lord appear among men**, saving *every race of men*<sup>1</sup>
- <sup>15</sup> And from the Lord's portion shall be thy life, and He shall be thy field and vineyard, and fruits, gold and silver.
- <sup>16</sup> Here, therefore, regarding the heavens which have been shown to thee.
- <sup>17</sup> The lowest is for this cause gloomy unto thee, in that it beholds all the unrighteous deeds of men.
- <sup>18</sup> And it has fire, snow, and ice made ready for the day of judgment, in the righteous judgment of God; for in it are all the spirits of the retributions for vengeance on men.
- <sup>19</sup> And in the second are the hosts of the armies which are ordained for the day of judgment to work vengeance on the spirits of deceit and of Beliar (Satan).

Chap. II, v.5:

- <sup>5</sup> The light of knowledge shalt thou light up in Jacob, and as the sun shalt thou be **to all the seed of Israel**.
- <sup>6</sup> And there shall be given to thee a blessing, and to all thy seed, until the Lord shall visit all the Gentiles (Israel Nations) in His tender mercies for ever.
- <sup>7</sup> **And therefore there have been given to thee counsel and understanding, that thou mightest instruct thy sons concerning this;**
- ...
- <sup>10</sup> And He said to me: Levi, I have given thee the blessings of the priesthood until I (Yahshua) come and sojourn in the midst of Israel.
- <sup>11</sup> And the angel brought me down to the earth, and gave me a shield and a sword, **and said to me: Execute vengeance on Shechem because of Dinah, thy sister,** and I will be with thee because the Lord hath sent me.

You should notice, this puts a whole different picture on what happened at Shechem than we have heard before. I wonder if Levi ever told Jacob of his vision and the command of the angel to execute vengeance on Shechem? Lets face it, there is more

<sup>1</sup>The word 'race' to mean people cannot be found in Scripture — it should be 'every nation of Adam'

to the story than has been told about this among ordinary sources. You will notice in the 49<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis that Jacob picked a replacement for the chief ruler and the blessing, but never picked a replacement for the priesthood! Yahweh picked Levi for the priesthood and the story is here in the “Testament Of Levi.” Lets continue on with it in chapter2:

<sup>12</sup> And I destroyed at that time the sons of Hamor, as it is written in the heavenly tablets.

<sup>13</sup> And I said to him: I pray thee, O Lord, tell me Thy name, that I may call upon Thee in a day of tribulation.

<sup>14</sup> And he said: I am the angel who intercedeth for the nation of Israel that they may not be smitten utterly, **for every evil spirit attacketh it.**

<sup>15</sup> And after these things I awaked and blessed the Most High, and the angel who intercedeth for the nation of Israel and all the righteous.

Let's now take a look at what these Hivites (ancestors of today's “Jews”) had in mind for all the females of this Hebrew race which Jacob came from! And the Jews are still doing it to our women today! Now continuing at chapter III, verse 6:

<sup>6</sup> But I saw that the sentence of God was for evil upon Shechem; **for they sought to do to Sarah and Rebecca as they had done to Dinah our sister**, but the Lord prevented them.

<sup>7</sup> And they persecuted Abraham our father when he was a stranger, and they vexed his flocks when they were big with young; and Eblaen, who was born in his house, they most shamefully handled.

<sup>8</sup> And they did to all strangers, taking away their wives by force and they banished them.

<sup>9</sup> But the wrath of the Lord came upon them to the uttermost.

<sup>10</sup> And I said to my father Jacob: By thee will the Lord despoil the Canaanites and will give thee their land to thee and to thy seed after thee,

<sup>11</sup> For from this day forward shall Shechem be called a city of imbeciles; for as a man mocketh a fool, so did we mock them.

<sup>12</sup> Because also they had wrought folly in Israel by defiling my sister. And we departed and came to Bethel.

Evidently these Hivites were relates to the people who Abraham and Isaac ran into when they went to Egypt to avoid the famines which each experienced during their day, Genesis 12:10-20 and Genesis 26:1-11, and in each case these people would have violated Sarah and Rebekah respectively as this latter Hivite did to Dinah. Now let's see how Yahweh Himself makes Levi the priest of Israel. Continuing in verse 14:

<sup>14</sup> and I saw seven men in white raiment saying unto me: Arise, put on the robe of the priesthood, and the crown of righteousness, and the breastplate of understanding, and the garment of truth, and the plate of faith, and the turban of the

head, and the ephod of prophecy.

<sup>15</sup> and they severally carried these things and put them on me, and said unto me: From henceforth become a priest of the Lord, thou and thy seed for ever.

<sup>16</sup> And the first anointed me with holy oil, and gave to me the staff of judgment.

<sup>17</sup> The second washed me with pure water, and fed me with bread and wine even the most holy things and clad me with a holy and glorious robe.

<sup>18</sup> The third clothed me with a linen vestment like an ephod.

<sup>19</sup> The fourth put round me a girdle like unto purple.

<sup>20</sup> The fifth gave me a branch of rich olive (symbol of Israel).

<sup>21</sup> The sixth placed a crown on my head.

<sup>22</sup> The seventh placed on my head a diadem of priesthood. and filled my hands with incense, that I might serve as priest to the Lord God.

<sup>23</sup> And they said to me: Levi, thy seed shall be divided into three offices for a sign of the glory of the Lord who is to come.

Finally in the “Testament Of Levi” it explains how Levi is confirmed to hold the offices of priest. We will read chapter III, verses 31-34:

<sup>31</sup> And after two days I and Judah went up with our father Jacob to Isaac our father’s father.

<sup>32</sup> And my father’s father blessed me according to all the words of the visions which I had seen. And he would not come with us to Bethel.

<sup>33</sup> And when we came to Bethel, my father saw a vision concerning me, that I should be their priest unto God.

<sup>34</sup> And he rose early in the morning, and paid tithes of all to the Lord through me. And so we came to Hebron to dwell there.

I don’t know how much plainer it could be than this with Jacob paying his tithes through Levi. This proves that the matter of Levi being the priest was settled long before Genesis 49. Also the story of Tamar proves that Judah had the signet, bracelets and staff (the ruling symbols of his tribe) long before Genesis 49. And I am sure that the matter of Joseph getting the double blessing was also settled much before Genesis 49. There is one more passage that I want to quote from the “Testament Of Levi”, chapter III, verses 37-38:

<sup>37</sup> And each day he was instructing me, and was busied on my behalf before the Lord, and said to me: Beware of the spirit of fornication; for this shall continue and shall by thy seed pollute the holy place.

<sup>38</sup> **Take, therefore to thyself a wife without blemish or pollution,** while yet thou are young, and not of the *race* (non-kindred) of strange nations.

As I said before, the word “race” as a group of people cannot be found in either the Old or New Testament. If you go to the *Wilson’s Old Testament Word Studies* by William



Wilson (which will take you from an English word to a Hebrew word), page 337, there are only two references to the word “race” and it means “path” in one place and “running” in the other. And if you go to *An Expository Dictionary Of The New Testament Words* by W. E. Vine (which will take you from an English word to a Greek word), page 244, the word “race” means “a contest” or a “racecourse.” It also says for “race” (kindred) see “kind.” The word “race” in English can be used to denote people of different ethnic groups, so it would be proper in English to say the “race of Adam.”<sup>2</sup>

## THE KJV ON LEVI

In the Old Testament of the KJV, nothing is mentioned of the Levitical priesthood until Moses is born of a Levite father and mother, Exodus 2:1-2. It seems that one Amram took him Jochebed, his father’s sister to wife and she bare him Aaron and Moses, Exodus 6:20. Nothing more is said of setting up the descendants of Levi to the Levitical priesthood until Numbers 3:6-13:

<sup>6</sup> Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the priest, that they may minister unto them.

<sup>7</sup> And they shall keep his charge, and the charge of the whole congregation before the tabernacle of the congregation, to do the service of the tabernacle.

<sup>8</sup> And they shall keep all the instruments of the tabernacle of the congregation, and charge of the children of Israel, to do the service of the tabernacle.

<sup>9</sup> And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to his sons: they are wholly given into him out of the children of Israel.

<sup>10</sup> And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on their priest’s office: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.

<sup>11</sup> And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

<sup>12</sup> And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the firstborn that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel: therefore the Levites shall be mine;

<sup>13</sup> Because all the firstborn are mine; for on the day that I smote all the firstborn

---

<sup>2</sup> Revision note made 2-9-2001: The research which I did on the word “race” is correct. While the word race does not appear in either the Old or New Testament, there are other words which imply race, and should be translated as such. 1 Peter 2:9 and Isaiah 49:6 are good examples. Almost three years after I had written this teaching letter, I was challenged on this. I checked in *The American Heritage Dictionary*, which is a dictionary that traces most all of the European languages back to the Indo-European family of languages. Under “race” #1, it says “French, group of people, generation, perhaps ultimately from Latin *ratio*, a reckoning, account. See *ratio*.” ... “*Ratio*: Relation in degree or number between two similar things; rate.” It would appear the word “race” might be a comparison. If this is true, the word “race” may be an offshoot of the Latin word “ratio” meaning “rate.” They do sound somewhat alike.

in the land of Egypt I hallowed unto me all the firstborn in Israel, both man and beast: mine shall they be: I am the LORD.

Numbers 3:12 also affirms, along with *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* from the *Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, that the Levites were chosen instead of the first born — the first born being Reuben. The KJV does not state it in that way, but that is the reason. If Reuben hadn't disqualified himself, his children would have had the priesthood instead of Levi. This does not mean that the first born male of each family in Israel is not still the ruler, priest and responsible for the care for any widowed mother or unmarried sisters if he is capable. He is still to receive his double portion by Yahweh's Law.





## LETTER 6

---

In this issue, we are going to consider another angle on Judah. If I would have continued my usual chronological study of Judah, I would have eventually gotten to what we are going to study in this lesson. I feel it is important to skip ahead because I received a letter from a man (I won't say who he is) saying that the Sephardim Jews may be of the satanic seed-line, but the Ashkenazi cannot be as they were only "converted" to Judaism. I thought about what he had said, and I said to myself, "I wonder how many other people may be under this false allusion?" Well, you say, "What does this have to do with Judah?" — It has everything to do with Judah! It has everything to do with Judah because the Jews falsely claim to be of Judah (Revelation 2:9; 3:9). With this lesson, we are going to prove that the Ashkenazi Jews are just as satanic as the Sephardim. If you have not read Arthur Koestler's book, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, you will have some catching up to do. Also, if you have not read my *Research Papers Proving Two-Seedline Seduction Of Eve* (that the Jews are descendants of Cain), then, you have more catching up to do. Basically, Arthur Koestler does a very good job of proving the Khazars of Khazaria were converted to Judaism, but he does not include all of the facts. With this lesson, we are going to consider some of these missing facts.

### A GENERAL VIEW OF THE KHAZARS

Before I go into detail, on the subject we are about to consider, I would like to give you a short overview concerning the Khazars. You will notice the word Khazar is spelled various ways, so don't let that confuse you as we go along. To get this short overview of this subject, I am going to quote from the *Collier's Encyclopedia* of 1985:

"**KHAZARS** [kaza'rz], a seminomadic tribe of Turkish or Tarter origin who first appeared north of the Caucasus in the early part of the third century. In the sev-

enth century the Khazars conquered the kingdom of the Bulgars. They built up a strong and prosperous state, which attained its greatest size in the ninth century, when it extended from the Crimea to the middle Volga and westward to the Dnepr (Dnieper) River, including the city of Kiev. The Khazars developed some important commercial cities and carried on trade between Russia and Constantinople. The khaghan or ruler of the Khazars was also the religious head of the state. Tolerant of other religions, **the khaghan welcomed thousands of Jews from Asia Minor and the Byzantine Empire**, as well as many Muslims and Christians. These three religious groups vied with one another to convert the Khazars, who had a primitive, idolatrous belief. In the eighth century (700's) Khaghan Bulan decided in favor of the Jews and accepted Judaism for himself and for his people, but the Khazar state continued religious tolerance. It was finally overthrown in A.D. 965 by a coalition of the Christian Russians and the Byzantines. The Khazars soon disappeared, either fleeing to Central Asia or intermingling with other peoples in southern Russia. The last vestiges of the Khazars in the Crimea were destroyed by the Greeks and Russians in 1016."

The important thing to note in the quote above is the part I underlined, "**the khaghan welcomed thousands of Jews from Asia Minor and the Byzantine Empire.**" You have to understand that these Jews who were swarming into Khazaria were the Sephardim which were expelled from Jerusalem in 70 A.D. These were Jews that can be traced back to Cain. We are going to go into detail how these Jews from "Asia Minor and the Byzantine Empire" happened to migrate to Khazaria. To show how the Khazars were converted to Judaism by these Asia Minor Sephardim Jews, we will use the Jew's own history books and let them tell you in their own words. We are going to start by quoting *The History Of The Jews* by Heinrich Graetz, volume III (of a set of 7 volumes), pages 138-140 (The "Jew's" Own Words):

"The heathen king of a barbarian people, living in the north, together with all his court, adopted the Jewish religion. The Chazars, or Khozars, a nation of Finnish origin, related to the Bulgars, Avars, Ugurs or Hungarians, had settled, after the dissolution of the empire of the Huns, on the frontier between Europe and Asia. They had founded a kingdom on the Volga (which they called the Itil or Atel) at the place near which it runs into the Caspian Sea, in the neighborhood of Astrakham, now the home of the Kalmucks. Their kings, who bore the title of Chakan or Chagan, had led these warlike sons of the steppe from victory to victory. The Chazars inspired the Persians with so great a dread that Chosroes, one of their kings, found no other way of protecting his dominions against their violent invasions than by building a strong wall which blocked up the passes between the Caucasus and the sea. But this 'gate of gates' (Babal abwab, near Derbend) did not long serve as a barrier against the warlike courage of the Chazars. After the fall of the Persian empire, they crossed the Caucasus, invaded Armenia, and conquered the Crimean peninsula, which bore the name Chazaria for some time. The Byzantine empires

trembled at the name of the Chazars, flattered them, and paid them a tribute, in order to restrain their lust after the booty of Constantinople. The Bulgarians, and other tribes, were the vassals of the Chazars, and the people of Kiev (Russians) on the Dnieper were obliged to pay them as an annual tax a sword and a fine skin for every household. With the Arabs, whose near neighbors they gradually became, they carried on terrible wars.

“Like their neighbors, the Bulgarians and the Russians, the Chazars professed a coarse religion, which was combined with sensuality and lewdness. The Chazars became acquainted with Islam and Christianity through the Arabs and Greeks, who came to the capital, Balanyair, on matters of business, in order to exchange the products of their countries for fine furs. **There were also Jews in the land of the Chazars; they were some of the fugitives that had escaped (723) from the mania for conversion which possessed the Byzantine Emperor Leo. It was through these Greek Jews that the Chazars became acquainted with Judaism. As interpreters or merchants, physicians or counselors, the Jews were known and beloved by the Chazar court, and they inspired the warlike king Bulan with a love of Judaism.**

“In subsequent times, however, the Chazars had but a vague knowledge of the motive which induced their forefathers to embrace Judaism. One of their later Chagans gives the following account of their conversation: The king Bulan conceived a horror of the foul idolatry of his ancestors, and prohibited its exercise within his dominions, without, however, adopting any other form of religion. He was encouraged by a dream in his endeavors to discover the proper manner of worshipping God. Having gained a great victory over the Arabs, and conquered the Armenian fortress of Ardelib, Bulan determined to adopt the Jewish religion openly. The Caliph and the Byzantine emperor desired, however, to induce the king of the Chazars to embrace their respective religions, and with this intention sent Bulan deputations with letters and valuable presents, and men well versed in religious matters. The king thereupon arranged for a religious discussion to take place before him between a Byzantine ecclesiastic, a Mahometan sage, and a learned Jew. The champions of the three religions disputed the whole question, however, without being able to convince one another or the king of the superior excellence of their respective religions as compared with the other two. But as Bulan had remarked that the representatives of the religion of Christ and of Islam both referred to Judaism as the foundation and point of departure of their faiths, he declared to the ambassadors of the Caliph and the Emperor that, as he had heard from opponents of Judaism themselves an impartial avowal of the excellence of that religion, he would carry out his intention of professing Judaism as his religion.”

I don't know how much of the above quotation you understand, but I want to repeat the part I underlined as it is important in understanding what is going on here:

**“There were also Jews in the land of the Chazars; they were some of the fugitives that had escaped (723) from the mania for conversion which possessed the Byzantine Emperor Leo. It was through these Greek Jews that the Chazars became acquainted with Judaism. As interpreters or merchants, physicians or counselors, the Jews were known and beloved by the Chazar court, and they inspired the warlike king Bulan with a love of Judaism.”**

Now we have to find out what was going on in the Byzantine Empire in 723 A.D. and what “Emperor Leo” had to do with it. To understand this we will go to pages 122-124 of this same book, *The History Of The Jews*, by: Heinrich Graetz, volume III (of a set of 7 volumes):

“At about this time the Jews of the Byzantine empire were subjected to severe persecution, from the effect of which they did not for a long time recover, and this, too, at the hands of a monarch from whom they had least expected hostile treatment. **Leo the Isaurian**, the son of rude peasant parents, having had his attention drawn by the Jews and the Arabs to the idolatrous character of the image-worship which obtained in the churches, had undertaken a campaign with the intention of destroying these images. Being denounced, however, before the uncultivated mob as a heretic and a Jew by the image-worshipping clergy, **Leo** proceeded to vindicate his orthodoxy by persecuting the heretics and the Jews. He issued a decree commanding all Jews of the Byzantine empire and the remnant of the Montanists (Christians looking for Yahshua’s return in their day) in Asia Minor to embrace the Christianity of the Greek Church, under pain of severe punishment (723). Many Jews submitted to this decree, and reluctantly received baptism; they were thus less steadfast than the Montanists, who, in order to remain faithful to their convictions, assembled in their house of prayer, set fire to it, and perished in the flames. Such of the Jews as had allowed themselves to be baptized were of the opinion that the storm would soon blow over, and that they would be permitted to return to Judaism. It was, therefore, only outwardly that they embraced Christianity; for they observed the Jewish rites in secret, thereby subjecting themselves to fresh persecutions. **Thus the Jews of the Byzantine empire pined away under unceasing petty persecution, and for a time they are hidden from the view of history.**

**“Many Jews of the Byzantine empire, however, escaped compulsory baptism by emigration.** They quitted (left) a country in which their forefathers had settled long before the rise of that Church which had so persistently persecuted them. **The Jews of Asia Minor** (Byzantine) chose as their home the neighboring Cimmarian of Tauric peninsula (the Crimea), whose uncivilized inhabitants, of Scythian, Finnish and Slavonian origin, practised idolatry. These Alani, Bulgarians and **Chazars** were, however, not jealous of men of other race, and of a different belief who settled in their vicinity. Thus, side by side with the Jewish communities

which had existed from early times, there arose new communities on the shores of the Black Sea and the Straits of Theodosia (Kaffa), and in the interior, in Sulchat (Solgat, now Eski-Crimea), in Phanagoria (now Taman), and on the Bosporea (Kertch), which lies opposite. From the Crimea the Greek (Byzantine Jews) spread toward the Caucasus, and the hospitable countries of the Chazars on the west coast of the Caspian Sea and at the mouth of the Volga (Atel). Jewish communities settled in Berdaa (Derbend), at the Albanian Gates, in Semender (Tarki), and finally in Balanyiar, the capital of the land of the Chazars. By their energy, ability and intelligence, the Greek-Jewish emigrants speedily acquired power in the midst of these barbarian nations, and prepared the way for an important historical event.”

What we have in the above quote on pages 122-124 are a large number of Sephardic (Cain satanic) Jews migrating from Asia Minor of the Byzantine Empire into the land of the Khazars. There were thousands, if not, tens of thousands of these Sephardic descendants of Cain in this migration! The conversion of king Bulan was in 740 A.D. and then the mixing of the Sephardic and the Ashkenazi started to take place. They have now had 1,275 years to mix the blood of Cain among themselves making them all satanic.

Let’s consider another Jewish source on this subject from, *The History Of The Jews*, by Paul Goodman (Revised And Enlarged By Israel Cohen), pages 87-89:

“*The Chazars*. The Jewish forces in Babylonia had been fatally weakened by the decay and final extinction of the venerable and universally received dignities of the Prince of the Captivity and the Gaonate; the Karaites had created the first and only irreparable schism in the body of Israel (Jews); the once tolerant and enlightened caliphs had begun to persecute the unbelieving Jews and Christians with equal impartiality; **even the Byzantine Empire Leo the Isaurian, being accused of ‘execrable’ Judaizing tendencies on account of his iconoclastic activities, cleared himself of all suspicion by subjecting the Jews to cruel persecution** — yet these were only the labors preceding the birth of one of the greatest and most fruitful epochs of Jewish history. From widely different quarters, at the shores of the Euxine and the Gates of Hercules, on the banks of the Volga and the Guadalquivir, Judaism received unexpected accessions of strength, while on the Rhine also the old Jewish tree blossomed out with renewed splendor . . .

“Of greater consequence was the migration of the Jews along the trade routes of the Black Sea and the Volga. In this region lived the Chazars, a people of Tarter race, whose chagan, Bulan, together with his nobles, adopted the Jewish religion (about 740). From the scanty records that have been preserved of this Jewish kingdom of the Chazars, which subsisted for a period of about 250 years, it appears that it had its capital, Atel, near the present Astrakhan, on the Volga, while the Chazarian territory stretched all over the south of Russia. The incursions of

the Chazars were so dreaded by the Persians that they built a great wall across the Caucasus to keep them away, while imperial Byzantium had to buy off their hostility by ill-disguised payments, and the Russian dukes of Kiev were forced to recognize the authority of the Jewish chagans of the Chazars by a fixed tribute. The country of the Jewish Chazars was governed in a spirit of exceptional tolerance, so that, for instance, the supreme court of justice was composed of two Jews, two Christians, two Mohammedans and one pagan to represent the Russians and Bulgars. The chagan Obadiah, the successor of Bulan, invited a number of Jewish teachers into his country, to instruct the people in the tenets of Judaism, and it was only the difficulties of distance and travel which kept this Jewish State from the general knowledge of the Jews. It was through ambassadors from Byzantium that Hasdai ibn Shaprut, a Jewish statesman at the court of Cordova in the middle of the tenth century, became acquainted with the fact of their existence. and it is to an extant correspondence he initiated with the chagan Joseph that we are indebted for our information regarding the Jewish Chazars. They maintained their power until the year 969, when Sviatoslav, Duke of Kiev, conquered the capital and territory of the Chazars. Many of them withdrew to the Crimea, which also became known as Chazaria, but their political power had gone, and they were lost in the mass of Jews and Karaites who had settled there and in southeastern Europe generally.”

Now we shall investigate the history that led up to the persecution of the Sephardim Jews which ultimately drove them massively into the Khazarian Empire. The next quotation will be taken from *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, The Age Of Faith*, by Will Durant, pages 425-426:

“Leo III (Leo the Isaurian) derived his cognomen (surname) from the district of Isauria in Cilicia; according to Theophanes he was born there of Armenian parentage. His father moved thence to Thrace, raised sheep, and sent 500 of them, with his son Leo in the bargain, as a present to the Emperor Justinian II. Leo became guardsman of the palace, then commander of the Anatolian legions, finally, by the convincing suffrage of the army, emperor. He was a man of ambition, strong will, and patient perseverance; a general who repeatedly defeated Moslem forces greatly superior to his own; a statesman who gave the Empire the stability of just laws justly enforced, reformed taxation, reduced serfdom, extended peasant proprietorship, distributed lands, repopulated deserted regions, and constructively revised the laws. His only fault was autocracy.

“Perhaps in his Asiatic youth he had imbibed from Moslems, Jews, Manicheans, Monophysites, and Paulicians a Stoic-Puritan conception of religion that condemned the addiction of popular Christianity to image worship, ceremonialism and superstition. The Old Testament (Deut. iv, 15) had explicitly forbidden any ‘graven image of any figure, male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth.’



The early Church had frowned upon images as relics of paganism, and had looked with horror upon pagan sculptures purporting to represent the gods. But the triumph of Christianity under Constantine, and the influence of Greek surroundings, traditions, and statuary in Constantinople and the Hellenistic East, had softened this opposition. As the number of worshiped saints multiplied, a need arose for identifying and remembering them; pictures of them and of Mary were produced in great number; and in the case of Christ not only His imagined form but His cross became objects of reverence — even, for simple minds, magic talismans. A natural freedom of fancy among the people turned the holy relics, pictures, and statues into objects of adoration; people prostrated themselves before them, kissed them, burned candles and incense before them, crowned them with flowers, and sought miracles from their occult influence. In Greek Christianity especially, sacred images were everywhere — in churches, monasteries, houses and shops, even on furniture, trinkets, and clothes. Cities in danger from epidemic, famine, or war tended to rely upon the power of the relics they harbored, or on their patron saint, rather than on human enterprise. Fathers and councils of the Church repeatedly explained that the images were not deities, but only reminders thereof; the people did not care to make such distinctions.

“Leo III was offended by these excesses of popular faith; it seemed to him that paganism was in this manner reconquering Christianity; and he felt keenly that satire directed by Moslems, Jews, and Christian sects against the superstitions of the orthodox multitude. To weaken the power of the monks over the people and the government, and win the support of Nestorians and Monophysites, he assembled a great council of bishops and senators, and with their consent he promulgated in 726 an edict requiring the complete removal of icons from the churches; representatives of Christ and the Virgin were forbidden; and church murals were to be covered with plaster. Some of the higher clergy supported the edict; the lower clergy and the monks protested, the people revolted. Soldiers trying to enforce the law were attacked by worshipers horrified and infuriated by this desecration of the dearest symbols of their faith. In Greece and the Cyclades rebel forces proclaimed a rival emperor, and sent a fleet to capture the capital. Leo destroyed the fleet, and imprisoned the leaders of the opposition. In Italy, where pagan forms of worship never died, the people were almost unanimous against the edict; Venice, Ravenna, and Rome drove out the Imperial officers; and a council of Western bishops summoned by Pope Gregory II anathematized the Iconoclasts — image breakers — without naming the Emperor. The patriarch of Constantinople joined in the revolt, and sought by it to restore the independence of the Eastern Church from the state. Leo deposed him (730), but did him no violence; and the edict was so mildly enforced that when Leo died (741), most of the churches retained their frescoes and mosaics unharmed.”

We will find some more information about the Jewish persecution that was going on as a result of the image breaking, at this period, from this same book, and we will

quote again from *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, The Age Of Faith*, by Will Durant, page 389:

“The Byzantine emperors continued for two centuries the oppressive politics of Justinian toward the Jews. Heraclius (628) banished them from Jerusalem in retaliation for their aid to Persia, and did all he could to exterminate them. **Leo the Isaurian sought to disprove the rumor that he was Jewish by a decree (723) giving Byzantine Jews a choice between Christianity or banishment.** Some submitted; some burned themselves to death in their synagogues rather than yield.”

I am having to present a lot of history here in order to make understandable the extent of the movement against the images and how it affected the migration of the Jews out of the Byzantine Empire and into the friendly area of Khazaria. It was a natural movement for the Sephardic to make as the Khazars were very tolerant with all religions. Not only was Leo the Isaurian involved with this anti-image movement, but it continued altogether for 120 years by him and his successors. In 120 years, there was a lot of time for a great number of these Sephardic Jews to move out of the Byzantine Empire. I am going to use another quote from the *Manual of Universal Church History* by the Rev. Dr. John Alzog, volume II (from a 3 volume work), pages 207-209, under the heading, “Byzantine Iconoclasts.” I wish to state here: although this comes out of a “universalist” manual, I do not promote universalism in any manner, shape or form. I use this reference for its historic value only!

“The origin of this deplorable controversy is usually ascribed to **Leo the Isaurian**, a rude and ignorant soldier, who rising from the humblest walks of life, finally succeeded, by the aid of the army, in reaching the imperial throne (A.D. 717). **Having already employed violent measures to compel the Jews to receive baptism**, and driven the Montanists to such a degree of desperation that they frequently resorted to suicide to escape his tyranny, he next turned his attention to the task of suppressing the use of images. He brought to the contest the fierce spirit of the law-giver of Mecca rather than the moderation of the one of Sinai, declaring ‘he could not endure that Christ should be represented under the form of a dumb and senseless figure, made of coarse material and bedaubed with vulgar colors’, and that such representations would shock both Jews and Mohammedans and repel them from Christianity. He therefore assumed the office of a self-constituted reformer of the Church, and set about putting an end to this superstition. He commenced by ordering Pope Gregory II to have the images and paintings on the walls of the churches raised sufficiently high to be beyond the reach of the embraces and kisses of the devout multitude, thus, as he thought, preventing profanation and removing the occasion of sin.

“Finding that his order was ineffectual, he published, in the year 726, in spite of the representations and protest of *Germanus*, Patriarch of Constantinople, and

other theologians of the capital, an edict forbidding the veneration of statues, images and mosaics, and the branding of the practice as idolatrous.

“This edict was shortly followed by a second (C.A.D. 730) of a far more severe and sweeping character, ordering the complete destruction of all images throughout the Western Empire. No words can convey an adequate idea of the agitation and tumult which followed its promulgation. The question, unlike any abstruse definition of a dogma, or authoritative solution of a subtle point of metaphysics, was within the comprehension of the multitude, and bore directly upon their religious life and devotional habits. It has been said that if an order were issued at the present day (1872), commanding the breaking and destroying of all the statues and images of the Blessed Virgin set up along the country highways and metropolitan thoroughfares of any Catholic country of Europe, no such revulsion of feeling would take place as that which followed the promulgation of Leo’s edict.

“The soldiers charged with its execution were treated with every sort of indignity, and frequently lost their lives in endeavoring to carry its instructions into effect.

“Above the bronze portal of the imperial palace stood a magnificent image of Christ, which was held in great reverence by the people. According to Theophanes and Cedrenus, the destroying of this was the occasion of a popular tumult, in which many of the participants paid with their lives the penalty of their devotion. When a soldier of the imperial guard had placed a ladder against the gateway, for the purpose of taking down the image, a number of ladies collected around begged him to spare it for their sakes. But, instead of heeding their remonstrances and acceding to their wishes, he struck the face of the image a blow with his ax — an act which so wounded the religious sensibilities, and so excited the indignation of the ladies that, forgetting for the time the gentleness of their sex, and yielding to the fierce impulse of the moment, they drew the ladder from under the soldier’s feet, precipitated him to the ground, set upon and murdered him.

“The chief opposition came from the monks who supplied the images and the bulk of the people who entertained great reverence for them.”

I could go on with this subject about the images for a long time, but I think you can see by now the importance of these events in connection with the forced migrations of the Sephardic Jews out of the Byzantine Empire into the Khazar Empire. What is interesting in Arthur Koestler’s book, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, is the fact he only devotes a single phrase within one sentence about the persecution of the Jews in the Byzantine Empire. This is the phrase found on page 16, “*in defiance of Christian proselytizing by Byzantium.*” Koestler is not completely honest with his presentation. He tells you a lot of truth, but leaves you with the impression that the Jews are a religion and not a race. The Jews are of many races, but they have one thing in common; they all have

the blood of Cain flowing in their veins. I recommend that any of you who haven't read his book to do so, but remember he has something to hide. Now on page 22, Koestler, for a moment leaves the cat out of the bag in describing the looks of some of the Khazars. Let's read it:

"Lastly the Arab geographer Istakhri, one of the main Arab sources, has this to say: 'The Khazars do not resemble the Turks. They are black-haired, and are of two kinds, one called the Kara-Khazars, [Black Khazars] **who are swarthy** verging on deep black as if they were a kind of Indian, and a white kind [Ak-Khazars], who are strikingly handsome.' This is more flattering, but only adds to the confusion. For it was customary among the Turkish peoples to refer to the ruling classes or clans as 'white', to the lower strata as 'black'."

**This does not add to the confusion** as these **dark haired swarthy Khazars** describes the Sephardic Jews perfectly. I think that Koestler is, again, trying to throw you off the track. I would trust the Arab before I would trust Koestler. No doubt, after the Jew from Asia minor was among the Khazars long enough, he was also referred to as a Khazar. Again, on page 25, Koestler mentions a very adept famed rhetorician by the name of Priscus of the Byzantine Empire. Let's read this comment:

"But Priscus also has anecdotes to tell about a people subject to the Huns whom he calls Akatzars — that is, very likely the Ak-Khazars, or 'White' Khazars (as distinct from the 'Black' Kara-Khazars)."

Now we will pick up another witness to this mixing of the Sephardim stock with the Ashkenazi stock. I am going to quote from an article out of *The Forum*, March 1926, volume LXXV, No. 3, entitled *The Pedigree Of Judah*, by Lothrop Stoddard (which I should point out is a better anthropologists than a Bible student) pages 16-18:

"The evolution of eastern Jewry is at once more obscure and more complicated. Their prosperity was gravely compromised by the Mohammedan conquest and conversion of Mesopotamia and Persia in the seventh century A.D. Harried and persecuted by Moslem zealots, the Jews grew restless and sought an avenue of escape. They presently found it to the northward in the plains of southern Russia, where opportunities beckoned them, perhaps more favorable than ever before in their history. Southern Russia was then occupied by the people known as the Khazars. Precisely what the Khazars were racially is a much disputed point. Probably they were predominantly of broad-headed Turkish stock from Central Asia, together with a strong strain of flat-faced, short-statured Mongoloids from still farther eastward. They certainly built up a flourishing state which derived its prosperity from its command of the overland trading-routes between the Near and Middle East, the Khazars being a mercantile town-dwelling folk. From the first they had been in contact with the numerous Jews of the Caucasus, and the two

peoples had got along well together. Soon the Jews of Khazaria became so numerous and influential that they made a cultural and spiritual conquest of their hosts. The Khazars became converted to Judaism and established what amounted to a Jewish state. **This acted like a magnet to the whole of eastern Jewry, and one of those vast mass-migrations which have occurred several times in Jewish history took place.** In the eighth century A.D. (700's), Mesopotamia, Persia, and the Armenian-Caucasian area still contained the bulk of the world's Jewish population. By the end of the tenth century (900's) these lands were almost emptied of Jews. Lured to Khazaria as to the 'Promised Land', Jewry pushed northward from Asia into southeastern Europe, — swarming in by the hundred thousand, by sea, river, and by mountain trail.

“And during those two centuries was forged the Ashkenazic stock of to-day. **This migration involved sweeping racial changes.** In the first place, Jewry's slow progress through the Armenian and Caucasian highlands implied a further admixture and strengthening of the Armenoid at the expense of the Semitic racial element. **Then, once in Khazaria, extensive intermarriage with the converted Khazars resulted in a further influx of Turkish and Mongoloid blood.** The result was a population prevailingly round-headed and thick-set, but with two outstanding facial types: the full-faced, hook-nosed Armenoid; and the flat-faced, squat-or pug-nosed Mongoloid, respectively. The Semitic type must have almost entirely disappeared. The consequences of this racial transformation were as unprecedented as they were far-reaching. Hitherto the base elements in Jewry's ethnic make-up had been either Semitic or Armenoid, waxing and waning in relative importance from age to age, it is true, yet still always preponderant, no other racial element having been sufficiently important to shake their joint significance. **Now, for the first time, radically new ethnic elements from Central and Eastern Asia, were injected into the Jewish blood, and injected in such volume as powerfully and permanently to alter the nature of the great mass of the Jewish people.** The profound differences, not merely in physical appearance, but also in mentality and temperament, which exist between Ashkenazim and Sephardim are thus clearly explained. They are obviously due to almost complete differences in racial make-up. The Sephardim have for the past thousand years been breeding away from the old Armenoid toward the long-headed Semitic and Mediterranean racial types. The Ashkenazim, on the contrary, have not only been breeding away from the Semitic toward the Armenoid type, but have also taken up a great amount of Central Asian and Mongoloid blood which was unknown to ancient Jewry and which has never flowed in Sephardim's veins.

“Great as is the present difference between Ashkenazim and Sephardim, however, it is not quite as great as the divergence eight hundred or nine hundred years ago, owing to certain minor modifications which have since taken place. The evolution of the modern Ashkenazim was not quite complete. By the eleventh

century, the Khazar Empire, grown rich and warlike, collapsed before the assaults of its enemies, and the Jewish masses, again fallen on evil times, drifted slowly westward in search of better opportunities. Seeping across southern Russia, they began to appear in Poland. This movement was soon accelerated by the action of the Polish Kings. Intent on building up a strong state, the Polish monarchs welcomed the Jews in order to build up a middle class devoted to industry and trade. **Immediately Poland became what Khazaria had once been,— a magnet of Jewish mass-migration. And these Jewish immigrants, though mainly from the east, came in lesser numbers, from the west as well.** Western Europe had by that time become the scene of bitter anti-Jewish persecutions, so that, there also, many Jews heeded the welcome summons of the Polish Crown. **Here, then, on Polish soil, the long-sundered branches of Jewry met once more.** The immigration from Western Europe were, of course, Sephardim, and though too few in number materially to affect the Ashkenazic physical type, they did impose their superior culture and a debased form of their Germanic speech, which mixed with Hebrew, Slavic, and other linguistic elements, constitutes the present jargon known as Yiddish, employed by the Polish Jews to this day. **The slight infusion of Sephardic blood gained during the Middle Ages, together with considerable Slovic blood picked up during their migrations through Russia and Poland, complete the racial evolution of the modern Ashkenazic stock in its present Polish home.”**

There is a possibility that the Khazars may already have had some of Cain’s satanic blood flowing in their veins before the mass-migrations of the Sephardim Jews into Khazaria and the conversion of King Bulan. We learn from Genesis 15:19-21 that the Canaanites (Jews) were made up from ten different nations. The first mentioned of these nations were the “Kenites” who were descendants of Cain. The fourth mentioned are the Hittites. It is a pretty well accepted fact (even by standard Bible commentaries) that these ten nations mixed with each other to become commonly known as “Canaanites.” Knowing that the Hittites were among them, let’s take another quote from *The Forum*, March 1926, volume LXXV, No. 3, entitled “The Pedigree Of Judah”, by Lothrop Stoddard (which I should point out is a better anthropologists than a Bible student), page 12:

“Even more striking is the parallel between the ancient Hittites and a large proportion of the modern Ashkenazim. One cannot look at a Hittite sculpture without being struck by the ‘Jewishness’ of the face there depicted. The famous ‘Jewish nose’, with its peculiarly hooked nostril, is found to be not exclusively Jewish, but to have been shared by the ancient Hittites, and also by modern peoples of the West Asiatic Highlands. Many Armenians, Caucasians, and Anatolians to-day look so much like this type of Jew that it is practically impossible to distinguish them by their physical appearance.

“Here, then, we seem to have found two primal elements in Jewry’s racial make-up: an ancient cross between Semitic and Hittite-Armenoid stocks. Which was the original root? Almost certainly, the Semitic. The entire weight of evidence tends to show that the Jews were originally a tribe of nomadic Semites who migrated from the desert lands on the southward into Palestine,— geographically a borderland between Arabia and the West Asian Highlands. Here they encountered folk of Hittite-like stock and took up a certain amount of Hittite blood, though for a long time the Semitic strain must have predominated.”

Now that you have some understanding of the Jewish question, and understand that the blood of Cain is flowing in both the Sephardim and Ashkenazic branches of Jewry, take time and listen to some of the stupid statements made by people like Ted R. Weiland, James W. Bruggeman, Stephen E. Jones, Charles Weisman and Pete Peters and you will begin to understand how false their teachings are. They will tell you that the Jews of “Christ’s” time were pure blooded Israelites. What more proof do you need to understand they are teaching you lies?!?! I could have gone on several more pages with documentation that the Sephardim and Ashkenazi continued to mix since the conversion of Bulan. Some of the Khazars went to Spain while many many Sephardim went to Khazaria. It is my deepest desire that this presentation will clear up this issue in your minds so you can get it out of the way and go on to deeper truths. Two Seed-line is the only truth concerning Jews. The most important thing you have to do is prove these things for yourself!









## LESSON 7

---

In the last Issue, I showed how the Ashkenazi and Sephardim Jews have been mixing for the last 1,275 years, since the conversion of King Bulan in 740 A.D., to spread the satanic blood of Cain among all of them. There is no such thing as a good Jew. You will remember that in lesson #4, I said that Judah became both a blessing and a curse. In this session, we are going to discuss the process of how Judah became a curse.

### JUDAH BECOMES A CURSE

If you have not read lessons #2 and #3 along with my “*Research Papers Proving Two-Seedline Seduction Of Eve*”, I advise you to do so as it will help you in understanding the lesson we are about to study here. In lessons #2 and #3 we discussed Judah’s personal family life, and established the following:

- ▷ Judah was entrapped by a Canaanite woman, Bathshua, into marrying her and having three half-breed children by her, Er ,Onan and Shelah.
- ▷ Judah obtains a wife, Tamar (of pure Adamic blood), from the house of Shem for Er, but he ejaculates on the ground rather than consummate the marriage, and Yahweh kills him.
- ▷ Judah gives Onan to Tamar as a levirate for Er, whereupon he does the same as his brother, and Yahweh kills him also.
- ▷ Judah promises his third son Shelah to Tamar as soon as he reaches marrying age, and sends Tamar to her father’s house.

- ▷ Shelah reaches marrying age whereupon Bathshua, his mother, marries him to a Canaanite woman causing a total breach of contract with Tamar and then Bathshua shortly dies.
- ▷ Tamar being still a maiden and Judah an eligible widower, Tamar decides upon a very daring plan to trick Judah into supplying the seed to fulfill the contract by feigning to be a common whore and twin boys were born by this union of Judah and Tamar; Perez and Zarah.

We know what happened to Er and Onan, but what ever happened to Shelah? That is the topic of this lesson, for with Shelah, Judah became a curse. The half-breed Shelah and his Canaanite descendants became a very prominent family living among the Israelites, and it is very important that we understand what happened to him and his descendants. Even the best Bible students have never figured out what happened to this family. After this lesson, you will be among the very few who will know this fuller extent of the descendants of Shelah.

In Genesis 38:5, 11, 14, and 26, we are told of Shelah's birth; Judah's promise to Tamar to give Shelah in marriage to her; Tamar's plan to avoid Shelah and choose Judah for a husband rather than Shelah; and Judah's acknowledgment of his broken promise to give Shelah to Tamar. Let's read these four passages:

<sup>5</sup> And she again conceived, and bare a son; and called his name Shelah: and he was at Chezib, when she bare him.

...

<sup>11</sup> Then said Judah to Tamar his daughter in law, Remain a widow at thy father's house, till Shelah my son be grown: for he said, Lest peradventure he die also, as his brethren did.

...

<sup>14</sup> And she put her widow's garments off from her, and covered her with a vail, and wrapped herself, and sat in an open place, which is by the way to Timnath; for she saw that Shelah was grown, and she was not given unto him to wife.

...

<sup>26</sup> And Judah acknowledged them, and said, She hath been more righteous than I; because that I gave her not to Shelah my son. And he knew her again no more.

The next reference in the Bible concerning Shelah is found in Genesis 46:12 and reads thusly:

And the sons of Judah; Er, and Onan, and **Shelah**, and Pharez, and Zarah: but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. And the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul.

In the next passage we are going to consider, there is a slight variation (or corruption) in the names of the descendants of Shelah. As we go along with this study, we are going to discover several variations (or corruptions) of the names of the descendants of Shelah. We will now read Numbers 26:20-21:

<sup>20</sup> And the sons of Judah after their families were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelanites: of Pharez, the family of the Pharezites: of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites.

<sup>21</sup> And the sons of Pharez were; of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites: of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites.

We should take particular notice here to the order in which Judah's sons are mentioned. It is important to notice this because it presents a problem. The order in which Judah's children were born was:

1. Er,
2. Onan,
3. Shelah,
4. Pharez and
5. Zerah.

We know that Yahweh killed Er and Onan leaving Shelah to be the next in line for the birthright and also Tamar's husband. But Shelah was bypassed completely and Pharez was considered the firstborn. This is why the midwife took special attention to mark the first one of the twins to be born. But like in the case of Reuben, when he was disqualified as firstborn of Jacob and Leah, the honor went to the firstborn of Jacob and Rachel, or Joseph. Evidently, when there was a different woman involved, and the original firstborn is dead or disqualified, the honor of firstborn went to the first born of the second union. You will remember that Ishmael was the firstborn of Abraham, but when Isaac was born to him by Sarah, Isaac was considered the firstborn. I only found one comment in all of my commentaries on the above verse which I don't think is quite right, but I will use it anyway, and it was in *A Commentary On The Holy Bible* by Matthew Pool, volume 1, page 320:

"The sons of Pharez were; though Judah's grandchildren, are here mentioned among his sons, because they were put in the stead of Er and Onan, which died before."

This may be true, but I would rather believe that Pharez simply was put in Er's stead. It is rather interesting, though, after the three families of Judah are recorded in their birth order, only Pharez's children are mentioned. I would say this is because Pharez's children were in the royal line and this is the reason they were mentioned here in this

passage. Going on now to 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 2:3-5 we have Shelah's name mentioned at the beginning of a long chapter which includes verses 3 through 55. In this genealogy of Judah, it gets off to a bad start with Shelah and has a bad ending with the Kenites in verse 55. Everything in-between is the pure line of Judah. As I have covered the Kenites (the descendants of Cain) in my other writings, I will not go into that subject here although the Kenites are a very important subject and should be understood by all in Identity. We will only use verses 3 and 4 at this time:

<sup>3</sup> The sons of Judah; Er, and Onan, and Shelah: which three were born unto him of the daughter of Shua the Canaanitess. And Er, the firstborn of Judah, was evil in the sight of the LORD; and he slew him.

<sup>4</sup> And Tamar his daughter in law bare him Pharez and Zerah. All the sons of Judah were five.

Now we come to a very interesting passage concerning Shelah and his descendants. I will have more than the normal amount of comment on this passage. This passage will start to open up this subject of Shelah and we will be able to start to get a perspective as to what kind of people he and his descendants were and their manner of lifestyle. Before making any comments we will first read the passage, 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 4:21-23:

<sup>21</sup> The sons of Shelah the son of Judah were Er the father of Lecha, and Laadah the father of Mareshah, and the families of the house of them that **wrought fine linen**, of the house of Ashbea.

<sup>22</sup> And Jokim, and the men of Chozeba, and Joash, and Saraph, who had the dominion in Moab, and Jashubilehem. And these are ancient things.

<sup>23</sup> These were the **potters**, and those that dwelt among plants and hedges: there they dwelt with the king for his work.

You will notice here that Shelah and his household were known as producers of fine linen and were also potters. At this time I wish to read from a small pamphlet entitled "David's Greater Son" written by Howard B. Rand concerning Shelah, page 6:

"Thus, from Zarah's line came the progenitors of the Milesian civilization that was established around the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. However, although they were descendants of Judah, *they were not Jews* (as we think of Jews today). The descendants of Shelah, who were workers in fine linen (1 Chronicles 4:21), left the rest of Israel shortly after the Exodus, and before Israel entered the Promised Land, joining with their brethren of the Zarah line in their westward trek. They became the progenitors of the linen workers in Ireland in the Isles."

I have done some research on this last statement of Rand's that Shelah and his descendants moved into Ireland with the line of Zerah. What Rand is doing is assuming that

because Shelah and his children are mentioned in 1st Chronicles 4:21 as being famous for fine linen and the Irish also later becoming famous for their linen, there must be some connection. I have a lot of respect for Howard B. Rand's writings, but I don't believe everything he teaches. I believe this is one of the places where Rand goofed. I think I have everything Howard B. Rand ever put out in my library, and I value it very highly. To show you why I think Rand is wrong in this case, I will now quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 12, page 294:

"Modern use of linen began in Europe in the 1600's. Skilled Flemish and French workers who left their countries to escape religious persecution helped develop linen spinning and weaving in England, the Netherlands, and Germany. Linen fabrics from France, Belgium, and Ireland have become famous throughout the world."

There you have it. Ireland learned the making of linen from the Flemish as an indirect result of religious persecution. Can you now see how **dangerous** it is to **assume** something like Rand did? There is obviously no connection between the linen business of the family of Shelah in Palestine and later in Ireland. Though there may be Shelanites in Ireland, I have never, as yet, seen any historical evidence of it. If I ever do, I will write about it. In this lesson, we will find some of the places they did go though. We will start with *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 2, pages 846-847. Matthew Henry doesn't have it entirely correct, but it will serve to give us a general view of what 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 4:21-23 is all about. As I quote from different sources, each source will contribute small items of evidence to help clear up the overall picture. Each source will also have a certain amount of error that we will have to overlook:

"That another is said to be the *father of the house of those that wrought fine linen*, v.21. It is inserted in their genealogy as their honour that they were the best weavers in the kingdom, and they brought up their children, from one generation to another, to the same business, not aiming to make them gentlemen. This Laadah is said to be the *father of those that wrought fine linen*, as before the flood Jubal is said to be the *father of musicians and Jabal of shepherds*, &c. His posterity inhabited the city of Mareshah, the manufacture or staple commodity of which place was linen-cloth, with which their kings and priests were clothed ... That another family had had *dominion in Moab*, but were now in *servitude in Babylon*, v. 22, 23. ... It was found among the ancient things that they had the *dominion in Moab*. Probably in David's time, when the country was conquered, they transplanted themselves thither, and were put in places of power there, which they held for several generations; but this was a great while ago, time out of mind. ... Their posterity were now **potters** and gardeners, as is supposed in Babylon, where they *dwelt with the king for his work*, got a good livelihood by their industry, and therefore cared not for returning with their brethren to their own land, after

the years of captivity had expired. Those that now have dominion know not what their posterity may be reduced to, nor what mean employment they may be glad to take up with. But those were unworthy the name of *Israelites* that would dwell among plants and hedges rather than be at pains to return to Canaan.”

The next reference we are going to use will clear up this story of the descendants of Shelah a little more. This will give us more insight into the occupations they followed. It will also give us an idea to what geographic area they may have migrated. It is found in *Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, page 386:

”<sup>23</sup> *These were the potters.* They were probably **brickmakers**; perhaps **potters** also, who had their dwelling in **low grounds**, and **fabricated the clay into pots and bricks** that was digged up in forming fences in the king’s domains.”

For another reference, we will use *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, page 372. From Wycliffe, we will find that we have a problem of translation with the words “plants and hedges”:

“23. The Hebrew words for **plants and hedges** are better taken as **place names: Netaim and Gederah.** **These were the potters . . . they dwelt with the king.** Archaeology has demonstrated the existence of **hereditary guilds of potters** during the divided kingdom (930-586 B.C.), with royal patronage, and using regular **jar-stamps** from generation to generation (R. A. Stewart Macalister, *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* (July and Oct., 1905), pp. 244, 245, 328, 329).”

From this, we can see they were actually leaving their trademark wherever they went. They had formed family guilds and didn’t let anyone else into their business. Today we would call this a closed corporation. We can also see from this that they were not attending to plants nor were they trimming hedges as this is evidently a mistranslation and should be names of places. With the curse of Cain on them, the plants and bushes would only die if they attended them. If you have any favorite plants, don’t ask a Jew to water them for you while you are on vacation, or when you get home they will all be dead! From *Jamieson, Fausset & Brown*, page 295, we get the following commentary on this passage:

“21-23. POSTERITY OF SHELAH. 21. **Laadah . . . the father . . . of the house of them that wrought fine linen** — Here, again, is another incidental evidence that in very early times certain trades were followed by particular families among the Hebrews apparently in hereditary succession. Their knowledge of the art of linen manufacture had been, most probably, acquired from Egypt, where the duty of bringing up families to the occupations of their forefathers was a compulsory

obligation, whereas in Israel, as in many parts of Asia to this day, it was optional, though common. 22, 23. **had the domination in Moab, and Jashubi-lehem** — ‘And these are ancient things’ seems a strange rendering of a proper name; and, besides, it conveys a meaning that has no bearing on the record. The following improved translation has been suggested: Sojourned in Moab, but returned to Bethlehem and Adaberim-athekim. These are the inhabitants of Netaim and Gedera [and they] were potters employed by the king in his own work.’ Gedera or Gederoth and Netaim, belonged to the tribe of Judah, and lay on the southwest border of the Philistines’ territory (Josh. 15:36; II Chron. 28:18).”

The *Revised Standard Version* and *The James Moffatt Bible* probably have better renderings on 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 4:23, and they read as follows:

Standard Revised Version:

“23 These were the **potters** and inhabitants of **Netaim and Gederah**; they dwelt there with the king for his work.”

The James Moffatt Bible:

”23 This from an ancient archive. (These were the **potters** and inhabitants of **Netaim and Gederah**; they resided there in the service of the king.)”

Next, I would like to quote this passage (1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 4:21-23 from the NIV. I know there are some reportedly very bad things about the NIV, but in this passage, they got it right:

“21 The sons of Shelah son of Judah: Er the father of Lecah, Laadah the father of Mareshah and the clans of the linen workers at Beth Ashbea, 22 Jokim, the men of Cozeba, and Joash and Saraph, who ruled in Moab and Jashubi Lehem. (These records are from ancient times.) 23 They were **potters** who lived in **Netaim and Gederah**; they stayed there and worked for the king.”

From all of this, we can see that the children of Shelah were in the textile trade of linen. Just like the “Jews” of today’ they controlled the production of fabrics, and in those days it was linen. The main building materials in that period of time was bricks, and the sons of Shelah (half Jews) were controlling that business also. Not only that, but they were in control of the making of dishes and clay pots to store food and water in. Also cups, jars. bowls, jugs, cooking pots, frying pans, lamps etc. They formed closed guilds (unions) and put their trade mark on every item they made. Not only were they doing this in Palestine, but they expanded to Moab and Babylon with their rule and industry. Next, I would like to take a short quote from *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume K-Q, pages 848-849:

“Just as in the Hyksos renaissance there had been a upsurge in both ceramics and metallurgy, so in David’s day iron came into its own along with improved ceramics. The Davided Kingdom — Iron II — saw a continuation in better wares and more forms as well as the introduction of wheel burnishing ... Toward the end of that period, however, something entirely new appeared in ceramics. The modern factory techniques, which we use, were created at that time, and mass production appeared. The potter was using assembly-line techniques, standardizing his wares, staggering his sizes, and at times even using trade-marks. The new techniques permitted the use of cheaper clays, cheaper labor, greater volume production, etc.; and yet the quality of the work continued high. The days of Isaiah and Jeremiah witnessed an industrial revolution in various fields, but ceramics seemed to be the most progressive of all.”

Now a short quote from page 850 from this same book on the same subject:

“The cooking pot was constantly subject to accident and to the expansion shock of heat and cold. It therefore demanded special skill in manufacture; and in the days of the Davided Kingdom **potters often stamped their trade-marks** on the handles of the wide-mouth variety.”

At this point, we should be getting a better picture in our minds of the activities of these sons of Shelah. You may be wondering what connection is there between the making of linen cloth and pottery? Let’s use a further quote from this same book under the subject of pottery, “*Miscellaneous ware*”, Page 852:

“In the cloth industry cheap spindle whorls ... (II Sam. 3:29 [‘spindle’; KJV ‘staff’]; Prov. 31:19 [‘spindle’; KJV ‘distaff’], were sometimes made of pottery. The loom weights which were used in the weaving of cloth, when this industry was at its peak late in the Davided Kingdom, were almost always made of pottery.”

You can see from this that the sons of Shelah had both the **pottery industry** and the linen cloth industry all tied up in their hands **monopolizing** it entirely in a large geographic area (all the way up to Babylon). The next time in the Scriptures we encounter the descendants of Shelah is in 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 9:5. We are only turning a few pages in our Bible, but we are jumping many years into the future to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah and the return of the Judean captives from Babylon. The first few verses of this passage look back upon the foregone genealogies, and tell us they were gathered out of the books of the kings of Israel and Judah. Mentioning Israel and Judah, the historian takes notice of their being *carried away to Babylon for their transgressions*. Then follows an account of the first inhabitants, after their return from captivity, that dwell in their cities, especially Jerusalem. Of the different ones that returned, in verse 5, we have this record:



<sup>5</sup> And of the Shilonites; Asaiah the firstborn, and his sons.

What we have to do next is find out who these “Shilonites” are. At this time, I am going to cite eight different references on who the Shilonites are:

*Matthew Poole’s Commentary on the Holy Bible*, volume 1, page 789:

“Or, Shelanites, as they are called from Shelah, Numb. xxvi. 20. **Asaiah called also Maaseiah**, Neh. xi. 5.”

*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 929:

“An alternate form (used in the plural) for the name of the family that sprang from Judah’s third son Shelah. — 1 Ch 9:5; Ge 46:12; see SHELAH No. 2; SHELANITES.”

*The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume R-Z, page 330:

“A designation of a member of one of the Judean families returning from exile (1 Chr. 9:5; Neh 11:5). **There are numerous differences in the names of the families** listed in 1 Chr. 5:9; Neh 11:5. If ‘Shilonites’ refers to persons from Shiloh, they traced their ancestry back to a place in the northern kingdom. It is more probable that השילֹנִי in both passages should be vocalized ‘Shelanite’ **to indicate a descendant of SHELAH** (cf. Gen. 38:5; Num. 26:20). (‘Shilonite’ in Scripture has two meanings: (1) Man from Shiloh and (2) Descendant of Shelah.)”

*Nave’s Topical Bible*, page 1269:

“Used apparently to denote a **descendant of Shelah**, 1 Chr. 9:5.”

*Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible* (1890), page 645:

“**Shilonites, The**, are mentioned among the descendants of Judah dwelling in Jerusalem at a date difficult to fix (1 Chr. ix, 5). They are doubtless the **members of the house of SHELAH**, who in the Pentateuch are more accurately designated **SHELANITES**.”

*The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary* (1901), volume 3, page 1577:

“**The descendants of Judah through Shelah** (1 Chron ix:5; Neh. xi:5); doubtless the same as the SHELANITES (NUM. XXVI:20).”

*Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, page 1168:

“The references to Shilonites in Nehemiah 11:5 (NRSV) and 1 Chronicles 9:5 probably should be to Shelanites, **to indicate a descendant of Shelah** (Gen. 35:8; Num. 26:20).”

*Unger's Bible Dictionary*, page 1015:

“The Shilonites are mentioned among the descendants of Judah dwelling in Jerusalem at a date difficult to fix (1 Chron. 9:5). **They are doubtless the members of the house of Shelah**, who in the Pentateuch are accurately designated Shelanites.”

### **SHELAH IN NEHEMIAH 11:5**

We have now traced Shelah and his descendants through the Bible and have arrived at the postexilic period of about 460 B.C. At this point, Shelah had been with the tribe of Judah for about 1,400 years. These half-breed descendants of Judah with mostly Canaanite blood (which includes the blood of Cain) had been passing themselves off as Judah all this time. As a matter of fact, they are still passing themselves off as Judah today. Yes, they can point to Judah as one of their progenitors and claim him as their father, but they are Canaanites of the serpent's seed-line of Cain. They represent, therefore, a curse to Judah. We will now take up the passage in Nehemiah where their names are mentioned (Nehemiah 11:5), and they are referred to as “Shiloni”:

<sup>5</sup> And Maaseiah the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Hazaiah, the son of Joiarib, the son of Zechariah, the son of **Shiloni**.

This passage represents some very serious problems that we need to clear up. If you will read earlier in this chapter, upon their return to Palestine from Babylon, certain of them as chief rulers were to live in Jerusalem. Then starting with verse 4, it names the families of Perez, (Pharez) Zerah and Benjamin that were to live and be rulers. Then verse 5 (above) included these sons of Shelah. Verse 6 makes it appear that all the families mentioned in both verses 5 and 6 are descendants of Perez (Pharez). In *The James Moffatt Translation* on verse 6, it reads this way:

<sup>6</sup> (the sons of Pharez who resided at Jerusalem were four hundred and sixty-eight in all, able-bodied men).

You will notice Moffatt enclosed it in parentheses ( ) indicating that it may have been added at a later date and not in the original text. Most people reading this passage

will **assume** that because it is speaking of Perez (Pharez) in verse 4 and then again in verse 6, that verse 5 are also the descendants of Perez (Pharez), and it is not so. The subject matter goes from Perez (Pharez) in verse 4 to Shelah in verse 5, and back to Perez (Pharez) in verse 6. **It is interesting to note in The New English Bible, they place verse 6 ahead of verse 5.** To make some sense out of this whole matter of verse 5, I am going to quote the comments from *The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 3, page 773:

“5 **Maaseiah** (cf. Ezra 10:18), **corrupted as ‘Asaiah’** in 1 Chr. 9:5, **is descended from ‘Shelah,’ third son of Judah**, by the Canaanite Shua (Gen. 38:2-5), but only the Peshitta properly **identifies Shelah, Shiloni** of the Masoretic Text and 1 Chr. 9:5 is the gentilic (from a clan) **the Shilonite**, ‘the man from Shiloh,’ which would be inappropriate since Shiloh lay not in Judah but in Ephraim, north of Bethel (cf. Judg. 21:19). **Zechariah** is one of the ‘Shelanites’ of Num. 26:20 and the word השלני, **the Shilonite**, must be revocalized as ‘the Shelanite.’ **Baruch** (ברוך, cf. 3:20) is corrupted to ‘first born’ in 1 Chr. 9:5, where the text is then deliberately abbreviated to ‘and his sons.’ **Colhozeh**: Cf. 3:15. **Adaiah**: Cf. Ezra 10:29, 30. **Joiarib**: Cf. Ezra 8:16. **Hazaiah** (‘The Lord Has Seen’) is found only here.”

You will notice that it speaks of the Peshitta here. You may have never heard of, or not be aware of, what the Peshitta is. It is the *Holy Bible From Ancient Eastern Manuscripts* by George M. Lamsa. On the page before the preface, it says this, “*Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, The Authorized Bible of the Church of the East.*” Knowing now what the Peshitta is, and the fact that Lamsa translated Nehemiah 11:5 correctly, let’s read Nehemiah 11:5 from his version (Lamsa is a native of the two modern cities which speak Aramaic as their first language.) [Note made 4-28-2006: Though Lamsa did well explaining idioms, I no longer consider some of his premises correct. I still consider his translation of the following verse in effect useful]:

<sup>5</sup> Maasiah the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Neriah, the son of Azariah, the son of Jonadab, the son of Zechariah, **the son of Shelah.**

Now let’s compare some other Bible translations on this same verse:

*The New Jerusalem Bible*:

<sup>5</sup> and Maaseiah son of Baruch, son of Col-Hozeh, son of Hazaiah, son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib, son of Zechariah, **descendant of Shelah.**”

*The New English Bible*:

<sup>5</sup> and Maaseiah son of Baruch, son of Col-hozeh, son of Hazaiah, son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib. son of Zechariah **of the Shelanite family.**

*The New Century Version:*

<sup>5</sup> There was also Masseiah son of Baruch, (Baruch was the son of Col-Hozeh, the son of Hazaiah. Hazaiah was the son of Adaiah, son of Joarib. Joarib was the son of Zechariah, **a descendant of Shelah.**

*The Good News Bible:*

<sup>5</sup> Maaseiah, the son of Baruch and grandson of Colhozeh. His other ancestors included Hazaiah, Adaiah, Joarib, and Zechariah, **descendants of Judah's son Shelah.**

I think we have proven this passage of Nehemiah 11:5 is indeed speaking about the descendants of Shelah. The next thing I want to do is compare three Scriptures in the *King James Version*, I think you will be amazed at the similarity of names. You will also see how some of the names were corrupted from one passage to another. I will do it in this order: (1) Nehemiah 11:5. (2) Ezra 10:18. (3) 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 9:5:

## Nehemiah 11:5:

<sup>5</sup> And **Maaseiah** the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Hazaiah, the son of Adaiah, the son of Joarib, the son of Zechariah, the son of **Shiloni**.

## Ezra 10:18:

<sup>18</sup> And among the sons of the priest there were found that had taken strange wives: namely, of the sons of Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and his brethren; **Maaseiah**, and Eliezer, and Jarib and Gedaliah.

1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 9:5:

<sup>5</sup> And of the Shilonites: **Asaiah** the firstborn, and his sons.

If the Maaseiah of Nehemiah 11:5, the Maaseiah of Ezra 10:18 and the Asaiah of 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 9:5 are all the same person, the Shelanites of Shelah had worked their way into the Levitical priesthood. I am pretty sure that this Maaseiah did work his way into the Levitical priesthood. When the captives returned from Babylon to Jerusalem, there was a shortage of Levites for all the needed offices, so they substituted heads of families for priestly duties. There is so much history to cover during this period, there isn't enough space in this teaching letter to cover it all here. I do expect to cover it in the next teaching letter though. This is a very critical era of history and all the ramifications must be considered. If you don't understand this period of time, and all

that was happening, you are not prepared to study the New Testament. In showing that Shelah was well established in the time of Nehemiah, you can be sure they were still well established in the time of the Messiah as Pharisees and Sadducees, which we know today as Canaanite Jews. Of course, this is only part of the background of the Jews as there are many other factors to consider.

In his book, *Documentary Studies* by Howard B. Rand, volume 1, page 415, we pick up more of the story of what was happening at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Rand says this:

“Certain ones, both of the house of Judah that had returned from Babylon and some of the priests intermarried with the Inhabitants of the land. These intermarriages were severely condemned by both Ezra and Nehemiah. These forbidden marriages were made with the Hittites and this in time produces a distinct racial type whom we call Jews today. In other words, the Jew as we know him today is not of pure Israel stock but, through the intermarriages in the day of Ezra and Nehemiah, has the blood of the Hittite in his veins. This intermarriage gave the Jew his dark hair and eyes and the facial characteristics by which he is known and recognized today. The origin of the Jew does not, therefore, antedate the return from the Babylonian captivity, but resulted from the admixture of Hittite blood after the return from Babylon to Palestine. Because the house of David was selected from the tribe of Judah many centuries prior to the time of these inter-racial marriages, there are no Jews as such in the house of David.”

Most of what Rand is saying here is correct. He either forgot or had never studied in depth how the Kenites (descendants of Cain) had intermixed with the Hittites and several other “ites” to make up the nation of the Canaanites. These Hittites Rand is talking about, had and still have the serpent blood of Cain in their veins. So you see, it does “antedate” this era of time. Add to this the admixture of the Shelanites, and we are beginning to get a definitive picture of the Jew. It should be pointed out Shelah and his descendants were a separate house dwelling in Israel. He was half Judah and half Canaanite (of the “ites” including Cain). His mother, Bathshua, married him off to a female Canaanite which is probably one of the only good things she did in her entire life. Who did Shelah’s descendants marry? — Of course, more Canaanites. There were probably a few Israelites, just like today, intermarrying with them, but they were basically Canaanite. Let’s take a look at Ezra 9:1-2 and see who all of these “ites” were that the priest and Levites were having intermarriage with and were instructed to put them, with their children, away. And the blood of Cain was in all of these:

<sup>1</sup> Now when these things were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priest, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the

Egyptians, and the Amorites.

<sup>2</sup> For they have taken their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy (set apart) seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands.

I had intended on finishing up this teaching letter on the topic of universalism, but I had my attention drawn to something more important. You can plainly see, there had been a change in attitude among these people returning from Babylon from separatist racism to universalism or these priest and people would not have been marrying strange wives as they were. I am only going to use one reference to show you how universalism got started at this period of time and it is found in the *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, page 126:

“Before Jerusalem fell in 586 some of the Jews (Judeans) had **become possessors of a spiritual truth not known anywhere else in the world**, viz. that one God of perfect moral character ruled supreme over the whole universe. How many of the Jews (Judeans) knew this it is impossible to say. Of course they were a small minority, but they were either numerous enough, or strong enough in their convictions, to influence history. The great majority of the Jews (Judeans) held the traditional belief **that Yahweh was a God of Israel alone**. It is possible that even those who accepted the new **universalistic** truth did not realize that the two views were incompatible. Anyhow, it needed the destruction of the nation and the Temple to free the wider truth from its nationalistic shackles.”

### SOME CANAANITES NOT CANAANITES!

Someone pointed out to me recently (I won't say who) that not only did Judah marry a Canaanite, but Simeon married a Canaanite too, Genesis 46:10. I had been aware of this, but in the *Book of Jasher*, chapter 45, verse 2 it indicates that Simeon took Dinah his sister for a wife and they had five sons. It goes on to say in verse 3, “*And he afterward came to Bunah the Canaanitish woman, the same is Bunah whom Simeon took captive from the city of Shechem, and Bunah was before Dianh and attended upon her; and Simeon came to her; and she bare unto him Saul.*” It also says in this same passage in the book of Jasher, chapter 45, verse 1, that Reuben took a Canaanite wife. This would make three sons of Jacob that took Canaanite wives. At least, this is the way it appears from the surface. I know I have pretty well cleared up the problem with Judah in his affair with a Canaanite woman which turned out all right in the end as the pure seed-line of Pharez and Zerah were uncorrupted. I covered Judah's personal life in detail in lessons 1, 2 and 3.

As soon as this was pointed out to me, I decided that this matter of Reuben and Simeon along with Judah marrying Canaanites needed to be addressed, so I went

right to work on it. I didn't think I would find the answer so quickly. I checked the Hebrew word for Canaanite in both Genesis 46:10 and Genesis 38:2 and they were both the same word, #3669 in Strong's. I checked in *The Strong's Concordance* and found it could mean a <sup>(1)</sup>Canaanite or, <sup>(2)</sup>an inhabitant of Canaan. I next checked with the Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament which said, "*Specially this was the name applied to the inhabitants of the lower region . . . on the sea shore, and the banks of Jordan; opposed to the inhabitants of the mountainous region*", and it showed a different Hebrew word for each one of these. Investigating this, I found it quite interesting, so I consulted *Insight On The Scripture*, volume 1, pages 399-406 on the word "Canaan/Canaanite." They put both of these names under the same heading. I found a very fascinating and important item on page 400:

"Canaan was evidently subject to some Elamite (and hence Semitic) influence and domination at this time, as indicated by the Biblical record at Genesis 14:1-7."

I then went to page 701 of this same book and it said this of Elam:

"ELAM 1. One of the five sons of Shem from whom descended 'families, according to their tongues, in their lands, according to their nations'."

I believe this should clear up the fact that all of the descendants of Israel were of pure blood except for Shelah. This is proof that there were people of Shem in Canaan at this early time for the sons of Jacob to find proper wives. In *The Lost Books of The Bible and The Forgotten Books of Eden*, *The Testament Of Judah*, II, verses 17,18, Judah definitely confesses to marrying a Canaanite, but in the "Testaments of Reuben" and the "Testament of Simeon", no such confessions are recorded. In fact, *The "Testament Of Simeon"*, III, verse 3 says this:

<sup>3</sup> Then shall perish the seed of Canaan, and a remnant shall not be unto Amalek, and all the Canpadocians shall perish, and all the Hittites be utterly destroyed.

If Simeon married a Canaanite as we usually think of the word Canaanite, would he have made a statement like this? If he did, he is saying her seed (his children) should perish! I don't know why someone is always trying to prove that the Israelites mixed with other races like Moses marrying a black woman, or Ruth being of another race, or Joseph taking a wife of the land of Ham, and that today we are somehow all mixed-up with other races. I am getting tired and pretty well frustrated with the various so-called experts on the Bible who are proclaiming this!









## LESSON 8

---

In the last issue, we traced Judah's third son, Shelah, through the Bible. We traced the descendants of Shelah as far as Nehemiah 11:5. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah concerns themselves (many consider it one book) with race-mixing on a grand scale and we can be sure that Shelah was right in there taking part in it and promoting the idea. Shelah didn't have anything to lose by this as he was a bastard from his beginning. With this lesson, we are going to continue from where lesson number seven ended. We left off with a person by the name of Maaseiah, who was a descendant of Shelah who was counted among the ruling families in Jerusalem at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. This name Maaseiah may be important because there was a Maaseiah (a high priest) who took a strange wife and rather than get rid of her, he went to Mount Gerizim to officiate there among the Samaritians. Whether this is the same Maaseiah, I am not sure. But I am getting ahead of the story, so I will go back to the beginning and start over.

### AN OVERVIEW OF HISTORY BEHIND EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

In his first year Cyrus, king of Persia, 538 B.C., issued a royal decree to the effect that the exiled Judeans were free to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the house of Yahweh (Ezra 1:1-4). It was a long and dusty trip which included 42,360 males besides slaves and professional singers carrying with them the temple treasures. They arrived at Jerusalem in time to celebrate the Feast of Booths in the seventh month, 537 B.C. The Persian appointed governor, Zerubbabel, of the house of David, soon organized the Temple rebuilding and ran into serious interference from local people, but it was completed 515 B.C. A second wave of exiles returned with the priest-scribe Ezra in the spring of 458 B.C., bringing additional items to decorate the temple at the autho-

rization of King Artaxerxes (Longimanus), Ezra 7:27. These treasures were valued at about \$43,000,000 (Ezra 8:25-27).

Because of the walls not having been repaired since the time of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest, Nehemiah obtained permission from Artaxerxes to go to Jerusalem to remedy the problem (Nehemiah 2:1-8). Nehemiah soon organized work groups and completed the rebuilding of the walls in 52 days. With the temple and walls rebuilt, there were not many people to occupy the city, so Nehemiah organized a plan to repopulate Jerusalem. It might appear that all is going well, but it is not! Before we go much further into this story, let's consider the time frame into which it fits. We are getting into a period of time that nobody wants to talk about today, and this is the so-called inter-testament period. We are talking about a period of about 500 years, and some people want to flush it down the toilet as if it never existed. I contend that if you don't know what happened during these 500 years, you really can't understand the New Testament! This is equivalent to erasing all the history in our history books from Christopher Columbus until our present day, which amounts to a lot of history! There are a lot of people who are spouting a lot of opinions about the New Testament, who haven't the slightest idea about this period of time! It's like building a house without a foundation! If one so much as even brings up the subject of this period, they will very quickly respond, "Oh! that is all uninspired." I contend this is one of the most important periods of time to understand in all of history. Five hundred years is a long time, it cannot simply be swept under the rug. Let's take an overview of Jerusalem during this time.

1. The end of Judah as a nation.
2. The 70 year exile in Babylon.
3. The return to Jerusalem under Persian rule.
4. Reconstruction and reform under Persian rule.
5. A second temple built by the Samaritans at Mount Gerizim.
6. Jerusalem under the rule of Alexander the Great.
7. Jerusalem under the rule of the Ptolemies.
8. Jerusalem under the rule of the Seleucids, and the fight of the Maccabees against Greek paganism.
9. The Maccabees fight the Seleucids for freedom.
10. The Hasmonean period.

## 11. Jerusalem under Rome.

I found a short history of this period in *Insight On The Scripture*, volume 2, page 44-45:

**“Hellenic and Maccabean Control.** The changeover from Medo-Persian to Greek control came in 332 B.C. when Alexander the Great marched through Judea. The Greek historians make no mention of Alexander’s entry into Jerusalem. Yet the city did come under Greek domination, and it is reasonable to assume that it was not completely bypassed by Alexander. Josephus, in the first century A.D., records the Judean tradition that, upon approaching Jerusalem, Alexander was met by a Judean high priest and was shown the divinely inspired prophecies recorded by Daniel foretelling the lightning conquest by Greece (Jewish Antiquities, XI, 326-338 [viii, 4, 5]; Dan. 8:5-7, 20, 21). Whatever the case, Jerusalem seems to have survived the change in control free of any damage.

“Following Alexander’s death, Jerusalem and Judea came under the control of the Ptolemies, who ruled out of Egypt. In 198 B.C. Antiochus the Great, ruling in Syria, after taking the fortified city of Sidon, captured Jerusalem and Judah became a dominion of the Seleucid Empire (Compare Dan. 11:16). Jerusalem lay under Seleucid rule for 30 years. Then, in the year 168 B.C., Syrian King Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), in his attempt to completely Hellenize the Judeans, dedicated Jerusalem’s temple to Zeus (Jupiter) and profaned the altar by an unclean sacrifice (1 Maccabees 1:57, 62; 2 Maccabees 6:1, 2, 5). This led to the Maccabean (or Hasmonaeen) revolt. After a three-year struggle, Judas Maccabaeus gained control of the city and temple and rededicated Yahweh’s altar to true worship on the anniversary of its profanation, Chislev 25, 165 B.C. — 1 Maccabees 4:52-54; 2 Maccabees 10:5; compare John 10:22.

“The war against the Seleucid rulers had not ended. The Judeans appealed to Rome for help and thus a new power came on the Jerusalem scene in about 160 B.C. (1 Maccabees 8:17, 18). Now Jerusalem began to come under the influence of the expanding Roman Empire. About 142 B.C., Simon Maccabaeus was able to make Jerusalem the capital of a religion ostensibly free from subservience to or taxation by non-Judean nations. Aristobulus 1, Jerusalem’s high priest, even assumed the title of king in 104 B.C. He was **not**, however, of the **Davidic line**.

“Jerusalem was no ‘city of peace’ during this period. Internal quarrels, fired and selfish ambitions and worsened by rival religious factions — Sadducees, Pharisees, Zealots, and others — gravely weakened the city. A violent quarrel between Aristobulus II and his brother Hyrcanus resulted in Rome’s being called on to arbitrate the dispute. Under General Pompey, Roman forces besieged Jerusalem in 63 B.C. for three months in order to enter the city and settle the dispute. Twelve thousand Judeans reportedly died, many at the hands of fellow Judeans. It is in Josephus’ account of Pompey’s conquest that the archway across the Tyropoeon Valley is first

mentioned. It served as a link between the eastern and western halves of the city and gave those on the western half direct access to the temple area.

“The Idumean Antipater (II) was now installed as Roman governor of Judea, a Maccabean being left as high priest and local ethnarch in Jerusalem. Later, Antipater’s son Herod (the Great) was appointed by Rome as ‘king’ over Judea. He did not get control of Jerusalem until 37 or 36 B.C., from which date his rule effectively began.”

### FIVE HUNDRED YEARS JUDEA AND JERUSALEM HAD NO RIGHTFUL KING

This is interesting because Yahweh promised David that he would always have a descendant on the throne (Jeremiah 33:17). Did Yahweh lie? Let’s read this scripture because there are some that teach that Yahweh broke His promise.

For thus saith Yahweh; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.

Maybe these people teaching this got it from the Polyglot Bible published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, of London. I am next going to quote from the book, “Judah’s Sceptre and Joseph’s Birthright”, by J. H. Allen, pages 177-181 which will be quite lengthily:

“Indeed, it was so well done (Jeremiah’s prophecy), that the heretofore accepted authorities in theologic, historic and ethnologic matters have taught that the scepter, throne and kingdom of David were wiped out of existence, together with the house of David, excepting only another branch of the family of Josiah, who were carried away into the Babylonish captivity, of whom came Christ, the son of David, who according to the Scripture, must yet sit upon the throne of his father David. We will give but one example of that class of sophistical reasoning which has led the mind of the Christian world into this gross error.

“Take, for instance, the well-known and much-used Polyglot Bible, published by Samuel Bragster & Sons, of London. The compilers of this work (whoever they are we know not) give what is called ‘A summary view of the principal events of the period from the close of the sacred canon of the Old Testament until the times of the New Testament.’ According to the system of chronology which this work adopts, the overthrow of Zedekiah occurred in the year 589 B.C. This proposed summary begins after the return of the Judean people from the Babylonish captivity, but while they were yet under the dominion of the Kingdom of Persia; and when Artaxerxes Longimanus was the reigning king, who in his twentieth year commissioned Nehemiah to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, an event which happened according to the chronology used in 446 B.C.

“Then follows a brief record of the death and succession of kings, the rise and fall of dynasties, and the overthrow of kingdoms, powers, dominions and empires. **But it is always shown conclusively that these ruling powers, whatever might be their nationality, were dominating the Judean people.**

“The summary shows that Alexander the Great marched into Judea to punish the people for certain grievances which, in his mind, they had practiced against him as commander of the Grecian forces, and that God thwarted him in that purpose. It shows that when Alexander died the Grecian empire was divided among his four generals; that Palestine was given to Loamedon, one of those generals, and that it was soon taken away from him by Ptolemy, the king of Egypt, and they ‘rejoiced to submit to this new master’, and what the consequences were. It shows that they suffered under Antiochus Epiphanes, especially after a false rumor had been spread concerning his death, which they believed and rejoiced in and that in consequence of this rejoicing ‘he slew 40,000 persons, sold as many more for slaves, plundered the temple of gold and furniture to the amount of 80 talents of gold, entered the Holy of Holies, and sacrificed a sow upon the altar of burnt offerings, and caused the broth of it to be sprinkled all over the temple.’ No greater indignity than this could have been put upon that people. The summary contains a truthful record of suffering after suffering, trouble after trouble, and indignity after indignity, heaped upon the conquered people, who during all those centuries were reigned over by their enemies the non-Israel nations; **but not once does the record show — no not for even one generation — that they were ruled by a prince of their own royal house.**

“Finally, the summary ends as follows: ‘At length Antipater, a noble but crafty Idumæan, by favor of Julius Caesar, was made procurator of Judea, and Hyrcanus continued in the priesthood. After Antipater’s death, his son, Herod the Great, by the assistance of Antony, the Roman triumvir, and through much barbarity and bloodshed assumed the regal dignity; which authority was at length confirmed by Augustus Caesar. He maintained his dignity with great ability, but with the utmost cruelty, in his own family as well as among others, till the birth of Christ. In the interval he built many cities, and to ingratiate himself with the Jews, almost rebuilt the temple.

“His cruel attempt to murder the infant Savior is recorded by the evangelist; and soon afterward he died most miserably. After some years, during which the dominions of Herod were governed by his sons, Judea became a Roman province, and the septre departed from Judah for Shiloh was come (the italics are their own); and after having been under the government of Roman procurators for some years, the whole Jewish state was at length subverted by Titus, the son of Vespasian.’

**“The sophistry in the use of those italicised words as employed by the compilers of that summary, is that they destroy the evident meaning of that**

prophecy to which they refer, the substitution of various sceptres — held by various kings, of various non-Israel nations, that have consecutively held dominion over the Judean people — for one particular Sceptre, which Yahweh promised should be held, only by some member of Judah's family line, and which should not cease to be held by those of his posterity until Shiloh should come.

1. A sceptre did not depart from over the Jews when Christ came. Forty years after Christ had come and gone finds them still under the power of Rome. Shortly afterward they were dispersed and have since been scattered among all nations, where they remain unto this day, and are still being ruled over.
2. If the first coming of Christ was his Shiloh-coming, then Shiloh failed; **for the people did not gather unto him.**
3. Yahweh declares: 'Judah is my law giver.' According to this summary and other accepted evidence, Judah as Lawgiver departed from the Judeans 588 years before Shiloh came. Hence that unbridged chasm of nearly six hundred years stands like a gaping wound in the side of the Church of Jesus Christ, whenever she is compelled to show herself in naked honesty. The entire trend of this summary with its subtle reference to the prophecy in question seems to be that so long as the Judean nation was ruled over, no matter by whom, and held together as a province or state, this prophecy was vindicated; whereas such vindication conception, or use of those words, is only an attempt to hold together, by daubing with untempered mortar, an edifice which is tottering and tumbling.

"The most charitable construction which can be put upon such accommodating mollifying, weak and abortive efforts to vindicate the truth of Yahweh, is that the persons are ignorant of just some such vital point as the fact **that Jeremiah was called and commissioned of Yahweh to build and plant anew the plucked-up kingdom of David.**

**"All who claim that Christ has come as Shiloh are compelled to resort to just such distortions of the Divine Word as the one under consideration, in order to fill up that gaping hiatus of 588 years, from the overthrow of Zedekiah until Christ.** Furthermore, after they have plastered over that gap to their own (questionable) satisfaction, they are still confronted with the fact that the Lord God did not give unto Christ the throne of his father David, nor cause him to reign over the house of Jacob — no, not even spiritually!"

We can safely sum up, then, that there was not a single king which was a descendant of David who ruled over Jerusalem or Judea for this space of time. As a matter of fact, Jerusalem and its outlying areas were ruled over by foreign nations during this period.

Furthermore, Yahshua was never made a king during His lifetime and has not been made a king as of this writing. Yes, He made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, but He was riding an ass, not a white horse. Yes, they crowned Him with thorns, but that was in mockery. Yes, He was born eventually to become king of all Israel, but that is still in the future. We can crown Him king in our heart — and that is good — but His final coronation is yet to come. Yes, Yahweh was true to His word, and He did keep the throne of David in perpetuity, but I will get into that in another lesson.

Now we will get back to our story of the happenings during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The best history of this, I have found is in the series of books, “History Of The Jews”, by Heinrich Greatz, volume 1, starting with page 355. I know that this is the history according to the Jewish viewpoint, but I believe you will have to agree with me, they did quite well on this era of history. I am going to quote excerpts from several pages. If it seems like I am changing the subject quite often, it is because I am skipping large portions of the text. I will be picking out the important parts and it will start to make sense after I have quoted some of the main portions. Again, this will be a lengthy quote.

“Cyrus sent an escort of a thousand mounted soldiers to defend the Judæans from the attacks of predatory tribes upon the way, and also to ensure their being able to take possession of Judæa . . . A great part of the country was inhabited by strangers; in the north were the Samaritans, or Cuthæans, in the south, the Idumæans. But these races were soon obliged to give place to the descendants of Judah, who with the tribe of Benjamin, returned to their ancient dwelling-places . . . From many countries to the east, west, south, and north, from Egypt, Phœnicia, and even from the Greek coast and islands, whither they had gone of their own free will or had been sold as slaves, Judæan exiles streaming back to crowd like children around their resurrected mother, Jerusalem. **These new Judæan arrivals were accompanied by large numbers of strangers**, both ‘great and small’, illustrious and obscure, who collected round them. They were received with rejoicing, for they all acknowledged the God of Israel, and were ready to follow His laws. **These new proselytes** not only added strength to the young community, but also inspired the settlers with greater self-reliance, who, with their own eyes, saw the words of the prophets fulfilled.

“At the approach of the seventh month, in which, according to law and custom, various festivals occur, the elders of the families among all classes in Jerusalem assembled, and marching under the command of their two leaders, the governor Zerubbabel and the high-priest Joshua, they proceeded to perform the first act of reconstruction — they erected an altar of stone . . . and, as in the days of King Solomon, cedar trees were procured from Lebanon; stone was brought from the mountains . . . Close to the boundaries of Judæa lived the mixed tribe of Samaritans or Cuthæans. These people had in part accepted the doctrines taught them

by an Israelitish priest at Bethel, but they had also retained many of their own idolatrous practices. Quite unexpectedly, some of the Samaritan chiefs came to Jerusalem, with the request that they might be allowed to help in re-building the Temple, and also that they be received into the Judæan community. This seemed so important a matter to the Judæans, that a council was convoked to discuss the subject. The decision was against the Samaritans. Zerubbabel informed the Samaritan chiefs that their people neither would nor could be permitted to join in the re-building of the Temple . . . From that day the Samaritans began to develop a hostile spirit against the Judæans, which seemed to show that they had been less anxious to take part in the temple-service than to injure the community and to obstruct the re-building of the Temple. On the one hand, they tried to make those Judæans with whom they came in contact lukewarm toward the project of building the Temple, and, on the other, they persuaded Persian officials to interfere with its execution, so that the work ceased for fully fifteen years.”

As I said before, this is from a Jewish standpoint, and you can be sure the Samaritans indeed wanted to be part of the Judean community and help rebuild the Temple. Don't let anyone ever tell you they didn't want to be part of the rebuilding as they had been practicing the Hebrew religion for almost 200 years by this time. If Stephen E. Jones or James Bruggeman would have been there with their universalistic ideas, they would have welcomed the Samaritans to come right in and **mix** with the crowd. Now let's get back to quoting excerpts from this book:

“It required the fiery enthusiasm of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah to set the work in motion . . . At last they roused the people to recommence their work. In four years (519-516 B.C.) the building was finished, and the Sanctuary was consecrated, amid great rejoicing, just before the Feast of Passover . . . The people had two leaders: Zerubbabel, of the royal house of David, and Joshua, the high-priest, of Aaronide descent . . . A circumstance in Zerubbabel's favour was the people's allegiance to the royal house of David . . . The prophet Haggai had called him the chosen favourite of God, His precious Signet-ring. But this in itself was an obstacle. It gave the enemies of the Judæans the opportunity to charge the community with the purpose of proclaiming him as the successor of David to the throne. On the other hand, the prophet Zechariah had proclaimed that the high-priest Joshua should wear the crown, ascend the throne, and effect the realisation of Messianic hopes . . . Peace could only be restored by the withdrawal of one of the two leaders: their joint rule could not fail to be the occasion of excitement and irritation. A choice had to be made between the two, and Zerubbabel was obliged to give way, the high-priest being more necessary than the king's son. It is probable that Zerubbabel left Jerusalem and returned to Babylon, and thus the house of David retreated into the background.

“After Zerubbabel's withdrawal, the leadership of the community was put into the hands of the high-priest Joshua, and after his death into those of his son Je-



hoiakim . . . The supreme command over the people does not seem to have been given to the high-priest, but to have been vested in a governor or administrator (Peckah), appointed over Judea either by the Persian kings or by the satraps of Syria and Phœnicia. This official does not appear to have lived in Jerusalem, but to have visited the city from time to time, where, seated on a throne, he heard and decided disputes . . . For, as some Judæans nourished the hope, held out by the prophets, that Judah might yet become a mighty power, to whom kings and nations would bow, the suspicion that the people were plotting a defection from Persia was not removed with the retirement of Zerubbabel . . . The enemies of the Judæans, particularly the Samaritans, did not fail to draw the governors attention to the disloyalty of the Judæans, and thus caused unfavourable decrees to be issued against them at court . . .

**“In order to free themselves, on the one side at least, from these constant troubles, the most distinguished Judæan families took a step that led in the end to mischievous complications. They approached the neighbouring peoples, or received the advances of the latter, in a friendly spirit, and as a proof of the sincerity of their feelings, they began to form connections by marriage.** As in the days when the Israelites first occupied the land of Canaan, in the time of the Judges, the necessity for friendly intercourse with neighbouring tribes led to mixed marriages, so during the second occupation of Palestine by the Israelites, similar relations led to similar results. But the circumstances differed, inasmuch as the Canaanites, Hittites, and other original dwellers in the land practiced abominable idolatry, and infected the Israelites with their various customs, while the new neighbours of the Judæan commonwealth, particularly the Samaritans, had given up idolatry, and were longing earnestly and sincerely to take part in the divine service at Jerusalem. They were, in fact, proselytes to the religion of Judæa; and were they always to be sternly repulsed? **The principal families determined to admit the foreigners into the community, and the high-priest, of that time, either Jehoiakim or his son Eliashib, was ready to carry these wishes into effect. Marriages were therefore contracted with the Samaritans and other neighbouring people, and even some members of the family of the high-priest formed such connections.**

“The leader of the Samaritans at that time was Sanballat, a man of undaunted strength of will and energy of action, clever, cunning, audacious and persevering. He was an honest proselyte who believed in the God of Israel, and desired to worship in His Temple; but he determined, as it were, to take by storm the kingdom of Heaven. If he were not allowed a part in it voluntarily, he would seize it by force or by cunning.

“But not only the Samaritans, also the Moabites and Ammonites were among the people anxious to maintain friendly relations with the Judæans. **Tobiah, the leader of the Ammonites, was doubly allied to the Judean families.** He had

married a daughter of a noble family of Arach, and a distinguished man, Meshullam, the son of Berechiah, had given his daughter in marriage to Tobiah's son. But mixed marriages with Ammonites and Moabites were specifically prohibited by the Law, until the tenth generation after conversion. (No, the original text says to the tenth generation **or forever!**)

“The leaders of the Judæan community, the high-priest and others, who were not quite prepared to violate the law, **doubtless eased their consciences by some mild interpretation of the text** . . . A small number of the noblest families had kept themselves pure from mixed marriages, which they deplored as an infraction of the law and as a cause of deterioration of the Judæan race. More especially the singers, who were the cultivators and preservers of the Hebrew language and of its ancient, venerated literature, kept themselves clear of mixed marriages, . . . but, **as they were in the minority**, their voices were not heeded. But when a leading authority appeared in Jerusalem from the land of exile, the minority cried out loudly against what had taken place, and a complete reaction followed, from which disagreeable complications necessarily ensued . . .

“In general the people who live during an important historical crisis are not aware of the changes occurring in themselves, in their opinions, their customs, and even in their language. Such a change imperceptible at first, but complete and effectual, took place in the Judæans during the first half of the fifth century. The transformation did not proceed from the community of Judæa, but from those who remained in the land of exile; it soon, however, penetrated to the mother-country, and impressed its stamp upon her . . . They kept themselves apart from all their neighbours, married only members of their own nation and were guided by the inherited Law as their rule of life. Their absence from the mother-country served but to make them obey the more strictly the behests of the Law, which thus formed a bond of union that bound them together as members of one community . . .

“(Then speaking of Ezra), for he was a descendant of [the] high-priest. It was his ancestor Hilkiah who had found the book of Deuteronomy in the Temple, and by giving it to King Josiah, brought about great changes. He was also the great-grandson of that high-priest, Seraiah, who was slain by command of Nebuchadnezzar, and whose sons carried the Book of the Law to Babylon. Ezra had, therefore, the opportunity of occupying himself with the study of this book. But he gave it more attention than either his ancestors or his relatives had done . . . He began by applying it to himself, carefully obeying the laws regarding dress, diet, and particularly those bearing upon the festivals . . . As soon as he had determined upon the journey, he invited those members of his faith who might be willing to join him. The number that responded was a considerable one, including over 1,600 men, together with women and children, of distinguished families who had remained in the land of captivity. Amongst them was a great-grandson of Zerubbabel, a descendant of the house of David. Those who could not take

part in the emigration gave Ezra rich gifts of gold, silver, and precious vessels for the Temple. It is an astonishing circumstance that King Artaxerxes (Longimanus) also sent presents for the sanctuary in Jerusalem, and that many Persian nobles followed his example . . . Not only did Artaxerxes grant Ezra permission to journey with his brethren to Jerusalem, but he also gave him letters to the satraps of the countries through which he passed, and to the authorities of Palestine . . . The arrival of Ezra with his numerous companions must have caused much surprise in Jerusalem (459-458 B.C.). They came provided with letters from the king, laden with gifts, and imbued with enthusiastic feelings.

**“No sooner had he assumed the ecclesiastical function, than the men of strong convictions who condemned intermarriages with surrounding peoples brought their complaints before him. Ezra was dismayed when he heard of these occurrences. The representatives of the people and of the Temple had, in contempt of the Law, connected themselves with the heathen.** Ezra held this to be a terrible sin. For the Judæan or Israelitish race was in his eyes a holy one, **and suffered desecration by mingling with the foreign tribes,** even though they had abjured idolatry. According to Ezra’s reading of the Law, heathens who had accepted the Law might enter into the community; they were, however, not to be put upon the footing of equality with Israelites by birth, but were to live as a group apart. The Gibeonites, in former days the slaves of the Temple, who had accepted the Israelitish doctrines more than a thousand years before, were still kept distinct, and were not permitted to intermarry with the Israelites; and in Ezra’s opinion, the new proselytes from the heathen nations were to be treated in a similar manner. The connection with them ought not to be of an intimate character . . .

“The fear seized upon his whole soul; he rent his clothes, plucked the hair from his head and beard, and refusing all nourishment, sat until the afternoon, sorrowing and desolate because of this danger which threatened the life of the nation . . . One of those present, Shechaniah, touched by sympathy, uttered a weighty suggestion: **‘Let us make a covenant to put away all the strange wives, and such as are born of them.’** Ezra seized upon the idea at once; he rose and **demanding that the heads of the families, who were present on that occasion, swear before the Sanctuary, and by their God, that they would repudiate their foreign wives and their children.** That moment was to decide the fate of the Judæan people. Ezra, and those who thought as he did, raised a wall of separation between the Judæans and the rest of the world . . .

“Such members of the community as, in a moment of enthusiasm, had taken this vow, were now obliged to keep it. With bleeding hearts they separated themselves from their wives, the daughters of neighbouring tribes, and repudiated their own children. The sons and relations of the high-priest were forced to set an example to the rest. Those of the elders of the people who were the most ardent disciples of

the Law formed a kind of senate. They issued a proclamation throughout Judah, commanding all who had been guilty of contracting mixed marriages. to appear within three days in Jerusalem, on pain of excommunication. A special court of enquiry was instituted for this one question. Ezra himself selected the members who were to make the needful researches to discover whether the Judæans had really repudiated their wives. So thoroughly was the work of this court of enquiry carried on, that all those who were living in the towns of Judæa separated themselves from their wives and children, as the inhabitants of Jerusalem had done. Still there were some, who influenced by family feelings, made some show of resistance.

“The severity with which this separation from all neighbouring tribes, Samaritans and others, had been effected led naturally to grave results. The raising of the wall of separation by Ezra and his party against those who were truly anxious to belong to the community caused much bitterness. They were to be separated for ever from the Deity they had chosen, and excluded from the Sanctuary in Jerusalem to which they had belonged. The decree of separation sent to them changed their friendly relations toward the Judæans to enmity. Hatred which arises from despised affection is always most bitter. The grief of the wives deserted by their husbands, and the sight of the children disowned by their fathers could not fail to awaken and to increase the animosity of those who were closely related to them. Unfortunately for the Judæans, **Sanballat and Tobiah**, two forceful and able men, were at the head of the party excluded from the community. **Tobiah, the Ammonite, was related to several Judæan families. They had both accepted the Judæan teaching**, and now they were both repulsed. Henceforth they assumed a hostile position towards Judæa; they were determined, by force and by intrigues to maintain their right of worshipping in the Temple and sharing in the faith of Israel. At first they probably took steps to restore their peaceful intercourse with the Judæans, and urged them to revoke their cruel decision. **In Jerusalem, as well as in the provinces, there was a party which strongly disapproved of Ezra’s stern action.** The well-informed among these differed with Ezra on the illegality of marriages with women who had, at all events outwardly, accepted the Law. Was Ezra’s severity justifiable? Did not the historical records contain many instances of Israelites having married foreign wives? (This last question is a Jewish question. They then bring up the question about Ruth! Same thing as many are doing today! But Ruth was an Israelite!) Let’s continue:

“But none of these representations (arguments) were of avail. Ezra and the reigning senate in Jerusalem insisted sternly upon the exclusion from the community of all people who could not claim Judaic descent, and who were therefore, **not of ‘the holy seed.’** . . . **Ezra was, unfortunately, not a man of action;** he could only pray and arouse the feelings of others, but he could not prevent many Judæan families from secretly abetting his opponents. On the other hand, Sanballat and his followers were men of decided character, full of virulent hatred towards their ad-

versaries, and they took every opportunity of harassing their enemies. At last they even attacked Jerusalem . . . But no matter what it was that induced Sanballet and his followers to take warlike steps against Jerusalem, they were entirely successful . . . The result was that Sanballet and his followers made breaches in the walls of the city, burned the wooden gates, and destroyed many of the buildings, so that Jerusalem again resembled a heap of ruins. They, however, spared the Temple, for it was sacred in their eyes also; but it was nevertheless abandoned, and most of the inhabitants, having lost the protection of the city walls, left Jerusalem, and established themselves in other places, wherever they could find shelter. The Aaronides and Levites deprived of their income from gifts and tithes, left the Temple and sought other means of subsistence . . . **Many noble families made peace with their neighbours, took back their repudiated wives, and contracted new connections with the stranger. (When you understand this last statement, you are beginning to understand what the Jews are made out of!!!!)**

“We are led to believe by our Bibles today that all of the people who had contracted foreign spouses during Ezra’s and Nehemiah’s time divorced them and repudiated the children they had by them, but this seems to be only part of the story, for they took back these divorced spouses and repudiated half-breed children and contracted more foreign mates. All we have to do is look around us today at multiculturalism, and it isn’t hard to imagine what was going on during this period in history. To understand better the mixture that was developing during this period, which we call Jews today, it might be well to further study the words Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, Sepharvaim, Jebusites, Girgashites, Canaanites, Amorites, Rephaims, Perrizzites, Hittites, Hivites Kadmonites, Kenizzites, Moabites, Ammonites, Egyptians, Zidonians (Sidonians (Canaanite merchants)), **and the Kenites who were and are the descendants of Cain. All these peoples represent a composite from which the Jews originated.** Check out the following passages: 2 Kings 17:24; Deuteronomy 7:1; Acts 7:45; Joshua 12:7,8; 24:11,12; Nehemiah 9:8, 24; 13:1; Ezra 13:1; Psalm 78:55; Genesis 15:19-21; Exodus 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23; Judges 3:5,6; 1 Kings 11:1; 2 Chronicles 8:7-10; Genesis 12:6.”







## LETTER 9

---

I am going to continue with this lesson from where I left off in lesson #8. In the last lesson, I considered an overview of the history during the inter-testament period from the return of the Judean exiles in Babylon to Jerusalem, until the time of Yahshua our Messiah, a period from about 529 B.C. to 4 B.C. Then I concentrated on the period of the reconstruction of the temple and walls of Jerusalem during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, when a considerable amount of race mixing happened among the peoples of the land in the surrounding area. To understand just what kind of a race mixture this produced, we must know who was living in this area at this particular time and how they got there. To refresh your memory on this, I am going to repeat the last paragraph of lesson #8:

“We are led to believe, by our Bibles today, that all of the people who had contracted foreign spouses during Ezra’s and Nehemiah’s time, divorced them and repudiated the children they had by them, but this seems to be only part of the story, for they took back these divorced spouses and repudiated half-breed children and contracted more foreign mates. All we have to do is look around us today at multi-culturism, and it isn’t hard to imagine what was going on during this period in history. To understand better the mixture that was developing during this period, which we call ‘Jews today’, it might be well to further study the words Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, Sepharvaim, Jebusites, Girgashites, Canaanites, Amorites, Rephaims, Perrizzites, Hittites, Hivites, Kadmonites, Kenizzites, Moabites, Ammonites, Egyptians, Zidonians (Sidonians, Canaanite merchants) **and the Kenites who were and are the descendants of Cain. All these peoples represent a composite from which the Jews originated.** Check out the following passages: 2 Kings 17:24; Deuteronomy 7:1; Acts 7:45; Joshua 12:7,8; 24:11,12; Nehemiah 9:8, 24; 13:1; Ezra 13:1; Psalm 78:55; Genesis 15:19-21; Exodus 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23; Judges 3:5,6; 1 Kings 11:1; 2 Chronicles 8:7-10; Genesis 12:6.”

Actually, this is not a complete list of all the ethnic peoples which Assyria imported into Samaria, after they had taken the northern Ten Tribe Kingdom into captivity and displaced them to the north. There were also the Dinaites, Apharsathchites, Tarpelites, Aphrasites, Archevites, Babylonians, Susanchites, Dehavites and Elamites as recorded in Ezra 4:9-10. There is another group of imported peoples which were brought into Samaria by Assyria that can be found only in Assyrian records and not the Bible. This list consists of the Thamudites, Ibadidites, Marsiminites and Khapayans. This adds 13 more ethnic groups to make up the peoples of the land, a total of 34 different so-called “Gentile” peoples. I read information on these people partly from *The Assyrian Invasions And Deportations of Israel* by J. Llewellyn Thomas, F.R.C.S. From this, we can begin to get an idea of the mixed crowd that became known generally as Samaritans, with whom the Judeans and Levites began to intermarry. We should be starting to see how severely dangerous it is to share our beliefs with other non-Israel peoples, or for us to accept, share and practice the religions of people not of our race. A religion can serve as an **artificial common bond**, thus breaking down the natural normal existing racial barrier. **Once a precedence is established of a common religion among racially different people, it can only lead to intermarriage with them.** The enemy has been very busy establishing **artificial common bonds**. As a matter of fact, anything in common with the other races can be risky. We must pause, at this point, and go back in history for not all of Judah was involved with this race-mixing at this time.

### JUDAH BECOMES DIVIDED

To understand how Judah became divided, let's go back and consider a general outline history of the Assyrian invasions of the then northern Tribes of Israel and Judah:

1. 745-727 B.C., Tiglath Pileser invades northern Israel and deports Israelites.
2. 727-722 B.C., Shalmaneser V invades the northern Ten Tribes and deports more Israelites.
3. 722-705 B.C., Sargon II invades the northern Ten Tribes and deports the remaining Israelites.
4. 705-681 B.C., Sennacherib invades Judah and deports all of Judah except Jerusalem to where the northern Kingdom of Israelites were deported.

At this point, all of Judah except Jerusalem is taken into **Assyrian** captivity along with the northern Ten Tribes. Only Jerusalem is left uncaptured. This is the division I



am pointing out, as Jerusalem went into Babylonian captivity later in 604-561 B.C. The Judeans which went into Assyrian captivity, eventually went into Europe with the northern Ten Tribes, while the Judeans of Jerusalem went into Babylonian captivity and 70 years later some of them returned to Jerusalem. This history of Judah is critical to understand in order to understand the difference between a member of the Tribe of Judah and a “Jew.” There are a lot of people (even in Identity) who don’t know the difference. This is why there is so much confusion on this issue today. I would highly advise anyone who does not understand the difference between a member of the Tribe of Judah and a “Jew” to study everything possible on Judah under the servitude of Assyria during the time of Sargon and Sennacherib. Also, if we don’t understand the history of Judah during this particular period, we cannot understand the problems that existed at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. In order to comprehend this period of time, I am now going to present to you some excerpts from different publications concerning this history.

### JUDAH UNDER THE ASSYRIANS

In order to grasp this era of time, we must take into account that Assyria had systematically invaded Samaria and taken the whole northern Kingdom of Israel into captivity over a period of about 65 years and replaced the population with foreigners from distant lands. I am going to start this study of Judah under the Assyrians by quoting excerpts out of the book *The Bible As History* by Werner Keller, pages 259-260:

“In 705 B.C. news spread like wildfire raising at once fresh hopes of liberation from the Assyrian yoke — Sargon had been murdered! All over the Fertile Crescent, in the Assyrian provinces and in the vassal states, conspiracies, discussions, and intrigues began. ‘In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death’ (II Kings 20:1). Happening precisely at this moment of feverish political activity, it was a grave handicap. For many states in Syria and Palestine were looking expectantly to the able king of Judah. How could Hezekiah be cured of his serious illness? ‘And Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs, And they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered’ (II Kings 20:7) ...

“At that time Berodach-Baladan, the son of Baladan king of Babylon, sent letters and a present unto Hezekiah: for he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick’ (II Kings 20:12). This was the traditional practice in court circles and was part of the royal etiquette in the ancient East ... Merodach-Baladan, however, found Hezekiah’s illness a convenient pretext for making contact with him. The real reason for his polite courtesies lay in the field of high-level politics. ‘Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon’, was for a long time a mysterious personage both to

readers of the Bible and to scholars. It is now certain that he was in his own day an extremely important person.”

Merodach-Baladan (in a former place he is called Berodach-Baladan) was a very important player in trying to throw off the yoke of the Assyrian. It was natural for him to take advantage of the death of Sargon to enter into confederacy with other countries to defeat the Assyrian bondage. Judah is one of the countries he attempted to enlist in this endeavor. Let’s now take a look at what the *Pictorial Bible Dictionary* by Merrill C. Tenny has to say about Merodach-Baladan, page 526:

“**MERODACH BALADAN** . . . (*Marduk has given a son*), a king of Babylon called Berodach-baladan in II Kings 20:12. He was a strong, courageous leader of the Chaldeans, who lived in the marshes of southern Mesopotamia. In 722 B.C. he rebelled against the Assyrians, who had control of Babylon for many years, and became king of Babylon. Sargon, king of Assyria (before he was murdered), recognized him as Babylonian king in 721 B.C. He reigned 11 years. At about 712 B.C., Merodach Baladan sent an embassy to Hezekiah. While it came ostensibly to congratulate the Hebrew king on his recovery (II Kings 20:12-19; Isaiah 39:1-8), the embassy really came to invite him to join in a confederacy with Babylon, Susiana, Phoenicia, Moab, Edom, Philistia and Egypt for a grand attack on the Assyrian empire, Sargon (before he was murdered), getting wind of the plot, attacked and defeated his enemies individually. In 710 B.C. he took Babylon; in 709 B.C. Bit-Yakin (Merodach Baladan’s home in southern Mesopotamia) fell and Merodach Baladan was captured. He managed to be reinstated in his principedom of Bit-Yakin. In 703 B.C., he briefly took Babylon and ruled there, but was again driven to Bit-Yakin by Sennacherib, Sargon’s son and successor. Later he was obliged to flee the country and found refuge in Elam, while the Chaldeans were subjugated. Although Merodach Baladan had failed in his project to revive the power of the city of Babylon, the Chaldeans, whose chief he was, became from his days the dominant caste in Babylon (Dan. 2:2, 10; 5:7; Ezra 5:12).”

Now returning to the book, *The Bible As History* by Werner Keller pages 260-263:

“Apart from his private hobby of gardening, Merodach-Baladan both as a king and as a Babylonian was the most bitter and determined opponent of Nineveh (Assyria). No other monarch in the Fertile Crescent attacked the Assyrian so vigorously over many years, engaged them in so many heated battles, or intrigued so unremittingly against the tyrants of the Tigris, as he did. The assassination of Sargon brought Merodach-Baladan into the field. It was at this point that his ambassadors visited Hezekiah. What was in fact discussed on the occasion of the official visit during the convalescence of Hezekiah can be read between the lines: ‘And Hezekiah hearkened unto them, and showed them all the house of his precious things . . . and all the house of his armor’ (II Kings 20:13), Judah’s arsenal.

Secret armaments and feverish preparations for D-day, the great showdown with Assyria which they saw to be imminent, were in full swing. ‘Also . . . he built up all the wall that was broken, and raised it up to the towers, and another wall without, and repaired Millo in the city of David, and made darts and shields in abundance’ (II Chron. 32:5) . . .

“‘This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper water course of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David . . .’ (II Chron. 32:30) . . . Outside the city where its southeastern slopes sweep gently down to the Valley of the Kidron, lies a small still sheet of water enclosed by walls, the Pool of Siloam . . . It was followed up and a long underground tunnel was discovered. A narrow passage about two feet wide and barely five feet high had been cut through the limestone. It can be negotiated only with rubber boots and a slight stoop. Water knee deep rushes to meet you. For about 500 yards the passage winds imperceptibly uphill. It ends at the Virgin’s Fountain, Jerusalem’s water supply since ancient times. In Biblical days it was called the Fountain of Gihon . . .

“During a siege the first problem is that of providing drinking water. The founders of Jerusalem, the Jebusites, had sunk a shaft down through the rock of the Fountain of Gihon. Hezekiah directed its water, which would otherwise have flowed into the Kidron Valley, through the mountain to the west side of the city. The Pool of Siloam lies inside the second perimeter wall which he constructed. There was no time to lose. The Assyrian troops could be at the gates of Jerusalem overnight. The workman therefore tackled the tunnel from both ends. The marks of the pickaxes point toward each other, as the inscription describes.”

Now let’s go to another book to pick up the next piece of the story. This time I am going to quote from a book entitled *History Of The Hebrew Commonwealth* by Albert Edward Bailey and Charles Foster Kent, pages 216-217:

“Sennacherib again marched westward evidently for the purpose of conquering Egypt, the arch-plotter and disturber of his peace. The army had reached the Philistine plain when Sennacherib decided that it was unwise military strategy to leave in his rear a strong fortress like Jerusalem, if it should revolt, it might cut off his retreat. He accordingly sent a detachment of his army under the Rabshakeh (commander-in-chief) to demand the surrender of the city. Three Hebrew officials came out to treat with the Assyrians but found them insolent in their demands. The Assyrians even talked loudly in the Hebrew tongue so that the common people on the wall might hear and take panic. Their argument was: ‘Surrender, and let us transplant you to a more fruitful land where you can prosper and be happy. If you resist we will tear you to pieces. Trust not that your god Yahweh will deliver you, for you see what we have done to the gods of all the other nations.’ When the officials brought the Assyrian demands to Hezekiah, he went into the temple

to spread them before Yahweh, and he sent for his best friend, Isaiah. The prophet assured him that Yahweh would not allow his city to be violated.

*‘He shall not come into the city,  
Nor shoot an arrow into it;  
I will guard this city that I may rescue it,  
For my own sake and for my servant David’s sake.’*

Isaiah was strengthened in his faith by his consciousness of the people’s virtue. They had paid their tribute (to Assyria) faithfully, they had purged away idolatry and had reformed their wicked ways in accordance with their best light. Sennacherib had no moral right to make these demands, and therefore it was right for Jerusalem not to yield. The prophet, who forty years before had warned Ahaz not to make alliance with Assyria, and who for thirty years after the compact was made had counselled absolute fidelity to Assyria, now in the light of Assyria’s perfidy boldly challenged the great empire and threw himself on Yahweh’s protection. It is a sublime spectacle of faith and courage.

The prophet’s faith was justified by an extraordinary event. When the Rabshakeh returned to Sennacherib with his report of Jerusalem’s defiance, he found that the Assyrian army had advanced to the border of Egypt to attack Tirhakah, the Ethiopian king. Here a pestilence broke out, or, in the language of the scripture, ‘an angel of Yahweh slew in the camp of the Assyrian 185,000 men.’ Sennacherib was frightened and beat a hasty retreat, ordering home at the same time the detachment that was about Jerusalem. The city was saved, and the aged prophet became after all his trials and labors the most honored and beloved citizen of the nation.”

Next I would like to comment on the Assyrian policy of repopulation of masses of people. So you won’t think it is all my words, I will take a couple of quotes from *Reader’s Digest Story of the Bible World In Map, Word And Pictures* by Nelson Beecher Keys, pages 81 and 84:

“Both there (in Babylon) and in other restless dependencies to the east, deportation on a large scale was inaugurated. Native populations **were mixed** with foreigners brought sometimes great distances from their home countries. The purpose behind this device was to temper national consciousness — to break up special groups and with them the will to resist . . .

“In the conquering Assyrian manner, people from other lands were then brought in and settled there, so that the population **might be mixed**.”

What you had going on back then — was the same as today! Race-mixing on a grand scale! And being promoted by the same people, the “Jews.” The Assyrians of those

days had the same hook noses as you can observe among the “Jews” of today. So now you know what they had in mind in the case of the Samaritans. Another topic I would like to stress is the incident of the plague that broke out among the Assyrians soldiers causing 185,000 deaths. For this, I am going to return to *The Bible As History* by Werner Keller, pages 266-268:

“Just at the moment when the whole country had been subjugated and the siege of Jerusalem, the last point of resistance, was in full swing, the unexpected happened: Sennacherib broke off the attack at five minutes to twelve. Only something quite extraordinary could have induced him to stop the fighting. What could it have been? While the Assyrian records are enveloped in a veil of silence. the Bible says: ‘And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib, king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh’ (II Kings 19:35, 36) ...

“It happened that at the very time that Sennacherib the Assyrian marched against Egypt with a large armed force, there was a priest-king on the throne of Egypt who treated the army as a contemptible profession. The Egyptian warriors, who had been so disdainfully dealt with, refused to take the field. Thereupon the priest-king hurried to the temple in deep despair. There he was told that the god would help him. Relying upon this the king who had actually no soldiers behind him but only storekeepers, tradesmen, and market folk, went to meet Sennacherib. At the narrow entrances into the country ‘an army of field-mice swarmed over their opponents in the night ... gnawed through their quivers and their bows, and the handles of their shields, so that on the following day they fled minus their arms and a great number of them fell. Hence’, concluded Herodotus’ story, ‘this king still stands in Hephaestus’ temple with a mouse in his hand, and with the following inscription: ‘Look on me and live in safety’.”

To bring another witness to this story, I am going to quote excerpts from the book, *Reader’s Digest Story of the Bible World In Map, Word And Picture* by Nelson Beecher Keys from pages 84 to 89. While this is a very well written documentation of this historical period of Judah, the writer does make inaccurate **suppositions**. I will point them out as we go along. The purpose for doing this is to show you how, when you are reading material like this, you can readily spot these untrue **assumptions** for yourself. So this will not only be a second witness to this story, but a critical review of this part of Key’s book:

“The kingdom of Israel, which had lasted for two hundred years, had now come to an end, in 721 B.C., and the members of the Ten Tribes who had been hurried off to Assyria became the Lost Tribes, for they have never again emerged in world history.”

Nelson Beecher Keys is very wrong here, for **the major share of world history** of the White nations is predominately Israel's history. But we will have to excuse Keys here as he is not the only one who is blind to who the true Israelites are. He probably **assumes** that Assyria was successful in **mixing** the Israelites with other races to the area where they were deported. Israel did indeed again emerge in world history, and what a history it is. Now back to his article on page 84:

“The **mixture** of peoples in and about Samaria came to be known as the Samaritans, and their numbers were far less than those who had peopled this highland area before the coming of the Assyrians. There were so few of them that lions began to multiply in the land. And since these people worshiped many false gods, the Lord used these beasts as a scourge against them. The poor discouraged people finally resorted to the Assyrian king for aid and guidance, and he sent them a priest of Israel from among the captives he had taken. The holy man established a shrine at Bethel and sought to instruct his charges in the worship of Yahweh. But their idolatry was too ingrained; they combined the worship of God with that of their many idols.”

Here is another **assumption** on the part of Keys, that somehow it was good on the part of the Hebrew priests to teach the Samaritans the ways of Yahweh. Yahweh declares to Israel: You only, have I known of all the families of the earth. Right away, these Samaritans wanted to pervert the teachings of Yahweh, making a sham out of them. Non-Israelites will do it every time! They are not kinsmen to Yahweh as we are, so their comprehension is nil. Let's again continue with excerpts from Keys' article from pages 84 to 88:

“... Now the northern kingdom, made up the greater portion of the domain promised to God's Chosen People, had passed back into heathen hands. Only the tiny Kingdom of Judah remained, a little oval block running from a few miles above Jerusalem south to Kadesh-barnea and from the Salt Sea to just west of Lachish. It embraced hardly more than one fourth the area of present-day Belgium. In fact, it was a mere trace of the kingdom passed along by David to Solomon; and even this remnant was virtually a possession of the Assyrians. Hezekiah, its king continued the role of vassal assumed by his father, Ahaz, and records of his annual payments of tribute may still be read on the numerous clay tablets unearthed in Assyria. He and his people found the burden unbearable ...

“... Assyria launched another series of invasions, which ultimately were to end disastrously for her. There were apparently three waves of invasions, the first coming while Sargon was still upon the throne, but led by a tartan, *turtanu*, or commander in chief, who may have been his son Sennacherib ... During the next ten years several notable occurrences took place. One was the death of Sargon,

which resulted in a wave of restlessness, sweeping the empire from one end to the other. Sennacherib quickly took over the throne, so no major revolt occurred . . .

“Sennacherib accepted the huge tribute sent to him by Hezekiah, but he had no intention of letting Jerusalem escape all punishment. After Lachish had been reduced and the main stage of this second invasion got under way, Jerusalem received immediate attention. Suddenly the Assyrian multitude was before its gates; as described in Byron’s classic words, ‘The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold.’ A *rab-saris*, or court officer of Sennacherib, bawled out a dire warning to the representatives of Hezekiah, who stood upon the wall to hear his words . . .

“His (Hezekiah’s) remarkable cure, plus the exhortation of the man of God, Isaiah, seems to have strengthened Hezekiah’s faith in Yahweh; he stoutly refused to admit these Assyrian troops sent to garrison the city. The main Assyrian army was just then embroiled in Libnah, and when Sennacherib heard of Hezekiah’s defiance he dispatched messengers with letters threatening vengeance. But as his own situation at the moment was highly critical — a major battle against the Egyptians was threatening — Jerusalem would have to wait.

“The Assyrian forces fell back to Eltekeh, about twenty miles west of Jerusalem. There Sennacherib met the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia and defeated them. Turning upon nearby Ekron, he added it to his list of conquests. While Sennacherib’s inventory, like other similar lists, may be exaggerated, he claims to have taken a total of forty-six fortified cities and towns in Judah alone, from which he led away into bondage a reported 200,150 persons. He plundered the countryside of countless horses, camels, donkeys, mules and sheep.

“He would most certainly have gone on and leveled Jerusalem had not disaster just then struck him a paralyzing blow. A plague broke out in the ranks of his army and killed according, to the Bible account, 185,000 of his warriors in a single horrible night (2 Kings [4 Kings (sic)] 19:35). He had no choice but to gather together his few remaining men and hurriedly retreat. Jerusalem was thus miraculously spared.

“Troubles in Babylon now demanded Sennacherib’s attention, and Judah was to know a few quiet years, during which Hezekiah died in peace. He was succeeded by his twenty-two year old son, Manasseh, whose reign was to prove at first as evil and revolting as his father’s had been just and good. He rebuilt the altars to Baal which his father had torn down; he believed in enchantments and dealt with soothsayers and wizards, all of which were an abomination in the eyes of the Lord.

“It appears that Manasseh continued as a vassal of Assyria; two Assyrian kings, Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, have left records of tribute payments made by him. It was probably the latter who caused the brash young man to be led captive to Babylon. While there, Manasseh repented of his gross wickedness, and the Lord

therefore restored him to his kingdom. He ruled for the incredible period of forty-five years, the longest term any king of Judah held that throne.”

The next to rule on the throne of David was Amon. I will use *Insight On the Scripture*, volume 1, page 96 to tell his story:

“AMON. A King of Judah (661-660 B.C.), and son of wicked king Manasseh. He began to rule at the age of 22 and followed the idolatrous course of his father’s earlier years. The bad conditions described at Zephaniah 1:4; 3:2-4 doubtless were developing at this time. After two years on the throne, he was murdered by his own servants. ‘The people of the land [‘am ha-’arets]’ put the conspirators to death, placed his son Josiah on the throne, and buried his son Amon in ‘the garden of Uzza.’ (2 Ki 21:19-26; 2 Ch 33:20-25) The genealogy of Jesus includes his name. — Mt 1:10.”

The next king after Amon was Josiah. For his story, we will return to *Reader’s Digest Story of the Bible World In Map, Word And Picture* by Nelson Beecher Keys, page 88:

“The people of the land then quickly dispatched the assassins and placed Amon’s eight-year-old son, Josiah, on the throne. Josiah’s reign was to prove one of the finest in the history of the little Kingdom of Judah . . . While still a young man he sought to make his life and that of his court conform to the Law of God, and he set about suppressing idolatry not only in his kingdom but also to the north in what had once been the Kingdom of Israel . . . Josiah was about twenty-six years old when he gave orders for the repair and refurnishing of the Temple, during which an ancient copy of the Law was discovered in a chamber. Its reading profoundly impressed not only the young king but his subjects as well. A second campaign for the elimination of every conceivable form or vestige of idolatry was set in motion, and the Passover celebration is said to have had greater religious fervor than any since the time of Samuel.”

We should take notice of something that is really important here. When Josiah tried to act as a missionary to the Samaritans trying to convert them to Hebrew ways, he was ignorant of the Law. If he would have found the copy of Yahweh’s Law first, and then studied it carefully, he would have never tried to force his beliefs on the Samaritans. This action only added fuel to the fire when Ezra and Nehemiah were having trouble with them later on, when the Samaritans wanted to join in to help rebuild the temple and join in worship with them. Keys, in his article, tries to imply that it was “very pleasing to the Lord” for Josiah to do this. You will notice that once Josiah had read the Law, he never tried to enforce his Hebrew convictions on the Samaritans again. We are to keep ourselves separate from the heathen! These heathen have no compunction about breaking Yahweh’s Law! This is one of the important incorrect postulations I



wanted you to notice about Keys' article. While Key's does a very excellent job of putting this story together, he has a few kinks in it. Let's continue with his article on page 89:

"Josiah, a vassal of Assyria like his father, grandfather and great-grandfather before him, hated the Assyrians and wanted to see them destroyed. Hoping, therefore, to prevent the Egyptians from joining the Assyrians, he gathered together his small army and met them at Megiddo in 609 B.C. During the battle a well-placed arrow dealt King Josiah a mortal wound. Hastily transferred from his own chariot to another, he was hurried back to Jerusalem, sixty miles away, but he had no more than arrived there when he died."

We should be starting to get an idea of the history of Judah under the hand of Assyria. It is important to understand that all of Judea except Jerusalem went into Assyrian captivity and about one hundred years later Jerusalem went into Babylonian captivity. This divided Judah into two different groups. Isaiah 1:7-8 describes this situation of Jerusalem being isolated from the rest of Judah quite well:

<sup>7</sup> Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers.

<sup>8</sup> And the daughter of Zion (Jerusalem) is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city.

To understand this passage more fully, I will use some comments from different commentaries to expound on it, and I will start with the 12 volume *Interpreters Bible* which has the following to say, volume 5, page 169:

"7. The devastation of war was almost as terrible then as now, especially after invasion by the Assyrians. who were specialists in the techniques of military terrorism. **As overthrown by strangers:** 'like an overthrow by [of] strangers.' Ewald's suggested reading, 'like the overthrow of Sodom', has much to commend it. 8. **The daughter of Zion:** The city personified as a young woman: cf. Amos 5:2. Originally the name of the Jebusite stronghold captured by David (II Sam. 5:7), Zion became a poetic name for the city as associated with David and his dynasty. The name Jerusalem, like the city itself, is many centuries older than his time ... In three deft (quick and skillful) illustrative phrases **the prophet here emphasizes the complete isolation of the capital.**"

The Dake's Annotated Reference Bible says, page 681, column 1, item v:

"This was literally fulfilled about 175-180 years after this stern prediction. Many times hereafter the word **desolate** is used of the coming destruction of Judah and Jerusalem."

*The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* remarks on this on page 610:

“Doubtless these verses look forward prophetically to the far more serious investment of Jerusalem by the Assyrians under Sennacherib in 701 B.C. (some scholars refer this whole chapter to that later period).”

*Matthew Poole’s Commentary on the Bible* says, volume 2, page 327:

*“Is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers; is left solitary,* all the neighbouring villages and country round about it being laid waste.”

*Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 564:

“8. *As a cottage in a vineyard* — ‘As a shed in a vineyard.’ A little temporary hut covered with boughs, straw, turf, or the like materials, for a shelter from the heat by day and the cold and dews by night, for the watchman that kept the garden or vineyard during the short season the fruit was ripening (see Job xxvii. 18), and presently removed when it had served that purpose. *As a lodge*. That is, after the fruit was gathered, the lodge being then permitted to fall into decay. Such was the desolate, ruined state of the city.”

With all this, we should have a better idea of the history of Israel’s deportations, and *Judah under the Assyrians*. I don’t know how many times I have read in the past, and continue to read articles by various Identity authors who continually persistently indicate that Israel went into Assyrian captivity and that Judah went into Babylonian captivity, it is simply misleading! I believe, in most cases, these writers and teachers are speaking in generalities, while others are ignorant of the facts and are just repeating what the others are saying without doing any research for themselves on the subject. I have to admit, for a long time, such writers had me convinced that this is the way the history of Israel and Judah were. After much study, I found there were a few writers and teachers who understood the true history of Israel and Judah, and this generalization didn’t fit with what I had previously been told. Once an understanding is achieved on the true history of Israel and Judah, one can begin to understand the difference between a Judahite of the tribe of Judah and a “Jew.” This is a very important difference to understand and there are many who have not accomplished this discretion. It would seem well, if these persons who have not done their homework on this history, discontinue having opinions on the subject until they have acquired such knowledge. In spite of the record, there are still many so-called big names in Identity who still claim the Jews are Israelites! It is high time they are taken to task! Now we will get back to the time period of Ezra and Nehemiah.

## NEHEMIAH RETURNS A SECOND TIME TO JERUSALEM

After Nehemiah left Jerusalem the first time, things started to fall apart at the seams. To tell the story of this, I will use excerpts from the *History Of The Jews* by Heinrich Graetz, volume 1, page 375-393. (I use this reference because there is not much written on this period of time, and it does go along with Scripture quite well):

“But no sooner had Nehemiah left than a counter-current set in that could be traced to the influence of the high-priest Eliashib. The first retrograde step was taken when Eliashib held friendly communication with the Samaritans and the offspring of the mixed marriages, in violation of the decision of the Great Assembly. As an earnest of his friendship, a member of the priest’s household, named Man-assah, married Nicaso, a daughter of Sanballat. Others, who had been secretly dissatisfied with Nehemiah’s strict line of separation, now followed the example of the priestly house. **An entire change took place.** Tobiah, the second great enemy of Nehemiah, was allowed to return unmolested to Jerusalem, and a large court in the outer Temple was actually assigned to him . . .

“But worse than all else was the discord which prevailed in the Judæan community, and which even divided families. What could be pronounced right and lawful? The father did not agree with the son; the one accepted the stern practice, the other the lax, and thus disputes arose in each household. To counteract these lamentable occurrences, the more pious, who would not allow themselves to be shaken in their convictions, met and discussed a plan of action. They turned with hope and longing towards Nehemiah, who was still at the court of Artaxerxes. If he would return to Jerusalem, he could, with one blow, put an end to this miserable state of confusion, and restore peace, unity, and strength to the city. At this auspicious moment a God-fearing man suddenly appeared on the scene. He belonged to the party that was incensed at the behavior of the high-priest, and he undertook to chastise the wicked, and to reanimate the waning courage of the good. This man, full of vigor, and moved by the prophetic spirit, was Malachi, the last of the prophets. Worthily did he close the long list of godly men who had succeeded each other for four centuries. Malachi announced to his dejected and despairing brethren the speedy arrival of the Messenger of the Covenant, whom many delighted in, and who would bring better days with him. The prophet counselled the people not to omit paying the tithes on account of the evil-doing of some of the priests, but to bring them all, as in former days, into the store-houses . . .”

“Did Nehemiah at the court of Persia have any idea of the yearning for his presence that existed at this moment in Jerusalem? Had he any knowledge that Malachi’s belief in better days rested upon the hope of his return? It is impossible to say, but, at all events, he suddenly re-appeared in Jerusalem, between the years 430

and 424 B.C., having again obtained the king's permission to return to his spiritual home, and soon after his arrival he became, in the words of the prophet, 'like a refiner's fire, and like the fuller's lye.' He cleansed the community of its impure elements. **He began by expelling the Ammonite Tobiah from the place which had been given him by his priestly relative, Eliashib, and by dismissing the latter from his office.** He then assembled the heads of the community, and reproached them bitterly with having caused the Levites to desert the Temple, by neglecting to collect the tithes. A summons from Nehemiah was enough to induce the landed proprietors to perform their neglected duties, and to cause the Levites to return to their services in the Temple. The charge of the collected tithes and their just distribution he placed under the care of four conscientious Judæans, — some of his devoted followers. He restored the divine service to its former solemnity, and dismissed the unworthy priest. **A most important work in the eyes of Nehemiah was the dissolution of the mixed marriages which had again been contracted.** Here he came in direct conflict with the high-priestly house. Manasseh, a son or relation of the high-priest Joiada, refused to separate himself from his Samaritan wife, Nicaso, Sanballat's daughter, and Nehemiah possessed sufficient firmness to banish him from the country. Many other Aaronides and Judæans who would not obey Nehemiah's commands were also sent into exile. After peace and order had been restored in the capital, Nehemiah tried to abolish the abuses which had found their way into the provinces. Wherever Judæans lived in close proximity to foreign tribes, such as the Ashdodites, Ammonites, Moabites or Samaritans, mixed marriages had led to almost entire ignorance of the Hebrew tongue, for the children of these marriages generally spoke the language of their mothers. This aroused Nehemiah's anger, and stimulated his energy. He remonstrated with the Judæan fathers, he even cursed them, and finally caused the refractory (obstinate or unmanageable) to be punished. **By such persistent activity he was able to accomplish the dissolution of the mixed marriages,** and the preservation of the Hebrew tongue."

#### **SANBALLAT AND THE SAMARITANS BUILD THEIR OWN TEMPLE AT GERIZIM**

"Sanballat, as well as his Samaritan followers and companions, out of preference for the God of Israel, had struggled to be received into the Judæan community. The virulence (hostile bitterness) of their enmity against Nehemiah, who had raised the commonwealth from its declining state, was in reality an impetuous offer of love, by which they hoped to secure an intimate connection with Judæa. But as they were repulsed again and again, this yearning love changed into burning hatred. When Sanballat, who thought he had attained his aim by his connection with the high-priest's family, learned of the insult shown him in the banishment of his son-in-law Manasseh, because of that priest's marriage with his daughter, the measure of his wrath was full. He cunningly conceived the plan of disorganising the Judæan community, by the help of its own members. What if he were to raise a temple to the God of Israel, to contest the supremacy of the one at Jerusalem?

There were among his followers priests of the descendants of Aaron, who could legally conduct the service, as prescribed in the Torah, in the projected sanctuary. The dignity of the high-priest could fitly be assumed by his son-in-law Manasseh, and the other Aaronides who had been expelled from the Temple could officiate with him. Everything appeared favorable to his design. Both his desire of worshipping the God of Israel, and his ambition to be at the head of a separate community, could easily be satisfied at the same time.

“On the summit of the fruitful Mount Gerizim, at the foot of the city of Shechem, in the very heart of the land of Palestine, Sanballat built his Temple, probably after the death of Artaxerxes (about 420 B.C.). The Aaronides who had been expelled from Jerusalem, and who were well versed in all the tenets of the Law (?), had selected this site because they knew that, according to the Book of Deuteronomy, the blessings were to be pronounced upon the followers of the Law of Moses from that mount. **But the Samaritans gave to the old words a new interpretation.** They called, and still call to this day, Mount Gerizim ‘Mount of Blessings’, as if blessing and salvation proceeded from the mount itself. Even the town Shechem they called ‘Blessing’ (Ma-Gerizim). Sanballat, or the priest of this temple of Gerizim, declared that the mixed race of the Samaritans were not descendants of the exiles placed in that country by an Assyrian king, but that, on the contrary, they were true Israelites, a remnant of the Ten Tribes, or of the tribes of Joseph and Ephraim . . . They declared that they alone were the descendants of Israel, disputing the sanctity of Jerusalem and its Temple, and affirming that everything established by the Judæan people was a mere counterfeit of the old Israelitish customs.”







## LETTER 10

---

In my last teaching letter, I showed how the Samaritans were a mixture of 34 groups of ethnic peoples, many of which the Assyrians had placed in the old northern Kingdom of Israel after they took the Ten Tribes captive and displaced them from their land. I very carefully presented the history of the deportations by Assyria and Babylon proving that most of Judah went into Assyrian captivity while only the inhabitants of Jerusalem went into Babylonian captivity thus dividing the peoples of Judah. As a matter of fact, this division of the descendants of Judah was very extensive, as there were a whole series of divisions of the descendants of Judah and I will give you an overview of these divisions shortly. Then I returned to the subject of Nehemiah's second return to Jerusalem to deal with the race-mixing that was going on during his time with the Samaritans and the people of the land, some of whom were the nations of the Canaanites who were infused with the Cain satanic seed-line.. Then I showed you how, after Nehemiah expelled the half-breeds and the heathen, Sanballet and company built their own separate temple on Mount Gerizim.

Now to give you an overview of the divisions of the descendants of Judah:

1. Division between the children born to Judah and Bathshua, and the children born to Judah and Tamar, (see lessons #2 and #3).
2. Division between Judah and Joseph — Judah getting the Scepter and Joseph getting the Birthright.
3. Division among the families of Judah with the House of David becoming the kingly line.
4. Division of the House of Israel from the House of Judah.

5. Division of Judah in captivity — most going into Assyrian captivity while the remainder in Jerusalem going into Babylonian captivity. (After the Assyrian campaign, only Jerusalem of all Judah remained.)
6. Division among the Judah captives going into Babylonian captivity — some going earlier as **good figs** and some going later as **bad figs**.
7. Division among the Judah captives in Babylon — some returning to Jerusalem after 70 years to rebuild the walls and temple, while others staying in Babylon.
8. Division and separation forever of the **seventy weeks nation** from the rest of Israel and Judah (never to bear fruit again) when Yahshua cursed the fig tree, Matthew 21:19; Jeremiah 19:1, 10-11.

If you are not aware of all the details of these divisions in Judah, you are not prepared to identify the difference between a member of the Tribe of Judah and a “Jew!” (The term “Jew” is very confusing and inconsistent, which can mean different things to different people. Judah is an entirely different and distinct subject from that of the “Jew.”) I have already gone extensively into detail on some of these divisions in Judah, but there is still much to cover. At this time, I wish to return to some significant Samaritan history. You will have to learn to love history or you will never come to a full understanding of the Scriptures. I will try my best to present this history in a manner that becomes interesting and easy to understand.

### A DEFINITION OF THE TERM, “JEW”

Before going any further, the term “Jew” should be defined. I use **quotation marks** properly in order to **disown this term**. The usage of the term “Jew” or “Jews” was and is very fluid (not firm or fixed) inasmuch as it can mean many things to many people. It is generally used incorrectly for the Tribe of Judah, and, sometimes, even for the entire scope of the Hebrew people. Sometimes it is used only to indicate national origin, or a citizen of **any race** occupying the southern Kingdom of Judah. After the dispersal of the “Jews” from Jerusalem in 70 A.D., one was called a “Jew” who adhered to “Judaism” (a corrupted form of Hebrew tenets). Proselytes to the religion of Judaism which includes the tenets of the Talmud (or traditions of the elders) were and are properly called “Jews.” *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 898 further defines the term, “Jew”:

“Today the term is even more fluid (not firm or fixed). There are Jews both by religion and by birth, by religion but not by birth, and by birth but not by religion.



Race, nationality, physical type, language, culture, belief — none of these nor any combination of these will distinguish or identify the Jew. While it is without question that the Jews represent a **clearly traceable continuum** in the history of mankind, there is no least **common denominator** for the ... people who call themselves Jews.”

The “**clearly traceable continuum**” and “**common denominator**” described here is the infusion of the Cain satanic seed-line blood through intermarriage with one or more of them? The main topic of our study is how this satanic blood spread among various peoples developing the “generation” (# 1081 gennema “race”) of vipers, Matthew 12:34) called “Jews” today. The proper definition, therefore, for a “Jew” is: one who has in some measure the slightest amount of satanic blood of Cain flowing in his veins no matter what else he may otherwise be called. A Judahite of the Tribe of Judah is not a “Jew”, and a “Jew” is not a Judahite or a pureblooded descendant of Jacob.

#### SAMARITANS UNDER JOHN HYRCANUS

We are going to skip all the way from the building of the temple at Mount Gerizim by the Samaritan Sanballat (about 420 B.C.), to its final destruction by John Hyrcanus (about 110 B.C.). This covers a period of about 310 years, and many things can happen in that long a span of time. Compare our own history for the last 310 years and you will have to agree, for it would take us back to 1689. Some do not agree with the 420 B.C. figure for the building of the temple at Gerizim, as some place it after Alexander the Great. This couldn't be because we have to consider that Jerusalem was under Persian rule at this time. Grecian rule under Alexander didn't come until much later. There was something very interesting which happened during the reign of John Hyrcanus.

The area occupied by Judah was becoming so small, and the number of Judeans were becoming so few, John Hyrcanus decided upon a new and devastating policy — he would expand the territory of Judea and force the peoples he conquered to become proselytes to Israelite tenets (most writers wrongly say to “become Jews”). He first made an expedition against Syria taking the city of Medaba after about six months. After this he took Samega and the surrounding places. Besides these, he then turned toward Shechem and Gerizim and the nation of the Cutheans (another name for Samaritans) who dwelt at the temple which had been build by Sanballat for the sake of Manasseh (the high priest), his son-in-law. Next, I am going to quote from *Josephus*, book 13, chapter 9, part of #1 (you will have to excuse the way he uses the term “Jew”):

“Hyrcanus took also Dora and Marissa, cities of Idumea (Edom), and subdued all the Idumeans; and permitted them to stay in that country, if they would circumcise their genitals, and make use of the laws of the Jews; and they were so desirous of living in the country of their forefathers, that they submitted to the use of circumcision, and the rest of the Jewish ways of living; at which time therefore this befell them, that they were hereafter no other than Jews.”

This expedition against the Edomites happened about one year after Hyrcanus' subjection of the Samaritans and the destruction of their temple. It is obvious that the Samaritans were already practicing a corrupted form of Israelite tenets and maybe even circumcision, so it isn't recorded in history that Hyrcanus enforced his tenets (whatever tenets he was keeping at that time) as a requirement upon them also. What Hyrcanus did do to the Samaritans was to destroy their temple at Mount Gerizim and treat them quite badly; so no doubt, they might have reverted to the temple at Jerusalem where they had been refused admission to worship earlier during Nehemiah's time. If the Edomites were invited to join, surely anyone accepting the tenets of the Jerusalem Temple were welcome. Only the Samaritans who continued to worship on Mount Gerizim would continue to be hated and not accepted by the Judeans. How can we tell this is probably what happened? You have to realize, if this was done, it opened the door to the 34 ethnic peoples which made up the Samaritans (which included the descendants of Cain) to become proselytes of the Judeans. Remember how in lesson #8, I explained how the Assyrians **had a policy** of mixing the people? It seems that John Hyrcanus **had a policy** of making proselytes of his conquered peoples. Perhaps if John Hyrcanus didn't accept the Samaritans as proselytes, his son, Aristobulus I, did. If Hyrcanus and his son Aristobulus 1 practiced the tenets of what was called, “the traditions of the elders”, it could properly be called “Judaism.” Reading from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 351:

“Aristobulus I (104-103 B.C.) is said by Josephus to have taken the title of king. He conquered Galilee and forced the Gentile inhabitants to become Jews.”

Now let's go to *Josephus*, book 13, chapter 11, and the last few lines of part 3:

“He (Aristobulus I) was called a lover of the Grecians; and had conferred many benefits on his own country, and made war against Ituraea, and added a great part of it to Judea, and compelled the inhabitants, if they would continue in that country, to be circumcised, and to live according to the Jewish laws. He was naturally a man of candour, and of great modesty, as Strabo bears witness in the name of Timagenes: who says thus: — ‘This man was a person of candour, and very serviceable to the Jews, for he added a country to them, and obtained a part of the nation of the Itureans for them, and bound them to them by the bond of the circumcision of their genitals.’”

Again, with this reference, you have to take the word “Jew” and “Jewish laws” the way the writer intended them, as Josephus never heard of the word “Jew” during his time. You can see very clearly that like father like son. This new policy to proselytize the heathen was a radical change from that adopted by Ezra and Nehemiah. I know I have had to go the long way around on this one to prove that the Samaritans became proselytes, but I believe you can see the evidence is very strong that they did. How many of the Samaritans might have become proselytes, can only be guessed at. It is my personal persuasion under the circumstances, because it was the policy of both the father and the son, that many of the Samaritans did become proselytes. Let’s next take a look at this place called “Ituraea” and see what that is all about. From *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 1238 we get the following information:

**“ITURAEA** (It-u-rea’a). A small territory of varying and undefined boundaries located northeast of the Sea of Galilee. The name Ituraea is thought to derive from Ishmael’s son Jetur, whose descendants residing east of the Jordan were defeated by the Israelites. Gen. 25:15, 16; 1Chr. 1:31; 5:18-23) Toward the close of the second century B.C., the Maccabean king Aristobulus 1 successfully warred against Ituraea and added much of its territory to Judea. To remain in the country, the inhabitants of Ituraea had to submit to circumcision and obey Jewish Laws (Jewish Antiquities, XIII, 318 [xi, 3]). Later Ituraea was one of the territories comprising the tetrarchy of Philip, inherited from his father Herod the Great. Luke 3:1.”

It’s a little hard to identify these Ituraeans, but they certainly were not Israelites. The more we learn about these Judean proselytes, the stranger they appear. There is one thing for sure — not everyone who is circumcised is necessarily a son of the Covenant! Now let’s talk about some of Judah’s divisions — let’s start with the division of the good figs and bad figs of Judah (#6 above).

### THE DIVISION OF THE GOOD FIGS AND THE BAD FIGS OF JUDAH

This Seventy Weeks Nation is a part of the bad figs. As a matter of fact, it is well referred to as the “bad fig nation.” Even though some good figs came through this nation like Yahshua and his ancestral line along with John the Baptist and his family line, nevertheless, it is and was a bad fig nation. We find the Scripture about the good and bad figs in Jeremiah chapter 24. Let’s read this passage at this time:

<sup>1</sup> The LORD shewed me, and behold, two baskets of figs were set before the temple of the LORD, after that Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon had carried away captive Jeconiah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, and the princes of Judah, with the

carpenters and smiths, from Jerusalem, and had brought them to Babylon.

<sup>2</sup> One basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe: and the other basket had very naughty figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad.

<sup>3</sup> Then said the LORD unto me, What seest thou Jeremiah? And I said, Figs: the good figs, very good; and the evil, very evil, that cannot be eaten they are so evil.

<sup>4</sup> Again the word of the Lord came unto me saying,

<sup>5</sup> Thus saith the LORD, the God of Isreal; Like these good figs, so will I acknowledge them that are carried away captive of Judah, whom I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans for their good.

<sup>6</sup> For I will set my eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them again to this land: and I will build them, and not pull them down; and I will plant them and not pluck them up.

<sup>7</sup> And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the LORD: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me with their whole heart.

<sup>8</sup> And as the evil figs, which cannot be eaten, they are so evil; surely thus saith the LORD, So will I give Zedekiah the king of Judah, and his princes, and the residue of Jerusalem, that remain in this land, and them that dwell in the land of Egypt:

<sup>9</sup> And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whether I will drive them.

<sup>10</sup> And I will send the sword, the famine, and the pestilence, among them, till they be consumed from off the land that I gave unto them and to their fathers.

Some, when they read verse 8, think that Zedekiah was a bad fig, that he had some Canaanite satanic blood in him and would receive the curse of the Canaanite Judeans because he was to go to Babylon with the bad figs. There was some bad blood in the king line of Judah all right, but Zedekiah was not one of them. When I say bad blood, I mean Cain satanic seed-line blood. At this time, we will trace just how that bad blood got into the royal line of the House of David.

### **BAD BLOOD GETS INTO THE KING LINE OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID**

For this story, we must take into consideration the life and aspirations of Jezebel. Because this is a well known story, I am not going to go into any particular detail of all the evil things she did. To pick up some of her background, I am going to quote from *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, page 590:

**“Jezebel . . .** (perhaps, *non-cohabited, unhusbanded*. the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre and Sidon, and queen of Ahab. Her father had formerly been a priest of Astarte, but had violently dispossessed his brother Phelles of the throne.”

We should give immediate attention to where Jezebel was from (Tyre and Sidon)!!!! For this I will quote from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 940:

“**SIDON** (Si´don), **SIDONIANS** (Si-do´ni-ans). Canaan’s firstborn son Sidon was the progenitor of the Sidonians. The seaport town of Sidon was named after their forefather, and for many years it was the principal city of the Phoenicians as the Greeks called the Sidonians. Today the city is known as Saida. A colony of Sidonians also settled about 35 km (22 mi) south of Sidon and called the place Tyre. In time Tyre surpassed Sidon in many respects, but she never completely lost her identity as a Sidonian settlement. The king of Tyre was sometimes called ‘The king of the Sidonians’ (1 Ki. 16:31), and frequently Tyre and Sidon are mentioned together in prophecy (Jer. 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Joe. 3:4; Zec. 9:2). Between the two cities was Zarephath, ‘which belongs to Sidon.’ ... Originally Sidon was considered the north limit of the Canaanite nations (Gen. 10:19).”

This story opens up another can-of-worms and we will have to consider it before we go on. We will now have to deal with the name Canaan. Again we will use information from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 399:

“**CANAAN** (Ca´naan) [Merchant Land; Land of the Tradesman], **CANAANITE** (Ca´naanite). The fourth-listed son of Ham and grandson of Noah (Ge. 9:18; 10:6; 1 Ch. 1:8). He was the progenitor of 11 tribes who eventually inhabited the region along the eastern Mediterranean between Egypt and Syria, thereby giving it the name ‘the land of Canaan.’ (Ge. 10:15-19; 1 Ch. 16:18).

“Following the incident regarding Noah’s drunkenness, Canaan came under Noah’s prophetic curse foretelling that Canaan would become the slave of both Shem and Japheth (Ge. 9:20-27). Since the record mentions only that ‘Ham the father of Canaan saw his father’s nakedness and went telling it to his two brothers outside’, the question arises as to why Canaan rather than Ham became the object of the curse.”

I won’t tell you the conjecture that *Insight On The Scriptures* goes on to comment concerning this story of Canaan. The story is the same as Reuben when he looked on the nakedness of his father’s wife. I went into a lot of detail and referred to Reuben’s cohabitation in Teaching Letters #2 & 3. To comprehend this passage, you have to understand that Noah’s nakedness was his wife. In other words, Ham violated Noah’s wife and to that union was born Canaan who was cursed by Noah. That is why the other children of Ham were not cursed, only Canaan. Being a child of incest, he was automatically an outcast of the family. And being an outcast, he could not marry with the other members of the family, therefore Canaan married with the satanic seed of Cain and that is why the Canaanites are listed with the ten nations of Genesis 15:19-21. In other words, Jezebel was a Canaanite Jewess! (a bad fig) Now that we know

this, let's look further into Jezebel's evil charades. We really aren't going to get into all the evil this woman did. As an evil satanic seed of Cain, she did that which came natural to her. Like some of the other "evil seed of Cain", she managed to have some little "serpents" by her husband Ahab. We will go back to *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 76 for more of the story:

"In the course of time Ahab died and was succeeded first by Jezebel's son Ahaziah (a serpent seed) who ruled for two years, and then by another of her (serpent seed) sons, Jehoram who ruled for the next 12 years before Ahab's dynasty ended (1 Ki. 22:40, 51-53; 2 Ki. 1:17; 3:1). During the reigns of these sons, Jezebel now in the role of queen mother, continued to influence the land with her fornications and sorceries (2 Ki. 9:22). **Her influence was even felt in Judah to the south, where her wicked daughter Athaliah, who married Judah's king, perpetuated the Jezebel spirit in that southern kingdom for another six years after her mother's death** — 2 Ki. 8:16-18, 25-27; 2 Ch. 22:2, 3; 24:7."

We can see from this that the northern Kingdom had two kings that were descendants of Cain, so let's take a look and see what was happening in the southern Kingdom. The reference this time will be from *Insight Into The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 209:

"**ATHALIAH** (Ath-a-li'ah) ... Queen of Judah, daughter of King Ahab of Israel and his wife Jezebel; granddaughter of Omri (2 Ki. 8:18, 26). She was the sister of Israel's King Jehoram, and sister or half sister of the other 70 sons of Ahab, all of whom Jehu ordered killed (2 Ki. 3:1, 2; 10:1-9). **Athaliah was given in a marriage of political expediency to Jehoram, the eldest son of Jehoshaphat of Judah** (2 Ki. 8:25-27; 2 Ch. 18:1). She was the mother of Ahaziah, who in time became king of Judah.

"Like her mother Jezebel, Athaliah egged on her husband, Jehoram, to do what was bad in Yahweh's eyes during his eight-year reign (1Ki. 21:25; 2 Ch. 21:4-6). And like her mother, **Athaliah wantonly shed the blood of the innocent**. When her wicked son Ahaziah died after a one-year reign, **she killed off all the others of the royal line, except the infant Jehoash, who had been hidden by the high priest and his wife, who was Jehoash's aunt**. Thereupon Athaliah installed herself as queen for six years, 905-899 B.C. (2 Ch. 22:11, 12). Her sons robbed Yahweh's temple of the holy things and offered them up to Baal — 2 Ch. 24:7. When Jehoash reached seven years of age, God-fearing High Priest Jehoiada brought the lad out of secrecy and crowned him rightful heir to the throne. Hearing the tumult, Athaliah rushed to the temple and seeing what was happening, cried 'Conspiracy! Conspiracy!' High Priest Jehoiada ordered her taken outside the temple grounds to be executed at the horse gate of the palace; she was perhaps the last of Ahab's abominable house."

If Athaliah had succeeded in killing Jehoash, that would have been the last of the House of David. The above events were taking place about 280 years before Zedekiah. These events show that bad blood in the form of Cain's descendants had worked themselves into the king lines of both Ephraim and Judah, but because of Jehoash the line of David survived. How can we be sure that it was indeed the blood of Cain that had surfaced in Jezebel and her daughter? To understand the full significance of this we will go to Ezekiel 28:1-19:

<sup>1</sup> The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying,

<sup>2</sup> Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the LORD GOD; Because thine **heart is lifted up**, and thou hast said, **I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas**; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine **heart as the heart of God**:

<sup>3</sup> Behold, thou art **wiser than Daniel**; **there is no secret that they can hide from thee**:

<sup>4</sup> With thy wisdom and with thine understanding **thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures**:

<sup>5</sup> By thy great wisdom and **by thy traffick** hast thou increased thy riches, and **thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches**:

<sup>6</sup> Therefore thus saith the LORD GOD; Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God;

<sup>7</sup> Behold I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against thy beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness.

<sup>8</sup> They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the **midst of the seas**.

<sup>9</sup> Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee.

<sup>10</sup> Thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised by the hand of strangers: for I have spoken it, saith the LORD GOD,

<sup>11</sup> **Moreover** (This is not all, there is more to come.), the word of the LORD came unto me, saying,

<sup>12</sup> Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD GOD; **Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty**.

<sup>13</sup> **Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering**, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, the gold: the **workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee** in the day that thou wast created.

<sup>14</sup> Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the **stones of fire**.

<sup>15</sup> **Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till**

iniquity was found in thee.

<sup>16</sup> By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

<sup>17</sup> Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.

<sup>18</sup> Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee.

<sup>19</sup> All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee: thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more.

#### ZEDEKIAH WAS NOT A “BAD FIG” IN THE SENSE OF BEING FROM CAIN

The only way this can be proven is by checking out Zedekiah’s genealogy. We will check this out as thoroughly by Scripture as we can. Let’s start by quoting from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 1226:

“**ZEDEKIAH** . . . Son of Josiah by his wife Hamutal; last of the Judean kings to reign at Jerusalem. Upon his being constituted vassal king, his name was changed by Babylon King Nebuchadnezzar from Mattaniah to Zedekiah. During the 11 years of his reign, Zedekiah ‘continued to do what was bad in Yahweh’s eyes’— 2 Ki. 24:17-19; 2 Ch. 36:10-12; Jer. 37:1; 52:1,2.”

“**MATTANIAH** (volume 2, page 351) A son of King Josiah and the uncle of King Jehoiachin. He was put on the throne of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, who changed his name to Zedekiah — 2 Ki. 24:15-17.”

“**HAMUTAL** (*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 1027) (Ha-mu’tal) [possibly, Father-in-Law Is Dew]. Daughter of ‘Jeremiah from Libnah’; wife of King Josiah and mother of Jehoahaz and Mattaniah (Zedekiah), both of whom reigned as kings over Judah — 2 Ki. 23:30, 31; 24:17, 18; Jer. 52:1.”

Again, in another article from *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scripture Dictionary*, page 756, we get the following on the name, Hamutal:

“**HAMUTAL** . . . (Hebrew . . . **kinsman** of the dew), daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, wife of king Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah, kings of Judah.”



From this, we know that Zedekiah's mother, Hamutal, had a typical Hebrew name meaning kinsman as fresh as the morning dew. Have you ever gone out early in the morning and observed the sun shining on the dew? — with millions of droplets of dew shining like gems of crystal? — each drop of dew being pure, without contamination, representing purity of race? This is a name for an Israelite, not a race-mixed rotten fig "Jew."

**"JEREMIAH FROM LIBNAH** (*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 30) A man of the town of Libnah, a priestly city. He was the father of King Josiah's wife Hamutal, who was the mother of King Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (Mattaniah). — 2Ki. 23:30, 31; 24:18; Jer. 52:1; Jos. 21:13; 1Ch. 6:57."

Joshua 21:13:

Thus they gave to the children of Aaron the priest Hebron with her suburbs, to be a city of refuge for the slayer; and **Libnah** with her suburbs.

*The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 3, page 921 says this of Libnah: It, (Libnah) later became a Levitical city, i.e. a city assigned exclusively to the priest and Levites for their places of residency in Palestine (Jos. 21:13; 1 Chron. 6:57). If this is true, Zedekiah's mother, Hamutal, was from the tribe of Levi. In order to cover all bases, let's take a look at Josiah, Zedekiah's father.

**"JOSIAH** (*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, pages 117-118) Son of Judean King Amon by Jedidah the daughter of Abiah (2 Ki. 22:1) Josiah had at least two wives, Hamutal and Zebidah (2 Ki. 23:31, 34,36) Of his four sons mentioned in the Bible, only the firstborn, Johanan, did not rule as king over Judah — 1Ch. 3:14,15.

"After the assassination of his father and the execution of the conspirators, eight-year-old Josiah became king of Judah (2 Ki. 21:23, 24, 26; 2Ch. 33:25). Some six years later Zebidah gave birth to Josiah's second son, Jehoiaquim (2 Ki. 22:1; 23:36). In the eighth year of his reign, Josiah sought to learn and to do Yahweh's will (2 Ch, 34:3). It was also about this time that Jehoahaz (Shallum), Josiah's son by Hamutal was born — 2 Ki. 22:1; 23:31; Jer. 22:11 ... About four years later( after the long procrastinated Passover) Josiah became father to Mattaniah (Zedekiah) by his wife Hamutal, — 2Ki. 22:1; 23:31, 34, 36; 24:8, 17, 18.

Also, we find more on Josiah's mother and grandfather from *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 997: "His (Josiah's) mother was Jedidah, daughter of Adaiah of Bozkath (cf. Josh 15:39)."

Then, if you will go to this reference in Joshua, you will find many of the old line Judah families listed from verses 21 to 62, so Josiah's mother was from the

pure tribe of Judah and there were no bad figs among Josiah's mother's side of the house. This can also be found in II Kings 22:1 which says: "Josiah was eight years old when he began to reign, and he reigned thirty and one years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Jedidah, the daughter of Adaiah of Boscath."

Now, back to quoting from: *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 1221:

**"ZEBIDAH** (Ze-bi'dah) [from a root meaning 'endow']. A wife or concubine of King Josiah and mother of King Jehoiakim. Zebidah was the daughter of Pedaiiah from Rumah — 2 Ki. 23:34, 36.

**"AMON** (*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 96) A king of Judah (661-660 B.C.), and son of wicked King Manasseh. He began to rule at the age of 22 and followed the idolatrous course of his father's earlier years. The bad conditions described at Zephaniah 1:4; 3:2-4 doubtless were developing at this time. After two years on the throne, he was murdered by his own servants. "The people of the land ['am ha-'a'rets]' put the conspirators to death, placed his son Josiah on the throne, and buried Amon in 'the garden of Uzza' (2 Ki. 21:19-26; 2 Ch. 33:20-25). **The genealogy of Jesus includes his name. — Mt. 1:10"**

While Amon was not a very good king of Judah, nevertheless he was a pure descendant of the house of David of the Tribe of Judah. I have now covered every possibility that Zedekiah may have somehow had some bad satanic blood of Cain, and there is no way he could have any. If Zedekiah was of unpure blood, then, Yahshua the Messiah's pure line is in doubt. Why is it so important to prove Zedekiah's bloodline? For if Zedekiah was of pure blood, so too was Tea Tephi and her sister, whom Jeremiah the prophet removed from old Palestine and placed in Ireland and Spain respectively.

## THE BIBLICAL HISTORY FOR THE PERIOD OF ZEDEKIAH AND THE GOOD AND BAD FIGS

It is always a good idea to get the historical background surrounding the topic we are considering. For the historical background of Jeremiah chapter 24, we must go to 2 Kings 24:10-17 which reads as follows:

<sup>10</sup> At that time the servants of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up against Jerusalem, and the city was besieged.

<sup>11</sup> And Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came against the city, and his servants did besiege it.

<sup>12</sup> And Jehoiachin the king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he, and his mother, and his servants, and his princes, and his officers: and the king of Babylon took him in the eighth year of his reign.

<sup>13</sup> And he carried out thence all the treasures of the house of the LORD, and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon king of Israel had made in the temple of the LORD, as the LORD had said.

<sup>14</sup> And he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, even ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths: none remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land.

<sup>15</sup> And he carried away Jehoiachin to Babylon, and the king's mother, and the king's wives, and his officers, and the mighty of the land, those carried he into captivity from Jerusalem to Babylon.

<sup>16</sup> And all the men of might, even seven thousand, and craftsmen and smiths a thousand, all that were strong and apt for war, even them the king of Babylon brought captive to Babylon.

<sup>17</sup> And the king of Babylon made Mattaniah his father's brother king in his stead and changed his name to Zedekiah.

This brings up an interesting situation. After the good king Josiah was killed in battle at Megiddo, his son by Hamutal, Jehoahaz was put on the throne by the people of the land. Jehoahaz ruled for three months and then was taken prisoner to Egypt where he died. This left three sons of Josiah who could become king. The next son of Josiah to become king of Judah was Jehoiakim who was mothered by Zebidah. Jehoiakim ruled 11 years and was not considered a very good king; actually a very defiant king. Finally, as we read the story in the above Scripture, Jehoiakim's son, Jehoiachin, was carried off to Babylon with many mighty men of war, smiths and craftsmen along with his immediate family as Jehoiakim, his father, had evidently died during Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem. This left two sons of Josiah who could be put on the throne of Judah, Johanan or Zedekiah. For some reason, Nebuchadnezzar chose Zedekiah. Nebuchadnezzar really didn't care which one was king as long as he got his tribute. What's important to notice here is, Nebuchadnezzar had only two choices if he wanted to stay with the usual king line, and this was the normal way they set up vassal kings at that time. There is more detail to this story, so let's go to *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 1269:

"Daniel's account (1:1, 2) states that Nebuchadnezzar came against Jerusalem and laid siege to it and that Jehoiakim, along with some of the temple utensils, was given into the Babylonian king's hand. However the account at 2 Kings 24:10-15 describes the siege of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and shows that Jehoiakim's son Jehoiachin, whose reign lasted only three months and ten days, was the one who finally capitulated and went out to the Babylonians. It therefore appears that Jehoiakim died during the siege of the city, perhaps in the early part thereof. Yahweh's prophecy through Jeremiah (22:18,19; 36:30) indicated that Jehoiakim was not to receive a decent burial; his corpse was to lie unattended outside the gates of Jerusalem, exposed to the sun's heat by day and the frost by night. Just

in what way Jehoiakim was given into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar' (Dan. 1:2) is not revealed."

If it was Jehoiachin that went into Babylonian captivity instead of Jehoiakim, it puts a whole different light on this story. We have to consider, we are talking about the lineage of Yahshua the Messiah with these personages. The two sons of Josiah who were in the direct lineage would have been the sons mothered by Zebidah, Jehoiakim and Johanan. I have checked several other reference books, and they all say essentially the same thing as the paragraph above. In fact, there exist Babylonian tablets (chronicles) that have been discovered by archaeologists which confirm the above. **If the above paragraph is true, Jehoiaikim is left out of the genealogy of the line of Yahshua in Matthew** where he rightly belongs (even though being a very bad king). The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, volume E-J, page 812 gives a short comment concerning this:

"In the genealogy in Matthew 1:11-12 Jechoniah (Jehoiachin) is given as the son of Josiah, the name of Jehoiakim being absent from the list."

You can see from this, we have problems with the genealogy of Yahshua our Redeemer. This is not the only problem we have with His genealogies, and I will be addressing some of them as I go along. Also the 14's do not add up correctly with Jehoiakim left out. Possibly he should be the last of the second fourteen, in series II. While we are on the subject of Jehoiachin, let's see what we can find out about him. The last thing we know, he was taken into Babylonian captivity along with his family. One thing we should clear up is his different names as recorded in Scripture. Besides being called Jehoiachin, he is called Jechoniah, Jeckonias and Coniah. When he was taken to Babylon, he was put in prison probably with the idea of leaving him there until he died. Then another king came along by the name of Evil-merodach (worshiper of Marduk) who succeeded Nebuchadnezzar on the Babylonian throne. Evil-meridach extended kindness to Jehoiachin, the king of Judah, by releasing him from his prison confinement after 37 years of exile. This is also confirmed by archaeological evidence. The story is found in 2 Kings 25:27-30 and Jeremiah 52:31-34. Let's now read the first passage only, as both passages read nearly the same :

<sup>27</sup> And it came to pass in the seventh and thirtieth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin king of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, that Evil-merodach king of Babylon in the year that he began to reign did lift up the head of Jehoiachin king of Judah out of prison;

<sup>28</sup> And he spake kindly to him and set his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon;

<sup>29</sup> And changed his prison garments: and he did eat bread continually before him all the days of his life.

<sup>30</sup> And his allowance was a continual allowance given him of the king, a daily rate for every day, all the days of his life.

King Jehoiachin is credited with having a son by the name of Shealthiel. It is not known whether this son was born before or after his 37 year incarceration in Babylon. For information on this we will go to *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 5, page 379:

“**SHEALTIEL** . . . (1 Chron 3:17; Matt. 1:12; Luke 3:27). The eldest son of King Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) of Judah . . . and the father of Zerubbabel the leader of the first group of returners from the Babylonian Captivity, and governor of postexilic Judah under the Persian King Darius I (Ezra 3:2; Neh. 12:1). **The apparent discrepancy between 1 Chronicles 3:19 and Matthew 1:12** where the Masoretic Text of the Chronicles reference makes Pedaiah (a brother of Shealtiel) the father of Zerubbabel, has been explained by the possibility that Shealtiel, being childless, adopted Zerubbabel the son of his brother Pedaiah, or perhaps that Zerubbabel was born to the widow of the childless Shealtiel as a result of the levirate marriage according to which the child would be legally the son of Shealtiel. It has also been conjectured that the reference in 1 Chronicles 3:19 is to another Zerubbabel, a cousin of the son of the same name in Matthew 1:12.”







## LETTER 11

---

In lesson #10, we were teaching about the division among the Judah captives going into the Babylonian captivity, some going earlier as **good figs** and some going later as **bad figs**. It would be well to repeat Jeremiah chapter 24 where the terms “good” and “naughty” (bad) figs are found:

<sup>1</sup> The LORD shewed me, and behold, two baskets of figs were set before the temple of the LORD, after that Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon had carried away captive Jeconiah the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, and the princes of Judah, with the carpenters and smiths, from Jerusalem, and had brought them to Babylon.

<sup>2</sup> One basket had **very good figs**, even like the figs that are first ripe: and the other basket had **very naughty figs**, which could not be eaten, they were so bad.

<sup>3</sup> Then said the LORD unto me, What seest thou Jeremiah? And I said, Figs: **the good figs**, very good; and the evil, very evil, that cannot be eaten they are so evil.

<sup>4</sup> Again the word of the Lord came unto me saying,

<sup>5</sup> Thus saith the LORD, the God of Israel; Like these **good figs**, so will I acknowledge them that are carried away captive of Judah, whom I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans for their good.

<sup>6</sup> For I will set my eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them again to this land: and I will build them, and not pull them down; and I will plant them and not pluck them up.

<sup>7</sup> And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the LORD: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me with their whole heart.

<sup>8</sup> And as the **evil figs**, which cannot be eaten, they are so evil; surely thus saith the LORD, So will I give Zedekiah the king of Judah, and his princes, and the residue of Jerusalem, that remain in this land, and them that dwell in the land of Egypt:

<sup>9</sup> And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I will drive them.

<sup>10</sup> And I will send the sword, the famine, and the pestilence, among them, till they be consumed from off the land that I gave unto them and to their fathers.

In order to understand this passage, it is going to be necessary to understand something of the nature of the fig tree. The fig tree is not just the ordinary type of tree. There are many peculiarities in the characteristics of the fig tree, and if we don't understand these unusual characteristics, we are apt not to understand this passage we have before us. I am going to quote first from *The Revell Bible Dictionary*, page 380:

**“fig:** A fruit tree common in the Middle East. Its fruit was one of the most important food crops of Palestine. Fig trees grow about 15 feet (5 meters) high. Dried figs, high in sugar content, were pressed into cakes and served as a staple in the Hebrew diet (1 Sam. 25:18). Poultices of figs were also applied to boils (2 Ki. 20:7; Isa. 38:21).

“Fig trees were valued for their shade as well as for their fruit. These two contributions make fig trees an appropriate biblical symbol of peace and prosperity (1 Ki. 4:25; Isa. 36:16; Hag. 2:19).

“The leaves of the fig tree appear in two important biblical stories. Adam and Eve tried to cover themselves by making aprons of fig leaves (Gen. 3:7). God replaced the leafy aprons with clothing of animal skins. Some scholars have pointed out that this constituted history's first sacrifice, a symbolic representation of the fact that sin can be covered only by blood.

“The Gospels tell us that Jesus cursed a barren fig tree (Mk. 11:13, 14, 20, 21). Most scholars view this fig tree as a symbol of Israel (the Jewish nation), which in Jesus' day appeared to be vital but was actually barren of righteousness (compare Mk 11:15-19; Isa. 5:1-7).”

For more information about the fig tree, I will next quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 7, pages 98-99:

**“FIG** is the name of a popular fruit and the plant on which it grows. The fig plant may grow as a low, spreading bush or as a tree, depending on how it is pruned. The fig is a native of the Mediterranean region. Man has eaten figs since earliest times and they are mentioned in the Bible and other ancient records. In the United States, fig trees grow chiefly in the southern half of the country, and in central California. However figs may be grown as far north as Michigan, if the trees are protected against frost in winter.

**“Growing Figs.** New trees may be grown by cutting two-or three-year-old branches and planting them in early spring. The plant may produce a few fruits within the second or third year after planting.



“The fig is sometimes called a fruit without a flower. However, the inside of each fruit has several hundred tiny flowers. An opening at the top of the fruit permits a small wasp to enter and pollinate the flowers. The common fig produces two crops of fruit each year. The first crop called *breba*, is produced on branches made the previous season. The first crop matures late June or early July. The second crop is produced on new branches and matures in late August or early September.

“**Types of figs** Include caprifigs, Smyrna figs, and common figs. *Caprifigs*, which usually cannot be eaten, are commonly known as *male* figs. They contain both male and female flowers. Fig wasps, which live in caprifigs, carry pollen from the male flowers to the female flowers of the *Smyrna* figs. *Smyrna* figs have only female flowers which must be pollinated by the pollen from caprifigs before the fruit will grow. The Calimyrna fig, a variety of *Smyrna* fig, is grown in California. *Common* figs also contain only female flowers, but they do not have to be pollinated by the caprifig.”

Knowing the nature of the fig tree, and how it bears fruit, will cause this passage to start to make sense. Not only was the fig good for food, but many times the term was used as a metaphor or parable to tell a story. We are dealing with just such a metaphor or parable in this passage talking about **good** and **bad** figs. To show you how the fig can be used figuratively, I will quote from *The Popular And Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary*, pages 659-660:

“**Figurative.** (1) The *fig-tree* is referred to as one of the signs of prosperity (I Kings iv:25). ‘And Judah and Israel dwell safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree.’ (2) And its failure is noted as a sign of affliction (Ps. cv:33). ‘He smote their fig-trees and broke the trees of their coast.’ (3) **The Jewish nation is likened to a barren fig-tree, spared another year at the request of the dresser. When our Savior came into the world, and for more than three years exercised his public ministry among them, how barren were they, and how ripe for destruction! But by His intercession and the prayers of His apostles, they were spared till it was seen that the preaching of the gospel had no good effect on the greater part of them; and (they) were afterward cut off with terrible destruction (Luke xiii:6-9).** (4) They were also shadowed forth by the *fig-tree* with fair leaves, but no fruit, which Jesus cursed into barrenness and withering; they had many showy pretenses to holiness and zeal, but were destitute of good works and refused to believe in and receive the promised Messiah (Matt. xxi:19). (5) The cursing of the fig-tree by our Savior (Mark xi:13, 21) has occasioned great perplexity. This incident occurred about the beginning of April, when, as the evangelist states, the time for figs had not come. Why, then, should Christ seek figs upon the tree and as it were, blame its barrenness? The best reply seems to be: because the tree was in leaf; and when the tree was in this state, abnormal though it was, fruit might be

expected. Dr. Thompson as the result of his observation, considers it not at all impossible that the early variety of this tree might have ripe fruit in the warm sheltered ravines of Olivet at Passover. If there were no fruit on this leafy tree it might justly be condemned as barren: and hence the propriety of the lesson it was made to teach — that those who put forth in profusion only the leaves of empty profession are nigh unto cursing.”

I do not wholeheartedly agree with this quotation above, but for the most part it is to the point. If the writer would have known who the “Jews” are, and the fact that they are the satanic offspring of Cain, how much better his remarks could have been. The cursed “fig tree” of Mark 11:13-14 has everything to do with the **bad figs** of Jeremiah 24! The passage found in Luke 13:6-9 also has a **direct connection** with Jeremiah chapter 24! While we are remarking about these two passages, it would be well to repeat them here for they speak of the “Jewish” nation. Before I quote these passages of Scripture, I would like to quote from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 2, page 534:

“Our Lord condemned a fig tree at Passover time on Mount Olivet (Mark 11:13; Matt 21:19). This tree should have born early ripe figs. The Lord would have known whether the tree should have been cropping. Moses had said that fruit borne on trees by the wayside could be picked by passers-by.

“Young fig trees growing in the drier regions need to be mulched with dung (Luke 13:8). Even today in Palestine fig trees grow in the corners of vineyards. Fig trees must have grown well in Bethphage, which means ‘house of figs’.”

Mark 11:13:

And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of the figs were not yet.

Matthew 21:19-20:

<sup>19</sup> And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away.

<sup>20</sup> And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!

Luke 13:6-9:

<sup>6</sup> He spake also this parable; A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none.

<sup>7</sup> Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?

<sup>8</sup> And he answering said unto him, LORD, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it:

<sup>9</sup> And if it bear fruit, well; and if it not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.

This **cutting down** of this **fig tree** is something that Yahweh promised He would never do to the **good figs** of Jeremiah chapter 24. Jeremiah 24:6 says of the **good figs**: “and I will build them, figs and not pull them down; and I will plant them and not pluck them up.”

You will remember that John the Baptist said in Matthew 3:10 and Luke 3:9: “*And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees.*” These trees being the family trees of the Canaanite satanic nations. We can know for sure, from this, the “Jewish” nation which was destroyed (plucked up) by Titus in 70 A.D. was not the **good figs** but the **bad figs** of Jeremiah chapter 24 for the good figs were figs, never to be **plucked up** or destroyed. There were a few **good figs** that returned to Jerusalem after the Babylon captivity, but for the most part, the main body of **good figs** never returned to Jerusalem. A second witness to this **bad fig** nation is Matthew 23:38 which says: “*Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.*” This hardly sounds like the nation spoken of here will ever exist again as some try to proclaim. The one Scripture which I do not believe applies to this particular fig tree is Luke 21:29 for it says: “*Behold the fig tree, and all the trees.*” This is the passage so often quoted claiming that the modern state of Israeli is the budding of this fig tree. If their house was left unto them desolate, why would it be coming to life again? That tree is dead and will never bear fruit.

There is another feature of Jeremiah chapter 24 that identifies who the **bad figs** are. There is only one group of people who can be qualified as described in verse 9 which says: “*And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.*” There has been a lot of movement of .” different peoples migrating to and from various places on the earth throughout the centuries and millennia, but there has only been one group of people who have been dispersed literally into all the nations of the earth, and they are the “Jews.” Sometimes it takes a considerable amount of research and study to separate the wheat from the chaff, but in the end, it all comes out in the wash. It is quite important here, to understand the difference between the **good figs** and the **bad figs**. You may figs ask: “What does this have to do with Judah?” — IT HAS EVERYTHING TO DO WITH JUDAH!!!!

Now let’s take into consideration Jeremiah 24, verse 8, where it says: “*and the residue of Jerusalem.*” Notice, here, it doesn’t say the residue of Judah, but the residue of

Jerusalem. It might be quite well to compare this verse with Jeremiah 32:31-32 which says:

<sup>31</sup> For this city hath been to me as a provocation of mine anger and of my fury from the day that they built it even unto this day; that I should remove it from before my face,

<sup>32</sup> Because of all the evil of **the children of Israel** and of **the children of Judah**, which they have done to provoke me to anger, **they, their kings, their princes and their prophets**, and **the men of Judah**, AND THE INHABITANTS OF JERUSALEM.

You will notice **the inhabitants of Jerusalem** are mentioned separately from **the men of Judah**! Who are these “inhabitants of Jerusalem” who are not the children of Israel or the children of Judah? They have to be some group or groups other than Israel or Judah who were living there at that time. Let’s take a look at who they may be, Joshua 15:63

As for the Jebusites the **inhabitants of Jerusalem**, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day.

Obviously, many of these inhabitants of Jerusalem who were not Israelites or Judahites which Jeremiah is speaking about, were these Jebusites which Judah never disposed of. Many of them, also, could have been the Canaanites from Tyre, with which Solomon engaged in commerce. Not only did Solomon become highly engaged in commerce with them, but he started to take many non-Israelites and non-Judahites as wives. Whatever became of some of the children of those wives? No doubt they became part of this **residue of Jerusalem**! Maybe even Hiram and his family became citizens of Jerusalem!

*Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 2, page 988-991 (under title: Solomon):

“**Building Projects** ... King Hiram of Tyre cooperated in supplying timbers of cedar and juniper trees in exchange for wheat and oil (I Ki. 5:10-12; 2 Ch. 2:11-16). He also furnished workmen. including an expert craftsman named Hiram, the son of a Tyrian man and a Hebrew woman (**a half-breed; check it out if you don’t believe it**), I Ki. 7:13, 14. Solomon conscripted for forced labor 30,000 men, sending them to Lebanon in shifts of 10,000 a month. Each group returned to their homes for two-month periods. Besides these, there were 70,000 burden bearers and 80,000 cutters. **The last-named groups were non-Israelites** — I Ki. 5:13-18; 2 Ch. 2:17, 18.

“**Nationwide building.** After completing his government building projects, Solomon set out on a nationwide construction program. He used as forced labor the offspring of Canaanites whom Israel had not devoted to destruction in their conquest of Canaan, but he did not reduce any Israelite to this slave status ...

**“His Deviation From Righteousness . . .** However, Solomon began to disregard God’s law. We read: ‘And King Solomon himself loved many foreign wives along with the daughter of Pharaoh, Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian and Hittite women, from the nations of whom Yahweh had said to the sons of Israel: ‘You must not go in among them, and they themselves should not come in among you; truly they will incline your heart to follow their gods’ . . .”

*The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 1, page 705, says this: “In Palestine the surviving Canaanites were absorbed by the Israelites.”

I am sure this is true to a degree. I am also sure there were many who were very careful to keep their racial purity and did not mix with the other peoples of Canaan. This Babylonian captivity is one of the best things that ever happened to Judah, as it separated the racially pure from the racially impure. There is another Scripture often quoted to prove this mixing of Judah and it is usually taken out of context. I have heard and read leading teachers in Identity use this passage to try to prove a point. On the surface, it does sound like the people of Jerusalem and Judah were mixing with the Amorites and the Hittites, and, no doubt, there was some mixing to a degree. This is not what Ezekiel is proclaiming to Jerusalem, in this case, when he says (Ezekiel 16:3, 45):

<sup>3</sup> And say, Thus saith the LORD GOD (Sovereign Yahweh) unto **Jerusalem** Thy Jerusalem; birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan; thy father was an **Amorite**, and thy mother an **Hittite** . . .

<sup>45</sup> Thou art thy mother’s daughter, that lotheth her husband and her children; and thou art the sister of thy sisters which lothed their husbands and their children: your mother was an **Hittite**, and your father an **Amorite**.

## THE TRUE MEANING OF EZEKIEL CHAPTER 16

This chapter is written in allegory, and is not saying at all what it appears to be saying. I think you will be amazed once you understand this passage. To start getting an understanding, I am going to quote from *The International Bible Commentary*, by F.F. Bruce, page 822:

### V. ALLEGORY AND EVENT (16:1-19)

#### “i. The unfaithful bride (16:1-63)

“The delinquency of Jerusalem is now portrayed in a powerful and indeed revolting allegory. The city is compared to a baby-girl exposed at birth without the

normal minimum of attention. Yahweh took pity on her, adopted her and brought her up and, when she became nubile (of marriageable age), made her His bride, decking her with garments and ornaments fit for a queen. But instead of showing gratitude and fidelity, she turned to prostitution and committed fornication with strangers — Egyptians, Assyrians and Chaldaeans — enticing them and even bribing them to become her lovers. In real life such a woman could not escape the penalty reserved for an adulteress: public exposure and stoning. Jerusalem's sisters, Samaria and Sodom (metaphorically), had behaved disgracefully and been punished for it; yet by comparison with her outrageous conduct theirs appeared positively innocent. So much the more certain and overwhelming would her punishment be . . .

"The portrayal of Yahweh's covenant with His people in terms of the marriage bond appears in Hos. 2:4 and Jer. 2:2 (cf. also Isa. 50:1; 54:6; 62:4). The Hosea precedent in particular seems to have influenced Ezekiel: there, as here, apostasy and idolatry on the part of Yahweh's people are stigmatized as fornication and adultery (cf. Jer. 2:20-3:5) . . .

**"3. . . . your father was an Amorite and your mother a Hittite:** yet the Jews (Judeans) charged the Samaritans with being half-breeds! Jerusalem was a Canaanite city until David's reign, and as its inhabitants were not expelled or destroyed it retained much of its non-Israelite character. The Amorites (cf. Jos. 10:5) and Hittites (cf. 2 Sam. 23:39) may represent the Semitic and non-Semitic elements in its indigenous Jebusite population."

From this reference, you can see that this Scripture is about something entirely different because it is told in a metaphoric sense. It does confirm that Jerusalem had an Amorite and Hittite population though. You have to visualize Jerusalem, like some of our larger cities today, with a "Jewish" district within it. To even get a better idea of this allegoric story in Ezekiel chapter 16, I am going to quote from *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 669-670:

**"2. Cause Jerusalem to know her abominations.** This chapter contains God's manifesto against the most abominable people; and although there are many metaphors here, yet all is not metaphorical . . . **3. Thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan.** It would dishonor Abraham to say that you sprang from him; you are rather Canaanites than Israelites. The Canaanites were accused; so are you. *Thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite.* These tribes were the most famous, and probably the most corrupt of all the Canaanites. So Ezekiel calls the princes of Judah 'rulers of Sodom', chap. i. 10; and John the Baptist calls the Pharisees a 'Generation [or brood] of vipers', Matt. iii. 7. **4. As for thy nativity.** This verse refers to what is ordinarily done for every infant on its birth. The umbilical cord, by which it received all its nourishment while in the womb, being no longer necessary, is cut at a certain distance from the abdomen; on this

part a knot is tied, which firmly uniting the sides of the tubes, they coalesce. and incarnate together. The extra part of the cord on the outside of the ligature, being cut off from the circulation by which it was originally fed, soon drops off, and the part where the ligature was is called the navel. In many places, when this was done, the infant was plunged into cold water; in all cases washed, and sometimes with a mixture of salt and water, in order to give a greater firmness to the skin, and constrict the pores. The last process was swathing the body, to support mechanically the tender muscles till they should acquire sufficient strength to support the body. 5. *Thou wast cast out in the open field.* This is an allusion to the custom of some heathen and barbarous nations, who exposed those children in the open fields to be devoured by wild beast who had any kind of deformity, or whom they could not support. 6. *I said . . . Live.* I received the exposed child from the death that awaited it, while in such a state as rendered it at once an object of honor and also of compassion.”

This should show us that we were not wanted, as a people, except by Yahweh. As far as the other peoples of the earth are concerned, we could have been cast into an open field to bleed to death. Only Yahweh cared for we, His people, and swaddled, nurtured, protected, provided for and raised us. Then we consented with Him in a marriage contract and became His wife. Yahweh never married another people except us. We then sold ourselves as harlots to strangers for pay (no, we paid the strangers). Yahweh could only then give us a bill of divorce. Once the divorce was in force, a remarriage could not take place except one of the parties die. Yahweh then decided to die as a ransom for us (to purchase us back by the kinsman redemption Law), so by dying, He could be in position to remarry us. Yahweh never nursed another people to life. Yahweh never trained up another people to adulthood. Yahweh never married another people. Yahweh never died as a ransom for another people. Yahweh will never remarry another people except Israel. Redemption is for Adam-Israel only! If you are not a **kinsman** (1350 in the Hebrew) , you don't get redeemed; I don't care what the universalists say! On occasion, Yahweh has given physical salvation to other people like Nineveh, only because He needed Assyria as His rod to punish Israel. And, after He was finished with Assyria, He destroyed them as a nation.

Next, I would like to quote from *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary* concerning chapter 16 of Ezekiel, pages 727-728. Wycliffe goes into more detail concerning the history of this era and mentions various publications. He mentions in particular, *Archaeology and the Bible*, by G. A. Barton. I wish I had that reference, but I don't. I do have, however, *The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* by E. M. Blaiklock and R. K. Harrison which covers the Hittites also whom Wycliffe alludes to:

“a) Jerusalem as the Foundling Child. 16:1-7.

**“2. Her abominations.** Especially the worship of Baal and Moloch (vv. 15-22) and alliances with heathen nations (vv 23-34). **3 The Canaanites.** Referred to in the stele of Amenhotep II (1447-1421 B.C.), in the El Amarna Letters of about 1370 B.C., and in an ancient Hittite incantation (see *Ancient Near Eastern Text*, ed. by Pritchard, pp. 246, 352, 483, 484). **Amorite** (Westerner). Or the Amurru, a powerful Semitic people who invaded the Fertile Crescent about 2000 B.C. Cf. Gen. 14:7; 15:16; Num. 21:21-30; Josh. 24:15. **Hammurabi (1728-1686 B.C.), of the first dynasty of Babylon, was an Amorite.** (See G. E. Mendenhall. ‘Mari’, *Biblical Archaeology* XI (1948), 1-19.) **Hittite.** A non-Semitic people, resident in Asia Minor in the second millennium B.C., with contacts in Canaan from patriarchal to Solomonic times (Gen. 23:10-20; 26:34; Josh. 4:1; I Sam. 26:6; I Kgs. 11:1). On Hittite bestiality, consult G. A. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*. pp. 423-426. Ezekiel was stressing the heathenism in Israel’s background. 4. Salting made the skin dryer and firmer, and aided in cleansing. **To cleanse**, (AV, supple) you (l<sup>e</sup>mish’i) is an unknown expression, but it is suggested by the Akkadian and the Targum. 5. This baby-girl, however, was **cast out in the open field**. Child exposure was practiced at the time of Christ’s birth (W . H. Davis, *Greek Papyri of the First Century*, pp. 1-7) **6. Polluted**; i.e. ‘kicking about.’ Five manuscripts, the LXX, the Old Latin, and the Syriac omit the second, ‘And I said . . . , Live’, as dittography (unintentional repetition of written letters or words). **7. To multiply.** The LXX and the Syriac read *grow up* in place of Masoretic Text *and a myriad . . . I made thee*. **Art come to excellent ornaments.** *Arrived at full maidenhood.* The Syriac *in the menses*, or verse 8, in **the time of love**, suggest the meaning, *full maidenhood*. **Thou wast naked and bare**; i.e., ‘unmarried’.”

It is apparent, there are many hidden details behind this portion of Scripture. By this time we should have a better idea of the difference between the **good figs** and the bad figs. At this point, Jeremiah 24:8-10 will be repeated as it is the destiny of the bad figs or what we call “Jews” today; although Zedekiah was not in the sense of what we call a “Jew” today with the idea of having some Cain satanic blood. History has proven the following verses to be very true.

<sup>8</sup> And as the evil figs, which cannot be eaten, they are so evil; surely thus saith the LORD, So will I give Zedekiah the king of Judah, and his princes, and the residue of Jerusalem that Jerusalem, remain in this land, and them that dwell in the land of Egypt:

<sup>9</sup> And I will deliver them to be Egypt: removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I will drive them.

<sup>10</sup> And I will send the sword, the famine, and curse the pestilence, among them, till they be consumed from off the land that I gave unto them and to their (half) fathers.



## BUT, WHERE DID THE GOOD FIGS GO?

For an answer to this we must go to the Scriptural passage, Jeremiah 50:4:

In those days, and in that time, saith the LORD, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the LORD their God.

Bertrand L. Comparet, a stalwart and accomplished Bible teacher of Identity with profound ability, did an outstanding presentation on this very thing in his booklet, *The Good Figs and The Bad Figs* and I will start quoting him on page 9:

“Jeremiah himself predicted what was going to happen to the rest, the good figs. Jeremiah 50, verses 1 to 4: The word of Yahweh spake against Babylon and against the land of the Chaldeans by Jeremiah the prophet. Declare ye among the nations, and publish, and set up a standard; publish and conceal not: say Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces; her idols are confounded, her images are broken in pieces. For out of the north there cometh up a nation against her, which shall make her land desolate, and none shall dwell therein: they shall remove, they shall depart, both man and beast.’ And note this final verse: ‘**In those days**, and in **that time**, saith Yahweh, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek Yahweh their God.’

“Now you hear some people who profess to know something of the Israel message, quoting this verse as though it were something future. But you remember, he has been talking specifically about the fall of Babylon, and says, ‘**in those days**, and **in that time**, saith Yahweh, the children of Israel shall come . . .’ You know, of course, the ten-tribed northern kingdom of Israel, together with a considerable fraction of the people of Judah and Benjamin, were deported by the Assyrians, and settled in an arc around the southern end of the Caspian Sea, where they became known as the Scythians.

“In 612 B.C., the nation of the Assyrians was broken up; their capital, Nineveh, was captured and destroyed; and the people that captured and destroyed it were an alliance of three: there were Scythians, in other words, the people of Israel destroying their Assyrian conquerors; and the Medes; and the Babylonians. They had formed that alliance against the Assyrians. So the Scythians were a very formidable military people, we have been a very formidable military people all our history.

“Then when you had later, the Medo-Persian army coming down and taking Babylon, some of the ancient historians record that the Scythians swooped down into

Babylonia, at that time, and gathered up most of the deported Judahites and Benjamites. They took them back with them; in other words, they were about ready to start their march northward into Europe, and they would not leave the people of Judah and Benjamin behind — they took them with them. So, as Jeremiah had said, ‘... **in those days**, and **in that time**, saith Yahweh, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek Yahweh their God’.”

The answer to the question, “Where did the **good figs** go”?, is very easy when understood. They went into Europe with the northern Ten Tribes of Israel!

### ONE OTHER SIN OF JUDAH, A REASON FOR CAPTIVITY

We have covered much of the background and reasons for Judah being punished with the Babylonian captivity. There is one more very important reason that the Babylonian captivity would be beneficial for Judah. This is found in Jeremiah 25:1-11. I will quote from the *Believer's Bible Commentary*, by William MacDonald on this passage, page 1013:

#### “B. The Seventy-year Captivity in Babylon Predicted (Jeremiah 25:1-11)

“Jeremiah had warned **all the people of Judah** for twenty-three years; other men of God had not ceased to call them to repentance. Because they would **not** listen, they would be taken captive by God's **servant, Nebuchadnezzar**, and remain in exile for **seventy years**.

“The reason the captivity lasted seventy years and God told the Jews (Judeans) in advance how long it would last is indicated in 2 Chronicles 36:20, 21:

“And those who escaped from the sword he carried away to Babylon, where they became the servants to him and his sons until the rule of the kingdom of Persia, to fulfill the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths. As long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath, to fulfill seventy years.’

“Leviticus 25:3-5 teaches that the land was to lie fallow every seventh year. The people had disobeyed this law.”

The reason that the land is to lie fallow every seventh year, is because it is necessary for the minerals to be broken down so they can be absorbed by the plants. By letting the land lie fallow for a year, chemical reactions take place to break down the minerals.

You can be sure that when that small remnant of Judah returned to Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity, the land was rejuvenated and ready to be farmed again. The Babylonian captivity became a very important health lesson for Judah! As for the good figs of Judah that joined up with the Ten Tribes on their way into Europe, they were breaking new ground all the way so this didn't become a problem immediately. No doubt, later in Europe, this misuse of the land might have contributed to some of the plagues experienced by the Israelites there. When the Tribes, consisting of both Israel and Judah, came to America, they continued the process of not giving the land rest. After farming a piece of ground for about 16 to 20 years, in the process wearing it out, they simply moved westward to new ground and started the process all over again. As a result, in about the last 100 years, there is no more new land to farm and the land has become very mineral deficient, and it is beginning to show in our general health. I live in Ohio, and some places in this area the farmers have planted corn every year for over fifty years. They simply add more commercial fertilizer along with weed killer each year. They get unbelievable yields, but where are the minerals? It appears that the Judah (German) farmers haven't learned their lesson yet! Maybe, if we can ever get the controls of the enemy out of the farming business, our farmers can get back to the right use of the land, according to Yahweh's Law, and our people can become healthy again!







## LETTER 12

---

With this lesson, we are going to continue the study of Judah. In this study, we will consider a passage that was prophesied by Daniel during the Judean captivity in Babylon, and see how it affected Judah when it was fulfilled about 1,100 years later. This passage is Daniel 7:24-25 which we will read at this time:

<sup>24</sup> And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings.

<sup>25</sup> And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

Before we get done with this lesson, we will find what this passage is, and what it is not!

First of all, we are going to skip the subject of, “And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise”, as it is a subject all in itself. It would take an entire lesson just to cover it. The part we are going to concentrate on is: “... and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.”

To start this discussion on this passage, I am going to quote from William V. Fowler’s book, *End Time Revelation*, page 127:

“To identify the ten horns of the fourth beast which was the Roman Empire, **one has but to examine history which records that ten kingdoms arose after A.D.**

**476 in the western half of the Roman Empire**, while the eastern half continued to flourish. History also reveals that Justinian, at the head of the Eastern (Roman) Empire at Constantinople subdued three of the ten kingdoms which were established in the western half of the Roman Empire after the fall of Imperial Rome. These were the **Vandals** whose kingdom had been established in north Africa, the **Ostrogoths** who had established a kingdom in Italy, and the **Alemanian** kingdom north of Italy. *‘And he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings’* (verse 24). **Justinian, as head of the civil government, united the interest of the church and established the temporal power of the Papacy** which clearly fulfilled the prophetic little horn by **dominating Europe for 1,260 years** until curtailed by Napoleon, (538 A.D. to 1,789 A.D.).

**“And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws”** (verse 25). Justinian’s best known work was as a codifier and legislator. He greatly stimulated legal studies, and set up a commission under Tribonian which issued the codex, the digest, and the institutes. (Originally introduced in Dec. 534 A.D., and completed in 538 A.D.). The second edition of the codex contained Justinian’s own laws known as the Novels (Novellae Constitutions). One need only read the utterances of Pope Innocent III in the thirteenth century and his immediate successors to recognize the fulfillment of speaking “great words against the Most High.” Study the history of the Inquisition with its massacres, martyrdom’s and every kind of persecution to substantiate this interpretation. (See *Halley’s Bible Handbook*, chapter on Church History.)”

This is one of the key passages “futurists” use to prove a future **so-called Antichrist** and a **three and one half year period of tribulation**, along with the **so-called mark of the beast**. If our people understood history, they wouldn’t be falling for such nonsense. All that futurist bunk was dreamed up by a Spanish Jesuit by the name of Ribera about 1580 A.D., and no one before that time ever heard of such a doctrine.

The important thing to notice, with this passage, is we are looking for a king of a kingdom who subdued three other kingdoms of our people during his reign. You will also notice we are looking for a king, during his reign, who had a very strong impact upon writing and managing laws. You will notice Justinian fits both of these qualifications. As we go along, the picture of the fulfillment of this passage will start to come into focus. I will now quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 11, page 168 to get further insight on this subject:

**“JUSTINIAN I.** *jus TIN ih un* (A.D. 482-565), was the *Byzantine* (East Roman) emperor from A.D. 527 until his death. He collected Roman laws under one code, the *Corpus Juris Civilis* (Body of Civil Law). This code, also known as the *Justinian Code*, is the basis of the legal systems in many nations today ... Justinian was

called *The Greek*. He recaptured many parts of what had been the West Roman Empire from barbarians. He built fortresses, harbors, monasteries, and the famous church of Saint Sophia in what is now Istanbul, Turkey.

“Justinian was born in a part of Macedonia that is now in Yugoslavia. His uncle, Emperor Justin I, made him co-ruler in 527. Justin died a few months later, and Justinian became sole emperor. During Justinian’s reign, his wife, Theodora, tried to influence his politics. Justinian was an orthodox Christian. and tried to unify his empire under one Christian faith. He persecuted Christian *heretics* (those who opposed church teachings), Jews, and *pagans* (non-Christians). In 529, he closed the schools of philosophy in Athens, Greece, because he felt they taught paganism.

“In the early 530’s, Justinian began a series of wars against the **Vandals, Ostrogoths, and Visigoths**, who had conquered most of the West Roman Empire in the 400’s. By the mid-550’s his armies had taken northern Africa, Italy, and parts of Spain.

“**JUSTINIAN CODE**. Justinian I, ruler of the eastern Roman Empire from 527 to 565, commanded 10 of the wisest men in his realm to draw up a collection of the Roman laws. This collection is known as the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, which means *Body of Civil Law*. Also called the Justinian Code, this body of law is recognized as one of the greatest Roman contributions to civilization. It was a compilation of early Roman laws and legal principles, illustrated by cases, and combined with an explanation of new laws, and future legislation. The code clarified the laws of those times, and has since been a basis for law codes of many countries.

“The scholars who compiled the Justinian Code divided it into four parts. The *Institutes* served as a textbook in law for students and lawyers. The Digest was a casebook covering many trials and decisions. The *Codex* was a collection of statutes and principles. The *Novels* contained proposed new laws.”

You will notice in both of these quotes, **three** kingdoms were taken by Justinian. William V. Fowler records them the same as *The World Book Encyclopedia* except for the Alemanian which *The World Book Encyclopedia* calls the Visigoths. The Alemanian and Visigoths are the same people, so there is no problem here. Justinian was corrupting the church and the state with his law code, so we will not completely understand this passage unless we look further. To see how all of this happened, I will quote from the book, *Study in Daniel*, by Howard B. Rand, pages 182 and 183:

“Having discovered the identity of the four beasts; let us now note the meaning of the little horn which Daniel saw arise from among the ten horns on the fourth beast. The ten horns represent subdivisions in the Roman Empire:

“**The little horn that arose among the ten, which was diversified from them, pulling up three, is none other than Justinian at the head of the Eastern**

**[Roman] Empire at Constantinople. History reveals that he subdued three of the ten kingdoms which were established in the Roman Empire after the fall of Imperial Rome.** These were the **Vandals** whose kingdom had been established in north Africa, The **Ostrogoths** who had established a kingdom in Italy and the **Alemannian** Kingdom north of Italy. In the eyes and the mouth that appear in this little horn we have a new power associated with the rule of the little horn. In fact, this power became the eyes and mouth of the civil and economic activities of the government represented in the little horn. **Justinian, as head of the civil government, and the Pope, as the head of the Church, united their interest and Church and State became one. Finally the Pope became the director of both Church and State and ruled as a great politico-ecclesiastical potentate.** One needs but read the utterances of past Popes to recognize the fulfillment of speaking ‘great words against the most High’ as prophesied by Daniel’.”

I will be quoting from different books on this subject. It may seem that I am repeating the same story over again and again, but with each new quote there will be additional information which will begin to round out the picture of this critical period of time. If we don’t take time to understand this period, we will not, in the end, understand the prophecy of Daniel 7:24-25. Next, I am going to quote from *Barnes’ General History, A Brief History of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Peoples*, by Joel Dorman Steele and Esther Baker Steele, pages 319-320:

**“The Eastern Greek, or Byzantine Empire**, as it is variously called, was governed by effeminate princes until the time of *Justinian* (527), who won back a large part of the lost empire. His famous general, Belisarius, captured Carthage, and overwhelmed the Vandal power in Africa. He next invaded Italy and took Rome, but being recalled by Justinian, who was envious of the popularity of his great general, the eunuch Narses was sent thither, and under his skillful management, the race and name of the Ostrogoths perished. Italy, her cities pillaged and her fields laid waste, was now united to the Eastern Empire, and governed by rulers called the Exarchs of Ravenna. So Justinian reigned over both new and old Rome. [Note: I have other information that the Ostrogoths simply moved to another area and didn’t “perish.”]

*“The Roman Laws* at this time consisted of the decrees, and often the chance expressions, of the threescore emperors from Hadrian to Justinian. They filled thousands of volumes, and were frequently contradictory. Tribonian, a celebrated lawyer, was employed to bring order out of this chaos. He condensed the laws into a code that is still the basis of the civil law of Europe.

**“During this reign, two Persian monks, who had gone to China as Christian missionaries, brought back to Justinian the eggs of the silkworm concealed in a hollow cane. Silk manufacture was thus introduced into Europe.”**



You will notice, with this last paragraph, that the **Jewish doctrine of universalism** at this universalism, period of time, was well imbedded into the so-called Universal Church. Yahshua said for his disciples to go only to the Lost Tribes of Israel. It is recorded in the Old Testament: *You (Israel) only have I known of all the families of the earth* (Amos 3:2). Our Kinsman Redeemer never instructed us to go to China or to any other race.

In this next quote, it will be established what happened to the Ostrogoths. Remember what was just insinuated in the last quotation by *Barnes' General History*, that: "*He next invaded Italy and took Rome, but being recalled by Justinian, who was envious of the popularity of his great general, the eunuch Narses was sent thither; and under his skillful management, the race and name of the Ostrogoths perished*"? You have to understand that Daniel saw all of this in revelation 1,100 years perished before it happened, so this should really be exciting to you. I am now going to quote from the book, *Rome: Its Rise And Fall*, by Philip Van Ness Myers, L.H.D., pages 560-563, which will clear up this question:

**"The Era of Justinian** (A.D. 527-565). — During the fifty years immediately following the fall of Rome, the Eastern emperors struggled hard and sometimes doubtfully to withstand the waves of the barbarian inundation which constantly threatened to overwhelm Constantinople with the same awful calamities that had befallen the imperial city of the West. Had the New Rome — the destined refuge for a thousand years of Græco-Roman learning and culture — also gone down at this time before the storm, the loss to the cause of civilization would have been incalculable.

"Fortunately, in the year 527, there ascended the Eastern throne a prince of unusual ability, to whom fortune gave a general of such rare genius that his name has been allotted a place in the short list of the great commanders of the world. Justinian was the name of the prince, and Belisarius that of the soldier. The sovereign has given name to the period, which is called after him the 'Era of Justinian.'

"Before coming to the throne Justinian had married Theodora, an actress of the comic stage of the capital. She was a beautiful woman, of great ambition, and of unusual ability. Her relation to Justinian, so long as she lived, was both nominally and actually that of co-ruler of the empire.

**"The Recovery of Africa** (A.D. 533). — One of the most important matters in the reign of Justinian is what is termed the 'Imperial Restoration', by which is meant the recovery from the barbarians of several of the provinces of the West — Italy, Africa, and a part of Spain — upon which they had seized.

"The state of affairs in Africa invited the intervention of Justinian first in that quarter. Gelimer, a zealous and **bigoted Arian**, [probably Aryan] had just usurped

the Vandal throne. Justinian sent an embassy to expostulate with the usurper and demanded the restoration of the throne to the rightful prince. Gelimer replied to the imperial commission with that **haughty insolence characteristic of his race**. ‘King Gelimer’, thus his answer ran, ‘wishes to point out to King Justinian that it is a good thing for rulers to mind their own business.’ Upon receiving this reply, Justinian resolved on war.

“The expedition was intrusted (sic. entrusted) to the command of Belisarius, a man worthy of the confidence that his master reposed in his fidelity and genius. Already in four years’ warfare upon the Persian frontier (A.D. 528-531) he had illustrated his rare qualities as a commander, although yet but a young man of twenty-six years.

“... Belisarius returned to Constantinople with many Vandal prisoners and with a large booty, a part of which is said to have consisted of the sacred vessels, **including the seven-branched candlestick, originally taken from the Temple at Jerusalem**. Fearing lest this sacred relic should bring upon his own capital the misfortunes which it was believed to have brought upon both Rome and Carthage, Justinian caused it to be taken back to Jerusalem and deposited in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

“**The Recovery of Italy** (A.D. 535-553). — The recovery of Africa from the Vandals was followed by the recovery of Italy from the Goths. The Goths, however, relinquished their hold on the peninsula only after a long and bitter struggle, the most noteworthy episodes of which are connected with the sieges of Rome. Five times during the war the unfortunate capital changed hands. In the year 537 it was invested by the barbarians under the command of their king Witiges. During this siege, which proved unsuccessful, the city suffered irreparable damage. All of the eleven aqueducts constructed under the Consuls and Cæsars were destroyed by the barbarians, and, with the exception of three, have remained in a ruined state ever since. The stately Mausoleum of Hadrian was converted by the Roman garrison into a fortress, **and the masterpieces of Greek and Roman art which embellished it were used as missiles and flung down upon the heads of the assailants.**”

I think that is just great, if that was our German people breaking up all of that pagan statuary and hurling it at the enemy. In my mind, I can just imagine heads, hands, feet, legs and what have you, flying through the air. I am proud of our people for doing such a thing, and if that is why the word “Vandal” got a bad name, so be it. Of course, these were Goths, not Vandals. But the Goths and Vandals were both German people of the Tribe of Judah, so what’s the difference. You may ask, “What does this have to do with Judah”? **It has everything to do with Judah!** Now continuing with this same quote:

“Ten years later we find the Goths in possession of the capital. They drove every soul out of the city and then evacuated it themselves, having first dismantled its walls, ‘For forty days or more’, affirms a chronicler, ‘Rome was so desolate that no one, either man or beast, remained there.’

“The war dragged on after this for six years. During the latter part of this time the command of the imperial forces was intrusted to the famous general Narses, who possessed military capacity second only to that of Belisarius. All Italy was at length wrested from that of the barbarian, and became once more a part of the Roman empire (A.D. 553). It was governed from Ravenna by an imperial officer who bore the title of *Exarch*.

(Here is the answer to where the Goths went.) **“The remnants of the Gothic nation, upon their promising never to return, were allowed to leave Italy. They crossed the Alps and disappeared into the northern darkness.”**

**“The Code of Justinian.** — But that which gives Justinian’s reign a greater distinction than any conferred upon it by the achievements of his great generals, was the collection and publication by him of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, the ‘Body of the Roman Law.’ This work embodied all the law knowledge of the ancient Romans, and was the most precious legacy of Rome to the world. Upon it are founded, as we have already learned, the law systems of most of the leading states of modern Europe, while the jurisprudence of all the others has been more or less influenced by it. In causing its publication, Justinian earned the title of ‘The Lawgiver of Civilization’.”

What do you think of the “haughty, insolent, bigoted Aryan, King Gelimer of the Vandals”? If he were living today, he would be called a neo-Nazi. We should get back to the Scripture we started with here for a moment, Daniel 7:24-25 (I will only quote part of it, as it is pertinent at this time): “... *and shall wear out the saints of the most High.*”

If you can understand that the “saints of the most High” are the German Teutonic tribes of Judah and Justinian is the one who is doing the “wearing out”, then you can comprehend what this passage is talking about. Not only are the Teutonic tribes of Judah the **saints of the most High** but High, all the tribes of Judah and Israel are **saints of the most High**. And this “haughty, insolent, bigoted High. Aryan King Gelimer”, of the Teutonic Vandals, was a **saint of the most High** being he was a son of High, Jacob! After all, this Gelimer was a great grandson of Judah and Tamar. You, too, if your heritage is of Israel or Judah, then you are a saint of the most High. And no Cain-satanic-Canaanite-Edomite “Jew” was ever a saint of the most High, ever!!!

Justinian just didn’t dream up this new law code for which he is given credit. It had been in the works for some time, but he was the one to finally organize the project. We

will now investigate some or the prehistory leading up to Justinian. I will now quote from Will Durant's, *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, The Age Of Faith*, page 103:

“In 408 Arcadius died, and his son Theodosius II, aged seven, became Emperor of the East. Theodosius' sister Pulcheria, having the advantage of him by two years, undertook his education, with such persistent solicitude that he was never fit to govern. He left the task to the praetorian prefect and the Senate, while he copied and illuminated manuscripts; he seems never to have read the Code that preserves his name. In 414 Pulcheria assumed the regency at the age of sixteen, and presided over the Empire for thirty-three years. She and her two sisters vowed themselves to virginity, and appear to have kept their vows. They dressed with ascetic simplicity, fasted, sang hymns and prayed, established hospitals, churches, and monasteries, and loaded them with gifts. The palace was turned into a convent, into which only women and a few priests might enter. Amid all this sanctity Pulcheria, her sister-in-law Eudocia, and their ministers governed so well that in all the forty-two years of Theodosius' vicarious reign the Eastern Empire enjoyed exceptional tranquillity, while the Western was crumbling into chaos. The least forgotten event of this period was the publication of the Theodosian Code (438). In 429 a corps of jurists was commissioned to codify all laws enacted in the Empire since the accession of Constantine. The new code was accepted in both East and West, and remained the law of the Empire until the greater codification under Justinian.”

You can see from this, the law codes were already partly revised by the time Justinian got them. This tells us why Justinian was able, in so short a time, to edit, revise and publish them with the help of the great lawyer, Tribonian, and his two associates. Justinian needed money to support all of his enterprises so let's take a look and see where he got it. Quoting again from this same book and the same page plus page 104, we read this:

Anastasius (491-518) was a man of ability, courage, and good will; he restored the finances of the state by wise and economical administration, reduced taxes, abolished the contests of men with wild beasts at the games, made Constantinople almost impregnable by building the 'Long Walls' for forty miles from the Sea of Marmora to the Black Sea, expended state funds on many other useful public works, and left in the treasury 320,000 pounds of gold (\$134,400,000), **which made possible the conquest of Justinian.** The populace resented his economies and his Monophysite tendencies; a mob besieged his palace, and killed three of his aides; he appeared to them in all the dignity of his eighty years, and offered to resign if the people could agree on a successor. It was an impossible condition, and the crowd ended by begging him to retain the crown. When presently he died, the throne was usurped by Justin, an illiterate senator (518-527), who so loved his septuagenarian ease that he left the management of

the Empire to his brilliant regent and nephew Justinian . . . Justinian so distinguished himself as an officer in the army, and as for nine years aide and apprentice to Justin, that when the uncle died (527), the nephew succeeded him as emperor. [Note: In 1999, with gold at \$275 per troy oz., this would be currently valued at 1 billion, 56 million dollars.]

Now we will go a little more into detail concerning The Code of Justinian and the process by which it was accomplished. We have to remember that these were the laws that Daniel was prophesying about 1,100 years earlier. It is awesome how Daniel described the taking of three kingdoms by Justinian and his codifying of the laws. This is nothing new, as there are other passages of Scripture which prophesied events which happened in the very manner and on the very day as prophesied. It's just a matter of connecting the prophecy with the historical event. Again, I am going to quote from Will Durant's, *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, The Age Of Faith*, page 111-112:

"History rightly forgets Justinian's wars, and remembers him for his laws. A century had elapsed since the publication of Theodosius' Code; many of its regulations had been made obsolete by changing conditions; many new laws had been passed which lay in confusion on the statute books; and many contradictions in the laws hampered executives and courts. The influence of Christianity had modified legislation and interpretation. The civil laws of Rome often conflicted with the laws of the nations composing the Empire; many of the old enactments were ill adapted to the Hellenistic traditions of the East. The whole vast body of Roman law had become an empirical accumulation rather than a logical code.

"Justinian's unifying passion resented this chaos, as it chafed at the dismemberment of the Empire. In 528 he appointed ten jurists to systematize, clarify, and reform the laws. The most active and influential member of this commission was the quaestor Tribonian, who, despite venality and suspected atheism, remained to his death the chief inspirer, adviser, and executant of Justinian's legislative plans. The first part of the task was accomplished with undue haste, and was issued in 529 as the *Codex Constitutionum*; it was declared to be the law of the Empire, and all preceding legislation was nullified except as re-enacted herein. The proemium (proem, prelude) struck a pretty note:

"To the youth desirous of studying the law: The Imperial Majesty should be armed with law as well as glorified with arms, that there may be good government in times both of war and of peace; and that the ruler may . . . show himself as scrupulously regardful of justice as triumphant over his foes.'

"The commissioners then proceeded to the second part of their assignment: to gather into a system those *responsa* or opinions of the great Roman jurists which still seemed worthy to have the force of law. The result was published as the *Digesta or Pandectae* (533); the opinions quoted, and the interpretations now given,

were henceforth to be binding upon all judges; and all other opinions lost legal authority. Other collections of *responsa* ceased to be copied, and for the most part disappeared. **What remains of them suggest that Justinian's redactors omitted opinions favorable to freedom, and by impious fraud transformed some judgments of ancient jurists to better consonance (harmony) with absolute rule.**

"While this major work was in process, Tribonian and two associates, finding the Codex too laborious a volume for students, issued an official handbook of civil law under the title of *Institutiones* (533). Essentially this reproduced, amended, and brought up to date the *Commentaries* of Gaius, who in the second century had with admirable skill and clarity summarized the civil law of his time. **Meanwhile Justinian had been issuing new laws.** In 534 Tribonian and four aides embodied these in a revised edition of the *Codex*; the earlier issue was deprived of authority, and was lost to history. After Justinian's death his additional legislation was published in *Novellae* (sc. constitutiones) — i.e., new enactments. Whereas the previous publications had been in Latin, this was in Greek, and marked the end of Latin as the language of the law in the Byzantine Empire. All these publications came to be known as the *Corpus iuris civilis*, or Body of Civil Law, and were loosely referred to as the Code of Justinian.

**"This Code, like the Theodosian, enacted orthodox Christianity into law. It began by declaring for the Trinity, and anathematized (solemn curse) Nestorius, Eutyches, and Apollinaris. It acknowledged the ecclesiastical leadership of the Roman Church, and ordered all Christian groups to submit to her authority. But ensuing chapters proclaimed the dominion of the emperor over the Church: all ecclesiastical, like all civil law, was to emanate from the throne. The Code proceeded to make laws for metropolitans, bishops, abbots, and monks, and specified penalties for clerics who gambled, or attended the theater or the games. Manicheans or relapsed heretics were to be put to death; Donatists, Montanists, Monophysites, and other dissenters were to suffer confiscation of their goods, and were declared incompetent to buy or sell, to inherit or bequeath; they were excluded from public office, forbidden to meet, and disqualified from suing orthodox Christians for debt. A gentler enactment empowered bishops to visit prisons, and to protect prisoners from abuse of the law."**

This last quotation should hit you like a bombshell, for it reveals that Justinian did just what was prophesied of him by Daniel. Justinian did, in fact, think to change laws. Justinian had the greatest opportunity to do this as the law was being translated from the Latin to Greek. It was an opportunity for him to change the law to his own religious convictions. How would you like to live in a country, where, if you didn't agree with the state religion, all of your earthly possessions would be taken from you? (2- You wouldn't be allowed to buy or sell to meet your physical needs? (3- You wouldn't be

allowed to leave your few earthly possessions to your children on your death? (4- You wouldn't be allowed to receive any of your parent's possessions upon their death? (5- You would be excluded from holding any public position where you might voice your religious convictions? (6- You would not be allowed to meet with friends who had similar convictions as you, if they didn't agree with the state religion? (7- You wouldn't be allowed to collect your rightful debts if you didn't agree with that state religion? (8- Where if you wanted to go to church, you went to the state approved Universal Church? You talk about the number 666 and the mark of the beast!!! Did you know that numerically, "Vicar of Christ" (the Pope) is equivalent to 666 in three languages, Latin, Greek and Hebrew? The mark of the beast, as the number 666 (not being able to buy or sell without it) is in the past, not in the future. It was the number of a man, and that man was the Pope. While we are still under the beast system, we are not under that phase of it, at this time. Justinian was making a religious mold with his civil laws, and if you didn't fit that religious mold, cursed be you! And if you didn't line up with his three god system, then, cursed be you three times. There is a short quote I would like to make from page 113 of this same book:

"Certain passages of the Code legalized serfdom, and prepared for feudalism."  
[Feudalism was the total legal right of the lord over the serf! In other words, if you were poor, you had no rights and no chance of ever getting ahead!]

### JUSTINIAN'S MARITIME LAW

Justinian's law lasted pretty much until the eleventh and twelfth centuries without a lot of modification. We are now going to leave Justinian for a moment and go to the eleventh and twelfth centuries and see what happened. For this, I will again quote from Will Durant's *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, The Age Of Faith*, page 434:

"While Islam confused law with theology, and Western Europe floundered through the chaos of a dozen barbarian codes, the Byzantine world cherished and extended the legacy of Justinian. The 'novels' or new laws of Justin II and Heraclius, the Ecloga, or selected laws, issued by Leo III, the Basilica, or royal edicts, promulgated by Leo VI, and the 'novels' of the same Leo, adjusted the Pandects of Justinian to the changing needs of five centuries; codes of military, ecclesiastical, maritime, mercantile, and rural law gave order and dependability to legal judgments in army and clergy, in markets and ports, on the farm and the sea; and in the eleventh century the school of law at Constantinople was the intellectual center of secular Christendom. So the Byzantines preserved Rome's greatest gift — Roman law — through a millennium of peril and change, until its revival at Bologna in the twelfth century revolutionized the civil law of Latin Europe and

the canon law of the Roman Church. **The Byzantine Maritime Code of Leo III, developed from the nautical regulations of ancient Rhodes, was the first body of commercial law in medieval Christendom;** it became in the eleventh century the source of similar codes for the Italian republics of Trani and Amalfi; and by that lineage entered into the legal heritage of the modern world.”

Those of you who are interested in Maritime Law; this last paragraph should perk up your interest. What we are talking about here is an ecclesiastical-political power with the combination of Justinian and the Pope. That is why this new ecclesiastic-political beast is *diverse from all the beasts that were before it*, Daniel 7:7. I will now quote from Howard B. Rand’s book, *Study In Revelation*, page 44:

“Upon the ruins of the ancient Roman Empire there arose, gradually, a new and different type of empire, which became all the more powerful because it **claimed** control over the souls of men as well as their bodies, and extended its dominion beyond this life into the grave. History has amply verified these facts and that the Popes claimed the right to temporal power, taking the place of the Caesars, while the Eternal City under pagan Rome **became the Eternal City under Papal control**. How apt is the description of her supporter as named by John, *Hell*. This is Hades or the abode of the dead, for through the doctrine of Purgatory, the church was able to hold supremacy and exercise tremendous power over her followers not only in this life, but beyond through the fear of future suffering in Purgatory.”

Then quoting on page 49 from this same book:

“**CHURCH OVER STATE:** Pope Agapetus, in a dispute with Justinian the Emperor of the East, won his point and the Emperor yielded to the Pope. The head of the Church had triumphed over the head of the government. This was 536 A.D. A Church council assembled at Constantinople this same year informed the government, as a servant of the Church, that an edict be issued ordering a decision of the council executed. This was done and thus Church and State became united. Persecutions followed, which the Church dictated and the State supported. **One thousand two hundred and sixty years** of cruel torture and destruction now followed, **resulting in nearly a hundred million dying violent deaths.**”

**538 A.D. TO 1798 A.D. = 1,260 YEARS, NOT 3 ½ YEARS**

Let’s go back to our original Scripture of Daniel 7:24-25 and pick up the sentence concerning this period of time: “... *and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.*”



This sentence is used by futurists as a basis for their postulation of a future three and one half year tribulation period, when a so-called Antichrist will set up his kingdom after a so-called rapture. Some futurists call for a seven year tribulation period. As I told you before, the futurist theory was dreamed up by a Spanish Jesuit priest by the name of Ribera about 1580 A.D., and the teaching had never been heard of before that time. It has a long and sordid history, and I don't have space here to go much into detail on the subject. But this portion of Scripture quoted immediately above is one of the basic passages they use, out of context, to support their theory. By showing you the true historical meaning of this passage, I hope to drive a nail into the coffin of this doctrine so it will stay dead for a long time. What could be more of a tribulation than 1,260 years and 100,000,000 violent deaths, mostly of our people? Some say as low as 60 million, but it is still a lot of people. This is the legacy of Justinian and his law code, along with the Universal Church.

There are many books written today on this futurist theory by many well-meaning people, and then by some that are not so well-meaning. I would like to cite one in particular. The title is, *Guide To Survival*, by Salem Kirban. On page 4 is a list of acknowledgments, one of them being a Dr. Gary G. Cohen, Professor of New Testament at Faith Theological Seminary, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania, who carefully checked the final manuscript to assure its accuracy to the Scriptures. (I'll bet he did!) On the back cover there is a small picture of Kirban, and it looks like he may be related to Cohen. Kirban might be one of those Ashkenazi names changed just a little bit. On the last 18 pages are lists of books that can be purchased through his publishing house in relation to futurism. I notice several books which were written by M. R. DeHaan, M.D., whatever that stands for, (Master of Divinity, no doubt). I notice one of his books is titled, *Israel and the Nations In Prophecy*, with this description, "*Presents the growing importance of Israel, the identification of the Jews as Israelites. Scriptural promises ... giving a clear picture of events in the end-time.*" Maybe the reason DeHaan wants to identify the "Jews" as Israelites is because he is one. Maybe he is some relation to Jack Van Impe (imp). On page 151 of Salem Kirban's book, *Guide To Survival*, he uses Daniel 7:23-26 as a reference and he never once says anything about Justinian!!! By the way, the subtitle just a half a page above it is "The Reign of The Antichrist." On page 152, under the subtitle, "The Sequence of Events", he speaks of, "the first 3 1/2 years of the Tribulation." I notice one of Kirban's books is titled "666"! I wonder what he knows about that? He is an expert, no doubt! This is what we were warned about in Matthew 16:6: "*Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*" (leaven means teachings)







## LETTER 13

---

With this lesson, we are going to get into the history of the Zerah branch of Judah (sometimes spelled Zara). Unless this history is learned, you will arrive at many false conclusions of Scripture. There are multitudes who don't know this history, and as a natural result, many are under strange delusions on many passages of Scripture. Examples of these will be discussed later. To get a favorable beginning on this subject, I am going to quote from the book, *Father Abraham's Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 98-101:

“ Let us put it in a different way, here is the beginning of royalty. What else does scepter mean? Judah led in the conquest of Canaan and received the first and choicest portion. David raised it to pre-eminence over the tribes and the nations. He is the first king of the Judah-Pharez line, and he did not appear for seven hundred years. Was there and is there an older line of royalty? The answer is, Yes. The Judah-Zerah was royal from the beginning. The two royalties are now merged and have been for centuries in the British royal house. And how long shall we have royalty? ‘Until Shiloh comes.’ [The future] Shiloh came to Bethlehem, the first Advent, and will come again [as Shiloh] at the end of time, the second Advent. Royalty is eternal. The throne of David is everlasting. There is no royalty in Europe but descends from Judah. And the Judah-Zerah royalty is, we repeat, seven hundred years older than Judah-Pharez because it began at once. You can read Genesis 38 to see how royalty began [but there is much more to talk about].

“ Another great event is recorded in Genesis 46:12, [if we dare mention it]. Here we can read the census of those of the family of Jacob who went with him into Egypt, eventually into Egyptian bondage though they did not know it at the time. Pharez took with him his **two sons**, (which did not include Shelah). Now Zerah went alone. No son accompanied him. We will see where the son later traveled. Here is the inference and the conclusion, **The Trojan-Welsh by-passed the Egyp-**

**tian captivity**, and all other captivities and have never been in slavery to any man, in any land, at any time.

“ Zerah’s son Ethan, very wise, and indeed this line of Judah-Zerah is the only royal line termed wise, on the other hand led his people north, from Egypt where he was born, into what is now Asia Minor, and his son Mahol continued likewise. Mahol’s heir, Darda, reached the western shore, where on a commanding site, he founded the metropolis of Troy. The date is 1520 B.C. Here the city flourished for nearly four hundred years. Darda first saw the straits that separated Europe and Asia and gave them his name, Dardanelles. Darda also founded a fort here that is named after him. But the greatest honor is recorded in the Bible, Solomon was ‘wiser than all men; than . . . Darda the son of Mahol.’ Thus great was the founder of Troy and the sire of the Trojan race whose children abide with us still. Troy fell because her sons had an eye for the refined and beautiful in woman (sic.). Her descendants have that exquisite eye still and are naturally very proud of the accomplishment . . .

“ When Troy fell she did so to arise on another shore in eternal and imperial splendor. I am not referring to Italy. That empire though long was ephemeral (short-lived). Italy is an interlude only. Aeneas, a member of the old royal family, attained the kingship, led the saddened Trojans around the Mediterranean Sea, as graphically described in the *Aenead*, and finally brought them to their new home on the Tiber in Italy. Including this Italian interlude, the Trojan period embraced 417 years.

“ Here on the Tiber happened a very sad event, too sad to be recalled, and would not be except for its denouement (final outcome). Brutus was one day hunting with his father Silvius, when he spied the prey, as he thought, and let fly an arrow. On running up he was shocked and grieved to find that he had killed his own father! Some people then, as now, were censorious and Brutus departed from the new colony, from which later sprang Rome, and with his royal followers, went to Greece, rallied the enslaved Trojans, defeated King Pendrasus, thus erasing the defeat of Troy, and as victor exacted these terms; he must give his daughter Ignoge for wife, furnish a big fleet of ships fully provisioned, for his emigrant force of seven thousand men, and free permission for them to sail unmolested . . .

“ Brutus, now with an object and direction, steered west through the straits of Hercules, then northward along the east Atlantic main, across the English Channel to the present river Dart, and up its stream to Totnes where stepping on a large stone he landed on the great island which was ever to bear his name as a memorial among the proud nations of the world. This rock, more famous throughout the centuries than Plymouth Rock, is marked as Brutus Rock, and has been visited perennially by people of all nations, all ranks, and all ages. With his people he explored the whole island and he apportioned to each one according to his rank

and services. At last he decided the proper place for his capital, a choice bank of the Thames river, so named for a stream, Thyamis, in Epirus from which he first sailed, and there he built his metropolis, and according to the advice of the oracle, he named it Tri Novantum, New Troy. This name it bore for over eleven hundred years when King Lud at the beginning of the Christian era built her walls and renamed her Luddun, Lud's wall, easily refined into London. London is also derived by some from Llandin, meaning 'Sacred eminence.' London dates from three hundred-fifty years before Rome. Why should Rome be called the Eternal City?"

This background history sets the stage for the rest of the story of Judah-Zerah. When one considers over 3,500 years of history, only a fraction of that history can be conveyed in this series of teaching letters. It just simply cannot all be told in one letter. There isn't enough space here to tell the entire story, but Judah-Zerah in Britain had the same Judah-Zerah family background as Rome, and I hope you noticed the account mentioned heretofore above, for this is going to play a very important part in this narrative. Although, Britain and Rome were Judah-Zerah kinsmen brothers, the roles they play in history are at opposite ends of the field in **politics, law and religion**. Judah-Zerah was not the only Israelite tribe to settle in Britain, but Judah-Zerah was far-and-away the most important. Because the above history is not very well known, it might be well to read it over several times to get familiar with it as you would with the Bible. To pick up more of the story, I will now quote from the book, *Father Abraham's Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 102-103:

" When Julius Caesar was planning the invasion of Great Britain in 55 B.C., he reveals to us the quandary that he was in and the relationship of the Roman and the Briton; 'In truth we Romans and Britons have the same origin, since both are descended from the Trojan race. Our first father, after the destruction of Troy, was Aeneas; theirs Brutus, whose father was Silvius, the son of Ascanius, the son of Aeneas . . . we must send them word . . . for fear we should violate the ancient nobility of our father Priam, by shedding the blood of our kinsmen.'

" Rome and Britain are at variance in their primitive history. Rome always emphasizes the story of Romulus and Remus who, bereft of their own mother, and cast into the flooded Tiber, were rescued by a she-wolf who took them to her den and played the mother act. A woodpecker also carried them dainties from her store. Thus their lives were preserved for the great benefit of humanity! This delectable bit from the far past is in our histories and schoolrooms as something to be remembered. It is enough to say that we have nothing so savory in the ancient past of old Britain. Perhaps that is the reason that our schools pass over the founding of the British Empire by Trojan-Welsh. But some time the whole story will be written and told.

“ Brutus reigned praiseworthily for twenty-four years. Then Britain was divided as today. Locrin, the eldest son, received the choicest portion, England, for fifteen hundred years called Loegria; Camber inherited the western division called after his name Cambria, now Wales; and Albanact the rest or northern portion drew, then and even now spoken of as Albany, or Albania, now Scotland. Locrin was the over-king. The great work of Brutus is with us today. Lord Chief Justice Cope of England affirms; ‘The original laws of the land were composed of such elements that Brutus first selected from the ancient Greek and Trojan institutions.’ And in the same strain writes Lord Chancellor Fortescu, ‘So the kingdom of Britain had its origin from Brutus of the Trojans, who attended him from Greece and Italy and wove a mixed government, compounded of the regal and the democratic’

“ The Roman writers and travellers after much experience admit that Britons (Cymry) had laws that excelled their own, and were highly skilled in agriculture. ‘The extraordinary similarity that exist between many of our early laws’, says Yeatman, ‘and those of the Israelites might raise an inference that they were copied from them after the introduction of Christianity, **but positive evidence exists of their pre-existence.**’ **The common law is identical in principal with what was known as the Law of the Lord as given in the books of Exodus.**’ **The British system of law is superior to any other European system** although several countries were more benefitted (?) by Rome.”

## BRITAIN’S LAWS

From all of this we can see, while most of the continent of Europe struggled under Roman law which was later codified by Justinian, Britain was thriving on laws based on the laws of Yahweh. For more on British law, I am going to quote from, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, pages 25, 49, and 77:

Page 25:

“ Another point on which Britain differs from other countries is that she has ever maintained the Common Law which holds a person under trial innocent until proven guilty, whereas the Continental nations maintain the Civil Law [of Justinian] which holds him guilty until proven innocent.”

Page 49:

“ That the Britons adopted anything they thought good from the Romans is perfectly true; they did not, however, abandon any of their old essential laws and customs and still less their religion. But it is untrue to say that the Britons had no

previous civilization of their own as it is to pretend that Roman laws and customs permanently established themselves in Britain and remained after the legions were withdrawn. There is sufficient evidence to prove that the ancestors of the British, centuries before the Romans gained a footing in these islands, were a polished and intellectual people, skilled in arms as well as in learning, with a system of jurisprudence of their own superior, even to the laws of Rome.”

Page 77:

“ Cusack says that the whole system of government and legislation was patriarchal — indicative of an Eastern origin — and that in the Brehon laws, said to be the oldest code of laws in Europe, there are evidences which look very like a trace of Jewish (Judah-Zerah) tradition.

“ Another writer affirms that the Brehon Code in parts is a re-publication of the Mosaic law which declared that the first-born of every creature, including the first-born of man, was to be presented to the Lord (Exod. 13:2; Num. 18:15).

“ In this connection it is interesting to note that the Welsh call the Irish Iddew and the country Iddewan or Jewslan.

“ Camden gives a quotation from Postellius’ lecture on Pomponius Mela, a first-century writer: ‘Ireland was called Jurin, quasi Jewslan, because in the distant past the Jews [Judahites of] (Israel), who were great soothsayers, knew that the future empire of the world would come to these parts.

“ The Psalter of Cashel says: ‘The Tuatha de Danaan ruled in Ireland for about two centuries and were highly skilled in architecture and other arts from their long residence in Greece.’

“ Sir Henry Maine observed: ‘We who are able here to examine coolly the ancient Irish law in an authentic form see that it is a very remarkable body of archaic law, unusually pure from its origin.’”

We should be beginning to get a pretty well rounded out picture in our minds of the great difference between Justinian’s law codes and Britain’s law codes. For a little more history on this, I am going to return to the book, *Father Abraham’s Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 104-105:

“ In the course of chronology, for I am following the royal line in its descent and great achievements, we come to the great law-giver, which is a rarity among the people of the world. His name is Dyrnwal Moelmud or in Latin Dunwallo Malmutius and he is often referred to by the historian who is acquainted with the history of Britain before the advent of the Anglo-Saxon. He reduced the whole

island of Great Britain to his sway as his ancestor Brutus had done and during his long reign of forty years gave them a **distinguished code of laws** named for him the Malmutian Laws. He is buried in Trinovantum, now London. Shakespeare has enshrined his glory thus:

*“... Malmutius made our laws; Who was the first of Britain which did put His brow within a golden crown, and called Himself a king.*

“ Just three reigns later came one who achieved even greater fame and longer service and she was a woman, the queen of Guytelin of Guithelin Batrus. Her name is Queen Martia, the author of the famed Martian Laws which centuries later by only making the necessary changes for time and place were adopted by Alfred the Great and are the basis for the present English laws. Then what shall be the praises of Queen Martia? Why is not she equally famous?”

It is evident, from all we have investigated thus far, the laws of Rome under Justinian and the ancient laws of Britain were and are as different as day is from night. Not only are the laws of these two different, but the religions of the two are 180 ° apart. I really don't like to use the term “religion” unless it refers to paganism, and for **Rome** the term **religion** fits quite well. Obviously the destinies of Rome are about to collide, and it's a big subject.

## BRITAIN'S RELIGION

To get started with this phase of the study, I am going to quote again from the book, *Father Abraham's Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 140-142:

“ Now we come to the missionary movement of Joseph of Arimathea, who was appointed by Philip the apostle. After the passion of his Nephew, persecution fell heavily upon the infant church. The Jew and the Roman were bitter persecutors but he knew where there was no persecution, but protection. However, he was seized, and since the Jew could not kill [under the Law directly], he and Lazarus and Mary and Martha his sisters, Mary Magdalene, Marcella, Maximin, and others, all objects of especial Jewish hostility, were ‘exposed to the sea in a vessel without sail or oars.’ They drifted to Marseilles, southern Gaul, where they arrived in a famished condition. The Arimathean knew the territory and friendly traders, and was aided on his way, the destination of which was now Britain. Here they eventually arrived and came to rest in Ynis Avalon, Glastonbury, where he rested and soon began his labors for his Nephew. The year was 37 A.D. On his tomb is the epitaph: Ad Britannos veni post Christum sepelivi — Docui — Quievi. ‘I came to the Britons after I had buried the Christ. I taught. I have entered on my rest.’



“ When he began, St. Paul was still in Arabia preparing for his mission. Joseph preached in Britain from 37-76 A.D. King Arviragus decreed the perpetual exemption from taxation of the twelve ploughs or hides of land on which this first mission stood. Thus Britain has the second congregation and the first Christian church building in the world. The mother church of Christianity was Jerusalem and it met in the ‘upper room.’ And the [pagan] church at Rome was not yet organized . . .

“ The first apostle to visit the island was Simon Zelotes after he had preached the gospel across Africa, Spain, and into Britain where he was crucified by the Romans. Coming at about the same time was Aristobulus, the brother of Barnabus, the father of Peter’s wife, and the first Bishop of Britain. He was sent by Paul. Arwystli, Wales, commemorates him.”

I am sure there are many who have never heard this particular story of Joseph of Arimathea, and fewer yet understand its importance. For more insight on Joseph of Arimathea, I will quote, *The Traditions of Glastonbury*, by E. Raymond Capt M.A., page 22:

“ Several ancient manuscripts indicate that after the Passion of Christ, Joseph of Arimathea was commissioned by St. Philip, the Apostle, to take the Gospel to Britain. One such manuscript is the ‘Victory of Aurelius Ambrosius’ by Gildas Albanicus. It asserts plainly that Britain received the Gospel in the time of Emperor Tiberius, and that Joseph was sent, with others (after the dispersion of the Disciples) to Britain by St. Philip. There, Joseph was to lay the foundation of the Christian religion. The author gives the date ‘about the year of Our Lord 63’ and adds that Joseph stayed in Britain the rest of his life.

“ Another manuscript, ‘De Antiquities of Glastonbury’ (1908), contains this entry in the opening chapter: ‘St. Philip . . . coming into the country of the Franks to preach . . . converted to the Faith, and baptized them. Working to spread Christ’s word, he chose twelve from among his disciples, and sent them into Britain. Their leader, it was said, was St. Philip’s dearest friend, Joseph of Arimathea, who buried the Lord.’ (Translated from ‘De Antiquite Glastonbiensis Ecclesia’ 1240)”

We can see from this, that outside of a **few** at Jerusalem, the Gospel was first preached in Britain. This brings up one of the most misunderstood, one of the most misrepresented, and one of the most misquoted passages of Scripture in the Bible. Almost everyone misunderstands it, or has a twisted conception of its meaning. This Scripture is Romans 1:16 which reads, KJV:

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

It's not talking about the Canaanite "Jews" here, it's speaking of the Judahites in Britain, and they got the Gospel message first just as it says! It should say: *To the Tribe of Judah in Jerusalem and in Britain first, and also the Greek*, and they were all Israelites, and nothing but Israelites! It was through Judah in Britain that the Gospel message was sent to all the other Israelite tribes. The few of Judah at Jerusalem, at this time, is hardly worth mentioning.

Up to this point, we understand that Britain was populated mostly by Zerah-Judah; we understand that Britain had a different code of laws than Rome; and we understand that Britain was the first nation to receive the Gospel. As a matter of fact, the church of Rome was never recognized by our Redeemer except as being a whore. The Roman Catholic Universal Church was never the true church for even one day; she was never the true church for one hour; she was never the true church for one minute; she was never the true church for one second or a division thereof. **Britain was the true church, and Rome was the counterfeit church. If you can trace your theology through Rome, you are a part of the whore system.** Because of the two theologies, there would be an ongoing war between Britain and Rome, until after approximately a thousand years the true church established in Britain would be completely subdued by the Roman religious system up to the Reformation. But the Reformation left us with a conglomerate of fractionalized divisions and that is the reason we have today so many denominations, each with its own doctrine. The thousand year reign of the true Church lasted from about 37 A.D. until about 1172 A.D., when the last remaining Church in Ireland came under the domination of Rome. **This was the Church Millennium as spoken of in Revelation 20:6.** If you are looking for a future millennium, it is already past and Satan (the "Jews") have been loosed out of his prison (the ghettos) to deceive the nations (called the United Nations), Revelation 20:7. The idea of a future millennium is a Canaanite "Jewish" doctrine! If the millennium is future, then the prophesied attack (Revelation 20:7-8) of Gog and Magog on the United States is one thousand years plus in the future, **while Russia and China pose a threat to us at this very hour!** If the Gog and Magog attack is that far in the future, let's forget about Russia and China for the time being!?!?! We will now investigate the fighting between Rome and Britain during these early years.

### [THE TRUE CHURCH, BRITAIN VS. THE FALSE CHURCH, ROME](#)

To get started on the history of the fight between Rome and Britain, I am again going to quote from the book, *Father Abraham's Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 105-107:

“ At the dawn of the Christian era the dark shadow on the horizon was Rome. What would be her attitude? Really the Cymry provoked the attack according to both Caesar and the Druidic Triads. In the day of Caesar the Roman proconsul, Lucius Valerius Praeconinus, was routed by the ‘second silver host’ of the Cymry at Tolosa, Aquitania, and the consul, Lucius Manilius, lost all his commissariat (food supply) and in addition was ingloriously compelled to retreat.

“ When this stunning news reached Julius Caesar he turned on the Veneti of Vendaeans, whose navy had been used by the Cymry or Britons and who enjoyed a flourishing trade with great Britian. This led to the first invasion of the Island of 5 August 55 B.C. This Campaign got only seven miles into the island, lost one battle, and had the camp attacked by the victorious islanders, a thing unheard of before this time. Caesar was baffled and decamped determined to return the following year with a mightier force. He wrote later, ‘The legionary soldiers were not a fit match for such an enemy.’

“ The second campaign came the next year and lasted from 10 May to 26 September 54 B.C., and got as far as seventy miles from shore when Caesar was compelled to make peace at Gwerddlan or St. Albans on account of the bad news from the continent as well as the triumphant resistance of the Cymry. He was royally feasted in London by King Cassibelaunus where Latin prevailed. Caesar left to reconquer Gaul and to subdue the Roman Empire for his family. He never returned. His enemies at Rome taunted him in the words of Lucan:

*“With pride he sought the Britons, and when found, Dreaded their force, and fled the hostile ground.”*

“ Now appears the second war of British Independence and it was longer and more stubborn. Rome at this time had consolidated her empire everywhere, in Asia, in Africa, and in all Europe. Her boundaries were entirely free of any invading foe. Her whole military force was at her command anywhere she desired. Her population was at this time 120,000,000 people of Caucasian or semi-Caucasian blood. The Caesars were sitting securely upon the throne. Everything was propitious for an easy conquest and a glorious victory. Caligula played the buffoon and we pass him by.

“ But we must give serious consideration to Emperor Claudius. He acts the part of a very capable leader. Rome had the benefit, sorry to say, of treason on the part of some Reguli of the Britons. Under the emperor were the greatest generals, Plautius, Vespasian, later Emperor, his son, Titus who during one battle rescued his father from death, also later an emperor, and Cneius Geta. All were proven by being successful in other campaigns against other peoples.

“ On the defensive side was Guiderius, who fell early, but a very efficient general. Immediately Caradoc, the Latin (Caractacus), a graduate of the Silurian college at

Caerleon-on-Usk, now Wales, King of the Silures, was unanimously elected Pen-dragon of all Britain. The Cymry stubbornly held off the Roman legions so accustomed to victory. Appeals for help reached Emperor Claudius in the imperial city and he left for the imperiled front with the second and fourteenth legions, their auxiliaries, and a cohort of elephants which were designed to break the charges of the Briton chariot with its scythe attached axle. Claudius negotiated a treaty a part of which was the marriage of his daughter Genuissa to King Arviragus, and he received a triumph at home. Nevertheless the war continued. In order to see the severity of the fighting in seven years there were about thirty-five battles. Treachery and heroism appeared.”

You will notice it is a bit hard to follow names here. For instance, let’s take the name of Caradoc. As long as he was not king, his name was Caradoc, but once he took the throne, he was called “King Arviragus” (being the same person as Caradoc). When he went to Rome, they Latinized his name to Caractacus (still being the same person), so whether he is called Caradoc, King Arviragus or Caractacus, it is the same person (see *Celt, Druid and Culdee* by Isabel Hill Elder, page 38, paragraph 4). Caractacus is the next person I am going to talk about, and for that I will quote from, *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 14-16:

#### “ CARACTACUS

“ From those valuable historical documents, the Welsh Triads — written originally in the British dialect — it appears that Caràdoc (Caractacus) was betrayed and delivered up to the Roman Commander by Arègwedd, about A.D. 51, and taken to Rome. Brân (Bernnus) his father, Llyn (Linus) his son, Eurgan a daughter, and Gladys (Claudia) a second daughter, were all taken to Rome likewise, and there detained seven years as hostages of Caractacus.

“ *Tacitus* furnishes an account of the battle which terminated the career of Caràdoc in field. Caràdoc seeing that the Romans were victorious, and that his own wife and daughter had fallen into the hands of the conquerors, took refuge himself, at her repeated solicitations, at Caer Evroc (York), with Arègwedd, Queen of the Brigantes, and grand-niece of the infamous traitor in the Julian war, Mandubratius of Avarwy. Here by her orders, — with hereditary treachery, he was seized while asleep in her palace, loaded with fetters, and delivered to Ostorius Scapula. On receiving intelligence of the event, Claudius ordered him and all the captive family to be sent to Rome. The approach and arrival of Caràdoc at Rome are finely described by the ancient historians — ‘*Roma catenatum tremuit spectare Britannum*’ — Rome trembled when she saw the Briton, though fast in chains.

“ The Senate was convened and the trial of Caràdoc began. With an unaltered countenance, the hero of forty battles, great in arms, greater in chains, took his position before the Emperor and defended himself in the following utterances:

“ Had my government in Britain been directed solely with a view to the preservation of my hereditary domains or the aggrandizement of my own family, I might long since have entered this city an ally, not a prisoner; nor would you have disdained for a friend a king descended from illustrious ancestors and the director of many nations. My present condition, stript of its former majesty, is as adverse to myself as it is a cause of triumph to you. What then? I was lord of men, horses, arms, wealth: what wonder if at your dictation I refused to resign them? Does it follow, that because the Romans aspire to universal domination, every nation is to accept the vassalage they would impose? I am now in your power — betrayed, not conquered. Had I, like others, yielded without resistance, where would have been the name of Caràdoc? Where [is] your glory? Oblivion would have buried both in the same tomb. Bid me live, I shall survive for ever in history one example at least of Roman clemency.’

“ Such an address as this, worthy a king, a soldier, and a freeman, had never before been delivered in the Roman Senate. Tacitus thought it worthy to be reported and immortalized by his pen. The preservation of Caràdoc forms a solitary exception in the long catalogue of victims to the policy then in vogue; nor can it be accounted for, considering the inflexibility of Roman military usage, in any other way than by an immediate and supernatural intervention of providence, **which was leading by the hand, to the very place of the British king at Rome, the great Apostle of the Gentiles** (Israelite nations). **The family of Aulus Plautius — a lieutenant in the army of Claudius — was already connected with that of Caràdoc, he having married Gladys (‘Pomponia Geæcina’), the sister of Caràdoc. Besides, an engagement existed between Gladys (Claudia), the daughter of Caràdoc, and Rufus Pudens Pudentinus, a young Roman Senator of large possessions.** But their united influence would not have sufficed to alter a fixed law of the Roman state in favor of an enemy who had tasked its uttermost powers and resources for so many years.”

These names just mentioned should be familiar to you as they are mentioned in II Timothy 4:21. I am sure that millions of people, over the years, have read this passage and had no idea who the people mentioned were, or that they had a direct connection with the first permanently organized church, the British Church. Let’s read it again with a new light on it:

Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and **Pudens**, and **Linus**, and **Claudia**, and all the brethren.

This not only proves that Paul had a direct connection with the church in Britain, but proves that Paul was a genuine apostle of Yahshua. It proves that his calling was true. There is a doctrine going around that Paul was not genuine, but an impostor and a deceiver. I will give you a short history of this “Anti-Paulism” which was published in

pamphlet form by Destiny Publishers, Merrimac, Mass. I will only quote the first three paragraphs:

“ **THERE IS A MOVEMENT** on foot to discredit the writings of the Apostle Paul in the Bible, declaring they are a perversion of the truth. The conclusion is that Paul’s Epistles should be expunged from the New Testament.

“ This is the objective of a book entitled *Who Was Paul of Tarsus?* by Isabel Upton Van Etten. In this book, a premise is established, based upon ‘ifs’, ‘surmises’ and ‘assumptions’ which enable the author to conclude that Paul was in opposition to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ and was completely out of step with the teachings of the disciples of Jesus.

“ It is a faithful axiom that, once a premise is established and accepted, the deductions drawn naturally follow. After reading this little book, we are reminded of another book, also by a women author, whose name was Mary Baker Eddy [founder of so-called Christian Science]. She also established a premise and won the acceptance of a substantial following in support of her conclusions. We pose the question: Will many succumb to the propaganda that Paul was subversive and that his writings are unacceptable and should be deleted from the New Testament?”

Obviously, Isabel Upton Van Etten overlooked II Timothy 4:21 (above), and II Peter 3:15 where Peter said in his epistle, *our beloved brother Paul*. I presume, because of this remark, might we have to delete all of Peter’s Epistles also? Either Paul was a “chosen vessel”, or he was not a “chosen vessel”, and we might advisedly tread very lightly in condemning his **commissioned ministry** to be unfit, as Paul commissioned Linus, first Bishop of Rome.

In the yearbook of DESTINY magazine (a monthly publication), June, 1946 published by Destiny Publishers, Haverhill, Massachusetts, there is an article, *Druidism in Britain*, by Rev. L. G. A. Roberts, pages 203-208. On page 207 of this article, we find the following information under the subtitle, “Christianity in the Isles”:

“ It was in A.D. 52 that the conflict took place between the Romans and British under Caractacus, who so nearly held back the Roman legions from conquering Britain, but he was cruelly betrayed by Cartismandua and taken prisoner to Rome. With him, as hostages, **Bran**, his father, **his three sons, and daughters**, were also taken captive. The struggles of this brave people for their liberty filled the streets of Rome with their daring prowess, and about A.D. 59 St. Paul was himself a prisoner at Rome, but in his own hired house. Whilst here he met with **Pudens** and **Linus** and **Claudia**, and evidently also **Eubulus**, i.e., **Aristobulus**. Timothy was also with St. Paul, and in the 2d Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, written a few

years after (chap. 4:21), he says, ‘Eubulus greeteth thee and **Pudens** and **Linus** and **Claudia**.’ **Every one of these we find intimately connected with Britain.** The prefix *Eu* in Eubulus being of the same meaning in Greek and *arestos*, the two names (Rom. 16:10; II Tim. 4:21), Aristobulus and Eubulus, have been considered to mean the same person. Of this man we read in the ‘Greek Menologies’ that St. Paul ordained him as a bishop to the country of the Britons. Another account says that this man died at Glastonbury in A.D. 99.”









## LETTER 14

---

To get started with this second in a series on the Church of Britain, I will quote from *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 36-37:

“ It could scarcely be expected that a people so savage as the Britons, so devoted to their superstitions, and so depressed by their fierce invaders, could speedily be converted to the Christian Faith. The branch of the spiritual vine, therefore, though planted so early in the soil of Britain, was, from the nature of things, slow in its growth, and during the first century did not make a rapid progress. By the middle of the second century, however, ‘She had sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river’; for it is evident that, by that time, a large number of the inhabitants, of all ranks, had abandoned idolatry and had embraced the Christian Faith. We have already seen that the *first Church* [building] ever built in Britain, and probably in Christendom, was erected at Glastonbury in the first century ...”

For further information that the establishment of the first church, other than that of Jerusalem, was at Glastonbury in Britain, I will quote excerpts from *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, pages 98-101:

“ Gildas, the British historian, writing in A.D. 542, states: ‘We certainly know that Christ, the True Sun, afforded His light, the knowledge of His precepts, to our Island in the last year of the reign of Tiberias Caesar, A.D. 37.’

“ Sir Henry Spelman states, ‘We have abundant evidence that this Britain of ours received the Faith, and that from the disciples of Christ Himself soon after the Crucifixion’, and Polydore Virgil observes that ‘Britain was of all the kingdoms the first that received the Gospel.’

“ The fact that Lucius established Christianity as the State religion **excludes the claim of the Latin Church to that eminence.** That this early establishment was acknowledged beyond the confines of Britain is well expressed by Sabellius, A.D. 250. ‘Christianity was privately expressed elsewhere, but the first nation that proclaimed it as their religion, and called itself Christian, after the name of Christ, was Britain’; and Ebrard remarks, ‘The glory of Britain consists not only in this, that she was the **first country which in a national capacity professed herself Christian, but that she made this confession when the Roman Empire itself was pagan, and a cruel persecutor of Christianity.**’

“ The writer of *Vale Royal* states, ‘The Christian faith and baptism came into Chester in the reign of Lucius, king of the Britons, probably from Cambria, circa A.D. 140.’

“ Missionaries are said to have come from Glastonbury, only thirty miles distant, to instruct the Druids of Amesbury in the Christian faith. When the Druids adopted and preached Christianity, their universities were turned into Christian colleges and the Druid priests became Christian ministers; the transition was to them a natural one . . . ‘It would be difficult to conceive of Christianity being preached to any people for the first time under more favourable conditions. There was hardly a feature in their national character in which it would not find a cord answering and vibrating to its touch.’ . . . ‘There was no violent divorce between the new teaching and that of their own Druids, nor were they called upon so much to reverse their ancient faith as to lay it down for a fuller and more perfect revelation.’”

For another reference on the Roman’s hatred for the British Christians and Druids, we are going to turn to *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 59-60:

“ Those who have been indoctrinated by the false stories describing the Druidic religion may pause in consternation. The malevolent infamy heaped upon the Druidic priesthood, their religion, with the practice of human sacrifice, is just as untruthful, vicious and vile as the other distortions stigmatizing the ancient Britons. On close examination it will be found that those who uttered the vindictive maledictions stand out in Roman history as the dictators of the Roman Triumvirate. Their bestial hatred for everything that was British and Christian deliberately promoted the insidious propaganda to defame the people they could neither coerce nor subdue. In our own time, among others, none other than the eminent archaeologist Sir Flanders Petrie, on examination of the ground around and under the altar at Stonehenge, completely exploded the infamous accusations. He found only the fossilized bones of sheep and goats which more firmly established the affinity with the patriarchal faith of the East. In each case the sacrificial burnt offerings were as stated in the biblical record . . .

“ The Roman persecutors, despising Druidic opposition, intensified their malignancy with the British conversion to Christianity. The Emperors Augustus, Tiberius

and the Claudian and Diocletian decrees **made acceptance of Druidic and Christian faith a capital offence, punishable by death**. Some have Page 2 claimed that this persecution by Rome drove both religions together to form the solid phalanx of Christianity. This is far from being the case. It has been already pointed out how the ancient Kymry were bonded in the ancient patriarchal faith even before they arrived in Britain. Organized by Hu Gadarn (Hugh the Mighty) the faith took on the name of Druid, a word some claim derive from the Keltic word ‘Dreus’, meaning ‘an oak’, arising out of the custom of worshipping in the open within the famous oak groves of the island. A more likely derivation is from ‘Druthin’ — a ‘Servant of Truth’, The motto of the Druids was ‘The Truth against the World.’ A casual study of the Triads emphasized the old Hebrew faith with positive clarification. The British Mother Church continued to teach the immortality of the soul, the omniscience of One God and the coming of the Messiah. They were aware of the prophesied vicarious atonement . . . At that period in history Britain was the only free country in the world. Gaul had received its baptism of Roman persecution long before the Caesars turned their attention upon the British. **It was the constant aid given the Gaulish brethren by the warriors of Britain which brought about the invasion of the Isles**. The first attack, led by Julius Caesar, 55 B.C., was purely a punitive expedition against the Britons for thwarting his arms in Gaul. Contrary to general opinion that Caesar’s attack was a conquest, it was [actually] a dismal failure. Within two weeks his forces were routed and pulled back into Gaul.

“ It was not until the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 120, that Britain was incorporated (by treaty — not conquest) within the Roman dominions, as described by Spartians in — *Vita Hadriani*. By this treaty the Britons retained their kings, lands, laws and rights, accepting a Roman nucleus of the army for the defence of the realm.”

#### EDICT OF EMPEROR CLAUDIUS, A.D. 43 “TO EXTERMINATE CHRISTIAN BRITAIN”

For this part of the story, I will quote from *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 89-90:

“ In the year A.D. 42 Claudius Emperor of the Romans, issued the fateful decree to destroy Christian Britain, man, woman and child, and its great institutions and burn its libraries. To this purpose Claudius equipped the largest army and most efficient army ever sent by Rome to conquer a foe and led by its most able generals.

“ In this edict, Claudius proclaimed in the Roman Senate that acceptance of the Druidic or Christian faith was a capital offence, punishable by death by the sword, the torture chamber, or to be cast to the devouring lions in the arena of the Colosseum. It is interesting to note that this ruling also included ‘any person descended

from David.’ This meant the Jew, making no exceptions as to whether he be a converted Jew or one holding to the orthodox Judean faith. This indeed was a paradox. While the converted Jew embraced Gentile followers of ‘The Way’ as a brethren, regardless of race, and died with them with equal courage, the orthodox Jew perishing in the arena by the side of the Christian, **never relented in his bitter hatred. With his dying breath he spat on the Christian in malevolent scorn . . .**

“ Further to seek to inflame the populace against Christian and Jew, the Romans were the first to create the false slander that Christian and Jew alike practiced human sacrifice in their religion. They knew better. They knew that the burnt offerings of Judean and Druid were animals. chiefly sheep, goats and doves . . . ”

It is apparent that the leaders of Rome were not aware of the difference between the true Judeans of the Tribe of Judah and the Canaanite Jews descended from Cain. Most are still making that same mistake today. You will notice here the natural hatred of the “Jew” for the Christian as foretold in Genesis 3:15! I believe the Romans lumped together the Zera-Judah Britons with the Jews, and it was an assault by Rome to destroy the king-line of the House of David because their pagan religion was in opposition to the newly revealed beliefs of Yahshua being the Messiah. “The Way” (followers of the Nazarene) posed a threat to the Roman leaders and their newly formed cult of emperors as gods. If you don’t understand the history of the worship of Augustus Caesar, you cannot understand the war that was shaping up between Britain and Rome. The religion of the Nazarene posed to undermine the authority of the Roman state religion. This was shaping up to be a religious war plain and simple, and it has continued down to our present day. The sad part of the story is, the Roman and Briton were kinsman, both of Zerah-Judah, although the House of David had merged with Zerah in Britain, but not with Rome, so there might have been a motive on Rome’s part to destroy the House of David-Pharez. Now continuing from the book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 92-94:

“ The overwhelming rise of Christianity in populous Britain and Gaul was viewed with grave consternation at Rome. Britain was the seeding-ground where an ever-flowing stream of neophytes were tutored and converted by Apostles and disciples of Christ and sent out into other lands to teach the Gospel. This the Romans declared had to be stopped. To them, as to all dictatorships, might alone was right. Nevertheless, from past experience with British military ability they had good reason to fear this stubborn valorous race, now inspired with the zeal of Christ. Forewarned, Rome built the mightiest army in its history to enforce the Claudian Edict to destroy Britain . . .

“ The Romans, who had ground so many nations under their despotic heel, looked upon all other nations with scorn as inferiors, labelling every enemy as barbarian,

no matter how magnificent their culture. The records attest to the indisputable fact that the Romans of all people were the most barbarous and brutal in history ...

“ Britain is the only nation in history ever attacked by the full might of another powerful people in an effort to purge Christianity off the face of the earth. Rome sent her very best against the British legions. As they failed to subdue the British, Rome recalled many brilliant generals who had gained fame for the double-headed eagle in other foreign conquest, as she determinedly sought to wipe out [and recover from] one defeat after another to her armies.

“ From the Claudian to the Diocletian persecution, extermination of Britain and all that was Christian was a Roman obsession. How satanic it was can be estimated in the brutal act which touched off the Diocletian campaign. The finest warrior battalions in the Roman army were the famed Gaulish Legions. On the order of Maximian co-ruler with Diocletian, the Christian Gaulish veterans were slaughtered to a man in cold blood. His hatred of the Christian is stated to have exceeded that of Diocletian and to satiate it he butchered his finest soldiers.

“ The martyrologies state that during the first two hundred years of Christianity over six million Christians were entombed within the catacombs of Rome — murdered. How many were buried within the other unexplored catacombs is difficult to say. The total number would be appalling. It is claimed that if the passages of the catacombs of Rome were measured end to end they would extend to a length of 550 miles, from the city of Rome into the Swiss Alps. It seems almost incredible that while only about one million Christians today walk the streets of Rome, under their feet are over six million mutilated bodies which had testified for Christ.”

It is possible some of you may not be familiar with the tenth persecution under Diocletian, or any of the ten persecutions by Rome, inflicted upon the followers of the Nazarene. You can read about the Diocletian persecution in, *Fox's Book of Martyr's*, pages 24-33. If you don't read any of the other Roman persecutions in this book, I highly recommend you read this passage especially. To get some idea of this, I am going to quote from *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 215-216:

“ The infamous Diocletian held the reins at Rome, and on his orders began what is often described as the worst persecution of the Christians in the year A.D. 290. In his Edict, he ordered churches to be pulled down, the sacred scriptures to be gathered together and burnt, along with other Christian literature on which they lay their hands. Libraries, schools of learning and private homes were to be destroyed ...

“ The Emperor Diocletian struck with sudden appalling savagery at the Christians. He blamed them for the series of disasters over the years that had decimated the

Roman arms to such an extent that they were no longer able to defend their own frontiers successfully, let alone conquer as formerly. Rome was on the decline; her glory was fast waning. Diocletian sought to avert national disaster by ordering the extermination of the Christians, their churches and other possessions. The bestial cruelty lasted eighteen years. The persecution flamed across Europe for several years before it struck the shores of Britain. Again the Romans were frustrated by the incredible zeal of the martyrs who died with prayer on their lips, or ringing exhortations. They saw the common people destroyed, showing the same disdain for death as had their Christian forebears. This infuriated Diocletian to more fiendish practices, in which he later was aided by Maximian, who became co-ruler with him over the continental Roman Empire. Brutal as was Diocletian, it is written by the Romans themselves that Maximian was worse. His ferocity and atrocities are claimed to be beyond description. He caused the finest Legions, exclusively composed of Gauls to be butchered to the last man because they were Christian. He was blind with maniacal (insane) hate.”

For more on Diocletian, and how his persecutions finally reached Britain, I will now quote from *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, pages 108-109:

“ Surprise is sometimes expressed that there are so few records of the early British Church. The savage edicts of Roman Emperors were directed not alone to the destruction of individuals who confessed the Christian faith, but also to the literature and records of the Church.

“ There were ten ‘high power’ persecutions of the Christians under these tyrants, extending from A.D. 66 to A.D. 303; the last being that of Diocletian which began in A.D. 290. Bede says: ‘The Diocletian persecution was carried out incessantly for ten years, with the burning of Churches, outlawing of innocent persons and the slaughter of martyrs. At length it reached Britain in the year 300, and many persons, with the constancy of martyrs, died in the confession of the Faith.’ The records of the Church had now to be written not with pen and ink but in blood and the flames of martyrdom. In the edict of Diocletian the Scriptures were to be carried away or destroyed, being regarded as **books of magic**; in this he was following older methods of suppression . . .

“ After the Diocletian persecution had died out, the churches in Britain were rebuilt, and Christianity flourished to so great an extent that at the Council of Aries, A.D. 314, the British Church was represented by three bishops and a presbyter, and again at the Council of Sardica and Arminium in the fourth century.”

The reason, today, we are so unaware of the fact that the British church was the true church established by Joseph of Arimathaea by the direction of St. Philip, is because most all the records have been destroyed. There have been enough records to survive,

though, to establish beyond all doubt that the church of Britain (not to be confused with the present day Anglican Church of England) was the true church, before being Romanized,. For this reason most everyone has **assumed** that the true church was the Roman Catholic Church, which is entirely false. Neither the Roman Catholic Church nor her Protestant daughters represent the true church established by our Messiah. There was a church established at Rome, and Linus (the son of Caractacus) was appointed by the Apostle Paul to be the First Bishop, and it was not related in any way to the Roman Catholic Church, ever! It was called, *Basilica Di Pudenziana* (also the Palace of the British). There were many incidents of burning and destroying church records at various times and places. I will now quote passages from different books concerning this:

*The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D.:

Page 3:

“ The very early history of the British Church has been involved in some obscurity **by the destruction of many of the ancient records**; and yet quite enough can be gathered from history of the remote times to serve our purpose — probably quite as much as can be obtained in support of any contemporaneous event of secular history.”

Page 47:

” The Emperor (Diocletian) commanded the Governor **to burn all Christian books**, and to destroy their places of worship. Christians who refused to deny their Lord were to be tortured and put to death. Amongst those who suffered death were St. Alban of Verulam, Julius of Caerleon, Aaron of Exeter, and Angulius of London.”

*Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder:

Page 75:

“ The next promoter of letters was King Tuathalius, first century A.D., who appointed a triennial reversion of all the antiquaries’ books by a committee of three kings or great lords, three Druids and three antiquaries. These were to cause whatever was approved and found valuable in these books to be translated into the Royal Book of Tara.

“ The third patron of literature was King Cormac, A.D. 266, who renewed the laws about the antiquaries, and rebuilt and enlarged the academy of Tara for history, law and military training. He was an indefatigable (untiring) distributor of Justice, having written numerous laws still extant . . .

“ The O'Duvegans were hereditary bards; the O'Clerys and the O'Brodins were hereditary antiquaries; the O'Shiels and the O'Canvans were hereditary doctors; the Macglanchys were hereditary judges.

“ The Druids did not at all times receive fair treatment from the Christians. Dudley Forbes, in a letter to an Irish writer, **states that in St. Patrick's time no fewer than one hundred and thirty volumes relating to the affairs of the Druids were burnt in Ireland.** What a deplorable extinction of arts and inventions; what an unspeakable detriment to learning. What a dishonour upon human understanding has the cowardly proceeding of the ignorant, or rather the interested at all times occasioned.”

Page 108:

“ Surprise is sometimes expressed that there are so few records of the early British Church. The savage edicts of Roman Emperors were directed not alone to the destruction of individuals who confessed the Christian faith, **but also to the literature and records of the Church.**”

*The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett:

Pages 138-139:

“ The hallowed sanctity of ‘Our Lady's Dowry’ is descriptively corroborated by the Saxon historian, William of Malmesbury, who wrote his outstanding works in the twelfth century. He wrote two histories covering the religious subject-matter related herein. His last work, *De Antiquitate Glastoniae*, is most authentic. He was specially commissioned by the Abbot of Glastonbury to write the complete history of the famous church from its beginning at Avalon and was invited to live at the Abbey **where he had full access to the world-famous Glastonbury Library.** Therein were contained all the original documents from Druidic times, consequently he wrote his history with the benefit of first-hand material, long before **the great fire completely destroyed the Abbey and its wonderful library, then considered one of the largest in the world.** Consequently, his historic literary work completed at the Abbey, under his commission, is probably the most precious document of the British Christian Church in existence.”

Page 154:

“ One should remember, however, that since the Claudian Edict for Christian extermination, beginning A.D. 42, up to and including the Boadicean war of A.D. 60, the people and the land of Britain suffered a persecution at the hands of the Romans for eighteen years which no other nation had experienced. Their towns,



religious institutions, **libraries and seats of cultural learning had been burnt to the ground** with a barbaric insolence unequalled. The defenceless had been massacred. Licentiousness, pillage and plunder of wealth, crops and cattle had been conducted unabated in the vicious Roman pledge to crush the Christian faith and spirit in Britain.”

Page 215:

” The infamous Diocletian held the reins at Rome, and on his orders began what is often described as the worst persecution of the Christians in the year A.D. 290. In his Edict, he ordered churches to be pulled down, **the sacred scriptures to be gathered together and burnt, along with other Christian literature** and private homes were equally destroyed.”

This should give you some idea as to the deliberate and accidental destruction of important historical and religious records that have happened over the many years since the time when Joseph of Arimathea was commissioned by Saint Philip through the laying on of hands. You can see very clearly, from all of this devastation of the written record, why so many have come to believe that the history of the church emanates through Rome. Almost without exception, all written church histories take that route. If you have come to identify the route through the British church, you are one of the very few who know the real and important truth! But if you want to become a member of the British Celtic church today, I am sorry, it no longer exists in its early form, it was completely Romanized until the Reformation and Protestantism, which has never since caused it to attain its original character. With these circumstances, there is no church today that has a continual descent from the original Apostles, I don't care what you call it! If you wanted to, you cannot start another one, I don't care how much you organize it. The descent of ordination was performed by the laying on of hands from the original Apostles on downward, and I know of no one today that has that kind of authority. If you find someone who can prove this continual lineal authority from the original Apostles, please let me know. For this, you can thank Rome. This is why it is important today to support the truth rather than some organization which **falsely claims descent** from the original Apostles, and is not teaching anything relative to the truth. I find this kind of ordination spoken of in the book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, page 64:

“ In order to be properly ordained to an apostolic appointment it was necessary for the consecration to be performed by the laying on of the hands by one of the original Apostles.”

For documentation on the ordination of Joseph of Arimathea, I will again refer to *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, page 64:

“ Philip, one of the original Apostles, was certainly present. There is a wealth of uncontroversial testimony asserting his commission in Gaul, all of which alike states that he received and consecrated Joseph, preparatory to his embarkation and appointment as the Apostle to Britain.”

I am sure someone reading this may take high exception to what I have just said about the present day churches not having a direct succession from the original Apostles, quoting to me Matthew 16:18 which says of the church: “*and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*” I agree that “the gates of hell” (Rome) has not prevailed against Yahshua’s Church because of, and as a result of, the Reformation. The Reformation, though, only served to form divisions and the Protestants continued to maintain much of the Roman doctrine. As I said in lesson #13: *But the Reformation left us with a conglomerate of fractionalized divisions and that is the reason we have today so many denominations, each with its own doctrine.* Mrs. Hill Elder says in her book, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*:

page 158:

“ The simple historical truth is, there was no break in the continuity of the Church of Ireland at the Reformation, and every attempt to prove the contrary has only resulted in confirmation of its unbroken descent from the ancient Church of our native land.”

page 159:

“ From the Reformation onward the Protestant Church did not maintain the intense zeal which her earlier supporters displayed; **apathy crept in, and divisions and sub-divisions occurred, weakening her cause throughout the land.**”

From all of this we can see, while the Reformation was good in some aspects, in other respects it had its bad points. Today, the true message is not coming from either the Catholic or Protestant churches or televangelist. If you are supporting any of these, you are throwing your money down a rat hole.

## HOW AND WHEN THE BRITISH CHURCH WAS FINALLY ROMANIZED

For this information, I am going to quote from the book *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 87-91:

“ From the days of St. Patrick to the conquest of Ireland by Henry II., in 1172, the Irish Church enjoyed a complete autonomy, and was free from all foreign control. It governed itself, knew no superior to its own Episcopate, and acknowledged no more obedience to Rome than to any other diocese in Christendom . . . Through all this period, when the Church of Rome had scarcely anything to do with Ireland, Christianity flourished as it has never done since the Popes have had [anything] to do with that island.

“ The question naturally arises — *How and when was Romanism introduced into Ireland?* First, through the influence and connection of the Danes with Ireland. The Danes, who invaded and pillaged Ireland, settled in Dublin, Limerick, and Waterford. They afterwards became converted to Christianity; but as they claimed affinity with the Normans they got their Bishops from [Romanized] Canterbury. Lanfranc and Anselm were partisans of Rome, and were thus *the first* to gain a foothold in Ireland for papal pretensions, near the close of the eleventh century. The Bishop of Limerick was nominated by the Pope as his legate in 1106, and in 1151 the Pope, for the first time, sent the pall (cloth) as a present to the four Archbishops. All the while, however, there was but one Church in Ireland, viz., the old Church of the land, **but now becoming more and more Romanized.**

“ Then, in 1156, Henry II., of England applied to the Pope, Nicholas Brakespear (the son of a priest at St. Alban's, and the only English Pope), known as Adrian IV., for permission to take possession of Ireland, and to make himself and his successors, the kings of England, masters of it; in order, he said, to establish religion ‘*in its purity*’ — showing that the religion which was there already, was not, in his estimation, all that it ought to be; in other words, it was not under the control of the Bishop of Rome. The Pope granted Henry's request, under the pretence that ‘all islands’ had been given to the Popes by the so-called ‘Donation of Constantine,’ and issued his bull accordingly. If it be asked why the Pope sanctioned Henry's invasion of Ireland, the answer is given in his own bull: ‘To widen the bounds of the Church, and to extend her jurisdiction *where she has none at present.*’ The Pope exacted a further condition, that the English King should pay him ‘a penny a year for every inhabited house in the island’, thus furnishing the evidence that ‘Peter's pence’ had not hitherto been paid from the Church in Ireland.

“ It will be seen that the transaction, on the part of the Roman Pontiff at least, was of the most deliberate and carefully calculated kind. **It is a little marvellous that Romanists of to-day in Ireland are so ill at ease under English rule . . .**

“ Henry, under various pretext, with the sanction and approval of the Pope, took his armies to Ireland. The Irish chiefs, taken singly, soon submitted to him, and paid him homage. **The Bishops agreed to a ecclesiastical union with the Church of England. Then Henry, to suit his own ends, handed over the Irish Church to the Pope of Rome. By these unwarranted acts schism was introduced, and**

**Bishops and priests were appointed by order of the Pope.** A few of the Bishops still continued to assert an independent position, and offered here and there a spasmodic resistance, **but the independence of the Celtic Church was gone. She had been betrayed by the King of England and the Pope of Rome. Irish national independence, and Irish ecclesiastical independence terminated practically together, and in both cases by fraud and grasping usurpation. The fate was sealed when Gelasius, Archbishop of Armagh, visited Dublin in 1172, and made his formal submission to King Henry II. From this date to the Reformation the papacy held sway, and the history of the 350 years which followed the *Synod of Cashel* — when the Irish Church agreed to an ecclesiastical union with the English — is indeed a dreary one.** The Church of St. Patrick held out against a foreign usurper longer than any other Church in Western Europe, and its final submission was largely secured through the influence of the Church of England, which had to a great extent yielded already. The usurped authority was rejected and thrown off in the year 1558 after only 400 years' subjection.

“When the work of the Reformation began in England it made itself felt in Ireland also, and Protestants arrayed against Rome increased everywhere. In the reign of Edward VI. (1551) a Synod of Irish Bishops adopted the English Liturgy instead of the Latin Service Book. In 1558 the Church in Ireland united with the Church in England in accepting the reforms proposed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and in 1560-61 regular Synods of the Irish Bishops were held, and the Reformed English Liturgy was fully accepted . . .

“The Romanists went out of the Irish Church in 1558, and formed a new sect, securing Bishops, as has been said, from Spain and from Italy. Such is the origin of the present Italian-Spanish Mission in Ireland . . . It follows, therefore, that the *Old Church* is the Church of Ireland; the *New Church* is the Church of Rome in Ireland, which, it will be seen, has no connection with the old Church of the land — the Church of St. Patrick — but it is a foreigner, and alien, an exotic (stranger) . . . Rome calls her schismatical, but history shows that it is the Church of Rome that is in schism, in Ireland as well as in England. She stole into the Irish Church in the days of Henry II. by means of schism, and she went out of it at the Reformation and set up a schism in opposition to it.

“... Yet in face of all her difficulties she still survives. “The gates of hell have not prevailed against her.”

Another short summary account of the Celtic Church is found in the book, *St. Joseph of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Smithett Lewis, page 191 as follows:

“It is very difficult to write a short account of the Celtic Church. But it must be done. For nothing is more pathetic than that, in spite of the glorious missionary zeal of the saints of that Church, the memory of it and of them has been nearly

forgotten, As mentioned in the text, this is mainly owing to political events. The constant raids of the heathen Saxons, their demolition of churches, monasteries, and manuscripts, coupled with the driving of the Britons into mountains and morasses, and, after the Saxons were converted, the similar raids by their still heathen kinsmen, the Danes, nearly wiped out the Christian Church in this land, except in portions of Western England. And then gradually, in spite of vehement Celtic resistance, by the 8<sup>th</sup> century the overwhelming Continental influence of the Roman Church, tremendously reinforced later by the Norman Conquest, and derived from the prestige of Imperial Rome's position as Mistress of the World, at last caused the memory of the Celtic Church, and her courageous saints, to be nearly eclipsed."

Although the gates of hell have not prevailed against her, she is badly scarred with Roman doctrine. I believe it is safe to say: we no longer have the original church which was established by the Apostles, or anything like it. It was only to last approximately a thousand years (Revelation 20:6). If you are reading this, and you are Irish or Scottish, we are talking about our ancestors — we are talking about our church. Once learning the history of our church, you and I should become quite disturbed whether we have a Roman Catholic or Protestant background. We are in a position where we can't go back, and neither Catholicism nor Protestantism or any other cult is the answer. We have been robbed of our heritage. If you are an Israelite, and you have come to the knowledge of your identity, and you also know the identity of the serpent "Jew" enemy, you have discovered the two most important pillars of truth that can be assimilated.







## LETTER 15

---

There may be some of you wondering when I am going to change the subject from Judah to something else. I feel it is imperative that we know the entire story of Judah, or we will not understand the Redeemer Himself. If we don't know the Judah story, we can have no idea who the true church is. Almost everyone is under the impression that somehow the true church came through the Roman Catholic Church, and this is entirely false. With this lesson, we will continue the history of the British Celtic church. In order to get started, I will go back to about 60 A.D. and pick up some of the story from there. We are going to consider one of the brilliant lady military leaders of that time. Her name was Boadicea. I will quote from two different books in order to cover the story. I will first quote from *Father Abraham's Children*, by Perry Edwards Powell, Ph. D., pages 108-109:

“ The last phase of this War of Independence is called the Boadicean War. The Icenii and Coranidae as allies of Rome had as yet been peaceful. **King Prasutagus had borrowed two million pounds sterling of Seneca**, Nero's minister, **and had given all his public buildings as security**. He died at the commencement of the war and made Nero heir with his two daughters. Caius Decius was ordered to collect and he did so with a ferocity and a barbarity, levying on the noble's palaces as well as the royal properties, that he inflamed the whole island. He seized Queen Boadicea and her daughters and among [his] outrageous acts lashed the bare back of the Queen. Now no Cymro will stand for that. When she made her appeal to the men and pulled her long tresses apart and showed her welted back all the men asked to march behind her. The army began with 120,000 men and at its height numbered 230,000. Eighty thousand Romans perished. The Roman army advanced not a step. No quarter was asked or given. Forty thousand Romans were slaughtered in London. In the midst of the conflict Boadicea died, according to Tacitus, of poison. She had earned her name, Victoria. Her successors as generals were Arviragus, Venusius, and Gwallog of Galgacus. The power of the whole Empire of Rome was paralyzed.”

I find it quite interesting this person Seneca lending the equivalent of “two million pounds sterling to King Prasutagus.” You can find information on Seneca in most any general history book or encyclopedia. I tried to find out if he had any “Jewish” background, but was unable to connect him with the serpent descendants of Cain. Seneca, though, had three marks of a “Jew”, (1) he was a money lender. (2) he was a playwright. (3) he was a political adviser to one high in position, Emperor Nero. I know this is not enough proof, but I am highly suspicious of him. I will now quote this same story from *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, pages 39-41:

“ Having effected a landing (and the testimony of their own historians is that never was country more dearly purchased nor held with greater difficulty) the Romans proceeded with their policy of destruction for which they had become notorious on the continent of Europe.

“ One notable instance has come down to us of the Roman spirit of cruel indifference to human feelings and sufferings. The immensely wealthy Prasutagus, King of the Iceni, apprehensive, in the event of his death, of the Roman brutality likely to be experienced by his queen, Boadicea, and his two daughters, left one half of his fortune to the Emperor Nero, endeavouring thus to secure for them a measure of protection. When, however, his death took place in A.D. 60, the Roman *praefect*, Caius Decius, seized the royal hoard on the pretext that it came under the denomination (sic. possibly domination) of public property. Resistance being made, the legionaries stormed the palace and carried the treasures off to the Castra. The story of the barbarous treatment meted out to its inmates need not be repeated here, nor of Boadicea, stung to frenzy by these atrocities, bravely taking to the field in defence of her family and her people, the Roman *praefect* having, in direct violation of the Claudian treaty, also confiscated the estates of the Icenic nobility.

“ Seneca, the usurious, millionaire philosopher, advanced to the Iceni, on the security of their public buildings, a sum of money — about two million pounds sterling in modern currency, at ruinous rates; this loan, suddenly and violently called in, was the indirect cause of the Boadicean war. It was a disgrace for a Roman to lend to a Roman for interest; they were permitted, however, to lend to a foreigner.

“ The territories of the Iceni were rich in lead-mines, some of which were known to have been worked in times of even greater antiquity; the Romans seized these mines soon after their arrival in Britain, thus cutting off an important source of the wealth of the Icenic people and obliging them to borrow money from Seneca for the maintenance of their state.

“ Boadicea, before leading her people and the tribe of the Trinobantes who joined them, to war, to redress her wrongs, ascended the ‘generals’ tribunal and addressed her army of 120,000 in these words: ‘I rule not like Nitocris, over beast of



burden, as are the effeminate nations of the East, nor like Semiramis, over tradesmen and traffickers, nor like the man-woman, Nero, over slaves and eunuchs — such is the precious knowledge such foreigners introduce amongst us — but I rule over Britons, little versed, indeed in craft and diplomacy, but born and trained to the game of war; men who in the cause of liberty stake down their lives, the lives of their wives and children, their lands and property — Queen of such a race, I implore your aid for freedom, for victory over enemies infamous for the wantonness of the wrongs they inflict, for their perversion of justice, for their insatiable greed; a people that revel in unmanly pleasures, whose affections are more to be dreaded and abhorred than their enmity. Never let a foreigner bear rule over me or over my countrymen; never let slavery reign in this island’.”

What do you think of this tremendously great lady, Boadicea? After all, she was a great-granddaughter (after several generations) of Tamar! This shows the kind of spirit and material of which Tamar and her descendants were, and are made of. Maybe, you too, are a descendant of Tamar and Boadicea. What does this have to do with Judah? **IT HAS EVERYTHING TO DO WITH JUDAH!** If you don’t know the entire story of Judah and Tamar, then, you cannot understand the actions and character of a lady like Boadicea! Her father, though, should have told Seneca to keep his filthy money with its obscene interest.

### PAUL AND PUDENS

We return now to another subject which I presented in lesson #13 about Pudens, Linus and Claudia of II Timothy 4:21. As you will remember, Linus and Claudia were children of Caractacus (Caradoc called King Arviragus). There is really more to this story than I rendered in that lesson. To understand more about these personages, I will quote from, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 122-125:

“... This fact supports the statement of the contemporary writers who state that St. Paul had his abode with the Pudens. There is a special and particular reason as to why he would prefer to reside with the Pudens at the British Palace, apart from its Christian environment.

“Startling as it may be to the reader, facts will prove that living with the Pudens family was the mother of St. Paul and that Claudia Britannica was the sister-in-law of the Apostle to the Gentiles (nations).

“St. Paul, writing in his Epistles to those at Rome prior to his coming says (Romans 16:13), ‘Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine.’

“ Some have sought to suggest that the woman was St. Paul’s spiritual mother. This is entirely outruled by the facts. A spiritual mother or father, was one who had converted another. As we all know, Christ had converted Paul on the road to Damascus, and Paul had not been to Rome since before the Judean persecution of Christ’s followers, A.D. 33. Thus, twenty-five years had elapsed before his arrival at Rome as an Apostle of Christ. By deduction, Pudens must have been in his late twenties when he married the seventeen-year-old British princess, and at the time of St. Paul’s salutation he must have been near his mid-thirties, which shows a long separation between ‘his mother and mine.’

“ Pudens was born on the family estate at Umbri, a Roman state. His father was a Roman senator, of a long illustrious ancestry. Paul, in describing his Roman citizenship, states (Romans 11:1) that he was a Jew (Benjamite) by race; therefore his parents must have been Jewish [Judean] Benjamites. From this it is obvious that his mother was probably married a second time, and to a Roman of distinguished birth. Rufus Pudens was born of this marriage. His mother was not a Roman consort as Pudens inherited his father’s estates as the legitimate son. If he had been an illegitimate son, born of a consort, the licentious pens of the time, ever ready to declare such an incident, would have said so. On the contrary, Pudens senior and his family are written of in high esteem. Therefore all facts point to a legal marriage, with Rufus as legal offspring. If it had been otherwise, Paul would not have addressed his mother and Rufus with the affection he did.

“ At that time Pudens donated the ground in Britain for the erection of the temple of Neptune and Minerva at Chichester, he was pagan, following his inherited family religion subject to the Roman gods. This does not prove that his Jewish [Judean] mother was a pagan worshipper. Born in the Judean faith she may have remained neutral or indifferent. However, it is certain, between the year A.D. 50 and the nuptial year A.D. 53, that both mother and son must have been converted, for we find **Priscilla, his mother**, a member of the British household, directly following the marriage of Rufus Pudens to Claudia. On the other hand, Paul would not have sought association with his mother and Rufus if he knew they had remained pagan. His salutation proves that Paul knew beforehand that both were then confirmed Christians. He salutes Pudens, ‘chosen in the Lord’, This is further supported by the Roman writers of that time who attest that ‘all’ of the Pudens household at the Palatium Britannicum were Christian.

“ **From all this we realize that St. Paul and Rufus Pudens Pudentius were half-brothers, each having the same mother.** In turn this made the British Princess Gladys the Emperor Claudius’s adopted daughter, now known as Claudia Britannica Rufina Pudens Pudentius, sister-in-law to the Apostle of the Gentiles (nations)! ... This substantiates other important facts cited in the *Roman Martyrologies* that, **‘The children of Claudia were brought up at the knee of St. Paul.’**

...

“ From the swiftness of the events that followed it is seen that St. Paul lost no time in putting into action his bold plan to erect at Rome, on an indestructible foundation, the first Christian Church among Gentiles (nations) above ground. This was the first need and was made possible by a bold act of the British royal family, Claudia and Pudens, in donating their home, the Palace of the British, to be openly declared to be the established Christian Church at Rome ... This was the birth of the first Church of Christ above ground at Rome ...

“ Linus, the son of Caractacus, who had remained at Rome, had long before been baptized and confirmed by St. Joseph of Arimathea in Britain. He was a priestly instructor. It was Linus whom St. Paul chose and personally consecrated to be the First Bishop of the Christian Church at Rome. A Prince of the royal blood of Britain, he is the same Linus whom St. Paul addressed in his Epistles ... St. Peter affirms the fact. He says: ‘The First Christian Church above ground in Rome, was the Palace of the British. The First Christian Bishop was a Briton, Linus, son of a Royal King, personally appointed by St. Paul, A.D. 58.’

“ The church still stands and can be seen in what was once the palatial grounds of the Palatium Britannicum, a memorial to the Christianizing endeavors of St. Paul and the expatriate (exiled) royal British family at Rome with Rufus Pudens. The church is recorded in Roman history under four different names: 1. Palatium Britannicum; 2. Titulus; 3. Hospitium Apostolorum; 4. Lastly, as St. Pudentiana in honour and memory of the martyred daughter of Claudia Pudens, by which name it is known to this day.”

Don't you find this situation to be outstandingly interesting? I have another good reference to Paul's being a half-brother to Pudens. It is found in the book, *Dedicated Disciples*, by Henry W. Stough, pages 158-159:

“ The Apostle Paul was aware of many things that are not recorded in the Scriptures. For one thing, Paul knew that there was a church in the city of Rome, and he knew that this church had been started by some British people who were Christians. They had been captured by the Romans and taken to Rome where they had started a little church. **Paul's mother and his half-brother were living in Rome. Paul's half-brother, named Rufus Pudens, had married a beautiful young British woman named Gladys.** Gladys, who was a princess and a daughter of the British King Caractacus, was living in Rome with her father ...

“ Paul's mother Prassede (Priscilla), who was a devout Christian, had no doubt told him about these things, and Paul felt that someone should go there and strengthen them in the faith. So, Paul sent Aristobulus to Rome to help them, and to tell them more about Jesus. Paul had probably given him letters of introduction, not only to his mother and brother Rufus, but also to the Royal Family of Siluria, **as Paul was indirectly connected with them, because Rufus had married a princess (Gladys) of the Royal Family.**”

Now that we know the Apostle Paul and Rufus Pudens were half-brothers by their mother Priscilla, and Claudia's children were Paul's nieces and nephews, making the British Royal Family of Caractacus Paul's in-laws, this should add a whole new dimension to our understanding of New Testament Scripture. When we add in the fact that the members of this British Royal Family are Tamar's children by descent, it should be even more interesting! To understand more about the importance of Tamar, you will need my Watchman's Teaching Letters #2 and #3. We will now move on to the next phase of the story which will be about the Good King Lucius (also a descendant of Tamar) and how he made Christianity the British national faith.

### GOOD KING LUCIUS NATIONALIZES THE FAITH

With this next phase of the story, you will notice it is again the British church from Rome which initiates the progress of action. It is the same group we have just been talking about. This British church in Rome has no connection whatsoever with what would later be called the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church was and is a total misfit. To get started on this subject of King Lucius, I will quote excerpts from, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 200-204:

“ In the year A.D. 137 St. Timotheus, son of Claudia Pudens, had journeyed from Rome to baptize his nephew King Lucius at Winton (Winchester), at the same time consecrating him, Defender of the Faith, as legal, royal successor to his ancestor, Arviragus, upon whom Joseph had confirmed the original honour. This began a new wave of evangelism in Britain **which, it is said, had somewhat waned since the death of Joseph.** To a certain extent this can be understood: rarely do we find the successor of a strong vigorous founding leader equally as dominant; nevertheless, as one reads the long list of teachers that continued to pour from Avalon and Cor Eurgain, filling new Bishopricks at home and abroad, there appeared to be little flickering of the light.

“ However, there is no doubt that the enthusiastic religious zeal that Lucius now supplied infused a vigour more akin to the energy that inspired the founders of the Josephian Mission at Avalon and the Pauline Mission in Cambria, particularly knowing that he was a direct descendant of the royal Silurian kingdoms of Cornwall and Cambria.

“ According to his genealogy Lucius was son of Coel, son of St. Cyllinus, son of Caractacus, son of Bran, son of Llyr. By intermarriage he was also directly descended from Arviragus, of the Cornish-Devon Silures. This made Lucius the great-grandson of both Caractacus and Arviragus, truly a majestic heritage ...

“ His native name was Lleurug Mawr. Because of his exemplary religious life and his outstanding achievements in church and state, he was termed in Celtic Lleuver Mawr, meaning the ‘ Great Light.’ However, the name by which he is best known is the Latin interpretation Lucius. The Romans latinized his name to Lucius from the Latin ‘ Lux ’, which carries the same implication as the Celtic to the Roman, the ‘Great Luminary.’ ...

“ The most notable event in the meritorious reign of King Lucius was performed in the year A.D. 156 when, at the National Council at Winchester, he established Christianity as the National Faith of Britain. By this act he solemnly declared to the world that Britain was officially a Christian nation by Act of Parliament. This act is described in the British Triads as follows: ‘King Lucius was the first in the Isle of Britain who bestowed the privilege of country and nation and judgment and validity of oath upon those who should be of the faith of Christ.

“ ... The great British Edict was joyously welcomed by Christians in other lands. Sabellius, A.D. 250, shows this national establishment was acknowledged elsewhere beyond the confines of Britain. He writes: ‘Christianity was privately confessed elsewhere, but the first nation that proclaimed it as their religion, and called itself Christian, after the name of Christ, was Britain.’ Genebrand declares: ‘The glory of Britain consists not only in this, that she was the first country which in a national capacity publicly professed herself Christian, but that she made this confession when the Roman Empire itself was pagan and a cruel persecutor of Christianity.’ (This reference to Sabellius and Genebrand can also be found in the book, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, page 99.) ...

“ All British and Roman records attest to the fact that Lucius was confirmed and baptized in the faith by his uncle, St. Timotheus, as stated before. He was baptized in the famous Chalice Well, at the foot of the Tor at Avalon, May 28, A.D. 137. In the Year A.D. 167 he commemorated the event by building St. Michael’s on the summit of the Tor, which was the largest Druidic Gorsedd in Britain. This memorial was destroyed in the earthquake that shook Glastonbury, A.D. 1275 ... In the year A.D. 170 Lucius founded the majestic church at Winchester, now known as Winchester Cathedral, and familiar to thousands of Canadian soldiers in World War II garrisoned at Winchester as the Battle Abbey of the British Empire.”

Again, on page 80, George F. Jowett says in his book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*:

“ The founding of Christianity in Britain by the Josephian Mission was truly the beginning of the British national Church. Conversion spread rapidly through the Isles. It is recorded, A.D. 48, that Conor Macnessa, King of Ulster, sent his priests to Avalon to commit the Christian law and its teachings into writing, which they named ‘The Celestial Judgments.’ However, it was not until A.D. 156 that Britain, by the royal edict of King Lucius, officially proclaimed the Christian Church to be the national Church of Britain, at Winchester, then the royal capital of Britain.”

Isabel Hill Elder, in her book, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, says this of King Lucius on pages 95-96:

“ The Christian king Lucius, third in descent from Caradoc and grandson of Pudens and Claudia, built the first minster (British word for church) on the site of a Druidic Cor at Winchester, and at a National Council held there in A.D. 156 established Christianity the national religion as the natural successor to Druidism, when the Christian ministry was inducted into all the rights of the Druidic hierarchy, tithes included.”

In the book, *St. Joseph Of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Smithett Lewis, says this of King Lucius, page 35:

“ St. Joseph’s little circle of twelve disciples was kept going by anchorites (hermits) — as one died another was appointed; but in [the] course of time a certain slackness seems to have come over them. William of Malmesbury tells us that the holy spot at length became a covert of wild beasts. Then in the days of Good King Lucius aforesaid came a revival. Llewrug Mawr, Llewrug the Great (grandson of Saint Cyllinus and great-grandson of Caractacus), nicknamed Lleiver Mawr or the great luminary (hence his Latinized name of Lux or Lucius), was king of Britain in the middle and towards the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. He increased the Light that the first missionaries, the disciples of Christ, had brought, by sending emissaries to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, requesting him to send missionaries to Britain. The Welsh Triads tell us that Eleutherius, in response, sent Dyfan and Fagan, Medwy and Elfan, all of them British names in A.D. 167.”

For a last quote concerning the Good King Lucius, I will use the book, *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 38-39:

“ We find ( A.D. 167) a British ruler not only professing the Christian religion himself, but becoming ‘a nursing father’ to the infant Church. This illustrious prince was *Lucius*, who, in the zeal for the conversion of all his subjects, sent two of his learned men (Elvanus and Medvinus) to Rome for the purpose of consulting Elutherius, then Bishop of Rome, as to the best measures to adopt for that purpose. The Bishop received the messengers gladly, instructed them more perfectly in the Christian religion, and sent them back to Lucius (together with two of his own trusted messengers) with a present of ‘ bothe the Oulde and Newe Testaments’, and also a letter containing these remarkable words: ‘ You have received in the kingdom of Britain, by God’s mercy, both the law and faith of Christ. You have both the Old and New Testament. Out of the same, through God’s grace, by the advice of your realme, take a law, and by the same, through God’s sufferance, *rule you your kingdom of Britain, for in that kingdom you are God’s vicar*’.”

I suppose one of the most important considerations we should take into account about Good King Lucius (and good is spelled with a capital “ G ”), is the fact that he was of the Tribe of Judah! This, for him, made all the difference in the world. After presenting all these references on King Lucius, you should never forget his tremendously important place in history. Until King Lucius came along, the teachings of the Nazarene were standing still, almost dying out. But with Lucius, the Gospel burst forth to spread all over Britain, and then the continent. Judah owned the sceptre; Lucius knew how to use it! — as the king, so his royal kinsman subjects. Lucius was the right man in the right place at the right time! Just like Tamar (his several times great-grandmother) was the right woman in the right place at the right time! I will say it again, without Tamar, there would have been no Tribe of Judah, and thus no Redeemer for Israel! The way back to Yahweh would have been blocked forever! The true teaching of Redemption is something that is seldom taught in its proper perspective today. **The teaching of salvation has been substituted for the doctrine of Redemption. Redemption correctly implies kinsman-ship, while the teaching of salvation incorrectly insinuates universalism.**

From the time of Lucius there was a general peace over Britain, though Rome still retained an occupation force in the area until and through the time of Diocletian. We are talking generally about a period from approximately 150 A.D. to 300 A.D., or about 150 years. As I have already discoursed on the Diocletian persecution, I will not reintroduce it at this point, except to make a small quote from the book, *St. Joseph Of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Snithett Lewis, page 17:

“ The Venerable Bede, writing about A.D. 740, says: ‘The Britons preserved the Faith which they had received under King Lucius uncorrupted, and continued in peace and tranquillity until the time of the Emperor Diocletian.’”

The next major event in the history of the British church, after the Diocletian persecution, was the coming of Constantine the Great. I looked up the subject of Constantine the Great in the World Book Encyclopedia, and I can tell you that the history, as told by many sources, of this man is grossly misrepresented. Although I do have a few history books that do some justice to the story of Constantine the Great. Even so, very few will tell you that Constantine the Great was related to the British of the royal line, especially through his mother.

### CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

Because much of the history of Constantine is not told in the usual history books, I will start this untold story by quoting excerpts from, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 211-214:

“ The great peace which had settled over the Island, beginning with the Treaty of Agricola, A.D. 86, continued for a period of two hundred years. During these two centuries there is no mention of any British-Roman conflict. Historians are silent, leaping the two-hundred-year gap as though nothing had occurred in the tight little island of Britain; then they take up the record in the year A.D. 287, to recite the usurpage of the Roman Emperor’s crown when Carausius, a Menapien by birth, who was then the Admiral of the Roman fleet, landed in North Britain, marching to York, where he had himself proclaimed Emperor.

“ Since the fall of London, under the arms of Queen Boadicea, the city of York had **become a popular resort of the Romans. From this ancient British city, first known as Caer Evroc, several Roman Emperors had functioned, probably deeming it a safer haven to rule from than the city of Rome, rife with jealousy, intrigue and assassination.** Several Roman Emperors are buried within the walls of this age-old citadel of the Brigantes . . .

“ Briefly, profane history tells us that Carausius reigned as Emperor from York for seven years and was then assassinated by Allectus, his minister, A.D. 294. The assassin reigned for two years and then fell in battle against the **forces of Constantius Chlorus**, who succeeded Allectus as Emperor. **He also ruled his Empire from York for ten years.** With him began one of the most momentous chapters in Christian history, beginning in a maelstrom of persecution and slaughter exceeding the brutal Menaii bloodbath of the Christians by Suetonius Paulinus and the Boadicean atrocities under the malignant direction of Catus Decianus, A.D. 60 to A.D. 62. Actually the stupendous events that began to be enacted with the reign of the **Emperor Constantius Chlorus** had their start in the lovely city of Colchester, thirty-one years before Constantius assumed the Roman purple . . .

“ **In the year A.D. 265 a daughter was born to King Coel** in his castle at Colchester, who was to become world renowned as **Empress Helen** of the Cross. **Helen** was the Graeco-Roman interpretation of the British name **Elaine**. As the **Empress-Auguste Helena**, she is best known and so recorded in the brightest annals of Roman history. This beautiful, accomplished woman was a noble counterpart of her famous predecessors, the **Princess St. Eurgain and the beloved Claudia (Gladys) Pudens (daughters of Caractacus)**. Raised in a Christian household and educated in its religious principles, her natural talents were developed to a high degree by the best scholars and administrators in the land. Steeped in the traditions of the faith, she espoused all that is Christian with intelligence and with courage. Helen possessed one attribute greater than either of her famous royal female predecessors, her capacity for political administration. **While her regal husband and son stood out eminently in the art of diplomacy**, all facts and records prove that her capacity in this direction played a prominent part in their imperial destiny. The Christianizing of the Roman empire would undoubtedly have been delayed centuries but for her energy and devotional support.



“ As usual, profane history merely describes Helen in her role as Empress. **No mention is given of her ancestry and brilliant heritage. To all Roman historical records the Empress Helen is made to appear as a Roman native, wife of a Roman, and the mother of the illustrious Roman son, none of which is true. They were British to the core . . .**

“ The Empress Helen is given credit for founding the first cathedral at Tréves, after the elevation of her husband to be Emperor of Rome. It became her favorite continental residence and. because of her manifold gifts to the city, she was held in the highest esteem and made the patroness of Tréves. The former British princess became titled ‘Helen of the Cross’, due to the claim that she found the cross of Christ buried near Jerusalem, A.D. 326 . . . **Due to her association with Tréves, and that of her Emperor husband Constantius and their noble son Constantine** (to become Constantine the Great), this city had closer contact with the early British monarchs than any other on the continent.”

From all of this, we can see clearly who the father and mother of Constantine the Great were. Did you notice, how the Roman emperors were using Britain as a base of operations, as they felt safer there than in their own country? There is no doubt, Constantine’s mother, Helen, was from the royal family of Caractacus, but Jowett does not go into detail on Constantine’s father’s side of the house. For this I am going to refer to *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition (1894), volume VI., page 275:

“ CONSTANTIUS, FLAVIUS VALERIUS, commonly called CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS, or the Pale (an epithet first applied by the Byzantine historians, though with doubtful accuracy, for there is evidence to show that he was, like his son, ruddy), Roman emperor **and father of Constantine the Great**, was born of noble **Dalmatian family** about 250 A.D. Having distinguished himself by his military ability and his able and gentle rule of Dalmatia, he was, in March, 292, adopted and appointed Cæsar by Maximian, whose daughter Theodosia he was obliged to marry after renouncing his wife Helena. By Helena he became the father of Constantine. He obtained the title Augustus in 305, and died the following year.”

Dalmatia is probably ancient Illyria ,which may also be connected historically with ancient Troy. If this is so, then Constantius Chlorus, and his son Constantine the Great, are probably also of Zareh-Judah as much as Constantine’s mother Helen. From this point, I will skip forward in time to about the year 300 A.D., and pick up the story from, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, pages 216-217:

“ The Emperor ( Diocletian) poured a huge army into Britain, while Maximian carried on his destructive course on the continent. Constantius Chlorus had already been proclaimed Emperor of Rome at York. The British kingdoms were better united. As one they responded to the battle call of Constantius. Previously the

British had fought years in deciding each Roman conflict, with victory swaying from one side to the other. Yet, within one year, Constantius terminated the Diocletian persecution in Britain, inflicting staggering defeats on the Roman arms, driving them back to the continent, A.D. 302 . . .

“ Following the expulsion of the Romans, we are told that the Emperor Constantius and his Queen Empress diligently began to restore the destroyed churches. It was a titanic task, speaking highly for the Christian devotion of this royal family who poured their personal fortune into the restoration. During this process of rehabilitation the Emperor Constantius Chlorus died at York, A.D. 306, and there he was laid to rest. Immediately, his son Constantine assumed the purple and at York declared himself Emperor of the Roman Empire. **For the next six years Constantine remained in Britain, building many new churches and institutions of learning after he had completed restoration of those destroyed.** During this time Diocletian, and particularly Maximian, continued their destruction of Christian lives on the continent.

“ Peace restored in Britain, Constantine, the famed son of famous royal Christian parents, began to prepare to cross the seas to the continent where his dramatic destiny was to unfold. He massed a powerful army in Britain, composed wholly of British warriors. With them he sailed, landing in what today is Germany. The two armies clashed together on the banks of the Tiber where the British, under the generalship of the Emperor Constantine, won an overwhelming victory, Maximian was completely routed and persecution ended. Constantine, with the British warriors, marched victoriously on to Rome, where he met with an uproarious welcome. Amid great rejoicing he ascended the Imperial throne, officially acclaimed by the Senate and the populace of Rome as Emperor . . .

“ His first act as Emperor of Rome was to declare Rome Christian, ending for ever Christian persecution within the Empire, *circa*, A.D. 312. Henceforth Rome began her history as a Christian nation. In nationalizing the faith, Constantine had done for Rome what King Lucius had done for Britain one hundred and fifty years earlier. In the great Christianizing work that followed, the gracious Helen, his mother, stood by his side and, as Severus said, reigned with her son as Empress.”

In the next lesson, I will explore further this interesting and complex story of Constantine. You can already see, by the preceding evidence, how Constantine who helped in the restoration of damaged churches, and then built new ones in Britain after the Diocletian persecution, which proves he was highly motivated toward Christianity. If he had been still pagan, why would he have done all this for the cause of the teachings of the Nazarene in Britain? The story that he was converted on his death bed, under these circumstances, just doesn't make sense. I will try to sort out all of the facts, and find out what kind of a person this man was. I believe there have been a lot of biased writings about Constantine the Great.







## LETTER 16

---

The Diocletian persecution covered the entire area of the Roman Empire at his time, but in the city of Rome itself, there was no one left to carry on the British church which had been started there, after the persecutions had subsided. We can know this for sure, as there are no records of the British church established by the Pudens family being connected in any way with the later Roman Catholic Church. In fact, the Roman Catholic Church claims that Peter appointed the first bishop Linus, which is a false claim, **for Paul appointed Linus as bishop**. All the members of that church, with its bishops, had evidently been martyred. What was started in its stead was not ordained or given authority by Yahshua! The instrument by which the Roman Catholic Universal Church **claims** authority is called “The Donation of Constantine” which has been proven by historians to be a forgery. It is important to understand the Roman Catholic Universal Church is not related in any way to the original British church organized by St. Paul, called “*Basilica Di S. Pudenziana*”, at Rome. For information on “The Donation of Constantine”, I am going to quote from, *The Horizon History Of Christianity*, by Roland H. Bainton, pages 243-244:

“ We do find skepticism of a sort in the form of historical criticism used to expose the spuriousness of famous forgeries and to examine sacred documents critically. Historical criticism was a by-product of studies by the Humanists, whose profound interest in the antique encouraged a pure Latin style. Through their comparison of classical and medieval Latin, there arose an awareness of philological (study in literature and linguistic) development. ‘ **The Donation of Constantine** ’, upon which the papacy long based its claims to dominion, was exposed as a forgery by Lorenzo Valla. The language, he pointed out, was not that of the age of Constantine. In the document there were references to the iconoclastic controversy of the eighth century. Documents of the period of Constantine never once mentioned the Donation, and at no time during that emperor’s reign did the popes actually exercise the authority Constantine was supposed to

**have bestowed upon them.** Valla disproved also the common assumption that the Apostles' Creed was the work of the twelve apostles. More daring was his application of historical, critical methods to the study of the Bible, even though he came up with no startling conclusions. **As far as the Church was concerned, Valla's demonstrations were not especially disturbing. She could survive the exposure of forgery."**

This may be new and startling to you, but it is well documented — there really is no question about this unmistakable fact. For another reference to "The Donation of Constantine", I will quote from, *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, "The Age Of Faith"*, by Will Durant, pages 525-526:

" At first it was the episcopacy (government of the church by a hierarchy) that profited most from the weakness and quarrels of the French and German kings. In Germany the archbishops, allied with the kings, enjoyed over property, bishops, and priests, a feudal power **that paid only lip service to the popes.** Apparently it was the resentment of the German bishops, irked by this archiepiscopal autocracy, that generated the ' False Decretals '; **this collection, which would later fortify the papacy,** aimed first of all to establish the right of bishops to appeal from their metropolitans to the popes. We do not know the date of provenance of these Decretals; probably they were put together at Metz about 842 A.D. **The author was a French cleric who called himself Isidorus Mercator. It was an ingenious compilation. Along with a mass of authentic decrees by councils or popes, it included decrees and letters that it attributed to pontiffs from Clement I (91-100) to Melchiades (311-314).** These early documents were designed to show that by the oldest traditions and practice of the Church, no bishop might be deposed, no Church council might be convened, and no major issue might be decided, without the consent of the pope. Even the early pontiffs, by these evidences, had claimed absolute and universal authority as vicars of Christ on earth. Pope Sylvester I (314-335) was represented as having received in the ' Donation of Constantine ', full secular as well as religious authority over **all western Europe;** consequently the ' Donation of Pepin ' was but a halting restoration of stolen property; and the repudiation of Byzantine suzerainty by the pope in crowning Charlemagne appeared as the long-delayed reassertion of a right derived from the founder of the Eastern Empire himself. **Unfortunately, many of the unauthentic documents quoted Scripture in the translation of St. Jerome,** who was born twenty-six years after the death of Melchiades. The forgery would have been evident to any good scholar, but scholarship was at low ebb in the ninth and tenth centuries. The fact that most of the claims ascribed by the Decretals to the early bishops of Rome had been made by one or another of the later pontiffs disarmed criticism; and for eight centuries the popes assumed the authenticity of these documents, and used them to prop their policies.

“ By a happy coincidence the ‘**False Decretals**’ appeared shortly before the election of one of the most commanding figures in papal history. Nicholas I (858-867) had received an exceptionally thorough education in the law and traditions of the Church, and had been apprenticed to his high office by being a favored aide of several popes. He equaled the great Gregorys (I and VII) in strength of will, and surpassed them in the extent and success of his claims. **Starting from premises then accepted by all Christians — that the Son of God had founded the Church by making Peter her first head, and that the bishops of Rome inherited their power from Peter in direct line — Nicholas reasonably concluded that the pope, as God’s representative on earth, should enjoy a suzerain authority over all Christians — rulers as well as subjects — at least in matters of faith and morals. Nicholas eloquently expounded this simple argument, and no one in Latin Christendom dared contradict it. Kings and archbishops could only hope that he would not take it too seriously.**”

Continuing from this same reference book, at the bottom of the page 526, *The Story Of Civilization*: Part IV, “The Age Of Faith”, by Will Durant, he has the following footnote:

**“ Lorenzo Valla, in 1440, so definitely exposed the frauds in the ‘ False Decretals ’ that all parties now agree that the disputed documents are forgeries.”**

For further proof the Roman Catholic Universal Church sits on a defective, deficient and ridiculous foundation, I will quote from the book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett. We find the following information on the “False Decretals” on pages 222-223:

“ Gore, in his *Roman Catholic Claims*, dispenses the claim, along with the present charge that no one belongs to the true church unless under the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The argument is worthless. The Papacy as we know it, and as William the Conqueror, Henry VIII, and Elisabeth I knew it, is not in and of the Primitive Church of Christ. It is devoid of all spiritual recognition. It evolved out of a combination of circumstance and pressure politics, based on a series of documents proven by all historians to be ‘the Forged Decretals’.”

From all of this, we can conclude “The Donation of Constantine” had nothing to do in, or with the life of Constantine as he never heard, in his lifetime of such a thing! What more proof do we need to know for certain that the Roman Catholic Universal Church was never the true church of Yahshua? — not for one day! — not for one hour! — not for one minute! — not for one second! I hope you will write it down someplace where you will never forget it. The forged document upon by which the Roman Catholic “Universal” Church bases its total existence, is called “The Donation of Constantine” or “the Forged Decretals.”

As I said in the last lesson, much of the story about Constantine the Great has been omitted, and much of what is written is very biased. With this in mind, I am going to be very careful about what I quote about him. I do have a fairly well written article on him from the 1951 edition of, *The World Scope Encyclopedia*, volume III (**At least in this article, it mentions him and his father entering Britain to fight the Picts.**):

“ **Constantine I** (*kon’stan-tin*), FLAVIUS VALERIUS AURELIUS, called the Great, born in February, 272 A.D.; died July 22, 337. He was the eldest son of Constantius Chlorus, and distinguished himself when 22 years old as a soldier in the expedition to Egypt and Persia. Constantine and Galerius became emperors in 305 A.D. respectively of the West and East. Constantine served in the Eastern Empire under Galerius, but, owing to extensive exposure in the East, he joined his father at Boulogne as the latter was **entering upon his expedition against the Picts in North Britain.**

“ Constantine succeeded his father as emperor in 306 A.D. Soon after he was opposed by two rivals, Maximilian and Maxentius, father and son. The son, owing to a quarrel, forced his father to flee to Rome, taking refuge with Constantine, but afterward he fled from Rome on account of a conspiracy and was captured and executed. Maxentius, greatly angered at the death of his father, collected a vast army and threatened Gaul. Constantine hastened to meet him, crossed the Alps by Mont Cenis, and defeated him three times. In the last engagement Maxentius was drowned in an attempt to escape across the Tiber. Soon after Constantine entered Rome in triumph, adopted a vigorous military policy, and quieted public excitement. He was now sole emperor of the West, and Licinius became emperor of the East about the same time. In A.D. 314 the two emperors became engaged in war, which terminated to the advantage of Constantine. Peace was soon concluded, the conditions being the cession of Greece and other territory to Constantine. He next devoted himself to the correction of abuses and public extravagance, strengthened his frontier, effected internal improvements, and established himself as a powerful military influence.

“ In A.D. 323 a war broke out between the West and East, and terminated in Constantine becoming sole ruler of the Roman world. The capital was now moved from Rome to Byzantium, which was solemnly inaugurated as the seat of government in A.D. 330 under the name of Constantinople. A dark shadow was thrown over his memory in A.D. 324 by the execution of his gallant and accomplished son, Crispus, along with some others on a charge of treason. The council of Nice met in A.D. 325 and was supported by Constantine. Subsequently he granted toleration to the Christians and had Christianity adopted as a state religion, **at the same time closing pagan temples and forbidding sacrifices.** Shortly before his death he professed Christianity and allowed himself to be baptized. As emperor, he was beloved by his people and moderate toward other nations. The efficient



organization of a stable government and **the adoption of Christianity in his vast dominion are the chief events of his life.**”

I would now like to quote from the book, *Rome: Its Rise And Fall*, by Philip Van Ness Myers, L.H.D., page 391, and I have a very, extremely important reason for doing it:

“ Galerius and Constantius, who, it will be remembered, had become Augusti on the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, had reigned together only one year **when the latter (Constantius Chlorus) died at York, in Britain.** His soldiers, disregarding the rule of succession as determined by the system of Diocletian, proclaimed his son Constantine emperor. Six competitors for the throne arose in different quarters. For eighteen years Constantine fought to gain the supremacy.”

This confirms that George F. Jowett, in his book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, was correct with his comments on Constantius Chlorus and his son Constantine the Great, when he talked about them being in Britain and ruling the empire from York. I quoted from his book, concerning Constantine the Great, in my last teaching letter. Jowett’s commentary on Constantine makes all other history writers look insensate (lacking sense or understanding). If you ever read Jowett’s book from pages 211 to 224, you will know what I mean. If you ever read these pages from his book, you will never look at Roman history the same again. It is obvious, most of the history of Rome has been written from the Roman Catholic “Universal” Church’s point of view, including the forgery, “The Donation of Constantine.”

### WHAT MOVED CONSTANTINE TO HIS DECISIONS?

We are going to examine the record in order to see what made Constantine, as a person, tick. Constantine was not just the ordinary run-of-the-mill type of personality. By nature he was very complex and intricate. We shall try to discover why he made many of the decisions he did when faced with problems. I don’t believe there is anyone who questions his military ability, so this is one area we can all agree on. Constantine was a spectacular man caught in an historical time frame which no other personality could have ever filled. His position was so consequential, we still have the results of those decisions he made (or at least given the credit for making) with us today. Nobody, before or after him, has faced as unique a situation as he encountered during his time. Therefore, it is hard to either condemn or support his motives. The only way we can understand this man is by putting ourselves in his shoes during his time, and consider what we might have done under his particular given set of circumstances. Before we get done with this study, we are going to know more about Constantine than we did. I found one passage in, *CYCLOPÆDIA of Universal History* (1885), by John Clark Ridpath, LL. D., volume 1, page 883:

“ To this epoch belong the great activities of Constantine. He was indefatigable (untiring) in promoting what he deemed to be the reforms demanded by the times. The bottom questions which he had to confront were essentially religious. His great principal of action looked to the union in one body of the Christian and pagan populations of the Empire. In this work he was soon confronted by what seemed to be insuperable (extremely difficult, if not impossible) obstacles. Not only did the Christians refuse to tolerate the doctrines of paganism, but they themselves divided into sects and refused to be reconciled. The bishops who headed the various parties in the new religion appealed to Constantine to settle their disputes. The latter, in A.D. 314, convened a council at Rome, and afterwards at Arles, to which bodies were referred the conflicting doctrines and disputed disciplines of the church. A decision was rendered against the sect of the Donatists, and they, having refused to accept the judgment which had been rendered, were visited with the arm of secular power. A persecution broke out, in which one body of the Christians became the persecutors of the other. The bloody bitterness of paganism was paralleled by the intolerance born of fanaticism among the believers.”

Not only was Constantine having troubles with the pagans, but the Christians were so divided it presented problems of persecution not faced by anyone before. It must be considered that it had been about three hundred years since the time of Yahshua, and that gave a lot of time for the doctrines of men to creep in and distort the true Gospel of Redemption. These divisions have continued to multiply for the last seventeen hundred years, until today, one can choose anything from crystal cathedrals to snake handlers, and it is called **Christian**.

### A “JEWISH” LOOK AT CONSTANTINE

To see another side of Constantine, we must take a look at him from a “Jewish” point of view. This will be quite revealing of his nature. You can be sure, Constantine did not escape the eye of the “Jew.” The “Jews” throughout all time have made it their business to know everything that was and is going on, for nothing escapes their attention. For the “Jewish” view of Constantine, I will use excerpts from the, *History Of The Jews*, by Heinrich Graetz, Volume 2, pages 561-562:

“ The Emperor Constantine, who had aggrandized the Church, and laid the dominion of the earth at her feet, had at the same time given her the doubtful blessing, ‘By the sword thou shalt live.’ **He had originally placed Judaism, as a religion, on an equal footing with the other forms of worship existing in the Roman Empire.** For, before adopting the Christian faith, and determining above all things to put a stop to religious persecutions throughout his dominions, Constantine had published a sort of edict of toleration, wherein he had commanded that **every man**

should enjoy the right of professing any religion without thereby becoming an outlaw. The Jews were likewise included in this act of toleration, and their patriarchs, elders, and the principals of the schools and synagogues enjoyed the same privileges as the Christian ecclesiastics and the heathen priests. These decisions continued in force, and in later times were sanctioned by new laws, although another spirit began to sway the newly-founded Byzantine court. The rule was established that the members of the synagogue who dedicated themselves to the Law, the Patriarchs, Priests, and other religious officials, should be relieved from all municipal and other onerous (oppressive) offices. Taking as models the constitution of the Roman priesthood, and the Christian system of bishops, the Patriarch of Judæa was regarded as the chief of all the Jews in the Roman Empire. **Constantine's impartial justice, however, lasted but a short time.** The more Christianity asserted its influence over him, the more did he affect the intolerance of that religion, which, forgetful of its origin, **entertained as passionate a hatred of Judaism** and its adherents as of heathenism. **Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, Paul, afterwards Bishop of Constantinople, the new capital, and Eusebius of Cæsarea, the first historian of the Church, did not fail to incite the inhabitants of the empire against the Jews.** Judaism was stigmatized as a noxious, profligate, godless sect (*feralis, nefaria secta*) which ought to be exterminated from the face of the earth wherever possible. An imperial edict was published to the effect that the Jews were no longer to make converts, those entering, as well as those receiving newcomers into the faith being threatened with punishment (A.D. 315). **Finally the proselytism of the Christians was afforded the aid of the State,** and the Jews were forbidden to pronounce upon such of the members of their community as apostatized the punishment **which Christianity was, however, permitted to inflict in a terribly aggravated degree upon its own adherents who left its fold."**

Another "Jewish" source, in her book, *The Story of the Jew*, by Elma Ehrlich Levinger, says this on page 87:

**" The final blow to the schools of Palestine fell when Constantine, the Roman Emperor, accepted Christianity. He made the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, the official religion of the Roman empire and all its provinces. The Jews of Palestine realized that they could no longer study and teach the law of their fathers in their ancient homeland.** They journeyed, as the captives of the Babylonian conquerors had journeyed centuries before, down the long road that led to Babylon. But now they did not move in bowed procession as humbled slaves. They marched as conquerors, for they knew that Rabbi Jochanan and the men who had followed in his footsteps had labored wisely and to good purpose. No matter how far the Jews might **wander** from their birthplace, no matter how widely the Jewish people might be **scattered**, they would never lack the golden chain to bind them to their homeland and to their God. In one hand the **Wandering Jew** carried

his traveler's staff; in the other his Torah (the mark of Cain, Genesis 4:12 — look up the word vagabond)."

To get to the heart of the matter and understand what motivated Constantine to make the decisions he did, can be found in a footnote of another "Jewish" book, *The History of the Jews*, by Henry·Hart Milman D.D., volume 2, page 189, that:

"Constantine in a public document declared that it was not for the dignity of the Church to follow that most *hateful of all people*, the Jews, in the celebration of the Passover."

Now back to some remarks from the, *History Of The Jews*, by Heinrich Graetz, Volume 2, pages 563-564 along this same line of thought:

"The festival of Easter had up till now been celebrated for the most part at the same time as the Jewish Passover, and indeed upon the days calculated and fixed by the Synhedrion (sic.) in Judæa for its celebration; but in [the] future its observance was to be rendered altogether independent of the Jewish calendar, 'For it is unbecoming beyond measure that on this holiest of festivals we should follow the customs of the Jews. Henceforward let us have nothing in common with this odious people; our Savior has shown us another path. **It would indeed be absurd if the Jews were able to boast that we are not in a position to celebrate the Passover without the aid of their rules (calculations).**' These remarks are attributed to the Emperor Constantine, and even though they may not have been uttered by him, they were nevertheless the guiding principle of the Church which was to decide the fate of the Jews."

It is apparent, from these remarks of the "Jews", there was no love lost between the Christians and the Jews. Truly, the prophecy of Genesis 3:15 was being fulfilled at this critical point of time in history. The conflicting **enmity** (hatred) between the offspring of the woman (Israel), and the offspring of the serpent race of "Jews" through Cain, was coming to the surface in a significant way at this historical period of time. Possibly, I may be one of the few to point this out in the case of Constantine, with his vehement hatred for the Jews. This would account for some of Constantine's and the church's unusual positions on important ecclesiastical matters. It was, then, the hatred for the "Jews" that motivated Constantine, with pressure from the church fathers, at the Council of Nicaea to drop the celebration of Passover and replace it with the celebration of Easter. I can understand their ill feelings towards these Messiah killing "Jews", but this was an unwarranted act on their part to make such a change. Passover was never the heritage of the "Jews", but of the Israelites. To further exacerbate the situation, the "Jews" had a corner on the market (so they thought) on how to calculate when the celebration of Passover should occur. By depending on the "Jews" for this

calculation, it would have put the church in subordination to them. This Constantine, along with the church father's influence, were not about to allow. The proper thing for the church fathers to have done, would have been to have figured out the proper calculations for themselves. Evidently, by Constantine's time, there were few left to be found who could properly figure the correct time for the celebration of Passover. There are some who doubt, even today, if the "Jew's" calculations for Passover are correct. If the celebration of Passover was being kept up until the time of Constantine by the ekklesia, we should still be keeping it today, and not Easter. The Druids evidently knew when to keep Passover, for in her book, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, page 63 says: "*The national religious procession moved through these to the circle on the **three great festivals of the year.***" But, were all of the records of the Druids destroyed by Constantine's time by the early Roman armies, or the Diocletian persecution?

I am not so sure that the celebration of Easter, as the "Jew's" claim, was all Constantine's idea. Let's backtrack a little here and see what we can find. In the book, *St. Joseph Of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Smithett Lewis, we read of the festival of Easter as early as about A.D. 193. Let's pick it up on page 109:

" St. Victor was the first to raise the controversy about the keeping of Easter, which lasted till after the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. The Eastern Churches kept it on the day of the full moon, whether it fell on a weekday or a Sunday; the Western Church always [kept it] on a Sunday."

If you start counting down from a new moon, as the Scriptures designate for fourteen days, you will always arrive at the time to the full moon as the Eastern Churches were doing according to the above quotation. Once Passover is established in any one particular year, all the other feast days that year automatically fall into place. Also, the early British church did not keep the festival of Easter which the Roman church did. This can also be found in the book, *St. Joseph Of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Smithett Lewis, pages 109-110:

" The British Church was as insistent upon being Catholic and Apostolic as it was being anti-Roman. And so after a dispute of 132 years the ultimate decision of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, that Easter was to be kept on a Sunday was binding on it. But it was exactly like the contentious **spirit of the race** still to differ from Rome in another point of the same question. Accordingly, it was not till the Council of Whitby, A.D. 664, when Saxon Wilfrid persuaded the Council to overthrow the old Celtic discipline, that the British Church agreed to keep Easter on the same Sunday as the Roman and the rest of the Western Church kept it.

(Footnote, same page): " From what Bede wrote, even after the Council of Whitby, the adoption of the Roman Easter was only gradual. The Welsh Church did not adopt it till A.D. 755."

In the following quotation from the book, *The Drama of the Lost Disciples*, by George F. Jowett, page 219, we get Constantine's own words in one of his Edicts which spells out clearly his position:

“ We call God to witness, the Savior of all men, that in assuming the government we are influenced solely by these two considerations: the uniting of the empire in one faith, and the restoration of peace to a world rent to pieces by the insanity of religious persecution.”

There is another account found in, *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, “The Age Of Faith”*, by Will Durant, page 7, which reveals much of Constantine's nature and methods of working out a problem:

“ CHRISTIANS AND PAGANS. In the Mediterranean world of the fourth century, where the state depended so much on religion, ecclesiastical affairs were in such turmoil that government felt called upon to interfere even in the mysteries of theology. The great debate between Athanasius and Arius had not ended with the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325). Many bishops — in the East a majority — still openly or secretly sided with Arius; i.e., they considered Christ the Son of God, but neither consubstantial nor coeternal with the Father. Constantine himself, after accepting the Council's decree, and banishing Arius, invited him to a personal conference (A.D. 331), could find no heresy in him, and recommended the restoration of Arius and the Arians to their churches. Athanasius protested; a council of Eastern bishops at Tyre deposed him from his Alexandrian see (A.D. 335); and for two years he lived as an exile in Gaul. Arius again visited Constantine, and professed adherence to the Nicene Creed, with subtle reservations that an emperor could not be expected to understand. Constantine believed him, and bade Alexander, Patriarch of Constantinople, receive him into communion. The ecclesiastical historian Socrates here tells a painful tale:

“ It was then Saturday, and Arius was expecting to assemble with the congregation on the day following; but Divine retribution overtook his daring criminality. For going out from the imperial palace . . . and approaching the porphyry pillar in the Forum of Constantine, a terror seized him, accompanied by violent relaxation of his bowels . . . Together with the evacuations his bowels protruded followed by a copious hemorrhage, and the decent of the small intestine, moreover, portions of his spleen and his liver were eliminated in the effusion of blood, so that he almost immediately died.

“ Hearing of this timely purge, Constantine began to wonder whether Arius had not been a heretic after all. But when the Emperor himself died, in the following year, he received the rites of baptism from his friend and counselor Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, an Arian.”

Concerning the death of Arius as described here, the story doesn't seem quite reasonable. I checked my copy of, *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 9, page 377, under the topic, "Human Body" where there is a several page overlay detailed color chart. In the above description of the death of Arius, if the named organs were evacuated as described through the anus, it couldn't have been in the order depicted by Socrates. After the small intestine, next would come the duodenum and pancreas before the spleen. Also the liver and spleen are on opposite sides of the body which would make this account almost impossible. Anyone familiar with the anatomy of the human body should be able to figure this out with very little difficulty. You'll have to agree, this would be a very strange, and not a very credible cause of death. I can see how this kind of story might be used to put the "fear of God" into a person to bring him to a particular way of thinking, though. As for Constantine, this proves he had a mind of his own and didn't always go with the status quo. In spite of the reported way Arius was supposed to have died, Constantine kept very close company with his friend, another Arian, Eusebius, even upon his own deathbed. This incident tells volumes about Constantine **of the Tribe of Judah**. It wasn't Constantine who was responsible for bringing heresy into the church, but the so-called church fathers.

#### CONSTANTINE'S PERSONAL LIFE

For information on Constantine's personal life, I will use *The Story Of Civilization: Part III, "Caesar And Christ"*, by Will Durant, page 663:

"Constantine had been twice married: first to Minervina, who had borne him a son Crispus; then to Maximian's daughter Fausta, by whom he had three daughters and three sons. Crispus became an excellent soldier, and rendered vital aid to his father in the campaigns against Licinius. In A.D. 326 Crispus was put to death by Constantine's order; about the same time the Emperor decreed the execution of Licinianus, son of Licinius by Constantine's sister Constantia; and shortly thereafter Fausta was slain by her husband's command. We do not know the reasons for this triple execution. Zosimus assures us that Crispus had made love to Fausta, who accused him to the Emperor; and that Helena, who loved Crispus dearly, had avenged him by persuading Constantine that his wife had yielded to his son. Possibly Fausta had schemed to remove Crispus from the path of her son's rise to imperial power, and Licinianus may have been killed for plotting to claim his father's share of the realm.

"Fausta achieved her aim after her death, for in A.D. 335 Constantine bequeathed the Empire to his surviving sons and nephews. Two years later, at Easter, he celebrated with festival ceremonies the thirtieth year of his reign. Then, feeling

the nearness of death, he went to take the warm baths at near-by Aquyrion. As his illness increased, he called for a priest to administer to him that sacrament of baptism which he had purposely deferred to this moment, hoping to be cleansed by it from all the sins of his crowded life. Then the tired ruler, aged sixty-four, laid aside the purple robes of royalty, put on the white garb of a Christian neophyte, and passed away.”

There is yet another view of Constantine’s personal life. I will now quote this same story immediately above as told by the, *CYCLOPÆDIA of Universal History* (1885), by John Clark Ridpath, LL. D., volume 1, pages 884-885:

“ Having completed his campaigns in the East (against Licinius A.D. 323), he (Constantine) returned to Italy and undertook the reconstruction of the government on an Oriental basis. The Empire was divided into præfectures after the manner of the satrapies of Persia. The basilica became the scene of intrigues and crimes, such as rivaled in number and character the deeds of Caligula and Nero. The queen mother Helena and the wife Fausta were deadly rivals. The brothers of the Emperor were excluded from the palace and forbidden to appear in public. His son Crispus, by whose energies as commander of the fleet the siege of Byzantium had been brought to a successful conclusion, became the victim of his father’s jealousy, and was suddenly ordered to execution. Then, Fausta, the queen, was for no better reason sent to a similar fate. Crime followed crime until the bloody mind of Constantine became haunted with specters (ghost). Not even the absolution which was freely given to their champion by the Christian priests could allay the remorse or quiet the distemper in his nature. He became a devotee to the new faith, and again undertook a reconciliation of the conflicting parties (then shortly convened the council of Nicaea).”

Here we have two entirely different stories. There are probably elements of truth in both of them. The first question that comes into my mind is: why didn’t John Clark Ridpath, LL. D., in his *CYCLOPÆDIA of Universal History*, mention Constantine’s other wife, Minervina who was the mother of Crispus? It is apparent he was unaware of all the elements in the story, and thus comes to a faulty conclusion (not playing with a full deck of cards in this particular case). I am inclined to lean more toward Will Durant’s, *The Story Of Civilization*, concerning Constantine’s personal life. If there had been incestuous relations between Fausta and Minervina’s son, Crispus, Constantine would have had all the reason in the world for ordering their death. After all, remember, that Judah was about to burn Tamar at the stake as his judgment upon her. This might account for the cases of Crispus and Fausta, but what about Licinianus, Constantine’s sister’s son? We may never know the true reason for Licinianus’ death, but if Constantine had good reason in the cases of Crispus and Fausta, he probably also had good reason in the case of Licinianus. We do know that Licinianus was the



son of Licinius, the last **pagan** *Augusti* in competition with Constantine to become emperor of Rome. Could Licinianus have been fostering thoughts of returning Rome to paganism in line with his father's (Licinius') policy? We also have to remember that Constantine's mother, Helena, was British and was probably very familiar with Hebrew Law which would have brought the death penalty in the cases of Crispus and Fausta. It is hard for me to believe that Constantine would murder in cold blood three of his close relatives, and within a very short time convene the Council of Nicaea. It appears that Constantine had very serious family problems to contend with, at the very time he was making some of the most important decisions of his life. We also have to remember that Constantius Chlorus, Constantine's father, also married two wives, so the family tree gets quite complicated at this point. Actually, Constantia was only half sister to Constantine by Theodora, Constantius Chlorus' second wife. All this from a genealogical chart from, *A Manual of Ancient History*, by George Rawlinson (1869). For a free copy of this chart, please send me a stamped self addressed envelope requesting it.







## LETTER 17

---

### CONSTANTINE'S ACTIONS HAD FAR-REACHING EFFECTS IN BABYLON

As a consequence of the first Ecumenical or General Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) Constantine's actions were experienced for the better in Babylon. For this portion of the account of Constantine, we will go to *The Story Of Civilization*, Part (volume) 1, "Our Oriental Heritage", by Will Durant, pages 245-246 (First Durant quotes the historian Herodotus as follows.):

"Every **native woman** (in Babylon) is obliged, **once in her life**, to sit in the temple of Venus, and **have intercourse with some stranger**. And many disdaining to mix with the rest, being proud on account of their wealth, come in covered carriages, and take up their station at the temple with a numerous train of servants attending them. But the far greater part do thus: many sit down in the temple of Venus, wearing a crown of cord round their heads; **some are continually coming in, and others are going out**. Passages marked out in a straight line lead in every direction through the women, **along which strangers pass and make their choice**. When a woman has once seated herself **she must not return home till some stranger has thrown a piece of silver into her lap, and lain with her outside the temple**. He who throws the silver must say thus: 'I beseech the goddess Mylitta to favor thee'; for the Assyrians call Venus Mylitta. **The silver may be ever so small, for she will not reject it, inasmuch as it is not lawful for her to do so, for such silver is accounted sacred. The woman follows the first man that throws, and refuses no one. But when she has had intercourse and has absolved herself from her obligation to the goddess, she returns home; and after that time, however great a sum you may give her you will not gain possession of her ...**"

(Back now to Durant's comments about these women on the same pages):

“ **Such women, of course, were not [considered] prostitutes.** But **various classes of prostitutes** lived within the temple precincts, plied their trade there, and amassed, some of them, great fortunes. Such temple prostitutes were common in western Asia: we find them in Israel, Phrygia, Phoenicia, Syria, etc.; **in Lydia and Cyprus the girls earned their marriage dowries in this way.** ‘ **Sacred prostitution** ’ continued in Babylonia until abolished by Constantine (ca, 325 A.D.). Alongside it, in the wine-shops kept by women, **secular prostitution** flourished.”

You can be certain, if the **sacred prostitution** was legally discontinued by Constantine, the Babylonian law requiring the women to yield to an absolute stranger (probably of most any racial background) once in her lifetime, was legally halted also. This story speaks volumes about Constantine’s character. This was a very difficult period in history, resulting in many false doctrines being introduced into the church by the early church fathers, and Constantine found himself right in the middle of it. Paganism had overwhelmed the Roman Empire as a direct result of the wars of Alexander the Great. This is another story, and will have to be treated separately.

### CONSTANTINE’S CONVERSION A DEATH-KNELL TO MARCIONISM

I don’t really have the time, at this point, to go into depth on the doctrines and tenets of Marcion, except to say they were not good. To engage in the subject of Marcion would require a separate comprehensive study in itself. This man did a tremendous amount of damage to the church and impaired the Word of Yahweh beyond description during the second century A.D. Some of his mischief remains with us today in the form of scriptural canon. Many of his misdeeds were later picked up and enlarged upon by the Roman Catholic Universal Church. In the book, *Forerunners And Rivals Of Christianity From 330 B.C. To 330 A.D.*, by Francis Legge, volume 2, page 220, says this:

“ The conversion of Constantine put a violent end to any open propagation of the doctrines of Marcion or his successors. In the picturesque words of Eusebius ‘ the lurking-places of the heretics were broken up by the Emperor’s commands, and the savage beasts which they harboured were put to flight’.”

### CONSTANTINE ISSUES GENERAL REFORMS

Upon coming to power in both the eastern and western parts of the Roman Empire, Constantine made several reforms that are notable, other than those of a religious nature. Anyone making such reforms, in any period of time, would be deserving of much

praise. *The Encyclopedia Americana*, ©1948, volume 7, under the topic “Constantine I” pages 554-555, has this to say:

“Many beneficial decrees were proclaimed by him. Among these were those which abolished all the establishments of debauchery, ordered the children of the poor to be supported at his expense, gave permission to complain of his officers and promised that the Emperor would not only hear complaints, but compensate the complainants for injuries received, when they were proved to exist. He diminished the land-taxes and caused a new valuation of estates to be taken. The state treasury had always been enriched by the property of criminals; but Constantine spared the property of their wives and ameliorated (improved) the condition of their children. Death in prison, he said, was a cruel punishment for the innocent, and an insufficient penalty for the guilty; he therefore ordered all trials of prisoners to take place at once. He forbade the use of unwholesome dungeons and oppressive chains. He gave leave to sick persons, widows and orphans to appeal from the local magistrates, and refused this privilege to their adversaries. It had been customary for the heirs of a person deceased to divide his slaves among them; Constantine forbade the separation in these cases of husbands from their wives and of parents from their children. **To the Christians he gave permission not only to erect churches, but to be remunerated for the cost of them from his domains.**”

#### CONSTANTINE FORBIDS JEWS TO LIVE IN JERUSALEM OR TO CONVERT SLAVES

Constantine further made it illegal for the “Jews” to reside in Jerusalem, and also to endeavor to make converts of slaves. Constantine’s son, emperor Constantius II followed up his father with even stricter more demanding laws pertaining to the Jews. For this interesting information I will quote from the, *History Of The Jews*, by Heinrich Graetz, volume 2, pages 564 and 567:

“The first utterance of Christianity on the very day of its victory [by Constantine] betrayed its hostile attitude towards the Jews, and gave rise to those malignant decrees of Constantine and his successors, which laid the foundation of the bloody persecutions of subsequent centuries. Constantine re-enacted — undoubtedly at the instigation of the clergy — the law of Hadrain which forbade the Jews to live in Jerusalem. Only on the anniversary of the destruction of the city were they allowed, on making certain payments to the officials, to mourn on the ruins of the Temple. The clergy further succeeded in obtaining a law from Constantine prohibiting the Jews from making converts among the slaves. Christianity claimed the monopoly of expansion, and forbade Judaism to increase its influence either by making proselytes or by converting its slaves . . .

“ The sentiment of hostility, nourished by Constantius against the Jews, also manifested itself in several laws concerning them. The causes of this persecution remain involved in complete obscurity, and it is impossible to ascertain whether the apostate Joseph, that second Acher, was in any way connected therewith. **Marriages between Jews and Christian women, which appear to have been of not infrequent occurrence, were punished with death under the emperor Constantius (A.D. 339).** Of even greater consequence was the law concerning slaves which was promulgated by him. **Whereas his father [emperor Constantine] had only forbidden the admission of slaves into the Jewish community, and had simply punished the transgression of this prohibition by declaring forfeited all slaves so admitted, Constantius decreed (A.D. 339) that the circumcision of a Christian slave entailed the pain of death and the entire loss of fortune. He even forbade the reception of heathen slaves into the covenant of Judaism.** The grounds for this law were twofold: **it was desired that Judaism should receive no increase** through its adoption by slaves, and also that **Christians should not serve Jewish masters**, ‘ the assassins of God.’ This preposterous view has been held by the Church ever since, and prevails even at the present day.”

### CONSTANTINE WAS A PURE-BLOOD OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH

Yes, Constantine was of the royal line of Judah on both sides of his house. He, therefore, was a descendant of Judah and Tamar. What does this have to do with the story of Constantine?!?!?! **IT HAS EVERYTHING TO DO WITH THE STORY OF CONSTANTINE, FOR HE WAS OF JUDAH!** Not only this, Constantine was of the House of David on his mother’s side. I will repeat it again, Judah owned the septre, and Constantine, like Good King Lucius, knew how to employ it! Constantine had all the necessary qualities of a leader built right into him; that is the reason he was so outstanding in everything he put his hand to, a cool, intelligent, levelheaded, natural born leader; man for his hour. For verification on Constantine’s background, I will now quote from, *Our Neglected Heritage*, volume 2, “The Hidden Centuries”, by Gladys Taylor, pages 46-47. (Notice when she uses the word “**Dardanian**”, as it is derived from the name **Darda**, a descendant of Judah, found in 1 Kings 4:31.):

“ A turning point was reached when Constantius Chlorus was appointed as ruler of the provinces of Gaul and Britain. In A.D. 293, he was adopted by the Emperor Maximian and appointed Caesar. **He was born in Illyria and had distinguished himself in his ‘ able and gentle rule ’ of the province of Dalmatia.** He seems to have had an affinity with the Celts of Gaul and Britain and was popular in the western Empire.

“ It is interesting to note that, **by ancestry, he came of a noble Dardanian family, which means he was most probably of Trojan stock, like the British royal**

**family.** Further point is given to this racial origin by the surname given to him by the Romans, ‘Chlorus’, which means ‘pal e’ or ‘fair.’

“ On the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, in 305, he became supreme ruler with the title ‘ Augustus ’, a position which was inherited by his son Constantine a few years later.

“ The outstanding achievement of Constantius, from our point of view, was the ending of the terrible Diocletian persecution of the Christians, which was wreaking havoc in Britain as well as on the Continent. Apart from the unusual leniency of his rule, it would seem that Constantius must have had some interest, at least, in the Christian faith. **Perhaps this was due to the influence of his British wife, Helena, the daughter of King Cole II,** ruler of eastern England from his capital, Colchester.

“ It would be unwise to judge the reigns of either Constantius [Chlorus] or his son, Constantine the Great, by mere superficial appearances. The facts recorded are sparse and sometimes contradictory. We have to feel our way through this jungle of expressed opinions, both from their friends and enemies trying to assess which statements are most logically fitting to the circumstances of the time ... ”

### BEWARE OF GIBBON’S ACCOUNT OF HELENA, CONSTANTINE’S MOTHER!

I don’t know why, but whenever I attempt to research to find something in Gibbon’s *History Of The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire* it seems that I am unable to find anything worthwhile of his to quote. I have searched his work several times on various subjects to find something to contribute to my writings, and I usually come up empty-handed. On this matter of Gibbons, I would like to quote what Gladys Taylor has to say about him on page 53 of her book, *Our Neglected Heritage*, volume 2, “The Hidden Centuries” [Note: 7-2-2006: Since I originally put this lesson together, I have found Gibbons to usually be a good source, although he is difficult in many ways because of his writing style. Sometimes, when researching a particular subject primarily from other sources, and then go to Gibbons, he then begins to make some sense. But as we shall see, in the next paragraph, even he should be scrutinized.]:

“ The early British historians, at least until the seventeen century, always obtained their information about **Helena** from the British, mainly the Welsh records and genealogies. **It was when Edward Gibbon, after a prolonged visit to Rome, wrote his History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, that he passed on the Roman fiction of Helena’s birth in an innkeeper’s family at the small town of Naissus in the Balkans.**

“ **If the Roman Church wants to propagate** a theory, the slenderest and weakest piece of evidence will be blown up, with the **addition of spurious miracles**, to serve the purpose. In spite of all the evidences in favour of the **British Prince Linus being the first Bishop of Rome, the Church of Rome has gone to great lengths to prevent British people [from] knowing this truth**. This began before the Reformation, but continued with even greater intensity afterwards. In the same way, the fact that **the mother of the first Christian emperor was a British Princess** was a bitter pill to swallow. The fact that the nation that Rome wanted others to despise had been responsible for so much of the early history of the Church was too much for proud Rome to bear. While in Rome, **Gibbon** could have **learned something** of the truth, but **he evidently listened to the prepared propaganda**. Since his day, other **historians and encyclopedias have slavishly copied Gibbon**. This would not have mattered if they had also been fair enough to quote earlier historians with contrary views, but the encyclopedias, at least, completely ignore all British references.”

### ONE ENCYCLOPEDIA GETS IT RIGHT

Maybe there are more than one, but the following encyclopedia is the only one that I am aware of which does an excellent job of presenting the facts about Constantine's family background. From the articles under the title “Constantine”, *The Encyclopedia Americana*, ©1948, volume 8, pages 420-421, we get the following information (This will be a lengthy quotation, but the information is very important and will bring us up-to-date. I will underline the most crucial parts):

“ **DALMATIA**, . . . (Slav **DALMACIJA**,) **Yugoslavia**, a strip of land along the north-eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea, some 210 miles in length and averaging about 35 miles in width, which with its important adjacent islands has a total area of 4,923 square miles. Formerly part of the **kingdom of Croatia**, (q.v.) and afterwards a semiautonomous crown land of the Austrian Empire, it became in 1918 part of the **Serb, Croat and Slovene State**, later **Yugoslavia** (q.v.).

“ Most of **Dalmatia** is protected along the northwest side by the Dinaric **Alps**, and because of this **has a pleasant climate all the year round**. Frosts very seldom occur, **and in summer the breeze from the sea keeps the air cool**. Although the soil was formed largely from the unfertile karst (porous limestone), **it has been made productive through many centuries of hard human labor**. The farmers still concentrate most of their efforts on such relatively high-paying crops as grapes, subtropical fruits, and tobacco. Because of the abundant sunshine, Dalmat wines are famous, but are not exported in very great quantities since each district specializes in its own brand, for which it has a limited number of patrons. **There**



are nearly 4,000,000 olive trees, but the methods used in processing olive oil are still primitive, and most of the oil is exported to Italy, to be refined and marketed there. **Dalmatia** grows excellent sour cherries (marasca cherries) for export. and specializes in the cultivation of pyrethrum — the camphor-yielding plant. **Figs and carobs (St.-John's bread)** are raised for home consumption. Fishing is a very important industry, giving employment to more than 30,000 men in over 7,000 fishing boats, the annual catch averaging about 1,500,000 tons. Before World War II there were only about 20 fish-canning plants, yet Dalmatian sardines, packed in natural olive oil, have a distinctive flavor and are easily marketed. In medieval times, when the mountains were covered with heavy timber, **Dalmatia was the center of the shipping industry in the Mediterranean**, supplying boats for all countries. **Zadar (Zara)**. **population** (1936) 12,838, became the capital; but Split (Spalato), estimated population (1945) 43,808 **was for centuries the cultural and commercial center of Dalmatia**. Other important cities with populations for 1931, are Sibenik (Sebenico), 37,284; **Trogir**, 23,468; and Dubrovnik (*Ragusa*), 18,767.

#### “ HISTORY

“ **The Dalmats, a branch of the Slavs, moving westward from the Black Sea region, reached the shore of the Adriatic Sea about 450 B.C. Here they found people of similar stock who called themselves Illyrs. (Meaning Elohim people — documented comment mine.)**

“ **Pre-Christian Settlements and the Roman Conquest of Dalmat Cities.**— The Dalmats settled north of the Illyrs and built a fort (Dimal), **but did not molest the Greek cities and harbors which they found in that area.** Like other Slavs, the Dalmats were **organized in clans**, and the head of each clan was called the pan (hence the modern terms ‘ ban ’ (q.v.), ‘ banat ’ and ‘ banovina ’), and the continued use by the Czechs and Poliaks of pan in the same sense as the English ‘ Mr.’ In 278 B.C., a leader named Demetrius declared himself supreme ban of all the Slavs and Illyrs. In 205 B.C., Agron, king of the Illyrs, was recognized as king of the Dalmats and Slavs. The Romans who knew him as a pirate, sent two emissaries in 200 B.C. to protest against his depredations. By that time Agron was dead, but his widow Teuta beheaded the ambassadors. Rome then sent a punitive army which in 182 B.C. took the island of Pharos (Pharia, modern Hvar) and destroyed the fortress of Dimal. Dalmatia was subjected by Rome in 6 B.C., during the reign of Augustus (r. 27 B.C.-14 A.D.). Rome never conquered all Dalmatia, confining its sway to a few cities and towns along the main road. The Dalmats remained under their native rulers, and so long as they did not attack Roman-held cities they were left in peace.

“ **From the Introduction of Christianity to the Union with Croatia.**— **The Dalmats were the first people** (outside of Britain — comment mine) **to adopt Christianity**, receiving it from St. Paul (about 67 A.D.), **who when shipwrecked on**

the island of Melita (modern Mljet), in 54 A.D., preached at Salona (Solin), now in ruins. He founded a diocese there installing Bishop Vinatius of Hvar. A new wave of Slavs must have arrived in Dalmatia about the year 375 A.D., since the old chronicles say that ‘Radigost came from Scythia with a great army and became the strong ruler of all the Slavs in 400 A.D.’ Then the Huns invaded Dalmatia, but were defeated by the Slavs in 470. By 525 the Dalmats succeeded in establishing an orderly state under Selimir, but five of his successors persecuted the Christians. In 639 Radimir conquered the cities of Zadar, Sibenik (Sebenico), Trogir, and Solin. Solin was destroyed in 615 during an invasion by the Avars, and the people moved into the abandoned palace of the Roman Emperor Diocletian (r. 284-305 A.D.), around which arose the city of Split. Svetimir liberated all the Christians and in 745 his son Budimir became the first Christian ruler of Dalmatia and the Croats. In northern Dalmatia the Franks ruled for nearly 100 years, from 776 to 871. But from the time of Budimir, southern Dalmatia and ultimately all of the country was closely connected with Croatia, and the two states ultimately merged, when Tomislav (r. as king, 910-928), who had been head of both, became the first recognized ruler of the united kingdom. From 1102 to 1918 Croatia and Hungary were ruled jointly by the Hungarian kings, Croatia retaining its identity, however. But in 1867 Dalmatia became a semiautonomous province of Austria.

“During the intervening centuries, Dalmatia had its own colorful history. When the Republic of St. Mark (Venice) was at its height, many Dalmat cities joined it in order to find protection against the pirates, of whom there were many along the coast. The ranks of these marauders were swelled by the populations of the whole districts, which during the reigns of weak rulers declared themselves independent, and took to piracy. The city of Dubrovnik, known also as Ragusa, became a republic in its own right, but turned to trade instead of to piracy. During medieval times it became the cultural center of the Yugoslavs. Dubrovnik managed to keep its independence for centuries, until the period following the Battle of Austerlitz (Dec. 2, 1805), when Austria was forced to cede Dalmatia and Istria to Napoleon as a prelude to further concessions, and his troops took over the small republic, which was included for a time with his ‘Illyrian Provinces.’

“**Dalmatia Becomes a Crown Land of Austria.**— In 1814 the congress of Vienna gave Dalmatia (including Dubrovnik) to Austria. After the fall of Napoleon’s Illyria, the Dalmats demanded union with Croatia, but Austria refused this demand, giving the ban of Croatia instead the empty title of ‘Ban of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia.’ During the reorganization of the Dual Monarchy (1867), Dalmatia became a crown land of Austria, with a degree of local autonomy. It had a Diet, and was entitled to send 11 deputies to the Reichsrat in Vienna. The overwhelming majority of the Dalmats are Catholics and profess to be Croats. **Adherents of the Orthodox Church prefer to be known as Serbs.** The ratio between the two is best shown from the fact that of the 11 deputies sent to the Reichsrat, 9 were

Croats and 2 Serbs. Italy claimed Dalmatia; yet there were not enough Italian votes to elect a single deputy. Despite this fact, Austria made Italian the prevailing language of the administration, the courts, and the city schools.

**“Dalmatia and Yugoslav Unity.**— Since medieval times the Dalmats have been among the most conscious of the Yugoslav peoples in their efforts to promote Yugoslav unity. During World War I, Dalmats figured prominently in the Yugoslav Committee in London which demanded that Dalmatia be united with Serbia. Dr. Ante Trumbic (1864-1938) the Dalmat leader, made a contract with Nikola Pasic, premier of Serbia, embodying definite plans for the organization of a new state. Authorities on Yugoslav history between the wars attribute much of the subsequent dissatisfaction in Yugoslavia, and the eventual collapse of the state to a failure — especially on the part of certain Serbian political leaders — in putting this control into effect. **During World War II, Dalmatia, in proportion to its population, contributed the largest quota of fighters to the liberation forces** under Marshal Tito.”

I hope you observed the use of the name **“Zara”** or **“Zadar”** as the name of a city in the above quoted article toward the bottom of page 4. There is no doubt in my mind that this name is derived from the name of the Zerah branch of Judah because of Zerahites occupying that area. An alternate spelling for Zerah is: Zarah or Zara. There was also quoted the name of a city by the name of “Trogir” which, no doubt, is derived from the name Trojan. All the evidence appears to point to the reality **that Emperor Constantine was a pure blooded descendent of Judah and Tamar through both Zerah and Pharez.** Constantine’s genealogy was, then, what gave him the ability to accomplish all the phenomenal things which he did. It just came natural to him.

You will also notice, by the last quoted article immediately above, from *The Encyclopedia Americana*, ©1948, volume 8, pages 420-421, that the Dalmatia spoken of, is the same general geographic area which President Clinton ordered, along with the NATO aligned nations to be bombed this spring and early summer. It would appear that some of these people being bombed may be the same people as Zerah Judah. In other words, they may be bombing Tamar’s grandchildren. What do you think of that? Because of its complicated history, we cannot be sure how many of Zerah-Judah, if any, may still reside in that area. As the “Slavs form a language group rather than a race” (*The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 17, page 414), we cannot be sure who the peoples of that area are today. Therefore, not all Slavic speaking people are Slavs, and not all Slavs are Israelites. You simply cannot categorize all Slavs into one group. The subject of the Slavs is another topic that needs a lot of study. Because of the Hunnic and Turkish invasions, the populations the Balkans have changed drastically. The racial stock in the old Dalmatia area is quite different today than it was in the day Constantius Chlorus.

We know there were Zerahites in the Balkans as late as the fourth century according to *Our Neglected Heritage*, volume 2, “The Hidden Centuries” by Gladys Taylor, which she speaks of on page 12 as follows:

“ Another first-century missionary was Mansuetus, an Irishman, baptized in A.D. 40 and martyred in the year 89. He travelled to France and joined Clement, Bishop of Rome, being appointed Bishop of Lotharingia (Lorraine), in eastern France, in the year 49. **He travelled even further east to Illyria, in the western Balkans,** preaching to a Gothic people, another branch of our own race, who possessed the Bible in their own tongue **as early as the fourth century**, translated by their Bishop Wulfilas.”

I think it is quite interesting to observe, the satanic serpent seed in the personages of Madeline Albright, James Rubin and others are the ones calling all the shots in this war. It would seem these “Jews” have a vested interest in it’s outcome. Just what kind of a war do we have going on here? It would appear that it is a war of the false Judeans trying to destroy the true Judeans. In fact, it is the same old war of Genesis 3:15. Therefore, those who don’t understand the Two Seed-line doctrine cannot fathom this war. Those one seed-liners promoting the idea that the war of Genesis 3:15 is the “seed” of the spirit at enmity with the “seed” of the flesh, can in no way comprehend what this present war is all about. In fact, they fail to grasp about 90% of what the entire Bible is all about. **It appears that the “Jewish” policy for the Balkans is the same as in other White countries — to force the different ethnic groups to live together so they can intermarry and inbreed thereby downgrading and destroying the White race** (at least what few there may be left in that area).

### WHERE ROME WENT WRONG!

It was not Constantine’s fault that Rome went wrong during the years of the Christian persecutions (and there were ten of them), or during the founding of the Roman Catholic Universal Church, or during the time of the Holy Roman Empire which followed. At this time, I could go into depth and show you how Rome had been importing paganism since the time of Alexander the Great. As Rome sent out her soldiers in conquest all over the then known world, when the soldiers returned home they brought back with them various forms of paganism as war souvenirs, so to speak. Thus Rome became the harbor, capital and stronghold of every known false and unclean religion of the world. Although these false religions did not contribute to the welfare of Rome, they were not the basic cause of Rome’s ultimate failure. The underlying reason for Rome’s eventual failure was in her law system. To comprehend how all of this happened, concerning her laws, it is essential to return to some history from the time of

the Trojans. For this history, I will quote from, *Our Neglected Heritage*, volume 3, “The Magnet of The Isles”, by Gladys Taylor, pages 28-30:

“ After the fall of Troy, the royal house of Dardanos was divided and scattered. Caesar claimed descent from Aeneas and Virgil wrote the *Aeneid* to proclaim this fact. From Ascanius Julius, son of Aeneas and Creusa, daughter of Priam King of Troy, came the Julian family of Rome and also Brutus the Trojan, grandson of Ascanius, who gathered together a band of Trojan exiles, soon after the fall of Troy and traveled westward to Britain. This could have been a considerable migration. From a wealth of Greek and Latin literature dealing with the departure of the Trojans, notably the *Trojan Cycle*, listed by Proclus in the second century A.D., we gather that Aeneas departed from Mount Ida with 88,000 Trojans and built a fleet of 332 vessels. We leave Aeneas in Italy and follow Brutus and his companions to Britain.

“ At Totnes, in Devon, where the Brutus Stone is preserved, tradition tells us that it was the pedestal of the Palladium at Troy, brought here by one Geryon the Augur (prophet) who came with Brutus. The presence of this stone on which, for many centuries, the Mayors of Totnes have proclaimed the accession of kings, is certainly interesting. The Palladium at Troy, a small figure of Pallas Athene, was sacred to the Trojans. It was their talisman. When Odysseus captured it, that was the ultimate insult. If the exiles wanted to take something to remind them of Troy, what better than the pedestal, since they could not have the Palladium itself.

“ The ninth century *Historia Britonum* of Nennius and, most notably, the Welsh chronicle *Brut*, both deal with the coming of Brutus and his foundation of London under the name of Trinovantium, or Caer Troia in the British tongue. Sir William Blackstone, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, deals with Brutus as our first lawgiver, ‘ Brutus the first king of this land, as soon as he had settled himself in his kingdom, for the safe and peaceable government of his people, wrote a book in the Greek tongue calling it the laws of Britons, and he collected the same out of the laws of the Trojans. This king died, . . . before the incarnation of Christ 1,103 years, Samuel then being judge of Israel.’

“ Links with Bible history are also given in *Brut*, and a mysterious reference to the giving of ‘ privilege ’ to the city, something which seems to have been continued by successive monarchs ever since: ‘ When Brutus had finished the building of the city, and had strengthened it with walls and castles, he consecrated them and made inflexible laws for the government of such as should dwell therein peaceably, and he put protection on the city and granted privilege to it. At this time Beli the priest ruled in Judea and the Ark of the Covenant was in captivity to the Philistines.’

“ We know no more of the Laws of the Trojans than we know of the laws established by Cecrops or the Minoan laws, but it is interesting to see that they formed

part of the most civilizing influences of antiquity and governed men noted for their wisdom and the reasonableness of their dealings, in each case. **We know that the Romans sent to Greece for their laws, but altered them to suit the Roman mind.** We have no record of the actual laws used by the Celts of France, but we do know from Caesar that they were written in the Greek tongue.

“ The codification of law occurs frequently in history, but this does not mean the introduction of revolutionary changes. The new code is merely the adaptation of original principles to the changing conditions of life.

“ There is an equilibrium in English Common Law which is hard to explain unless we do so in terms of Divine Law. The same principles of justice and right dealing are there every time the law is codified. There seems to be a remarkable similarity between the Common Law of England, on which so many legal systems in the new nations of the world are based, and those ‘ changeless and unwritten laws of God ’ to which Sophocles referred. The definition of Common Law, given in *Nelson’s Encyclopedia*, is in these words, ‘ As opposed to Statute Law. it is the unwritten law of the land. Being older than Statute Law, it was founded on considerations of general justice, and fortified by the decisions of judges handed down from generation to generation, and binding on their successors.’

“This appears almost casual to people accustomed to everything ‘ legal ’ being written down, yet it is the system that has worked admirably for many centuries. **It was practiced by our brethren on the Continent, until Roman Law was forced upon them against their will, during the sixteenth century.**”

### [MORE INFORMATION ON THE CITY OF ZARA IN DALMATIA](#)

As Darda left his name to the geographic area of the Dardanelles, so Zerah’s descendants left his name to a city in Dalmatia and a narrow channel called the “Channel of Zara.” For information on this, I will quote from, *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1894, volume 24, page 807:

“ **ZARA** (Slav. *Zadar*), an Austrian seaport, the capital of Dalmatia. and the seat of the Roman Catholic archbishop and of a Greek bishop, lies on the Adriatic, 130 miles southeast of Trieste, opposite the island of Ugliano and Pasman, from which it is separated by the narrow **Channel of Zara**. The promontory (point of land jutting into the sea) on which it stands is separated from the mainland by a deep moat, practically making an island of the site of the city. Down to 1873, **Zara** was strongly fortified; but its ramparts have now been converted into elevated promenades, which command extensive views to seaward and to landward. Of its four old gates, one, Porta Marina, incorporates the relics of a Roman arch, and another,

the Porta di Terraferma., was designed by Sanmichele. The general aspect of the town, which is oval in form, is thoroughly Venetian. The main streets, dividing it into four quarters, are straight and wide, but the side-streets are ill-paved and narrow. The chief interest in **Zara** lies in its churches, the most remarkable of which is the cathedral of St. Anastasia, a fine Romanesque basilica, founded by Doge Enrico Dandolo after the capture of the town in 1202 and finished in 1205. The churches of St. Chrysogonus and St. Simeon are also in the Romanesque style, and St. Mary's retains a fine Romanesque campanile (bell tower) of 1105. The old octagonal church of St. Donatus, traditionally (but in all probability erroneously) said to have been erected in the 9<sup>th</sup> century on the site of a temple of Juno, has been converted to secular purposes. Most of the Roman remains were used up in the construction of the fortifications. But two squares are embellished with lofty marble columns; a Roman tower stands on the east side of the town; and some remains of a Roman aqueduct may be seen outside the ramparts. Among the other buildings are the Loggia del Comune, rebuilt in 1565, containing a public library of 34,000 volumes; the old palace of the priors, now the governors residence; and the episcopal palace. The harbor, to the northeast of the town, is safe and spacious, and it is annually entered by about 1200 vessels, of 185,000 tons, mainly engaged in the coasting trade. The chief industry is the preparation of maraschino, made from the marasco cherry, which covers the hills of Dalmatia. About 340,000 bottles of this liqueur are exported annually. Glass-making and fishing are also carried on. The population of the town in 1881 was 11,861, of the commune 24,536. Almost all of these are of Italian descent, and Italian is practically the only language spoken in the town.

“ The foundation of **Zara** is ascribed by tradition to Liburni (Illyrian — Elohim people). In the early days of the Roman empire it became a flourishing Roman colony under the name of *Jadera*, subsequently changed to *Diadora*. It remained united with the Eastern empire down to about the year 1000, when it sought the Venetian protection. For the next four centuries it was a bone of contention between Venice and Hungary, changing hands repeatedly. It was occupied by the Hungarians at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, but was recaptured by the Venetians in 1202, with the aid of French crusaders on their way to the Holy Land. In 1409 it was finally purchased from Hungary by the island republic for 100,000 ducats [\$226,800]. In 1792 it passed, with Venice, into the possession of Austria. From 1809 to 1813 it belonged to France.

“ About 15 miles to the southeast lies **Zara Veechia**, or **Old Zara**, an insignificant village on the site of Biograd (White Town), formally the residence of the Croatian kings, but destroyed during the Hungarian-Venetian wars.”

Now we will have to find what the term or name “**Liburni**” means. To do this, we will return to *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1894, volume 14, page 554:

“ **LIBURNIANS** were a people who at different times were **prominent on the Adriatic coasts**. They were originally, one cannot doubt, one of the homogeneous **Illyrian tribes** (see **ILLYRIA**). Living in a barren rocky country along the north-eastern coast of the Adriatic **they devoted themselves to the sea, and were the chief navigators of the Adriatic** in the early period. They settled on the coast of Picenum. where the town of Truentum was always counted Liburnian; and the Greek colonists found them at Corcyra and other places. They were pressed on all sides by other races, but were still a powerful people in the time of Scylax (Scyl., p 7). The islands that lay along the coast were peopled by them and called by their name. They were a race of pirates **who used swift boats with a large sail**. These Liburnian ships became famous when the Romans adopted them in several of their naval wars. The heavy and lofty ships that had been developed by the later Greek states proved unequal to the light and swift Liburnian boats. The country was incorporated by the Romans in the province of Dalmatia.”

This should establish a better concept of just who the man Constantine the Great was, **a man of the royal line!** With the next lesson, we will leave Constantine the Great and investigate the invasions of Britain by the various Saxon tribes and see how these invasions affected the British Celtic Culdee church. Without the knowledge of this past history, it is impossible to appraise what is called “church” at our present time, Without a working knowledge of the general developments in history since the time of the Passion of our Messiah until now, we will only come to many mistaken conclusions.







## LETTER 18

---

### KING HENRY II SELLS OUT THE CELTIC CHURCH TO ROME

To start this lesson, I am going to quote from the book, *The Story of the Irish Race*, by Seumas MacManus (assisted by several Irish scholars), pages 327-328:

“ Then he (King Henry II) won Rome too. He had a synod of the Irish ecclesiastics — all but the Primate Gelasius, and the other northerns — called at Cashel, where, following the example of their chiefs the Bishops acknowledged Henry as lord supreme in Ireland. At this synod they passed decrees for the bettering (?) of church discipline, which, being sent to Rome, confirmed the fact that Henry was carrying out his undertaking, and reforming morals (?) in the land, and evoked from Alexander the Third the letter confirmatory of Adrian’s (an English Pope’s) Bull.

“ At Easter Henry had to return in haste to England, carrying with him the undisputed lordship of Leinster, Meath and the cities of Dublin, Wexford and Waterford. Meath he gave in trust to De Lacey — who had the governorship of Dublin also. The city of Dublin was given to the occupation of the merchants and people of Bristol. Strongbow was left in possession of Leinster.

“ The strange mesmerism which the presence of Henry seemed to have wrought on the Irish princes was dissipated on his going. They awoke to the rude reality that they had welcomed an invader and meekly accepted him. From the various quarters they began to rise up against the enemy, harass him, and endeavour to drive him out. Now more familiar with, and therefore less daunted by, Norman discipline and equipment, the Irish princes set strategy against skill, and discovered that the Normans were not omnipotent. O’Brien of Thomond inflicted a big defeat upon them at Thurles — not the only big defeat that he was to give them. Strongbow the mighty was beaten back in the south and bottled up in Waterford in imminent danger of capture. And only [the fact] that the redoubtable le Gros

hurried back from Wales to release him [or] he would have been overthrown. Roderick O'Connor with the help of O'Neill, O'Mellaghlin, O'Carroll, MacDunleavy of Uladh, and an army of twenty thousand overran Meath, and set out for Dublin which he might easily have captured but for his vacillation (indecision). He soon after thought it to be to his advantage to make treaty with Henry. He sent to England for that purpose Concord, Abbot of Clonfert, Catholicus, Archbishop of Tuam, and Archbishop Lawrence O'Toole of Dublin. This treaty, known as the Treaty of Windsor, acknowledged Henry's right to the lordship of Leinster, Meath, and the other few places and cities then occupied by him. He was also acknowledged as the overlord to whom Roderick should pay formal tribute. On the other hand it acknowledged Roderick's right to the high-kingship of five-sixths of Ireland.

“ But such pacts had little effect either in securing peace or insuring the rights of either party. Every Norman chief warred on his own account, for purpose of extending his power and possessions. And of course every Irish chief and prince, when opportunity offered, warred against the invader.”

This Synod of Cashel with King Henry II handing over the British Celtic church to Pope Adrain happened in 1172 A.D., so we are getting ahead of our story. The story that we want to bring forward in this lesson is the Saxon invasions of Britain. By the year 411 A.D., the Roman Empire was in such a massive decline, it was necessary for her to recall her troops from Britain. If you will remember, in lesson #16, page 3, it was mentioned how Constantius Chlorus and his son Constantine, who later became Constantine the Great, initially went to Britain to fight the Picts. After the Romans withdrew their troops from Britain in 411 A.D., the Britons were still having problems with the Picts. After 106 years the Picts were still giving the Britons headaches. The Britons then invited a few Saxons in to help control the unruly Picts, whereupon the Saxons kept coming in waves for the next two hundred years. This is where we will pick up our story, and I will quote from *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester*, by Robert B. Stoker, starting with page 21:

” **BRITISH INVITE THE SAXONS (JUTES) TO HELP FIGHT THE PICTS**

“ Let us now move to the invasion of the Saxons, and archbishop 10, Guitelin [one of 13 named Archbishops of Caerleon]. When the Saxon came in A.D. 449, they were invited by **Vortigern**, King of the Britons, as mercenaries, and were given the Isle of Thanet. After beating the Scots (who had penetrated a long way into England) at Stamford, the Saxons were rewarded by **Vortigern** with the land in Lincolnshire, and further Saxons landed. As the British were suspicious of **Vortigern's** friendship with the Saxons, **Hengist**, who had only three ‘ keels ’ of his troops, used this suspicion to persuade the king to allow him to bring over more ‘ trusty Saxons ’ for his protection. **Hengist** had a beautiful daughter called Rowena who, after dancing before **Vortigern** (who had a grown-up son) and drinking his

health, ‘ Liever Kyning (Koenig) wass Heal! ’ (Lord King your health!) so inflamed the king that not only did he divorce his wife, but gave **Hengist** Kent as a marriage gift, without consulting the nobles or people. (Geoffrey of Monmouth.)

“ **Hengist** persuaded **Vortigern** to allow him to bring more Saxons over to protect him from his complaining subjects, who began to turn their eyes toward Ambrosius (young son of the later Constantine — that Constantine who was beheaded by the Emperor Honorius (Rapin)), who was sheltering at the home of his kinsman, Aldroen of Brittany. **Hengist** then started to ravage the country, especially the churches, which being of wood, have disappeared without a trace.”

This is an excellent quote and should start to give you a good picture in your mind as to the situation which was happening during this period of time in Britain. On pages 23-24 of this same book we get the following:

“ These Saxons attacked the Scots and established themselves in Northumbria under Octa and Ebissa (or Ebusa), of whom we shall read later. **Vortigern’s** son then surprised him, and taking over the kingdom, made war on the Saxons, but in A.D. 457 was badly defeated in Crayford, Kent, and sought refuge in London. This would account for Guitelin, the Archbishop of London, becoming Archbishop of Chester, and Chester being the capital of Ambrosius who had deposed **Vortigern** ... When **Hengist**, by treachery, killed three hundred or more British nobles at Stonehenge (A.D. 473) and took **Vortigern** prisoner, he received Essex, Middlesex, London and Winchester (and some say York and Lincoln as well) as ransom.”

Now that we have laid an understandable foundation for this interesting, intriguing story of the invasions of Britain by the Saxons, which included the Angles and Jutes, we can single out pieces of the story from various sources to make it even more crystal-clear. The next authoritative source I would like to quote, which presents a comprehensive portrayal of this period, is from *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 55-60:

“ **The Saxon Invasion.** No longer protected by the powerful countenance of the Roman Emperors, she was now grievously oppressed by the frequent incursions of those predatory tribes who occupied the Northern frontier of Britain — the Picts (as the Caledonians were then called), and the Scots (a tribe who had migrated from Ireland [via Scythia and Spain]). In their distress, the people of South Britain sent an appeal to Rome for help, inscribed, ‘ *The Groans of the Britons.*’ But there were Northern barbarians at the time threatening Rome itself. The great fabric of the Empire was tottering to its foundation; and Rome, feeling obliged to concentrate around the capital, the scattered forces of the Empire, had withdrawn her legions from Britain in A.D. 410. Attila, surnamed ‘ The Scourge of God ’, with his conquering hordes had crossed the Alps and was advancing on Rome ... so the petition from Britain was unheeded.

“ In this extremity of desertion [of the Romans] on one hand and suffering on the other [from the Picts], the Britons persuaded *Vortigern*, Prince of Damnonium, to send deputies to the Saxons requesting their assistance. This was an evil hour for the Britons, for of all the German tribes the Saxons were the most warlike and savage. Gildas speaks of ‘ the stupidity and infatuation under which the Britons acted, in calling to their help a nation whom they dreaded more than death.’ The Saxons readily responded to the request, and under **Hengist** and **Horsa**, their leaders, they landed in Britain (A.D. 449), and made short work with the Picts and Scots. This first success speedily brought over more of their adventurous countrymen, who became so charmed with the fertility of the soil, and the mildness of the climate, that they soon assumed the attitude of conquerors; **and joining the Picts and Scots against the Britons**, by force of arms, they maintained their possession of the country. For a time Britain, unaided and alone, successfully withstood them. Indeed, under Ambrosius Aurelianus, A.D. 489, they seem to have won an important battle at Bannesdown. Ambrosius is said to have employed the respite (temporary delay) thus afforded in rebuilding some of the churches which had been destroyed in the war, and in providing for the better settlement of religious affairs . . .

“ But eventually victory crowned the efforts of the enemy (Saxons, Angles and Jutes); and never was a victory more complete, or more cruelly misused. Probably of all the hordes that dismembered the Roman Empire, the Saxons were the most barbarous . . . The greatest virtue with them was courage, and the greatest vice was cowardice. And so Britain, from the east to west, became involved in rapine and slaughter. Her cruel masters turned their ruthless hands against every thing and person that had a religious character, destroyed every church they could reach, and slew the Christians at the very altars. The Bishops and clergy were hunted down like wild beasts, and they either miserably perished, or else sought refuge in expatriation (exile). And, as if this condition of things was not already bad enough for the despised and down-trodden Faith, **Vortigern**, the prince [king?] already referred to, married the daughter of **Hengist**, thus forming a royal alliance with [Saxon] paganism . . .

“ The Jutes and the Angles rushed to the quarry, and with murderous rapidity carried fire and sword to every part of Britain proper. The Britons long maintained the unequal combat, but after a struggle of 150 years, were compelled to receive the yoke of their heartless pagan conquerors . . . the German conquest of Britain was a complete dispossession or slaughter of the conquered people. Wherever the conqueror went, the vengeance he took on the Britons was terrible. Whole villages and towns were consigned to the flames, and a promiscuous slaughter of the inhabitants ensued. Everything Celtic was as effectively wiped out of the land as everything Roman was wiped out of Africa by the Saracen conquerors of Carthage. Britain ceased to be Britain, and became England. The religion, the laws, the language were all changed . . . Bede says that all public and private

buildings were destroyed; the blood of the priest was poured out on the altars; the prelates and people were destroyed together by fire and sword, and no man dared to give them burial.”

This should give you some idea what brother will do against brother, and kinsman against kinsman in the name of religion. By this time in history, evidently, all knowledge of kinsman-ship had been lost. Writers on this subject debate the extent of the paganism of the Saxons, but it is evident that if the Saxon and British beliefs were somewhat similar, all these wars could have been avoided. Later, the Saxons, Angles and Jutes would be converted in one way or another back to belief in our Redeemer. This is another very involved story in itself, and must be dealt with in its proper place and order. To further document this story of the invasions of the Saxons, I will quote from, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, by Isabel Hill Elder, Pages 118-120:

” **CELTS PUSHED WESTWARD**

“ The Anglo-Saxon invasion, which resulted in the most important and complete of all the tribal settlements in Britain, took place between A.D. 446 and 501. In these incursions the Jutes and Angles were the first to arrive, and the Angles, being numerically the strongest constituent, gave their name in this country to the entire group, which on the Continent were known as Saxons ...

“ The Anglo-Saxon invasion had the effect of gradually pushing the Celts to the west of England and south-west Scotland. When this occurred and the Archbishops of Caerleon-on-Usk, London and York, saw all the churches in their jurisdiction lying level with the ground, **they fled with all the clergy that remained after so great a destruction, to the coverts of the woods in Wales, and to Cornwall.** From this fact it is easily discernible how it came to pass that the Culdee British Church has been associated to so great an extent with Wales and Southern Scotland ... ”

As the British were being driven farther and farther to the west, naturally they moved their ministries along with them. It was similar in manner to the early Christians moving their worship services into the catacombs and the Waldenses moving their place of worship into mountain caves and secluded forested areas. I found the following information in a very unusual place, the book *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*, by Ellen G. White (she did not know of, nor teach Israel Identity), pages 70-71. She had the following to say about Britain:

” **THE CELTIC CHURCH GOES UNDERGROUND**

“ In Great Britain, primitive Christianity had very early taken root. The gospel received by the Britons in the first centuries, was then uncorrupted by Roman

apostasy. **Persecution** from pagan emperors, which extended even to these far-off shores, was the **only gift** that the first churches of Britain **received from Rome**. Many of the Christians fleeing from persecution in [Saxon] England, found refuge in Scotland; thence the truth was carried to Ireland, and in all these countries it was received with gladness.

“ When the Saxons invaded Britain, heathenism gained control. The conquerors disdained to be instructed by their slaves, and the Christians were forced to retreat to the mountains and the wild moors. Yet the light, hidden for a time, continued to burn. In Scotland, a century later, it shown out with a brightness that extended to far-distant lands. From Ireland came the pious Columba and his co-laborers, who, gathering about them the scattered believers on the lonely island of Iona, made this the center of their missionary labors. Among these evangelists was an observer **of the Bible Sabbath**, and thus this truth was introduced among the people. A school was established at Iona, from which missionaries went out, not only to Scotland and England, but to Germany, Switzerland, and even Italy.”

To understand where the Angles, Saxons and Jutes were pushing the Britons, I will quote again from *The Origin and Early History of Christianity In Britain*, by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 60-62:

” **THE BRITISH CELTIC CHURCH ALMOST FADES FROM VIEW**

“ But the whole of the western part of the country remained *un* conquered. *Strathclyde*, including the country from the Clyde to the Dee, the Kingdom of Cumbria; *North Wales*, or Cambria; *South Wales*, and Devon and Cornwall, with part of Somerset and the sacred Avàlon, remained purely British. This land the English called Welsh-land, or the ‘ Land of the Foreigner ’ , Welsh being the name which the Germans applied to all nations speaking languages of Latin descent . . . and they found that all was lost, then, in A.D. 587, they were forced by persecution to fly and join their brethren in Wales.

“ To those parts we must now look *for the Primitive Church of Britain*. It was shut off from, and perhaps to a considerable extent forgotten by, the larger portion of Christendom; but it now formed a closer alliance with the sister Churches of Ireland and Scotland. It was conscious of no submission to any foreign Church, **but gazed fondly back to Jerusalem and the Holy Land rather than to Rome**. It had its own Liturgy, its own customs, its own peculiar (although erroneous) cycle of computing Easter. (Note: If they were keeping Passover at the time of the full moon regardless of the day of the week, as in the East, it was not erroneous.) It was orthodox in faith. It had, as we learn from Gildas, a regularly ordained Episcopate. **It believed its Bishops to be the successors of the Apostles**, and its priests claimed the power to bind and loose . . .

“ It is of the greatest importance that we should gather all the information possible concerning the Church in Wales, and get as definite an idea of it as we can. There are, unfortunately, those who erroneously suppose that the link between the early British Church and the Church of England of the present day, was broken by the Saxon invasion; and that the present Church of England arose in the time of Augustine, deriving its origin from Rome through him, and not, as we are bound to maintain, from the Apostles and Jerusalem in unbroken, continuous descent, through the British or Celtic Church . . . The Saxon invasion had destroyed civilization and Christianity in the larger part of England proper, but a remnant was driven westward, and found its home in Wales . . . ”

I have now shown you several of the pro-Identity sources for this information concerning the Saxon invasions of Britain which many will ridicule. Many historians and older encyclopedias relegate this time period to Romance and the mythical, as though it were never historical fact; especially my 1894 edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is guilty of this. Usually the older the book, generally the better its content, but not in this case. I am finding, in my research on these things, different writers, citing archaeologists, finding from time to time proof of the facts written by these old antiquarians. Evidently, enough evidence has been brought forward so that more modern reviewers are a little hesitant to consign this very important history (as they put it) to “Romance”. For instance, when one considers the personage of **Vortigern**, he is getting very close in time and place to the so-called legendary personage of King Arthur. If you want to research this subject of the Saxon invasions from some of your own encyclopedias and history books use these key words in the indexes: **Vortigern; Saxon; Anglo-Saxons**. I will now quote from some of my encyclopedias and history books, and as I do, compare some of the facts as I have quoted above from pro-Identity sources. First, I will quote from, *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 1, under “Anglo-Saxon”, page 441:

“ **ANGLO-SAXON**, (ANG gloh SAX s'n), is the name given to the nation created by the union of the Germanic tribes that settled in England in the A.D. 400's and 500's. These tribes were the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. In about 449, a British king named **Vortigern invited the Germanic tribes to come to England to help him drive back the invading Picts and Scots**. But the allies quarreled, and soon these tribes began to drive out the Britons. By the end of the 500's, the Angles, Saxons and Jutes occupied nearly all of England to the borders of Wales and Scotland. The word *England* was taken from the Old English words *Engla* and *land*, which mean *land of the Angles*.

“ There were seven major Anglo-Saxon kingdoms — Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, Essex, Sussex, Kent, and Wessex. These were known as the *Heptarchy* . . .

“ The Anglo-Saxons left their mark on the English language in its grammar and in thousands of words, including perhaps half the words we usually use today. These

words may be traced to the dialect that was developed in northern England. The southern dialect became the literary language of Anglo-Saxon England and was used chiefly in writing verse.”

Again, from, *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 17, under “Saxon”, page 142 we read this:

“ **SAXON** was a member of a Germanic tribe that invaded the island of Britain about 1,500 years ago. The Angles, another Germanic tribe invaded Britain about the same time. The two tribal groups mixed and established the Anglo-Saxon kingdom which lasted until the Norman Conquest of 1066.

“ The ancient geographer Ptolemy first mentioned the Saxons in a book he wrote during the A.D. 100’s. According to Ptolemy, the Saxons lived in an area in southern Denmark called *Saxony* (now *Schleswig*, in Germany). They were a warlike people who invaded Roman territory in the late 300’s, during the reigns of the emperors Julian and Valentinian. By the 500’s, the Saxons had settled along the coast of Gaul (now France), between the Elbe and Loire rivers. The Saxons invaded Britain in the mid-400’s, conquered the Celts who lived there, and settled in the southern and western parts of the island . . . ”

You will notice the facts presented in these articles by *The World Book Encyclopedia*, supports, assists, upholds and strengthens the information and actuality of these other writers quoted before above. For further confirmation from a history book (actually a volume or a set of several books), I will quote from *The Story Of Civilization: Part IV, “The Age Of Faith”*, by Will Durant, pages 80-81:

“ But in the fourth and fifth centuries security was threatened on every front: on the north by the Picts of Caledonia; on the east and south by Norse and Saxon raiders; on the west by the unsubdued Celts of Wales and the adventurous Gaels and ‘ Scots ’ of Ireland. In 364-367 ‘ Scot ’ and Saxon coastal raids increased alarmingly; British and Gallic troops repelled them, but Stilicho had to repeat the process a generation later. In 381 Maximus, in 407 the usurper Constantine (a later Constantine), took from Britain, for their personal purposes, legions for home defense (Roman). and few of these men returned. Invaders began to pour over the frontiers; Britain appealed to Stilicho for help (400 A.D.), but he was fully occupied in driving Goths and Huns from Italy and Gaul. When a further appeal was made to the Emperor Honorius he answered that the British must help themselves as best they could. ‘ In the year 409 ’, says Bede, ‘ the Romans ceased to rule in Britain.’

“ Faced with a large-scale invasion of Picts, the British leader **Vortigern invited some North German tribes to come to his help**. Saxons came from the region of



the Elbe, Angles from Schleswig, Jutes from Jutland. Tradition — perhaps legend — reports that the Jutes arrived in 449 under the command of two brothers suspiciously named **Hengist** and **Horsa** — i.e., stallion and mare. (Note: I don't see where these names are any more suspicious than Sitting Bull or Crazy Horse, as the Israelite tribes loved and even decorated their horses like they custom detail paint their autos today!) The various Germans drove back the Picts and ' Scots ', received tracts of land as reward, noted the military weakness of Britain, and sent the joyful word to their fellows at home. Uninvited German hordes landed on Britain's shores; they were resisted with more courage than skill; they alternately advanced and retired through a century of guerrilla war; finally the Teutons defeated the British at Deorham (577), and made themselves masters of what would later be called Angle-land — England. Most Britons thereafter accepted the conquest, and mingled their blood with that of the conquerors [which were actually of the same stock]; **a hardy minority retreated into the mountains of Wales and fought on**; some others crossed the Channel and gave their name to Brittany. The cities of Britain were ruined by the long contest; transport was disrupted, industry decayed; law and order languished, art hibernated, **and the incipient Christianity of the island was overwhelmed by the pagan gods and customs** of Germany, Britain and its language became Teutonic; Roman law and institutions disappeared. Roman municipal organization was replaced by village communities. A Celtic element remained in English blood, physiognomy, character, literature, and art, but remarkably little in English speech, which is now a cross between German and French."

I know I am repeating and going over this story again and again, but with each new quotation, more intriguing details come to light so we can understand all the circumstances surrounding this story. We have to know all of this because very important church history surrounds all of these interesting movements and counter-movements. It may not appear like it, but Yahweh was moving everything according to His Plan for His people and His anointed Celtic Culdee British evangelistic gospel message to all of His Israel nations. Once you comprehend all of these historical movements, His plan becomes evident. Never once did His plan get delayed nor ever was it premature. Now we will read this story as presented by, *CYCLOPÆDIA of Universal history*, by John Clark Ridpath, LL. D., volume 2. pages 81-86:

" To people of the English speaking race, the story of the Anglo-Saxons can never fail to interest. The hardy and adventurous stock transplanted from the stormy shores of the Baltic to the foggy island of Britain had grown into imperishable renown, and the rough accent of the old pirates of Jutland is heard in all the harbors of the world.

" The native seat of the Anglo-Saxons has been already defined. From the river Scheldt to the islands of the Jutes, and extending far inland, lies a low and marshy

country, through which the rivers for want of fall can scarcely make their way to the sea. The soil is a sediment; the sky, a bed of dun mist and heavy clouds, pouring out their perpetual rains. Ever and anon (after a while) the storms roll in from the North Sea, and the black waves plunge and roar and bellow along the coast. From the first human life in this low and doleful region has been an everlasting broil with the ocean.

“ It was from these dreary regions that the storm-beaten, war-hardened fathers of the English race came forth in the middle of the fifth century to plant themselves in Britain. Nor was the natural scenery of the new habitat, shrouded in fogs and drenched with rain, girdled with stormy oceans and clad in sunless forest, better calculated than their original seats to develop in our forefathers the sentiments of tenderness and refinement. By the banks of the muddy British rivers, and on the margin of the somber oak woods, the mixed tribes of Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Frisians established themselves and began to work out the severe but grand problems of English civilization. Of the personal characteristics and intellectual features of the race much has been written, but nothing better in the way of description and analysis than the essay of the eloquent Taine. Of the Anglo-Saxons he says:

“ Huge white bodies, cool-blooded, with fierce blue eyes, reddish flaxen hair; ravenous stomachs, filled with meat and cheese, heated by strong drinks; of a cold temperament, slow to love, home-stayers, prone to brutal drunkenness: these are to this day the features which descent and climate preserve in the race, and these are what the Roman historians discovered in their former country . . . ’

“ Behold them now in England more settled and wealthier. Do you look to find them much changed? Changed it may be, but for the worse, like the Franks, like all barbarians who pass from action to enjoyment. **They are more gluttonous, carving their hogs**, filling themselves with flesh, swallowing down deep draughts of mead (alcoholic beverage brewed from honey), ale, spiced wines, all the strong coarse, drinks which they can procure; and so they are cheered and stimulated. Add to this the pleasure of the fight. Not easily with such instincts can they attain to culture; to find a natural and ready culture we must look among the sober and sprightly populations of the south.’

“ Such is a picture of the character and life of the Anglo-Saxons when they began to possess themselves of England. It was in the middle decade of the fifth century of our era that the half-civilized Celtic people of South Britain, left naked by the withdrawal of the Roman legions, and hard pressed on the north by the Picts and the Scots, adopted the fatal expedient of inviting to their aid the barbarians of the Baltic. The tribes thus solicited were the Jutes, the Angles, the Saxons, and the Frisians. The first mentioned dwelt in the Cimbric Chersonesus, now Jutland, or Denmark. Parts of Schleswig and Holstein were also included in their territories.

In the latter country the district known as Angeln was the native seat of the Angles. To the south of these two regions, spreading from the Weser to the delta of the Rhine, lay the country of the Saxons, embracing the states afterwards known as Westphalia, Friesland, Holland, and part of Belgium. A glance at the map will show that these tribes occupied a position of easy approach by sea to the British Isles . . .

“ Albeit, in matters of war the British Celts were no match for the rude barbarians of the North, who now descended in countless swarms upon the coast of the island. It is believed that **Hengist** and **Horsa**, the leaders of the barbarian’s host which accepted the call of the Celts, as well as a majority of their followers in the first expedition, were Jutes. With them, however, a large body of Angles from Holstein, and Saxons from Friesland, were joined in the invasion. So came a mixed host into England. At this time the king of the British Celts was **Vortigern**. Him the Jute chieftains aided in driving back the Picts and Scots. When the island was thus freed from its peril the Celtic king was entertained at a feast given by **Hengist**. Beautiful was Rowena, the daughter of the warlike host. By her was the heart of **Vortigern** fatally ensnared. Humbly he sought and gladly received her hand, and in proof of gratitude he gave to the Jutes the isle of Thanet. Here the invaders found a permanent footing and would not be dismissed. Fresh bands were invited from the Baltic.

“ The fertility of exposed Britain and the wealth of the Celtic towns excited the insatiable cupidity of the barbarians. First quarrels and then hostilities broke out between them and the Celts. The sword was drawn. **Vortigern** was deposed and his son Vortimer elected in his stead. A hollow and deceptive truce was concluded, and the chief personages on both sides came together in a feast. When the drinking was at its height, **Hengist** called out to the Saxons. ‘ *Nimed eure seaxas* ’ (Take your swords); whereupon each warrior drew forth his blade and cut down all who were present except **Vortigern**. The result of the first contest in the island was that all of Kent, the ancient Cantium, was seized by the invaders and ruled by Eric, the son and successor of **Hengist**. Thus was established the first Saxon kingdom in England . . .

“ . . . The western coast of England, from the Frith to Clyde to the Land’s End in Cornwall and the southern coast from Cornwall to the borders of Hampshire remained in possession of the Celts . . . A large proportion of the original Celts remained in their homes, and were blended with the conquering people. The Mercian Angles are said to have contributed more than any other of the northern tribes to the general subjugation of Britain.

“ Such was the Saxon conquest of England, and such is the story of the establishment of the seven petty kingdoms known by the name of the HEPTARCHY. **The movement of the German tribes from the north occupied a period of nearly**

**two hundred years.** More than half of that time (so stubborn was the resistance of the Britons) was occupied with fierce wars between the invaders and the invaded.”

### THE BRITISH CELTIC CHURCH REBOUNDS TO LIFE AGAIN

The Celtic church was finally driven to the extreme west of the island because of the two hundred years of Saxon invasions. The Saxons were, by this time, in possession of over 75% of the land. It appeared, again, that the light might flicker and finally go out on the church which was started by Joseph of Arimathea, but suddenly the light recovered to shine even brighter. For this part of the story, I will quote from a secular source of history, *The Story Of Civilization*, Part IV, “The Age Of Faith”, by Will Durant, page 532:

“ As Germanic invasions of Gaul and Britain had driven scholars from those lands to Ireland, so now the wave returned, the debt was paid; Irish missionaries flung themselves upon the victorious pagan Angles, Saxons, Norwegians, and Danes in England, and upon the illiterate and half-barbarous Christians of Gaul and Germany. **With the Bible in one hand and classic manuscripts in the other;** and for a time it seemed that the Celts would win back through Christianity the lands they had lost to force. **It was in the Dark Ages that the Irish spirit shone with its strongest light.**

“ The greatest of these missionaries was St. Columba. We know him well through the biography written (c. 679) by Adamnan, one of his successors at Iona. Columba was born at Donegal in 521, of royal stock; . . . he was a saint who could have been a king. At school in Moville he showed such devotion that his schoolmaster named him Columbkille — Column of the Church. From the age of twenty-five he founded a number of churches and monasteries, of which the most famous were at Derry, Durrow, and Kells. But he was a fighter as well as a saint, ‘ a man of powerful frame and mighty voice ’; his hot temper drew him into many quarrels, at last into war with King Diarmuid a battle was fought in which, we are told, 5000 men were killed; Columba, though victorious, fled from Ireland (563), resolved to convert as many souls as had fallen in that engagement at Cooldrevna. He now founded on the island of Iona, off the west coast of Scotland, one of the most illustrious of medieval monasteries. Thence he and his disciples brought the Gospel to the Hebrides, Scotland, and northern England. And there, after converting thousands of pagans and illuminating 300 ‘ noble books ’, he died, in prayer at the altar, in his seventy-eighth year.”

*The Horizon History of Christianity*, by Roland H. Bainton, (a secular source) has this to say on page 142:

“ In 563 Saint Columba, a Celtic abbot, had gone from Ireland to Scotland, where he established a monastery on the island of Iona. After converting the king, the saint and his disciples won the inhabitants of Scotland, then called the Picts. The Celtic Irish were ready to convert the Picts, but there was at first no disposition on the part of the Celtic Britons to convert the Anglo-Saxons. Unlike the barbarians who invaded other parts of Europe, these barbarians were brutal in their conquest of Britain; consequently those native Britons that survived the invasion were driven west into Wales and Cornwall. It was left to the Irish monks settled in Scotland to begin the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons of northern England, just shortly after Augustine (a Roman Catholic priest who had no connection with the Celtic church whatever) undertook the conversion of [Saxons] of the south.”

Isabel Hill Elder, in her book, *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, has this to say about Saint Columba and Iona, page 113:

“ The great St. Columba, fourth in descent from Niall of the Nine Hostages, born A.D. 522, about fifty years after the death of St. Patrick, was associated with the Culdee Church of Iona for thirty-two years, where he arrived from Ireland with his twelve disciples on Pentecost Eve in the year 565. We are here given another instance of the faithfulness of the Culdees to first foundations in the formation of a new settlement.

““ Many of the Continental monasteries owed their foundations to Irish scholars. When St. Columba turned his back on Derry with the lament that is one of the loveliest ancient Irish poems, and founded the monastery at Iona, it was but the beginning of a movement which brought so many scholars to the Irish schools. But the claim of the Irish schools is not so much in the intricate treasure of their manuscripts, as in the other pattern which they wove into the history of Europe ... ”







## LETTER 19

---

In the last lesson we studied about the invasions of the Saxon tribes and how it affected the British Celtic church. In this lesson we will deal with the subject of how the Saxons and finally the Irish became Roman Catholic. This lesson will bring us to the latter half of the 4<sup>th</sup> Century. I will be bringing you information on persons like Gregory, St. Columba, Augustine of Canterbury and St. Patrick. It may seem, at times, I am getting off the subject, but just be patient with me, as the full story will play out as we go along. We will begin this lesson with the subject of St. Patrick.

### TWO ST. PATRICKS, THE TRUE ONE WAS NOT ROMAN CATHOLIC

Yes, you heard me right, there were two St. Patricks. For this part of the story, we will read from the book *Celt, Druid and Culdee* By Isabel Hill Elder, pages 110 to 113 (Most all other histories seem to get the two mixed-up):

“ During the storm which the Pelagian heresy caused in Britain, one of the brightest lights of the Culdee Church, St. Patrick, was, in the providence of God, being prepared for his great work of revival among the Irish people, Christianity, according to Gildas, having been planted in Ireland before the defeat of the Boudicca, A.D. 61.

“ Maelgwyn, or Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland and of the Isle of Man, born at Llantwit Major, Glamorganshire, A.D. 363, from whence he was taken prisoner and carried to Ireland, was by tradition, a Culdee and the son-in-law of a bard; by his own statement the son of a presbyter, and grandson of a deacon, both of the British Church, St. Illtyds, Llantwit Major, to which was attached a college.

“ Patrick’s father, Calpurnius (not Patrick himself, as frequently erroneously stated), would appear to have been principal of this college, acting at the same time as an official of the Roman Empire, probably as *broveratus*, ‘ district justiciary and chief.’ Patrick would, in such case, have had early opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of Roman law and British Church government.

“ Niall of the Nine Hostages, so-called because five provinces in Ireland and four in Scotia delivered hostages to him, changed the name of North Britain from Albania to Scotia at the request of a colony of the Dalriada, the Irish colonists who had been led by Fergus from Antrim to Argyllshire. Niall, in one of his raids, took Patrick prisoner from Llanwit Major to Ireland in A.D. 379. The captive escaped to Gaul, returning to Ireland nearly fifty years later as a missionary revivalist.

“ St. Patrick is said to have introduced the use of the Latin language, the previous missionaries having used chiefly Greek. Latin, did not, however, rapidly supplant Greek. Professor H. Zimmer states: ‘ It is almost a truism to say that whoever knew Greek on the Continent in the days of Charles the Bald (tenth century), was an Irishman or was taught by an Irishman.’

“ Bede does not mention Patrick for the very obvious reason that the Culdee hierarchy, with its hereditary succession, was obnoxious to Bede as an earnest adherent of the novel Papal Church introduced in A.D. 664, but he speaks of his contemporary, Palladius, a Caledonian and a Culdee, who became like Ninian an emissary of the Roman See, which was now resolutely setting itself to grasp the sceptre of universal dominion in the Christian Church. Baronius states: ‘ The bishops of Ireland were all schismatics, separated from the Church of Rome.’

“ Many saints of the British Church were, at a later date, claimed by the Latin Church, and legends undeserving of the slightest credence grew around their names. Those who owed nothing to Rome in connection with their conversion, and who long struggled against her pretensions, were later claimed by the Latin Church as though they had been her most devoted adherents. This is especially noticeable in the case of St Patrick, whose conversion was the result of training in a British home, who was all his life a Culdee, yet is now given the greatest prominence in Roman Catholic hagiology.

“ Deliberate confusion was created by the Papal Church between the Culdee St. Patrick of the fifth century and the later Patrick of the ninth century who, according to the ‘ Chronicles of Ireland ’, was, in the year 850, Abbot of Ireland, Confessor. For there were two Patricks, the first a very learned and godly man, the second an abbot, given to superstition and founder of the fabulous Purgatory, which goes in Ireland under the name of St. Patrick’s Purgatory. During a great rebellion in Ireland, Patrick the Abbot was compelled to flee the country. He fled into Britain and lies buried at Glastonbury. The Martyrology of Sarum reports that in Ireland



they kept the feast of Patrick the Abbot on the 24<sup>th</sup> of August. It was to this second Patrick that the Pope sent the pallium (cloth) as a reward for his Romanizing zeal, its first appearance in Ireland. (underline emphasis mine)

“ The great St. Columba, fourth in descent from Niall of the Nine Hostages born A.D. 522, about fifty years after the death of St. Patrick, was associated with the Culdee Church of Iona for thirty-two years, where he arrived from Ireland with his twelve disciples on Pentecost Eve in the year 565.”

Now for another short quote, which will provide further evidence St. Patrick was from the British Celtic church, and not the Roman Catholic Church, and it is from the book *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester* by Robert B Stoker, page 95:

“ St. Patrick, as we have noted before, was a member of the British Celtic Church, and it was this Church that he introduced into Ireland. He had been consecrated bishop, but about A.D. 440, he made himself Metropolitan of Ireland . . . ”

Because it is our purpose here to learn as much as we can about St. Patrick, I am going to include a sizable quote on this subject from the book *St. Joseph Of Arimathea At Glastonbury*, by Lionel Smithett Lewis, pages 195-198:

“... ST. PATRICK THE BRITON. In the text we have spoken of his parentage, birthplace, and place of burial. But he cannot be quite left out here because of the immense importance of his missionary work in the Celtic Church. We would just add that his real name was Succat, and that the name Patricias or Patrick means ‘ of noble birth.’ Professor Hewins in his *Royal Saints of Britain*, in a pedigree, names his sister Darerca as the wife of Conan ‘ Meriadec ’ Duke of the Armorican frontier (a Roman office) under the Emperor Maximus, who is said to have been the first King of the Bretons. She is also called great-niece of St. Martin of Tours. The difficulty is — who gave St. Patrick the name of Succat? For he was carried away captive to Ireland when about sixteen. The amazing thing is that the *Book of Ballymote*, and the *Book of Lecan*, both say that he, the son of a deacon and grandson of a priest, was baptized during his captivity by Caranoc, above mentioned, who was at a Christian settlement at Nendrum in Stratford Lough. It is more likely that St. Patrick the slave somehow came across Caranoc, who, as we know, was on his mission to Ireland, and that he influenced him for good, and led to his great repentance. Baptism in those unsettled days was sometimes amazingly delayed. The Christian Emperor Constantine the Great was not baptized till on his death-bed, twenty-five years after his conversion; St. Ambrose not till his thirty-fourth year. St. Augustine not till his thirty-second; both of the latter were born in Christian families, and were convinced and keen Christians.

“ We know from St. Patrick's ‘ Confession ’ in the *Book of Armagh* that St. Patrick had not taken advantage of all the Christian teaching in which he had been

brought up, and that like the Prodigal Son this was brought home to him by his misfortune. It is possible that the story of the two books may have some light thrown on it by the horrid fact that when he was about to be made bishop someone disclosed a sin of his early youth that he had confessed before being made deacon and that some bishops, unwilling that one so unlearned should be consecrated, used it as an excuse. But even then, if he was careless, or wild, how came it that the son of a deacon and the grandson of a priest was unbaptized? St. Patrick was always full of repentance for a wasted youth and the neglect of opportunities, educational and otherwise, His own words were ‘ Before I was afflicted, I was like a stone which lies in the deep mire,’ But what a precious jewel for Christ the stone turned out to be! The first part of his captivity was in the Wood of Lochlut, ‘ the oldest wood that ever was in Ireland, and the gloomiest.’ There he made friends with the little children who were kind to him. In return, he, prayerful, and fully repentant, tried to convert them, In consequence he learned Gaelic, and the ways of the Irish, so useful to him when he came on his mission. These children always lived in his affectionate heart. Afterwards in Ulster, as a slave to Milchu, he taught other children at Glemish in Antrim. After his escape, and landing at Marseilles, on his way to his friends in England, he made for Tours where his great-uncle, St. Martin, was consecrated bishop in 371. He passed through Auxerre where St Germanus was consecrated bishop on July 7, 418. St. Patrick is said to have been born about 395. He was sixteen when taken captive. He was a slave for six years. If these dates be right he would have been free about 416. But there is no certainty about the date of St. Patrick’s birth. So it is quite possible that he found that most remarkable man Germanus on his episcopal throne. Germanus’s biographer, Constantius, who wrote forty years after his death records that Germanus died July 31, 448. In 429 he and his fellow Gallican bishop, Lupus of Troyes, in response to an appeal from the British Church, were sent by a Gallican synod to Britain to fight the Pelagian heresy and, as it turned out, to win the Alleluia victory (Smith and Wace’s *Christian Biography under Germanus*). Whether St. Patrick had known St. Germanus before or not, William of Malmesbury tells us that Germanus, after the victory, took him into his own suite of followers. He is said to have learned more from St. Germanus than from anyone else. It seems that St. Patrick was advised by St. Paulinus of Lola to study on the island of Lerin near Cannes, but exactly when is not clear. One thing is for certain: Palladius was sent to Ireland by Pope Celestine in 431. He was a failure, and died after a few months. Immediately, in 432, St. Germanus, who saw St. Patrick’s worth, consecrated him at Auxerre, and sent him to take Palladius’s place, where his charm, courage, and knowledge of the Irish succeeded. He bearded King Leary at Tara itself. He won permission to preach throughout his kingdom. Conall, one of the King’s brothers, was converted and built St. Patrick a church at Donaghpatrick, whence he spread the Faith through Meath. He destroyed the chief idol of Ireland. In seven years he built fifty churches in Connaught. He built the church at Armagh, which became the Archiepiscopal See. He established monasteries for monks and nuns all

over the land. He taught through Leinster and Munster. He became Archbishop of Ireland, and his See remains to this day. He had entered Ireland as a slave. He left it as Archbishop to return to the Mother Church of his native Britain, there to gather the successors of the first anchorites under one roof, and to die blessed and beloved of all, as William of Malmesbury tells us . . . ”

Andrew Gray, in his book *The Origin And Early History of Christianity In Britain*, gives a very extended treatment to the subject of St. Patrick which I will quote at this time starting with and including pages 81-86:

“ ST. PATRICK. About the year A.D. 432 Patrick, afterwards known as ST. PATRICK, went into Ireland establishing Christianity in the country. He was so successful in his work that he has been called ever since the ‘ Apostle of Ireland.’

“ The great man, whose original name was Succoth, but to whom that of Patricius or Patrick was given on account of his noble birth, was undoubtedly born near Dumbarton on the Clyde, in the village called after him Kirkpatrick. His father was a deacon and his grandfather a priest, both of St. Ninian’s Mission, and his mother is believed to have been the sister of St. Martin.

“ When he was sixteen years old a band of pirates, from the North of Ireland, landed at the mouth of the Clyde, and carried him off to Ireland, where, as a slave for six years, he was made to attend cattle. At the end of these years he managed to escape. He then went to Gaul, and studied theology in the School of St. German, Bishop of Auxerre, and probably in that of his uncle of Tours also. He was almost assuredly ordained deacon and priest by St. German, and consecrated Bishop by the said German, assisted by the far-famed St. Martin. He now felt himself called to go to the land of his captivity, and preach the Gospel to the Irish.

“ We are sometimes told that Pope Celestine ordained Palladius (who was a Briton) a deacon, and sent him into Ireland before St. Patrick entered on his work there. Very true, Palladius did go to Ireland about the year 430, but his mission proved a complete failure, and he was expelled from the country by the king of Leinster, and died shortly after. Not, then, to Palladius but to St. Patrick belongs the honour of the conversion of Ireland. His mission was eminently successful, one of his first converts being the king himself. With true devotion he preached the Gospel from North to South. He is said to have built about 360 churches, to have baptized 12,000 converts and to have ordained many Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. He fixed his principal See at Armagh, A.D. 454, and that has continued to be the seat of the Primate of the Church of Ireland. He lived to see the whole country Christianized, and after a long and useful career he, according to Archbishop Usher, fell asleep in the year A.D. 493, at the age of 120 years . . .

“ This appears to be a suitable place for emphasizing a few facts concerning St. Patrick and the Irish Church, about which there is a lamentable lack of information.

“ . . . Do the thousands of Roman Catholics, and especially Irish Roman Catholics, who join so heartily in the celebration of St. Patrick’s Day, and sound his praises so loudly, realize that *he never was a Roman Catholic*? This fact is overlooked, or not understood, by many others who do not belong to the Roman obedience. Romanists claim him, and many who protest against Rome, weakly and ignorantly give up to Roman monopolization one who never owed or acknowledged allegiance either to the Bishop or Church of Rome. What has the Church, whose boast is *semper idem*, to say to his parentage? Deacons and priests in that Church are not supposed to have sons. His own account of his parentage, given in his ‘ Confessions ’, reveals to us the fact that the domestic and social life of the clergy of his day was very much like that of the clergy of the Church of Ireland, or of the Church of England, of our day, and very unlike that of the clergy of the Roman obedience in modern times. (underline emphasis mine) . . .

“ He never held or taught the modern doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility. Both have been invented and promulgated in our times, to wit, in 1854 and 1870 respectively. His teaching was in harmony with primitive Christianity, with the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, which until this day are held and taught by the Church of Ireland, which he founded. As to the Creed of Pope Pius IV — the Official Creed of the Church of Rome — neither St. Patrick nor any other person had ever seen or heard of it in his day; and we believe, and are sure, that if he were now living in the Roman communion, and held and taught the very same doctrines which he held and taught in Ireland in the fifth century, he would be promptly excommunicated for heresy. But he would find the Church, which he founded in Ireland, had ‘ kept the Faith.’ . . . ”

### AUGUSTINE CONVERTS THE SOUTHERN SAXONS TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM

There is one very important fact which must be established at the very beginning here, and that is, this Augustine was not the same as Augustine of Hippo. This Augustine was called “Augustine of Canterbury.” To get an idea of just who we are talking about, we will do a short overview of this Augustine taken from the *World Scope Encyclopedia*, volume 1, under the term Augustine:

“ Augustine, OR AUSTIN, Archbishop of Canterbury, called the *Apostle of England*, born in the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, died at Canterbury, May 26, 604. He is first mentioned as a Benedictine monk in the monastery of St. Andrews at Rome. Pope Gregory I sent him with 40 monks to England, where he was detailed to work among the Saxons. The latter not only received him with kindness, but gave marked heed to his teachings, and many were baptized into the faith. A large number of heathen temples were converted into Christian churches under his direction.”

In speaking of Augustine, I will be getting back on the subject of St. Columba which I presented in detail in lesson eighteen. I will repeat part of a passage I quoted in that lesson plus more. You can see very clearly here how the Roman Catholic Church deliberately used deceit and cunning to use the good name of a member of the Culdee Celtic church to their advantage. To see where St. Columba fits in with St. Patrick, I will repeat this passage plus more from letter eighteen where I quoted *The Horizon History of Christianity*, by Roland H. Bainton. This will also convey more in detail the story of how the southern Saxons were converted to Roman Catholicism by Augustine. I will be quoting pages 142-143:

“ Another of the many reasons why this pope is remembered as Gregory the Great is that during his papacy monasticism was brought into the active and important service of the [Roman] Church. In 596 he sent forth the prior of a Roman monastery, Saint Augustine — called Augustine of Canterbury to distinguish him from Augustine of Hippo — to regain England for the Church. Following the withdrawal of the Roman troops England had been invaded by Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, and Christianity had been largely superseded by paganism. Some missionary activity had already been directed to the British Isles. In 563 Saint Columba, a Celtic abbot, had gone from Ireland to Scotland, where he established a monastery on the Island of Iona. After convincing the king, the saint and his disciples won the inhabitants of Scotland, then called the Picts. The Celtic Irish were ready to convert the Picts, but there was at first no disposition on the part of the Celtic Britons to convert the Anglo-Saxons. Unlike the barbarians who invaded other parts of Europe, these barbarians were brutal in their conquest of Britain; consequently those native Britons that survived the invasion were driven west into Wales and Cornwall. It was left to the Irish monks settled in Scotland to begin the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons of northern England, just shortly after Augustine (a Roman Catholic priest who had no connection with the Celtic church whatever) undertook the conversion [of Saxons] of the south.

“ Augustine commenced in Kent under the favor of Queen Bertha, a Christian queen (Merovingian French princess, obviously a British Celtic convert) eager to convert her pagan husband. King Ethelbert was willing to grant Augustine an audience but only out of doors, where Augustine would be less able to exercise what the king supposed were magical powers; for he was reputed to be able to make tails grow on the backs of those with whom he was displeased. The king was so far persuaded that he granted land for the foundation of a monastery at Canterbury, ever after to be the seat of the English primate . . . ”

While this article by *The Horizon History Of Christianity* is fairly accurate, it is not entirely honest. For instance the Roman Catholics could not “regain England for the Church”, as the Celtic Church was never under its domination before this stated time, there was nothing to regain. The word “regain” is totally out of place here. It only

takes one misleading word such as this to throw the reader entirely in the wrong direction, and as a result, assume something that is entirely false. It was a political plan (a power move) on the part the Roman Catholic Church to expand into territories formerly held and directed by the British Celtic church.

Also *The Horizon History Of Christianity* is not entirely honest when they don't explain that Queen Bertha was a British convert who was over anxious to see her husband, King Ethelbert become a Christian. Queen Bertha was a Merovingian French princess which we will soon prove. The reason we have so many Irish, Scottish and Anglo-Saxon Roman Catholics today is because of Bertha's prodding of her husband King Ethelbert. As the king, so went his subjects. We find more on Queen Bertha in *The Story Of Civilization*, part IV, "The Age Of Faith", by Will Durant, page 533:

"Tertullian mentions Christians in Britain in 208; Bede speaks of St. Alban as dying in the persecution by Diocletian; British bishops attended the Council of Sardica (347), Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, went to Britain in 429 to suppress the Pelagian heresy. William of Malmesbury avers (declares positively) that the British, presumably on a later visit, routed an army of Saxons by having his British converts shout 'Hallelujah!' at them. From this vigorous condition British Christianity pined and almost died in the Anglo-Saxon invasions; we hear nothing of it again until, at the end of the sixth century, the disciples of Columba entered Northumberland, and Augustine, with seven other monks, reached England from Rome, Doubtless Pope Gregory had learned that Ethelbert, the pagan King of Kent, had married Bertha, a Christian Merovingian princess. Ethelbert listened courteously to Augustine, remained unconvinced, but gave him freedom to preach, and provided food and lodging for him and his fellow monks in Canterbury. At last (599) the Queen prevailed upon the King to accept the new faith; and many subjects followed their example. In 601 Gregory sent the pallium (cloth) to Augustine, who became the first in an impressive line of distinguished archbishops of Canterbury. Gregory was lenient to the lingering paganism of England; he allowed the old temples to be christened into churches, and permitted the custom of sacrificing oxen to the gods to be gently transformed into 'killing them to the refreshing of themselves to the praise of God' so that the English merely changed from eating beef when they praised God to praising God when they ate beef . . .

"Christianity came to Germany as the gift of Irish and English monks. In 690 the Northumbrian monk Willibrord, who had been educated in Ireland, crossed the North Sea with twelve adventurous aids, fixed his episcopal seat at Utrecht, and labored for forty years to convert the Frisians. But these realistic lowlanders saw in Willibrord the hand of his protector Pepin the Young, and feared that their conversion would subject them to the Franks; moreover, they were not pleased to be told that all their unbaptized forebears were in hell. A Frisian king, having learned this as he stood on the brink of baptism, turned away, saying that he preferred to spend eternity with his ancestors."

We can know that Bertha was a British Celtic convert, as indicated by the book *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester* by Robert B. Stoker, page 84:

“ Evidently the Celtic Church played a full part in the Christianizing of the Franks, hence the tomb of a Frankish king at Iona.”

### [MORE PERSPECTIVE ON AUGUSTINE](#)

Now I will tell the story from a different perspective, and we will see that this Augustine was quite a manipulator. I will now quote again from *The Legacy of Arthur's Chester* by Robert B. Stoker, pages 85-86:

“ Let us examine the career of St. Augustine as described by Bede. He was Prior of St. Gregory's Monastery in Rome, and having been sent with a party to convert the English, was hesitant. However, encouraged by the promise of becoming Bishop of the English (which could be read 'Archbishop'), Augustine set off again. Received by Ethelbert, King of Kent (the great grandson of Escus, son of Hengist and the grandson of Octa, Arthur's opponent) who had a Franco-Christian wife, Bertha, they were able to use the old British church of St. Martin at Canterbury, and made a convert of the king. Once a king was converted, his subjects found it safer also to follow suit. Augustine said he had ten thousand converts, the large number probably being accounted for by this fact of it being unwise not to worship the same God as your king. Augustine immediately raced back to the Archbishop of Arles to be consecrated archbishop, and then presented Rome with a *fait accompli*. No other archbishop has had no bishops and such a dubious flock! He next asked Gregory a number of questions, presumably contemplating a 'take-over bid'; 'What are to be our relations with the Bishops of Gaul and Britian?' Gregory answered that he had no authority over the Gaulish bishops, 'who since ancient times had been under the Archbishop of Arles, who had received the ' pallium ' from his predecessors, and his authority was in no way infringed.' If he went to Gaul and saw anything wrong with the behavior of the French bishops, he had to consult with the Archbishop of Arles. Augustine evidently, as a new broom, was not content just to show his authority in Britain, so Gregory wrote to the Archbishop of Arles asking him, if Augustine should visit him, to receive him kindly, and if 'as an independent observer' he should report anything wrong asking his colleague of Arles fully to enquire into it. However, to soften the blow of excluding Augustine from France, Gregory committed all the bishops of Britain to his charge, He ignored the fact that just as the Archbishop of Arles had the ' pallium ' since ancient times, so had the Archbishop of Chester.

“ Pope Gregory then sent over Mellitus, Justus, Rufinianus and Paulinus. and three companies, with the pallium to Augustine, and instructions that he was to consecrate twelve bishops, subject to his jurisdiction . . .

“ A few years later, round about A.D. 604, not long before his death, Augustine appointed Mellitus Bishop of London, and Justus Bishop of Rochester, and so now there were two bishops (not twelve); therefore there could not be an Archbishop of London (or York). The head bishopric remained in Canterbury, Laurentius being appointed. Augustine’s arrogant behaviour with the British bishops earned no dividend amongst the other branches of the Celtic Church, as Laurentius complained that a Scottish bishop not only refused to eat with him, but would not eat in the same house.” (underline emphasis mine)

### WHAT CAUSED GREGORY TO SEND AUGUSTINE TO ENGLAND?

For this information, we will pick up the story in the book *The Origin And Early History of Christianity In Britain* by Andrew Gray, D.D., pages 111-114:

“ We come now to speak of the arrival of Augustine, and of his mission in Britain. Gregory, afterwards Bishop of Rome, before his elevation to the Episcopate, chanced one day to be passing through the Roman slave-market, where he saw, among the slaves, some fair-complexioned, light-haired youths. Their fresh beautiful countenances instantly attracted his attention. On inquiring whence they came, and who they were, he was told they were Angles, from Britain. ‘ Ah! ’ replied Gregory. ‘ they rather deserve the name Angels.’ ‘ From what province do they come?’ He was told they were from Deira, a district in Northumbria, ‘ Deira ’, he said; ‘ that is well — they are called to the mercy of God from His wrath (de ira). But what is the name of the King of that province?’ He was informed that it was Alla or Ælla — ‘ Alleluia ’ he exclaimed; ‘ Alleluia must be sung to their country.’

“ Influenced by these coincidences, Gregory resolved upon undertaking a mission into Britain, supposing that the inhabitants were all pagan. He would at once have carried this resolve into effect, had not his elevation to the Episcopate, in the year 590, prevented his leaving Rome. But the noble resolution of converting the Saxons was not abandoned, for immediately after his consecration he ordered a Gallic priest, named Candidus, to buy some Saxon youths, to be educated as missionaries for their native land.

“ The ardent mind of this prelate, however, could not endure the delay of educating missionaries for so pressing and darling an object. He resolved, therefore, on speedier measures. He looked around him for a man of zeal, talent, and resolution. Such an one he found ready for him, in the person of Augustine, the Prior of



St. Andrews. The enterprising ecclesiastic, having secured a band of forty monks as his associates, directed his course towards Britain; but on his way through Gaul his heart failed him, and he would have abandoned the undertaking had it not been for the rebuke of Gregory.

“ The time chosen was *providential*. Ethelbert, King of Kent, and Bretwalda over the other kingdoms of the Heptarchy . . . , had married a Christian wife, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, King of Paris, on condition that she should be allowed the free exercise of her religion, and to take with her Luidhard, her chaplain. For her use a British church (St. Martin’s Canterbury) had been restored and made fit for service. Augustine, taking with him interpreters from France, came into Britain with singular advantages; he was the messenger of Gregory, whose spiritual power was widely acknowledged throughout Europe; he bore recommendations from the King of France, and was sure of the favour of Queen Bertha. Ethelbert, who no doubt already looked on Christianity with favour, was willing to receive the missionaries. They landed at Ebb’s Fleet, on the island of Thanet, in A.D. 597 — the same place where Hengist and Horsa landed a century and a half before — and after a few days delay the King proceeded to meet them. Augustine and his monks approached the King in formal procession. One bore on high a silver cross, another carried a banner with a representation of the Crucifixion of our Savior, and all chanted a Litany. Through their interpreter they explained to the King the object of their mission. They told him they were come ‘ to preach the word of life to him and to his people.’ ‘ These are indeed fair words and promises which you bring with you ’, said the King, ‘ but because they are new, and uncertain, I cannot at once take up with them, and leave the faith which I and the Saxon people have so long observed. But as you have come from far, and as I think you wish to give us a share in things which you believe to be true and most profitable, we will not show you unkindness, but rather will receive you hospitably, and not hinder you from converting as many as you can to your religion.’ This was all that they could expect. They were allowed to preach; they were provided with sustenance, and given a temporary abode at Canterbury. They used St. Martin’s church for their services; and by their preaching, as well as by their holy and self-denying lives, and their frequent prayers and fastings, they soon made many converts. Indeed the progress of the work of the conversion was so great, and the success which crowned their efforts so extraordinary, that at Christmas of the same year Augustine and his associates are reported to have baptized 10,000 persons. Soon afterwards the king declared himself a convert, and was baptized on the Whitsunday following, probably in St. Martin’s Church.”

Isabel Hill Elder in her book *Celt, Druid and Culdee*, has a very interesting remark of explanation defining the difference between the British church and the Church of England, page 8. I will also quote excerpts from pages 20, 57, 65 and 104:

Page 8:

“ An interesting point also is made as to the difference between the British Church and the Church of England. The Church of England was originally, of course, Roman, founded by St. Augustine, and was turned Protestant by the powers that be in our country, but it has never been quite so independent in thought as the British Church that fought Rome over so many hundreds of years. The history of the British Church, described in the book as Culdich, is of outstanding interest and should be read by all, for it redounds to the credit of our islands.”

Page 20:

“ A great deal of history, so-called, has come down to us from Latin sources, whose one object was, from the very first, to make us believe that we owe all to Rome, when, in fact, Rome owes a great deal to us; so much error has been taught in our schools concerning the ancient Britons that it is difficult for the average student to realize that the British, before the arrival of Julius Caesar, were, in all probability, among the most highly educated people on the earth at that time and, as regards scientific research, surpassed both the Greeks and the Romans — a fact testified to by both Greek and Roman writers themselves.”

Page 57:

“ By very stringent laws the number of priests was regulated in proportion to the population; and none could be a candidate for the priesthood who could not in the previous May Congress of the tribe prove his descent from nine successive generations of free forefathers. Genealogies, therefore, were guarded with the greatest care. This barrier to promiscuous admission had the effect of closing the Order almost entirely to all but the Blaenorion or aristocracy, making it literally a ‘Royal Priesthood.’”

Page 65:

“ A breastplate was found in an excavated cist at Stonehenge, on the skeleton of an important Briton. Five similar breastplates have been found in Britain and Ireland.”

Page 104:

“ Giraldus Cambrensis, Bishop of St. David’s, in the twelfth century, a strong supporter of the Latin Church, complains of the Celtic Church that ‘ the sons after the deaths of their fathers, succeed to the ecclesiastical benefices, not by election, but by hereditary right.’”





## LETTER 20

---

### JUDAH AND TWO SEEDLINE DOCTRINE

You may wonder: “What does Two Seedline have to do with Judah?” **It has everything to do with Judah!** This is going to be the most difficult lesson I have yet attempted. We are going to explore an area of the Scriptures which few people have ever contemplated to any degree. You may not want to agree with the conclusions which I am going to bring forward, but you will have to acknowledge that they are very serious. To quickly get your attention, the Bible and most all Bible commentaries indicate that Jezebel was one of the ancestors of Yahshua the Messiah. This may seem like a very strange topic to consider, but it is extremely important to do so. With this lesson, I am going to demonstrate, and make a strong circumstantial case, that Jezebel was not in the lineage of Yahshua. We will start this dissertation by quoting a passage of Scripture which most all Two Seedline teachers use in their presentations of the subject, Matthew 23: 35:

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

If you have a *King James Version Bible* with a good center reference or *The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge* by Jerome H. Smith, it will take us to II Chronicles 24:20-21. When we are quoting a Scripture, it is always advisable to know its context and its frame of reference. To my knowledge, no one I have ever heard of or read, who quoted this passage, ever took the time to explain what it was all about. This is what I am now going to attempt to do. First, we will read II Chronicles 24:20-21:

<sup>20</sup> And the spirit of Yahweh came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, which stood above the people, and said unto them, Thus saith Yahweh, Why transgress ye the commandments of Yahweh, that ye cannot prosper? because

ye have forsaken Yahweh, he hath also forsaken you.

<sup>21</sup> And they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king (Joash) in the court of the house of Yahweh.

In order to understand who and what was going on here, we have to grasp the rest of the story. Because there are so many crooks and turns to this account, it is not going to be an easy chronicle to relate. What it all boils down to is this: as long as the priest Jehoiada lived, King Joash and the people refrained from worshipping Baal, but upon his death things changed (II Chronicles 24:17-18):

<sup>17</sup> Now after the death of Jehoiada came the princes of Judah, and made obeisance to the king (Joash). Then the king hearkened unto them.

<sup>18</sup> And they left the house of Yahweh *singular*-Elohim of their fathers, and served groves and idols: and wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for this their trespass.

The *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 404 has this to say on verse 17:

"After the death of Jehoiada, the great men of Judah came and adored King Joash, and seduced him; and then the king received from them their idols."

We only have to go to verse 7 of this chapter (II Chronicles 24) to find out who "these great men of Judah" were, for they were the ones who were formerly contending for the house of Baal:

For **the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman**, had broken up the house of *singular*-Elohim; and also all the dedicated things of the house of Yahweh did they bestow upon Baalim.

We now know who Yahshua was talking about in Matthew 23:35. He was speaking about the sons of Athaliah who was the daughter of Jezebel, who was the daughter of Ethbaal who murdered Phelles (Pheles), a descendant of Hiram to become King of Tyre (Josephus, *Against Apion*, 1. 18). As we begin to list all the various murders committed by this Cain satanic seedline through Ethbaal, Jezebel, Athaliah and Ahaziah and the sons of Athaliah, we will begin to understand the marks of Cain upon them. Who else but Cain could have been responsible for the blood of Abel? We will also understand who is meant by the "prince of Tyrus" who had "been in Eden", Ezekiel 28:2, 12. Now that we have laid the foundation for our narrative, we will explore the details of the various intrigues that developed from time to time. We will investigate this **wicked woman**, Athaliah, from *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 1, page 401:

“ **ATHALIAH** . . . The wife of Jehoram, king of Judah, and daughter of Ahab, king of Israel, and granddaughter of Omri (2 Kings 8:18, 26; 2 Chr. 22:2). She reigned from 841-835 B.C. Because peace prevailed in her time between the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, she married Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat of Judah (2 Kings 8:16, 17). It was a marriage of political convenience with disastrous spiritual results. She inherited the unscrupulous nature of her mother Jezebel. Her influence over her husband and her son Ahaziah was for evil. She introduced into Judah the worship of the Phoenician Baal. When Jehoram ascended the throne, she showed her zeal for the cult of the Sidonian Baal.

“ She was widowed after eight years on the throne. and her son Ahaziah succeeded his father (2 Kings 8:26; 2 Chr. 22:2) Within a year Ahaziah [along] with Joram of Israel was murdered (executed by divine order) by Jehu, at which time Athaliah destroyed all her grandchildren except Jehoash (Joash), who was stolen away and hidden by his aunt, Jehosheba (2 Kings 11:2; 2 Chr. 22:11). Athaliah usurped the Davidic throne for six years, the only woman in history to do so. Under her sponsorship Baal worship was vigorously promoted (24:7).

“ Jehoiada, high priest and husband of Jehosheba (22:11), led the revolt against Athaliah in her seventh regnal year (23:1ff.). Using as the occasion the changing of the palace guards on the Sabbath, and aided by the guards, Jehoiada had Joash proclaimed king. When Athaliah tried to thwart the uprising, she was evicted from the Temple courts and killed at the horses' entrance to the palace (2 Kings 11:1-16; 2 Chr. 22; 23). She died at the hands of the guards. Scripture characterizes her as a wicked woman (24:7).

“ The sons of Athaliah ' (24:7) create no discrepancy when they are understood as Ahaziah and his brothers before they were removed (21:17) . . . ”

This last paragraph cannot be correct because verse 10 of 2 Chronicles 23 indicates that Athaliah, when she saw Ahaziah (her son) was dead that *she arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah*. It says nothing here to indicate that all these were Athaliah's, or Ahaziah's children or grandchildren. They very well may have been children of Jehoram by his other wives. I am aware that II Chronicles 21:16-17 indicates that the Philistines and the Arabians *carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house and his sons also, and his wives; so that there was never a son left him, save Jehoahaz (Ahaziah) the youngest of his sons*. All this simply suggests that when a new king was to take the place of Jehoram, Ahaziah, the youngest by Athaliah, was the only one available at the time. The problem is: if Joash were Ahaziah's son and Athaliah's grandson, then Jezebel is an ancestor of Yahshua the Messiah. Another problem is: Jehu was commissioned by Yahweh to destroy the entire house of Ahab which included any of Jezebel's offspring. For anyone who knows the story, Jehu did indeed execute Ahaziah (Athaliah's son). Therefore, Joash could not have been

Ahaziah's son and Athaliah's grandson or Jehu would have executed Joash too. Joash, therefore, could not have been of the house of Ahab as Athaliah and Ahaziah were. Although Athaliah was not executed by Jehu, she was nevertheless executed by divine order.

*The Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle has an interesting comment along this same line of thought on page 403 concerning II Chronicles 22:10, and is worthy of quoting here:

“ 10 All the seed royal of the house of Judah. Nothing but the miraculous intervention of the divine providence could have saved the line of David at this time, and preserved the prophecy related to the Messiah. The whole truth of that prophecy, and the salvation of the world, appeared to be now suspended on the brittle thread of the life of an infant of a year old (see chap. xxiv. 1), to destroy whom was the interest of the reigning power! But God can save by few as well as by many.”

*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 972 gives an interesting comment of the account surrounding the invasion of Jehoram's Judah by the Philistines and Arabs. Also the comments here are not favorable to the scribe who wrote this portion of Scripture:

“ Chronicles reports an invasion of Judah during Jehoram's reign by Philistines and Arabs (2 Chr. 21:16-17). The whole section (vvs. 11-19) raises many questions regarding its historicity.

“ In all probability the Chronicler has based his account on certain historical data: (a) the sharp contrast between the characters of Jehoram and his father, Jehoshaphat — this manifested itself particularly in their differing attitudes toward the worship of Yahweh; (b) an attack on Judah by the Philistines and the Arabs; (c) the severe sickness of Jehoram which brought about his death. **The Chronicler has woven around these data his own viewpoint.** (emphasis mine)

“ As against II Kings 8:24, which declares that Joram (Jehoram) ‘ was buried with his fathers in the city of David ’, the Chronicler records that ‘ He departed with no one's regret. They buried him in the city of David, but not in the tombs of the kings ’ (II Chr. 21:20b). The Chronicler adds, further, that ‘ his people made no fire in his honor, like the fires made for his fathers ’ (vs. 19b). **The additions of the Chronicler here are of doubtful historical value. They give the impression of being assumptions.**” (emphasis mine)

As we can see from this last quotation, the translated Bible record may not be entirely correct. So, too, I believe the translated Bible record may not be entirely correct concerning the royal seedline of Judah, especially concerning Joash. I believe that

Ahaziah (son of Athaliah and Jehoram) was not the father of Joash as the translated Scriptures claim. After Jehoram had killed all of his six younger brothers at the behest of Athaliah his wife, he became the paternal father of the remaining royal seed that was left, which included children by his other wives (2 Chronicles 21:17). I contend that Jehoram and Athaliah were only paternal and maternal grandfather and grandmother to Joash. By Jehoram assassinating his other brothers, the father-headship of the family was left in his hands. After both Jehoram and Ahaziah were dead, Athaliah took it on herself to destroy the remaining Davidic royal seed and proclaimed herself queen of Judah. For more on the story of Jehoram, I will quote from *Insight On The Scriptures*, volume 1, page 1270:

“ **Jehoram** . . . The firstborn son of Jehoshaphat who, at the age of 32, became king of Judah. (2 Chr. 21:1-3, 5, 20) It appears that for a number of years Jehoram was in some way associated with his father in the kingship. (2 Kings 1:17; 8:16) The eight years of rulership credited to Jehoram count from 913 B.C. (2 Kings 8:17) So during these years both the northern and southern kingdoms had rulers with the same name. They were also brothers-in-law because Jehoram of Judah married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel and sister of Jehoram of Israel. — 2 Kings 8:18, 25, 26 . . .

“ At least partially because of the bad influence of his wife Athaliah, Jehoram did not pursue the righteous ways of his father Jehoshaphat. (2 Kings 8:18) Not only did Jehoram murder his six brothers and some of the princes of Judah but he also turned his subjects away from Yahweh to false gods. (2 Chr. 21:1-6, 11-14) His whole reign was marred by both internal trouble and external strife. First Edom rebelled; then Libnah revolted against Judah. (2 Kings 8:20-22) In a letter to Jehoram, the prophet Elijah warned: ‘ Look! Yahweh is dealing a great blow to your people and to your sons and to your wives and to all your goods.’ Moreover, you, King Jehoram, ‘ will be with many sicknesses, with a malady of your intestines, until your intestines have come out because of the sickness day by day.’ — 2 Chr. 21:12-15.

“ It all occurred just that way. Yahweh allowed Arabs and Philistines to overrun the land and take Jehoram’s wives and sons captive. God permitted only Jehoram’s youngest son, Jehoahaz (also called Ahaziah), to escape, a concession made, however, only for the sake of the Kingdom covenant made with David. ‘ After all this Yahweh plagued [Jehoram] in his intestines with a sickness for which there was no healing.’ . . . He was buried in the City of David, ‘ but not in the burial places of the kings.’ Ahaziah his son became king in his stead . . . ”

Another account of the story can be found in *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, volume 1, pages 84-85 under the subtitle “Ahaziah”. This is one of the better references I was able to find on this subject as it brings out the truth about the Canaanites and the forbidden marriages of Israelites with them:

“ The later Ahaziah, nephew of the earlier Ahaziah, was the eighth Davidic king reigning in Judah for less than a year in 842 B.C. He suffered chiefly from the baleful influence of that same wicked queen mother Jezebel, whose idolatries the older Ahaziah had imitated, and who was also the grandmother of the younger Ahaziah. For Jehoshaphat (king of Judah 873-849), good man that he was, made the disastrous mistake of espousing his son Jehoram (father of the younger Ahaziah) to Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. He is called Azariah (2 Chr. 22:6, though RSV gratuitously changed this to Ahaziah for reasons unknown) and Jehoahaz (2 Chr. 21:17, cf. 22:1) by simple transposition of the elements in his name. He lived to reign but one year (2 Chr. 22:2-5). His age at accession is given in 2 Kings 8:26 as twenty-two years while in 2 Chr. 22:2 as forty-two years. Second Chronicles 21:5 and 20 show that his father was only forty years old at Ahaziah's accession, so the lower figure is undoubtedly correct . . .

“ Providence allowed Ahaziah only one major military error, one purely personal error, and one spiritual error. The military error was to join his Uncle Jehoram, king of Samaria, in an expedition to conquer Ramoth-gilead in the Trans-Jordan (2 Kings 8:27, 28; 2 Chr. 22:6), a contested city between the house of Omri and the kings of Syria through several generations. Jehoram (Joram) was badly wounded in the evidently otherwise successful encounter and went to Jezreel (a city south of Lake Chinnereth safely within uncontested Israelite territory) to recover. In this connection Ahaziah made his great personal mistake: he traveled from Jerusalem to Jezreel to visit the ailing Jehoram. The story of the result of their visit as reported in 2 Chronicles 22:7-9 cannot be improved upon and may not wisely be abbreviated: ‘ But it was ordained by God that the downfall of Ahaziah should come about through his going to visit Joram (Jehoram). For when he came there he went out with Jehoram to meet Jehu the son of Nimshi, whom the LORD had anointed to destroy the house of Ahab. And when Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, he met the princes of Judah and the sons of Ahaziah's brothers, who attended Ahaziah, and he killed them. He searched for Ahaziah, and he was captured while hiding in Samaria and he was brought to Jehu and put to death.’ His spiritual mistake was to follow the pernicious religious customs of his ancestors through his mother Athaliah, daughter of Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre (viz. Jezebel, Ahab, Athaliah). ‘ His mother's name was Athaliah; she was a granddaughter of Omri king of Israel. He also walked in the way of the house of Ahab, and did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, as the house of Ahab had done . . . ’ (2 Kings 8:26, 27).

“ The pervasive depravity of mankind which renders evil more easily propagated than good **makes the intermarriage of a member of a godly family with an ungodly one almost invariably disastrous. Ahaziah was the miserable fruit of the error of Jehoshaphat, his otherwise righteous grandfather, in securing Athaliah the morally depraved daughter of a morally depraved daughter of the vile Ethbaal, king and priest of the soused-with-sexual-depravity religion**



**of ancient Canaan as bride for Ahaziah's father. There were strong reasons, indeed, for the Mosaic command to exterminate the Canaanites and the prohibition of intercourse with them on all levels."** (emphasis mine)

### WHO KILLED WHO?

You will notice the writer in the last paragraph above has no problem of identifying Jezebel and her relation as Canaanites (a people who had mixed their blood with the descendants of Cain). From four different passages of Scripture, we get two different stories of who killed Ahaziah's brethren and Athaliah's children. These passages are: II Kings 10:12-14; II Chronicles 22:8; II Kings 11:1 and II Chronicles 22:10;. Let's compare these passages now:

II Kings 10:12-14:

<sup>12</sup> And he (Jehu) arose and departed, and came to Samaria. And as he was at the shearing house in the way,

<sup>13</sup> Jehu met with the brethren of Ahaziah king of Judah, and said, Who are ye? And they answered, We are the brethren of Ahaziah; and we go down to salute the children of the king and the children of the queen.

<sup>14</sup> And he said, Take them alive, And they took them alive, and slew them at the pit of the shearing house, even two and forty men; neither left he any of them.

II Chronicles 22:8:

And it came to pass, that, when Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, and found the princes of Judah, and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah, that ministered to Ahaziah, he slew them.

II Kings 11:1:

And when Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah saw that her son was dead, she arose and destroyed all the seed royal.

II Chronicles 22:10:

But when Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah saw that her son was dead, she arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah.

It is obvious from these passages, Jehu did his killing before Athaliah did hers, so the question is: who killed whom, when and where? These killings do not include the killings which might have happened when the Arabs and Philistines invaded Judah during the time of Jehoram, “*And they came up into Judah, and brake into it, and carried away all the substance that was found in the king’s house, and his sons also, and his wives*” (2 Chr. 21:17). This also does not include the six killings of his brothers by Jehoram (2 Chr. 21:2, 4). A better question might be asked: who of the royal line, at this time, was left alive? I will now cite some more references, though not completely perfect in nature, to help bring this story into focus.

*Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 370 concerning II Kings 10:13:

“*The brethren of Ahaziah*. The relatives of his family; for it does not appear that he had any brethren, properly so called. But we know that the term brethren among the Jews (Judeans) signified the relatives of the same family, and especially brothers’ and sisters’ children; and that these were such . . .”

*Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 370 concerning II Kings 11:1:

“*Athaliah*. This woman was the daughter of Ahab, and granddaughter of Omri, and wife of Joram (Jehoram), king of Judah, and mother of Ahaziah. *Destroyed all the seed royal*. All that she could lay her hands on whom Jehu had left, in order that she might get undisturbed possession of the kingdom.”

*Believer’s Bible Commentary*, by William MacDonald, pages 457-458 concerning II Chronicles 22:10-12:

“Having lost her husband and now her son, **Athaliah** seized the throne for herself by killing her own grandchildren(?)! Satan was the unseen motivator behind this ruthless slaughter of the royal family, attempting to cut off the messianic line as he had tried to do earlier and would try to do again. **But since the promise of Genesis 3:15 guaranteed the Lord’s preserving the line through which the Lord Jesus would eventually come, Jehovah moved Jehoshabeath to hide her nephew Joash. He was hidden** in the temple, where Jehoshabeath’s husband, Jehoiada the priest, took care of him **for six years**.” (underline emphasis mine)

*Believer’s Bible Commentary*, by William MacDonald, page 402 concerning II Kings 10:12-14:

“**On the way to** the capital, **Samaria**, **Jehu met . . . forty-two** of Ahaziah’s relatives, ‘**Brothers**’ (v. 13) means cousins, nephews, etc., since Ahaziah’s brothers

had been slain (2 Chr. 21:17). These people had come from Judah to visit the royal family of Israel. Realizing that they had ties with the house of Ahab, Jehu ordered them to be killed **at the well of Beth Eked.**<sup>1</sup>”

*Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 277 concerning II Kings 10:12-14:

“ **We are the brethren of Ahaziah** — i.e., not full, but step-brothers, sons of Jehoram by various concubines. Ignorant of the revolution that had taken place, they were traveling to Samaria on a visit to their royal relatives of Israel, when they were seized and put to death, because of the apprehension that they might probably stimulate and strengthen the party that still remained faithful in their allegiance to Ahab’s dynasty.”

*Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 278 concerning II Kings 11:1:

“ JEHOASH (Joash) SAVED FROM ATHALIAH’ S MASSACRE.

” **Athaliah** . . . She had possessed great influence over her son, who, by her counsels, had ruled in the spirit of the house of Ahab. **destroyed all the seed royal** — all connected with the royal family who might have urged a claim to the throne, and who had escaped the murderous hands of Jehu (2 Chr. 21:2-4; 22:1; ch. 10:13, 14). This massacre she was incited to perpetrate — partly from a determination not to let David’s family outlive hers — partly as a measure of self-defense to secure herself against the violence of Jehu, who was bent on destroying the whole of Ahab’s posterity to which she belonged (ch. 8:18-26); but chiefly from personal ambition to rule, and a desire to establish the worship of Baal. Such was the sad fruit of the unequal alliance between the son of the pious Jehoshaphat and a daughter of the idolatrous and wicked house of Ahab. [I will include verse 2 here too.] Jehosheba — of **Jehoshabeath** (2 Chr. 22:11) **daughter of King Joram** (Jehoram) — **not by Athaliah, but by a secondary wife. stole him from among the king’s sons** which were slain — either from among the corpses, he being considered dead, or out of the palace nursery. **hid him . . . in the bedchamber** — for the use of the priests. which was in some part of the temple (vs. 3). and of which Jehoiada and his wife had the sole charge.” (underline emphasis mine)

*Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 325 concerning II Chronicles 22:10-12:

<sup>1</sup>2 Chr. 21:17 does indicate there were no brothers left but “ Jehoahaz the youngest ” (Ahaziah), but it doesn’t say anything about grandchildren of Jehoram.

“ATHALIAH, DESTROYING THE SEED ROYAL SAVE JOASH, USURPS THE KINGDOM.

” Athaliah ... **arose and destroyed all the seed royal** ... Maddened by the massacre of the royal family of Ahab, she resolved that the royal house of David should have the same fate. Knowing the commission which Jehu had received to extirpate the whole of Ahab’s posterity, she expected that he would extend his sword to her. Anticipating his movements, she resolved, as her only defense and security, to usurp the throne and destroy ‘ the seed royal ’, both because they were hostile to the Phoenician worship of Baal, which she was determined to uphold, and because, **if one of the young princes became king, his mother would supersede Athaliah in the dignity of queen mother.**” (emphasis mine)

**Maybe we better read this last sentence again!!!** In other words, if Joash were allowed to live, his real mother would have superseded Athaliah! This last writer understands that Athaliah was not Joash’s grandmother, nor was Ahaziah Joash’s real father! We can also know further that Ahaziah was not the father of Joash because Jehu killed all of Ahaziah’s relatives of an age to potentially take the throne. (II Kings 10:13-14). All that Athaliah was interested in, at this point, was killing all the royal seed of the house of David! It is unthinkable to imagine that Athaliah, Jezebel or Ethbaal were legal ancestors of our Messiah. Joash was of the royal line which Yahshua would later legally inherit through Joseph, and if either Ahaziah or Athaliah were his father or grandmother that would put Jezebel in the bloodline of the royal kingship of our Redeemer. How many *sons of Athaliah* (relatives) were left alive by this time is uncertain<sup>2</sup>

Now to give you some background on Ethbaal, I will quote from Josephus, “*Against Apion*” book 1, section 18, page 612:

“ Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hirom (Hiram) took the kingdom; he lived fifty-three years, and reigned thirty-four. He raised a bank on that called the Broad place, and dedicated that golden pillar which is in Jupiter’s temple; he also went and cut down timber from the mountain called Libanus, and got timber of cedar for the roofs of the temples. He also pulled down the old temples, and built new ones: besides this, he consecrated the temples of Hercules and Astarte. He first built Hercules’s temple, in the month Peritus, and that of Astarte when he made his expedition against the Tityans, who would not pay him their tribute; and when he had subdued them to himself, he returned home. Under this king there was a younger son of Abdemon, who mastered the problems which Solomon, king of

<sup>2</sup> Last three sentences amended 7-3-06, inasmuch as Christ’s line came through Nathan rather than Solomon. The important thing here to consider is that had Athaliah killed Joash, Christ could not of inherited the kingship. In short, Christ was born of the seed of David through Nathan, but received the inheritance of king through His stepfather, Joseph.

Jerusalem, had recommended to be solved. Now the time from this king to the building of Carthage, is thus calculated:— ‘ Upon the death of Hirom, Beleazarus his son took the kingdom; he lived forty-three years, and reigned seven years: after him succeeded his son Abdastartus, he lived twenty-nine years, and reigned nine years. Now four sons of his nurse plotted against him and slew him, the eldest of whom reigned twelve years: after them came Astartus the son of Delestartus: he lived fifty-four years, and reigned twelve years; after him came his brother Aserymus; he lived fifty-four years, and reigned nine years: he was slain by his brother Pheles, who took the kingdom and reigned but eight months, though he lived fifty years: **he was slain by Ithobalus** (another name for Ethbaal), the priest of As-tarte, who reigned thirty-two years, and lived sixty-eight years: he was succeeded by his son Badezorus, who lived forty-five years, and reigned six years; he was succeeded by Matgenus his son: he lived thirty-two years, and reigned nine years; Pygmalion succeeded him: he lived fifty-six years, and reigned forty-seven years. Now, in the seventh year of his reign, his sister fled away from him, and built the city of Carthage in Libya ’.” (emphasis mine)

## CAIN THE MURDERER

In the above paragraph we have recorded four generations of the descendants of Cain: (1) Ithobalus (Ethbaal), (2) Badezorus, (3) Matgenus and (4) Pygmalion. As I said before, Ethbaal was the father of Jezebel who was the mother of Athaliah who was the mother of Ahaziah, and like Cain, murder was their trademark. Recorded above is the record of how Ithobalus (Ethbaal) murdered Pheles in order to become King of Tyre followed by three of his sons. I am sure that I don’t have to go into detail of how Jezebel murdered many of the prophets of Yahweh, and with the foregoing evidence we can see very clearly that Athaliah was just like her satanic mother and grandfather. Not only this, but her son Ahaziah, followed right in his mother’s footsteps. This was nothing more than another failed attempt by the Cain satanic seedline people trying to work their way into the royal line of Judah, and therefore, if they had been successful, corrupting the line of the Messiah. (For further study reference to establish Athaliah’s relation to Jezebel and Ethbaal, check II Kings 3:1-2, 13 and Josephus, *Antiquities* 9:6:2.)

## THE HOUSE OF DAVID

As we have been discussing events which have affected the House of David, we should really take time to understand more about this subject. Because there was a special

promise made by Yahweh to David and his posterity, we need to consider what all was involved in it. For information concerning this, I am going to quote excerpts from *Study in Jeremiah*, by Howard B. Rand, pages 207-210:

“ **CERTAINTY OF THE COVENANT.** God not only confirms the perpetuity of the Kingdom by referring to the ordinances of heaven but also to the continuity of the Davidic throne in the same way. ‘ Thus saith the Lord; If you can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me ’.” ( Jer. 33:20-22.)

“ **ESTABLISHED IN PERPETUITY.** If there were no other reason than this declaration on which to base our faith in the continued existence of the Throne of David, with a man somewhere upon the earth today reigning on that Throne over some portion of the House of Israel, this declaration by God to Jeremiah would be sufficient evidence to sustain our belief. The man of God will accept this confirmation of God’s promise as a fact, knowing it to be true, and await the revelation of time which he knows will certainly substantiate his faith. The original covenant God made with David was: ‘ And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever ’.” (II Sam. 7:16.)

“ God has promised three unconditional things to David (1<sup>st</sup>) The Continuity of David’s House. (2<sup>nd</sup>) The Endurance of his Kingdom. (3<sup>rd</sup>) The Perpetuity of his Throne. God confirmed the certainty of this covenant which he made with David as set forth in the Psalm: ‘ I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations ... I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him ... My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. 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. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven ’.” (Ps. 89:3, 4, 20, 28-37) ...

“ The covenant is made with the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and with His servant David, and He looks forward to the day of their deliverance from

bondage: ‘ Thus saith the Lord; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.’ ( Jer. 33:25-26) Here we have a double witness to His promise that He will keep his covenant with David. The continuity of David’s House, Kingdom and Throne are assured and today there is a man of the line of David ruling over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in fulfillment of these promises. Only the blindness of unbelief on the part of the Christian world prevents many from seeing the truth and recognizing these great and wonderful facts which, when understood and believed, fully substantiate God’s Word.”

There are many who claim that Yahshua the Messiah took His Throne at His first advent, but this simply cannot be true, so there has to be someone of David’s line sitting somewhere upon a throne today if Yahweh’s promises are true. This treatise would not be complete if we did not include Revelation 2:20 which reads:

Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.

Undoubtedly this woman in Thyatira was not named Jezebel, but Yahshua using a play on words alludes to Jezebel, the wife of Ahab. It is apparent that our Redeemer was not very well pleased with this woman he dubbed by this name. It is also obvious that this woman had many of the bad qualities of the original Jezebel, and would suffer a similar fate. Jezebel is used simply as an adjective, to describe the woman. Therefore, it is absurd to believe or intimate in any way that Jezebel was a forebear of Yahshua our Redeemer!!!









## LETTER 21

---

### WHY THE NATION OF JUDAH WAS TO PASS OUT OF EXISTENCE FOREVER

We are not talking about the people of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and a branch of Levi which made up the larger part of the southern Kingdom of Judah, we are talking about the nation itself. Actually the people which constituted Judah were made up of both good figs and bad figs. The good figs of the Tribe of Judah were to be incorporated back into the main body of Israel. E. Raymond Capt puts his finger on the problem with Judah in his small booklet *Abrahamic Covenant*, pages 27-29 which I will quote here, but not necessarily in its exact order:

“There are many so-called Jews, today, that are not descended from Abraham, that claim to be God’s people ‘Israel’, because some of them are of Judah. However, being of Judah does not necessarily mean they are still His people, for some of Judah were cut off from the promises to Israel. In Jeremiah we find God showing the prophet how He separated the bad figs (mixed seed) from the good figs of Judah who were to be Christian people for only of them could God say ‘I will give them a heart; to know me that I am the Lord: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me with their whole heart’.” (Jer. 24:7) ...

“Josephus records that the portion of the nation of Judah carried into Babylon captivity by King Nebuchadnezzar was a million and a half (Neh. Chapter 7). Seventy years later, when Judah was allowed to return to their homeland, although still in subjection, only some forty-two thousand (Neh. 7:66) went back into Jerusalem, rebuilt the temple and set up the nation, later to be called the nation of the Jews. While in Babylon, many of the forty-two thousand intermarried with Babylonians, adopted the Babylonian financial, political and ecclesiastical systems.

“Josephus further reports that many non-Israelites joined themselves to the returning Judahites. Later, Christ identified these people, also called Jews, as not

of Galilee, (John 7:1-13) not of Abraham or of God, (John 8:39-47) and not His sheep (John 10:26-30). These Jews themselves testified to not being a part of Israel by their answer to Christ's words, 'the truth shall make you free', that they 'were never in bondage to any man' (John 8:33). All Bible students know every tribe of Israel was in bondage in Egypt (Deut. 5:6).

"It was this mixed remnant of Judah, upon returning from the Babylon captivity in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, that became known as the nation of the Jews; a name not applied to Judah prior to the Babylonian captivity. Included in this nation were the Edomites (known to the Greeks as Idumeans) who had occupied Jerusalem during the captivity period. King Herod the Great was an example of this as he was of Idumean (Edom) origin and thus not an Israelite. King Herod filled the ranks of the Sadducees with his own kind. This explains why the Sadducees did not believe in resurrection and said there was no angel, nor Spirit (Acts 23:8).

"By the time of Christ, continued mixing with Amorites, Philistines, Canaanites, Babylonians and Hittites resulted in a racially mixed nation. From the Hittite infusion came the so-called 'Jewish nose' (Hammonds World Atlas 1954 — page 266) ...

**"It is evident that among these mixed people in Israel (Judah) at the time of Christ were literal descendants of Cain,** for Christ said of these 'Jews': **'Ye are of your father the devil,** and the lusts of your father ye will do. **He was a murderer from the beginning,** and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God' (John 8:44-47). (emphasis mine).

"But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My father which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my father's hand. I and my Father are one' (John 10:26-30) ...

"Christ clearly shows the separation of the people of Palestine into two classes in His answer to the question as to why He spoke in parables, "Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven but to them it is not given" (Matt. 13:11).

"The parable of the tares (Matt. 13:24-30) again points up two classes of people, and Christ's explanation (Matt. 13:37-43) identifies one class (the good seed) as the children of God, and the other class (the tares) as the children of the wicked one (devil) '."

Thank you, Mr. E. Raymond Capt!

For more information on this subject and period of time, you will need my Watchman's Teaching Letters #8, #9, #10 and #11. Jeremiah the prophet made a prophecy (Jeremiah chapters 18 & 19) that this bad branch of Judah would in time cease to exist forever. Yet, many today arrogantly want to dispute this foretold Scripture. For a narration on this passage, I will quote from *Destiny Magazine* (Yearbook), July, 1946, pages 244-246:

“ **The Clay Vessel.** God next instructed Jeremiah to go down to a potter's house. The prophet obeyed the command and there he found the potter working upon a vessel on the wheels.

“ The shaping of vessels on the wheels dates back to very early history. In their original form the wheels were stone disks arranged to be turned by hand on a vertical axis. The wheels used in Palestine and Syria today probably differ in no respect from those used in Jeremiah's time. The wheel or, to be more exact, the wheels, are fitted on a square wooden or iron shaft about three feet long. The lower disk is about 20 inches in diameter, and the upper one 8 to 12 inches in diameter. The lower end of the shaft is pointed and fits into a stone socket or bearing in which it rotates. A second bearing just below the upper disk is so arranged that the shaft inclines slightly away from the potter. The potter leans against a slanting seat, bracing himself with one foot so that he will not slide off, and with the sole of his other foot he kicks the upper face of the lower wheel, thus making the whole machine rotate. The lower wheel is often of stone to give greater momentum. With a marvelous dexterity, which a novice tries in vain to imitate, he gives the pieces of clay on the upper wheel any shape he desires. Jeremiah watched the potter at work moulding the clay upon the wheel and the vessel he was making was spoiled in his hands so he remoulded it until he was satisfied.

“ **The Divine Potter.** The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah saying: ‘ O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hands, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.’ ( Jer. 18:6) Now the House of Israel [along with those of Judah captured by Sennacherib] was in exile and away from Palestine as a result of the Assyrian invasions and captivity. They had been living in the land of their captors for over a hundred years at the time Jeremiah was speaking.

“ **The Broken Bottle.** In contrast with the illustration of the House of Israel the condition of the House of Judah [that part of Judah which Sennacherib was unable to capture, being the city of Jerusalem itself] was depicted in the command of Jeremiah to get a potter's earthen bottle (fired pottery) with which he was to demonstrate the judgment upon [the remaining portion of] Judah. Jeremiah was told to take with him some of the leaders among the people and the priests and

to the valley opposite the pottery-gate where he was to proclaim a message of judgment upon them for their evil ways. He was then to break the bottle in the sight of those who went with him and say to them: ‘ Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Even so will I break this people **and this city**, as one breaketh a potter’s vessel, that cannot be made whole again.’ ( Jer. 19:11.)

“ The captivity of [this portion of] Judah was imminent for, together with Benjamin, a tribe of Israel, they were about to be carried away into Babylonian captivity. We know the fate of [this portion of] the House of Judah **for nationally they were broken and after 70 A.D., ceased to be a nation any more . . .**

“ Judah, **the nation**, likened to a fired bottle, was broken in pieces and could never again be restored to nationhood. Though the Zionists are today endeavoring to set up a Jewish state in Palestine, an abortive attempt to restore the Kingdom of Judah, their efforts are doomed to ultimate failure. There is not one shred of scriptural justification whatever for their sponsored program for an independent state in the endeavor to make Judah a nation among the family of nations once more . . . This is confirmed in the fig tree emblem (symbolical of the Jews) which Jesus cursed for being unfruitful with the consequence that it withered and died. When the Kingdom was taken from the Jews for their unfruitfulness and given to a nation which would bring forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21:43) the end of the Jewish nation was at hand. They withered and died to nationhood when the Roman armies destroyed the city and Temple in 70 A.D.”

It should also be mentioned that the Tribe of Benjamin left the area of Palestine and headed into Europe just before Titus besieged Jerusalem in 70 A.D. (the “ light ” was totally removed never to return). That the meaning of the breaking of the bottle was the final destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D. is confirmed by the Adam Clarke’s *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 628, concerning Jeremiah 19:11 (this is a view from about 1830 A.D.):

“ 11. *Even so will I break this people and this city.* The breaking of the bottle was the symbolical representation of the destruction of the city and of the state. *That cannot be made whole again.* This seems to refer rather to the final destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, than to what was done by the Chaldeans. Jerusalem was healed after seventy years: but nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed since Jerusalem was taken and destroyed by the Romans; **and it was then so broken that it could not be made whole again.**”

We should include the comment of verse 9 of this chapter from this same commentary:

“ 9. *I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons.* This was literally fulfilled when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans.”

For more comment on the broken bottle nation, I will quote from *Destiny Magazine* (Yearbook), an article entitled “The Potter’s Vessels”, March, 1952, page 92:

“ This breaking of [the remaining part of] Judah’s Kingdom was wrought by Babylonian power; **the city of Jerusalem** was laid low and the people were deported to Babylon. After a period of seventy years, a small remnant of the broken bottle returned to the Holy Land and became known as the Jews. They never re-established the Kingdom of Judah and the Throne of David, but remained a subservient people under various powers, including Persia, Egypt, Syria and Rome. During the more than four hundred years from Nehemiah to New Testament times, ‘ no inspired writer, historian or prophet appeared, and it is called the ‘ Period of Silence’.” (*New Analytical Bible*, p 1097).

“ Then the time came for the Advent of Israel’s Redeemer and King, Jesus the Christ. The Jews refused Him as their Savior; they refused Him as their King. They said, ‘ We will not have this man to reign over us.’ With characteristic callousness and arrogance the mob cried: ‘ Crucify him! His blood be on us and on our children!’ Defiantly they shut themselves out of the Kingdom by crucifying the King. The die was cast. Henceforth the Kingdom of God would be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth fruits thereof, as Jesus had said (Matt. 21:43). The last fragment of Judah’s bottle was broken, never to be made whole again . . .

“ Theologians generally have taught that the Throne of David was broken and came to an end along with the Kingdom of Judah; however, that is not the teaching of the parable. Note the reading, ‘ I will break this people and this city.’ Although the words were addressed to the ‘ kings of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem,’ the sentence is against the people and the city — but not against the throne. After Zedekiah’s death, the Throne of David was transferred from Palestine to Israel in the Isles, where it stands securely to this day. If Jeremiah had declared the downfall of David’s throne and royal line in chapter 19, he would have contradicted himself in chapter 33, verses 17-26, in which he calls upon the ordinances of heaven and earth to bear witness that God’s covenant with David could never be broken, and that every generation would find the Davidic throne occupied by a descendant of King David. Therefore it is most interesting and significant to find that the British royal family stems from the House and lineage of David.”

## JEREMIAH’S COMMISSION

The next thing we really need to know is what all Yahweh commissioned Jeremiah to do. Jeremiah’s commission is recorded in Jeremiah 1:10:

See, I have this day set thee 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.

This commission breaks down into six phases thusly: (1) to root out, (2) to pull down, (3) to destroy, (4) to throw down, (5) to build and (6) to plant. You may search all the Bible commentaries, dictionaries, atlases or encyclopedias on this verse and find next to nothing worth repeating. Its almost as if the verse didn't exist, and this commission is probably one of the greatest ever authorized by Yahweh. All the great minds of nominal theology are stymied for an explanation. What few utterances these sources do have to offer are preposterous generalizations which have little, if any, application. It is only in British-Israel that a satisfactory answer can be found especially on the "building and planting." All others are helplessly mute on the subject. On this among a very few other key verses, the entire Bible stands or falls. If the "building" and "planting" cannot be explained, Israel Identity is a myth as well as all Holy Writ. Without this verse, we might as well quit and join the world order.

To bring you the details surrounding this verse commissioning Jeremiah, I will quote *Destiny Magazine* (Yearbook), May, 1947, the last of a series called "Study In Jeremiah" entitled "Building and Planting", by Howard Rand, pages 163-165:

" We now come to the most important part of Jeremiah's mission. It concerns the task God assigned to him to build and to plant. The first part of his mission was carried out in Palestine and finally in Egypt. He was hated by his countrymen because he told them the truth, denouncing their sins and calling upon them to restore righteousness in the nation.

" The holy Scriptures are silent concerning Jeremiah's whereabouts after describing his journey to and sojourn in Egypt. But we do know that the Bible records only the fulfillment of the first part of the prophet's mission: ' See, I have this day set thee 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.' ( Jer. 1:10.)

" Jeremiah accomplished in its entirety the destructive phase of his commission and we have every reason to believe God would see to it that he was prepared to accomplish the building and planting for which he was also commissioned. The daughters of Zedekiah became the prophet's wards and because God had promised that his covenant would not be broken with David, that he would never lack a son to reign upon his Throne, the building and planting obviously had to do with preserving this royal branch of the House of David.

" **Daughters of Zelophehad.** When Nebuchadnezzar killed the sons of Zedekiah, allowing his daughters to go free, he did not know of the Israel law. Under a decision rendered by the Lord in the matter of the daughters of Zelophehad, a

judgment was incorporated into the Israel Law of Inheritance to provide for the daughters so that they might inherit as though they were males when there were no sons. The case of Zelophehad's daughters was presented to Moses when they appeared before him and demanded an inheritance in the land, for their father died leaving no sons: ' And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, The daughters of Zelophehad speak right: thou shalt surely give them a possession of an inheritance among their father's brethren; and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them ' (Num. 27:6-7.)

" The Judgment was laid down: ' And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a man die, and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter. And if he have no daughter, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his brethren. And if he have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his father's brethren. And if his father have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his kinsman that is next to him of his family, and he shall possess it: and it shall be unto the children of Israel a statute of judgment, as the Lord commanded Moses.' (Num. 27:8-11.)

" **Daughter of Zedekiah.** Zedekiah's sons were killed so there were no male heirs to the throne. Under the above law a daughter would inherit as though she were a son and the right of descent would pass to her. This fact was evidently unknown to Nebuchadnezzar who thought that in slaying Zedekiah's sons he had destroyed every heir to the Throne of David. It became Jeremiah's responsibility to see to it that the Throne of David was established in the appointed place.

" **Escaping Remnant.** While Jeremiah prophesied that those who had gone down into Egypt would be destroyed by the sword and famine, he also said, ' For none shall return *but such as shall escape* ' (Jer. 44:14), indicating that a remnant would leave. The prophet also declared that the Lord would not prevent evil from befalling those who had gone down into the land of the Pharaohs against His command but he qualified this statement by referring again to a small number who would escape (Jer. 44:28).

" At an earlier date, during the time the prophet was experiencing troubles and turmoil in the violent opposition he was meeting from his countrymen, he exclaimed: ' Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth! I have neither lent on usury, nor men have lent to me on usury; yet every one of them doth curse me.' ( Jer. 15:10.)

" The Lord then said to Jeremiah: ' Verily it shall be well with thy remnant; verily I will cause the enemy to entreat thee well in the time of evil and in the time of affliction '." ( Jer. 15:11.)

" **Unknown Land.** This statement is followed by the promise that Jeremiah would pass into a land which he did not know. Where was this unknown land to which

he was to go? Before answering this question let us review the statements of other prophets. Isaiah tells us of a remnant that was to go forth from Jerusalem and escape from Zion, of whom he says: ‘And the remnant that is escaped, of the house of Judah, shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward.’ (Isa. 37:31.)

“These promises are entirely overlooked by those who seek to end Jeremiah’s career in Egypt. It is well known that Jeremiah was fully alive to the importance of securing every evidence which might be of value in carrying out his work. He could not begin the building and planting until after the fall of Jerusalem and the dethronement of Zedekiah. This part of the mission must be completed somewhere, evidently somewhere other than in Palestine or Egypt. He could no more fail to accomplish this, or avoid its deliberate undertaking, if he was (Yahweh’s) agent, than he could prevent the preceding and predicted destruction of Jerusalem and Egypt to which he bore testimony.

“Long before the days of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, Nathan told David of this place of planting (II Sam. 7:10). We have already referred to Jeremiah’s purchase of the title deeds of Anathoth, concealing them prior to his departure from the land. To date this hidden evidence of Jeremiah’s right to Palestine has never been produced, for they were to continue in concealment for many days (Jer. 32:14-15), a period which evidently has not yet run out.

“**Tea Tephi.** Jeremiah had every means at his command to fulfill his mission, for he was as greatly honored and respected by the King of Babylon as he was persecuted by his countryman, who looked upon him as a traitor. After the capture of the city by the armies of Babylon, Jeremiah could go where he liked and do as he liked, and Bible history traces him to Egypt with the King’s daughters where he vanished from Biblical records.

“The signs of Jeremiah in Egypt are his own writings and the testimony of the Jews, all of which was corroborated by E. Flanders Petrie. Jeremiah disappeared with an escaped remnant from Jewish sight out of Egypt. That he doubtless visited Palestine to complete his work in gathering certain relics to be taken by him to the far country is clear from the record of the things he had with him when he arrived in that far country. Following the disappearance of Jeremiah from Egypt, there appears in western history a man with a group of people who answers in every respect to the description of Jeremiah and the remnant — who had with them certain valuable possessions. The evidence of all this from Irish history would fill a volume.

“To enumerate a few recorded facts, we have Tea Tephi (whose name means ‘tender twig’), a Princess from the East, coming to Ireland at this time. She was known as the King’s daughter, and her guardian was the prophet, Ollam Folla.



With them was the Urim and Thummin breast plate, or the Jordan Moran, and the Stone of Destiny, or Lia Fail, which accompanied them to this Isle in the sea. The Harp of David hung in Tara's Halls and the evidence also bears out the claim that the Ark of the Covenant accompanied this remnant to the Isles.

“The *Irish Chronicles* record the fact of the coming of an Eastern Princess. In these chronicles appears an interesting poem purporting to set forth the facts told by the Princess: ‘We were five that rode upon asses, And five by the mules they led — Whereupon were the things brought forth — From the house of God when we fled; The Stone of Jacob our father — The seat wherein Yahveh dwells — Upon Sacred things whereof the Book of the Prophet tells — And the signs of my father David, On whom was the promise stayed — Bright as the crown of the dawn, Deep as the midnight shade, \* \* \* Upon me was that promise fallen. For me was the Prophet's toil. He had signed me with David's signet, Anointed my head with oil. He had set my hands to the Harp; He had bidden me hold the spear [scepter]; The buckler was girt to my bosom, And Barach and he drew near — To set my feet upon Bethel, The stone that is seen this day. That my seed may rest upon it — Where'er it is borne away: And its promises be sure beneath them, Strong to uphold their throne; Though the builders cast it aside, It shall never be left alone.’

“**Pharez and Zarah.** Let us pause here to briefly outline the history of the Zarah branch of Judah's posterity. Judah had two sons by Tamar, named Pharez and Zarah. When Jacob and his family went down into Egypt Zarah, as yet, had no children. Pharez was accompanied by two sons, Hezron and Hamul. Two sons, Ethan and Zimri, were born to Zarah in Egypt. Ethan profited by the opportunities he received in the land and so did his son Mahol, who also enjoyed the same advantages. Their success won them much fame so that they are named in connection with Solomon whose wisdom did exceed theirs: ‘And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt, For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol: and his fame was in all nations round about.’ (I Kings 4:30-31.)

“**Zarah's Ambitions.** It seems certain that the family of Zarah aspired to the sceptral honors of Judah but failed to attain their ambitions, and Zarah's entire household seems to have moved out of Goshen. The three sons of Mahol evidently were schooled in all the wisdom of Egypt as was Moses.

“**Professor C. A. L. Totten states:** ‘Where the Sacred Canon (purposely, as we believe) allows the record of Zarah's line to lapse, there they are blindly taken up and continued by no less than three, perhaps more, independent and widely separated secular colleges of history.

“‘For if Darda, the Egyptian, son of Zarah, was Dardanus, the Egyptian founder of Troy, and if Chalcol was the Egyptian Cecrops or Niul and the contemporary

founder of Athens and Thebes, and if Heman, the brother of Niul, was likewise contemporary Egyptian Agenon who inherited Phoenicia, and Mahol, the son of Zarah and the father of these famous Egyptians, was Scythia, or Fenesia Farsa, the Egyptian ancestor of the Milesians, whose records, full and complete, enable us to blend the whole into one continuous recital down to the present day, surely we have means at hand in Trojan, Grecian and Milesian sources to continue out the record of the Sacred Chronicles, and lend them greater reverence as we come to understand and prize them at their worth!

“ And it is just this claim that we now advance, for by rescuing this fragmentary reference to Zarah’s line, found in I Kings (4:30-31), from the ignorance and misconception with which all former generations seem to have treated it, and by reading in it a clear and intentional reference to the famous Heroes of Secular History, to the founders of Phoenicia, Grecia, Troy, and the Milesians, and indirectly to Rome, the child of Troy, to Carthage and to the Brigantes of Hispania. we place in the hands of our race, and before their opened eyes the peer of the Rosetta Stone itself. ’ (*The Secret of History*, pages 164-166.)

“ **Jeremiah in Ireland.** There are two distinct phases to the Hebrew story concerning Ireland. One deals with the Milesian records, the history of which line originated in Egypt and Palestine, while the other line concerns Jeremiah and the King’s daughters, one of whom married Eochaidh, the Heremonn of the line of Zarah, upon her arrival with the Prophet in Ireland.

“ All the authorities agree in stating the following facts that at this time ( circa 583 B.C.) a ‘ notable man ’, an ‘ important personage ’, a patriarch, a saint, an essentially important one, according to the various ways of putting it, came to Ulster, the most northern province of Ireland, accompanied by a princess, the daughter of an eastern king; and that in company with them was Simon Brach, Breck, Barech, Berach, as it is differently spelled; and that this royal party brought with them many remarkable things. Among these were the harp, the ark and a wonderful stone called Lia Fail, or stone of destiny.

“ **The Coronation Ceremony.** Just at this time as Jeremiah, with the King’s daughter, his ward, arrived in Ireland, a ceremony was taking place. Under the laws of Ireland, and according to the ritual of Druidism, Eochaidh, the Heremonn, a Prince of the Tuatha de Danaans on his mother’s side and a direct descendant also of Fenesia Farsa, and thus of the line of Zarah, twin brother of Pharez of the Royal House of Judah, was about to receive national recognition as the ‘ crown Horseman ’ of the four principalities of Ireland.

“ God had removed the crown from the head of Zedekiah of the line of Pharez and placed it upon the head of a Prince of the line of Zarah who at this time was united in marriage with the daughter of Zedekiah, heir to David’s Throne. Here, then,

**the prophet began the building and planting for which he had been divinely commissioned.**

“ **School of the Prophets.** The Eastern Princess married Eochaidh, the Heremonn, upon a condition made by this notable patriarch that the Heremonn should abandon his former religion and build a college for the prophets. This he did, and the name of the school was Mur-Ollam, which is the name in both Hebrew and Irish for the school of the prophets.

“ **Year of Jeremiah’s Arrival.** Mr. Thomas W. Plant in his article *The Date of Jeremiah’s Arrival in Ireland*, DESTINY for March, 1938, refers to his visit at Glastonbury, in the summer of 1935 when the subject of Jeremiah’s arrival in Ireland came up for discussion. He was asked by Mr. George Dansie of Bristol if he was interested in the decipherment of hieroglyphics. He was then shown a jumble of lines, circles, dots and spirals. Later, in a letter to Mr. Plant, Mr. Dansie wrote:

““ These are the particulars that I gave you, when at Glastonbury, of the carved stone in the tomb of Ollam Fodhla, which is in Schiabhna-Cailliche, near Old Castle, Co. Meath, Ireland. It shows a Lunar Eclipse, in the constellation of Taurus, also a conjunction of the planets Saturn and Jupiter in Virgo. The prow of a ship is shown in the center, with five lines indicating the number of passengers it carried. On the left a part of the ship, which might be the stern, is shown and only four passengers, one having been left behind or lost as indicated by the line falling away from the ship. The wavy lines indicate the passage of the ship across the ocean, terminating at a central point on an island.

““ Ollam Fodhla having been identified as Jeremiah, this stone would be a record of his journey from Egypt to Ireland, having in his care the two daughters of Zedekiah, and his scribe or secretary, Baruch, and probably an attendant for the two Princesses. [The fifth passenger might have been Ebed-melech, the Ethiopian.] One of the Princesses appears to have been left at a country en route.

““ The date of arrival according to the necessary stellar calculations made by an expert, V. E. Robson (a friend of Mr. Dansie), being *Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> October, 583 B.C.* At this date there was an eclipse of the moon in the constellation of Taurus, and a conjunction to within 10 degrees of Saturn and Jupiter in Virgo. The bird at the top may be a representation of Ezekiel’s eagle which carried the tender twig to a mountain in Israel.

““ I believe the date of departure from Egypt was stated by Rev. W. M. H. Milner in an article or book, I cannot remember which, to be 584 B.C. At any rate, Mr. W. Campbell, writing in 1914, states that Jeremiah arrived in Ireland 230 years before the death of King Cimboath, which was in 353 B.C., and that, added to 230 years, gives us 583 B.C’. (See *Northern British-Israel Review*, Vol. 4, p 171.)

“ **Eochaidh, the Heremonn.** Eochaidh, the Heremonn, changed the name of the capital city, Lothair, (sometimes spelled Cothair Croffin) to that of Tara. It is a well known fact that the Royal Arms of Israel is the harp of David. Further, the crown which was worn by the sovereigns of that hitherto unaccounted for kingdom of Ireland had twelve points. Who shall say that ‘ the King’s daughter ’ was not planted there and that the first of the three of Ezekiel’s overturns was not accomplished in the removal of the Royal line of David from Palestine to Ireland?

“ **Stone of Destiny.** Because their King had passed on before them to the unknown country into which Israel was later to be regathered, Hosea declares of them: ‘ For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a King, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim.’ ( Hos. 3:4.)

“ The marginal rendering of ‘ without an image ’ is ‘ without a standing pillar ’ while *Young’s Analytical Concordance* gives other definitions, i.e., ‘ memorial stone, and pillar ’. Scholarly men who have investigated this passage in connection with its context give a correct rendering as ‘ pillar rock and pillar stone. ’ Jeremiah journeyed from Egypt with this stone in his possession, and the other sacred emblems, and first landed in Spain from whence he sailed to Ireland according to the records. Beginning with Eochaidh, the Heremonn, and his young bride, Tea Tephi, who were crowned on this stone in Ireland, their descendants in succession were crowned on this stone of destiny. The ancient kings of both the Danaan and Milesian races (being the same people) were for many ages crowned at Tara. This stone was sent to Scotland about 350 B.C. for the coronation of Fergus, King of Scots, who was a descendant of the Milesian Kings of Ireland. For many centuries this stone was used by the Scottish Kings in their coronation and was kept in the Abbey of Scone. This removal of the stone from Ireland to Scotland was its second overturn (Ezekiel 21:27).

“ In 1297 A.D., when King Edward I invaded Scotland, the stone was taken to England and was placed in Westminster Abbey where it has remained to this day. This removal from Scotland to England was the third and final overturn! Following this final overturn the promise is made that it will remain in its present resting place until He comes whose right it is.<sup>1</sup>”

As you can see, the nation of Judah in Palestine (not the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and part of Levi) but the so-called nation of the bad fig, Cain-Satanic-Edomite-Canaanite “ Jews ” was shattered forever, never again to be reestablished as a Royal House. This “ broken bottle” nation of the “Jews” is now **history, it is in the past!!!**



<sup>1</sup>It has recently been returned to Edinburgh Castle in Scotland.