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FOREWORD

BRIGADIER-GENERAL W. H. FASKEN, C.B., is to be congratulated on the book here presented to the reading public. The theme is one of great and increasing interest to a very large circle of readers because the subject of the theme—Israel—has played and still plays such a vital part in world affairs.

In his Preface, General Fasken shews that his aim is to co-ordinate the study of Ethnology, History and the Bible. The scientist approaches the study of ethnology with a scientific aim in view; he keeps his mind clear from preconceptions in order to be able to accept facts at their intrinsic value and their implications, no matter what they are.

The general reader, however, is first interested in the subject—Israel—and then seeks to find its place in the science of ethnology. It is to help this class of student that General Fasken has written.

First, he has undertaken to shew the place of Israel in the ethnological groupings of the human family at various stages of world history.

Next, he has undertaken to shew the relationship of Israel to Bible prophecy at every stage of world history.

Further, he has undertaken to shew that the ethnological group—Israel—has worked out in history the fulfilment of its predicted course as foretold in prophecy.

This is a clear, logical and important plan of procedure, and the author has achieved a goodly measure of success. Pursuant to this object, General Fasken has given extracts from outstanding auth-
orities; and what is better still, he has furnished an excellent bibliography so that his own words are an introduction to a very wide circle of literature bearing on the subjects dealt with.

In Part II, our Author emerges from the consideration of the general ethnological plan to the clear-cut consideration of the object of the theme, viz.: Israel. He shews Israel in Greece, Israel in Asia Minor and Central Asia; Israel in Spain and Ireland; Israel in Europe generally, thus giving a view of their geographical distribution.

He further deals with the names Israel bore, such as Sacae, Scythians, Getae, Goths, and so on; and ends in Chapter XIII with the arrival of Israel in Britain.

In the Appendices a very useful chronology is furnished. Altogether this book is a valuable study, introducing the general reader to a side line of British-Israel Truth, which, while of secondary, is none the less of vital, importance.

W. PASCOE GORDON.

PREFACE

This book is put forward as an attempted co-ordination of ethnology, history, and the Bible, in a study of Israel's racial origin and migrations.

It is hoped that this compilation—for it is nothing more—may be of use to those who wish to get a general idea as to the racial character of Abraham's family, and as to how—according to our ideas—Israel came to Britain. It may serve as an outline for guidance in future research.

The idea that Israel is not a Semitic race is forced on us by ethnologists themselves, who say that there is no such race, and, when one examines the question from their point of view, one is forced to the conclusion that there is very good ground for believing that Israel was, and is, a Nordic (long-headed) race. It is possible that Mediterranean (also long-headed) elements crept in by marriage with Phoenicians and Canaanites. The amount of round-headedness acquired in the passage across the Continent may be considered negligible, but it has been increased lately—possibly through latter-day immigration.

I wish to express my acknowledgments to the various authors from whom I have imbibed, consciously and subconsciously, a good deal of what I have tried to express about "the migrations."

I also wish specially to thank Mr. Gair, of the department of Anthropology and Allied Sciences, and Director of the Natural Science Museum, Free Church College, Edinburgh, for permission to make use of his papers bearing on the subject, the titles of which are included under "acknowledg-
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ments”; also for his advice, the loan of many books, and for checking over what I have written on ethnology.

W. H. FASKEN.

Hyde Grange,
Chalford, Gloucestershire.

July 1934.

PART I

ISRAEL'S RACIAL ORIGIN
CHAPTER I

SOME ELEMENTARY ETHNOLOGY

The word 'Race'\(^1\) is used as meaning a collection of like individuals, of the same blood, sprung from the same stock, which in turn produces\(^3\) its own like. Ethnology—the science of race\(^3\)—has nothing to do with the artificial distinctions of the languages and customs of various nations, comprised within a given race, which are matters dealt with by history. It does show the fixedness of bodily characteristics. External conditions,\(^4\) such as climate, drought, etc.—especially in prehistoric times—as well as heredity, undoubtedly produced race, but there is a reaction from the opinion of the historians and biologists of the last century as to the importance of present-day surroundings and education, which it is now acknowledged have only temporary influence, while heredity has deep abiding effect.

RACE AND LANGUAGE

At the same time, we are warned\(^5\) that the idea of the word 'Race' has been strained inordinately by those who ought to know better. Thus there is no Aryan race. There used\(^6\) to be a race so designated, but the term has become absorbed in the word 'Nordic.' Philology (the science of language) used formerly to give the name 'Aryan' to the Indo-European languages, but it is now generally restricted to the Indo-Persian branch of the latter. Similarly, there is no Celtic race now,\(^7\) though there used to be one, so-called, which formed the vanguard of the Nordic race, and is found absorbed in that race now, and not elsewhere.

"The fact that the original Celts left their speech

\(^1\) "Race and History," Pittard, p. 3.
\(^2\) "Racial Elements of European History," Gunther, p. 3.
\(^3\) "The Passing of the Great Race," Madison Grant, Introduction. 3rd edit.
\(^4\) Ibid., Osborne's Preface. 3rd edit.
\(^5\) "Race and History," Pittard, Foreword.
\(^6\) "Racial Elements of European History," Gunther, p. 257, Footnote.
\(^7\) "The Passing of the Great Race," Madison Grant, p. 62.
on the tongues of Mediterraneans in Wales, and of Alpines in Brittany, must not mislead us, as it indicates nothing more than that Celtic speech antedates the Anglo-Saxons in England and the Romans in France. We must discard the name 'Celt' for any existing race, and speak only of 'Celtic' language and culture."

Again, there is no French race, but a French nation; no Latin race, but a Latin civilization; no Germanic race, but a German nation; no Slavonic race, but Slav-speaking people. For a rational classification of races their bodily characteristics only must be taken into consideration. No link exists between a language and the race of those who speak it, or who have spoken it. For instance, the words 'Pan-Germanism' and 'Pan-Slavism' may be the expression of political desires; they are not the realities of racial facts.

"German-speaking people belong to many races. There is as much difference between a Pomeranian of the Baltic coast of Prussia (a long-headed Nordic) and a Bavarian of S. Germany (a round-headed Alpine) as there is between a horse and a zebra."

"The racial composition of England is worthy of special mention, for the common opinion exists about the English people that it owes its capacity to much racial mixture... Whatever peoples, whatever individual Viking bands, may have trodden English ground—Kelts, Angles, Jutes, Danes, Norwegian and Icelandic Vikings, Normans—they were always predominantly Nordic peoples... English history is rich in movements of peoples: in movements of races it has little to show."

This is the opinion of a well-known German ethnologist and anthropologist.

Racial Characteristics

The best method of determining race has been found to lie in a comparison of the proportion of the breadth of the skull to its length. This was worked out by the Swede, Retzius, in 1845, and is now universally accepted. It consists in determining the proportion—looking down at the head from above—that the maximum width of the skull (taken at the widest part above the ears) bears to its greatest length. These proportions, in general, vary between 72 and 88. In simple terms, skulls of 75 and under are long-heads, skulls between 75 and 80 are medium-heads, and skulls of 80 and over are round-heads. This 'cephalic index,' as it is called, is the most prominent racial feature, and the least affected by other influences. Being hereditary, it is only modified by heredity, that is by the crossing of races. Normally a long skull is associated with a long face, and a round skull with a (short) round face. In addition to the cephalic index there are other distinctive characteristics of race, viz. the colour of the skin, the colour and character of the hair, the colour of the eyes, height, shape and measurement of the nose, the proportion of its width to its length, and the amount of projection of the jaw and teeth.

The use of the test of the cephalic index divides the races of the world into three main divisions:

1. **Nordic.**—Long-headed, tall, fair-skinned, blond or brown hair, light-coloured eyes.
2. **Mediterranean, or Iberian.**—Long-headed, but the absolute size of skull less than the Nordics, less tall than the Nordics, weak bodily frame, eyes and hair dark, or black, skin more or less swarthy.
3. **Alpine.**—Round-headed, medium height, sturdy build, hair and eyes originally very dark, but many light-coloured eyes are now common in Western Europe.

In addition there is a subdivision of the Alpine which is generally accepted:—

1. **Dinaric,** or Adriatic—tall, round-headed.

Madison Grant thinks that they may represent an ancient cross between Nordics and Alpines. They resemble the Round-Barrow race, which...
entered Britain at the beginning of the Bronze Age (beaker makers). A characteristic feature is a steep cut-away to the back of the head.

It is most unfortunate that professional ethnologists themselves add to the confusion of racial designations. Although they themselves declare that there is no such thing as a Celtic race, but only Celtic-speaking people, yet they constantly speak of ‘Celts,’18 when they mean what is termed, in British designation, ‘Alpines.’ They also use the words Germanic (Pittard), Teutonic (Ripley), Kyrric (Broca), in a racial sense when they mean Nordic.

There is a German nation, but Germans are not a unit race, in that nation, as two-thirds19 of the German nation are Alpines, and only a bare one-third are Nordic, in spite of the wish of the late German Emperor and of Herr Hitler to consider themselves the head of a homogeneous Nordic (Aryan) Race. Again, to speak of ‘Celtic fire’ in our land is bunkum, unless it is understood that, for practical purposes, there is not a Celt in the land, though we have got Celtic-speaking people in Wales, Ireland, and the highlands of Scotland who have acquired that language by contact with other Celtic-speaking people in their passage across the Continent (or Continents) to Britain. Madison Grant says20:

“...The language that a man speaks may be nothing more than evidence that at some time in the past his race has been in contact either as conqueror, or as conquered, with its original possessors. Postulating the Nordic origin and dissemination of the Proto-Aryan language, then in Asia, and elsewhere, existing Aryan speech on the lips of populations—showing no signs of Nordic characters—is to be considered evidence of a former dominance of Nordics now long vanished.”

Effect of Invasions

An important point may be mentioned here that the effect of warlike invasions of early historic times must not be exaggerated21 nor minimised.” Generally speaking, these displacements made no external racial change, if the invaders and invaded were of the same race, as fusion would take place, and the ordinary rules of heredity would follow. If the invaders and invaded were not of the same race then—unless the invaders brought their own women22 with them—the result must have been a mixture of races, of which the effect was not a blend nor a melting-pot but a reversion to a race of a more generalized and lower type in which the ancient dark traits are dominant. Peaceful penetration on these lines has happened in the United States of America, in accordance with the national motto of no ‘distinctions of race, creed, or colour,’ and the shock of appreciating the consequences has resulted in a tightening-up of the immigration laws.

But even if, in an invasion, there is little outward racial effect apparent, the internal spiritual influence may be very great. It has often happened that the invaded has imposed its own23 language and customs upon the invaders. For instance, Israel was ordered by God24 to “drive out the inhabitants of the land” of Canaan, to “destroy all their pictures, and to destroy all their molten images.” The result of their disobedience was to destroy the soul of the people. The punishment pronounced was: “Those which ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell.”
CHAPTER II

THE JEWS

"There are a great many false ideas about the Jews"—quite apart from the original basic error of imagining that the words 'Jew' and 'Israel' are synonymous terms, and this cannot be discussed here now.

"They are said, for instance, to belong to a Semitic race. There is, however, no such race: there are only Semitic-speaking people showing varying racial compositions. The Jews, again, are said to be a race in themselves, 'the Jewish race.' This is just as mistaken: a casual glance at once shows men of greatly differing appearance among the Jews."

The word 'Nordic' is a racial term, the word 'Semitic' is a cultural and linguistic term, and should not be used as a racial term.

I quote the views of Professor Roland Dixon,26 Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University, U.S.A.:

"We are probably justified in believing the people of Palestine and the adjacent country to have been, in the second and third millennium, B.C., primarily of the Mediterranean and Caspian (Nordic) types. Brachycephalic, Alpine peoples, such as the Hittites and related groups, had, however, probably very early worked their way southward from the Anatolian plateau along the Syrian uplands as far, at least, as the northern border of Palestine. These northerners were, as we know, furthermore characterized by the possession of the same 'Semitic' nose which has come to be popularly regarded as so typically Jewish. This peculiar form of nose was not only then marked in the population of the Asia Minor region, but is still very common among the remnants of the old pre-Turkish peoples, such, for example, as the Takhtadjy of Lycia and the Armenians.

"The brachycephalic 'nosey' immigrants from the north had doubtless mixed to some extent with the earliest Canaanite settlers, and the later Hebrews coming into Palestine in the second millennium B.C. must have absorbed not a little of this element, either by intermarriage with the Canaanites or with pure remnants of the Anatolian group, or by conversion. This result probably occurred irregularly, although the mixtures were probably more common in the north than in the south, where the mass of the Hebrews probably retained, substantially unchanged, the physical characteristics with which they came into Palestine. That these were predominantly dolichocephalic (long-headed) seems probable, yet the possibility that some round-headed factors may have been brought from southern Arabia must not be forgotten. The population of Palestine and western Syria was thus probably much mixed at the beginning of the first millennium, although not so much so as it is to-day. That some portion, at least, of the Jewish people at this period were already marked by the same peculiar type of nose which was also found among the Hittites, is shown by the representations of the Jewish prisoners on the famous Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser II, dating from the ninth century B.C.

"With the dispersion, the conditions under which different groups of the refugees, or settlers, lived were very different. Those who spread westward and southward came among peoples who were physically more or less closely allied to the original Hebrew group, having a considerable majority of Mediterranean and Caspian factors. Those whose fate it was to settle, voluntarily or as
forced colonists, in Anatolia, Armenia, northern Persia, Central Asia, and the Caucasus were in quite a different position. Here they were in the midst of peoples primarily brachycephalic, and in part at least, characterized by the possession of the so-called ‘Semitic’ nose. To some extent by intermarriage, in larger part probably by conversion, these features became more and more prevalent among the Jewish population of the northern borders of Asia Minor and the Caucasus region. . . . To how great an extent, further, the perpetuation and even intensification of the peculiar type of nose (popularly considered as distinctly Jewish, but which we have seen to have been in all probability derived from a wholly different source) may be traced to conscious selection, in that a certain type of features became in a way a popular Jewish ideal, it is quite impossible to say.

One outcome is nevertheless clear, that is, that the proportion of so-called “Semitic” noses is very much greater among the non-Jewish population than it is among the Jews themselves, either here (Palestine) or anywhere else in the world, a fact that would seem to suggest that this feature is, after all, not a specifically Jewish characteristic.”

There are two divisions of Jews:

The Eastern (Ashkenazim) which comprises nine-tenths of the Jews throughout the world, who come from Russia, Poland, Galicia, Austria, and Germany.

The Southern (Sefhardim) which comprises the remaining one-tenth of Jews throughout the world, who come from Africa, the Balkans, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and part of the Jews in France, Holland, and England.

CHAPTER III

ORIGIN OF RACIAL TYPES

I will quote freely, by permission, from papers read before the Ethnic Research Society by Mr. G. R. Gair M.A. (Edin.), in The Cradle of Mankind and Geographical Environment and Race Movements.

LANGUAGE

Fifty years and more ago philologists were led to the valley of the Oxus and the mountains to the South as the starting-point of nations. Adolphe Picket attempted to show that the Aryan cradle was ancient Bactria (N.E. Afghanistan). Slowly, however, opinion turned against this hypothesis. Karl Prenta, O. Schrader, and others represented the anti-orient school. Max Muller would not commit himself—as to the place whence our Aryan ancestors came—other than to say “somewhere in Asia.”

The discovery of the Stone Age men in Europe—and not elsewhere—was an important factor in apparently overthrowing the “oriental origin” theory.

Against this Sir Arthur Keith (in his Frazer lecture, March 4th, 1932) has turned again to give general support to the “oriental origin” theory when, in speaking of the mountainous area of Iran (Persia), he said: “Discoveries are being made which, if they do not reveal the actual Aryan home, do guide us in that direction.” There are, also, other points of view beside that of language.

CLIMATE

Climate requires to be taken seriously into consideration. The plateau region of Iran shows a variation in temperature, in the present day, of
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35 deg. F. between the summer and winter months, whereas in most of Britain a similar variation amounts to only about 20 deg. F. The consequence is that in Persia to-day the population runs only from 2 to 26 persons per square mile. This hardly indicates—as it is at present—that such a region could have been a centre for the dispersion of humanity in general and of the great Aryan-speaking people in particular. But climate has not always been as it is to-day. There is definite evidence of continuous change, and also that the Iran plateau enjoyed a milder climate, so from a physical standpoint there is nothing to oppose Max Muller's (philologist) opinion as to origin, 'somewhere in Asia,' nor Sir Arthur Keith's (anthropologist) support of it. This hypothesis is also supported by tradition and history. From Iran we have migrations southward to India, and eastwards into China, also migrations westward, into Europe, of Huns, Avars, Magyars and Goths. We must also not forget the movements of Kassites and Elamites into Mesopotamia, of Hittites into Syria, and of Hyksos and Israelites into Egypt. Further, archaeology has discovered three centres of very ancient civilization. The modern view is beginning to conceive this as one widespread civilization, along the shores of the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean, at the foot of the Western Asiatic mountains, which was its core.

ARARAT

29 Gen. x. 32; xi. 1.

The Bible,29 too, adds full weight to the view that the Ark, from which came forth races and civilization of the whole earth, grounded upon 'High Hills' (correct translation of 'Ararat') which must have been east of the Tigris and east of the plain in the land of Shinar, because it was "as they journeyed from the east (A. V., margin, "eastward"—R.V., "east," margin, "in the east") that they found it" (Gen. xi. 2) and therefore it could not have been north of it, as Mt. Ararat actually is—so the 'High Hills' must, presumably, have been in the moun-
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tainous regions of Western Central Asia. All these considerations support Mr. Gair's contention that civilization and race development started neither in the shell heaps of the Baltic nor in the equatorial regions of Africa, as scientific opinion at the beginning of the twentieth century was inclined to believe.

GEOGRAPHICAL FACTORS

Geographical factors also have played an important part in making what are termed 'Races.' Migrations of primitive races are only possible where there are land bridges and easy corridors. From Central Asia to Europe there are at present two corridors. The northern one runs west-south-west from about Omsk to the Black Sea: this would be suitable for pastoralists. The southern one goes from the highlands west of Afghanistan, through Persia to the Caspian, and through Anatolia to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Such a corridor, which is more suitable for the migration of agriculturists and mixed farmers—especially in the more rainy climate which existed in early times—would form the means of communication between the three great centres of ancient civilization—N.W. India, Mesopotamia, and Egypt—by which culture was transmitted and races disseminated.

"Given a boat,30 however, man became amphibious; he could to that extent make free with geography."

ENVIRONMENT

Settlement is decided by climate, for by its variations physique is moulded and race variations are created. If we apply to man the same principles that the zoologist and botanist apply to fauna and flora there should be a zoned appearance around the original centre of distribution of races. Griffith Taylor31 and others contend that such a series of zones can be detected in Central Asia.

It is now generally admitted that climate in Europe is dependent on the position of the cyclonic belt, evidence of the movement of which is made easy to
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"Geographical Environment and Race Movements"—Gair.


scientists by archaeology and geology. Ellsworth Huntington32 shows how just as the climate of N.W. Europe and the eastern United States of America is now most favourable to civilization, so, when the cyclonic belt was in a more southerly position, first Mesopotamia and Egypt, and afterwards Greece and Rome, received most-favoured treatment. The gradual drying-up of Central Asia is held by Kropotkin to have been the cause of the general unrest in the period 1700-1400 B.C., when the movements already noted began.

The influence of climate33 on civilization is illustrated by the successive civilizations and migrations which have taken place at Anau near Askabad in Russian Turkestan.

"Prehistoric archaeology can show many examples of the transference of culture into Europe from Asia, implying greater age for civilization in Asia than in Europe. Philology points to a zone round Central Asia. The distribution of primitive man (Neanderthal, Talgai, Rhodesian, Galilee, Pekingensis) seems to indicate dispersion from a point in Western or Central Asia. Thus it would appear as if the centre of land masses (perhaps in the region of Western Turkestan) and the centre of the zones of races and languages must be the birthplace of the nations." This is supported by Dr. Frankfurt,34 who thinks that the western section of the Iranian plateau was the centre of distribution of races, because, from that area there was evidence of the distribution of flat-ended ear-rings and pins of the rolled eyelet and raquet varieties—tokens of intrusive culture.

Another important point is, how far do climatic conditions cause divergence from racial characteristics? Walter Bagehot35 assumes that "so long as culture remained backward, the stress of natural selection fell mainly on the body." Certain characters, such as head-form, seem to remain almost invariable, yet others, such as hair and eye-colour, stature, skin-colour, do show modification which once acquired by hybridization, or
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 environment, are reproduced with regularity. Otherwise, how can we account for the tendency of the Scots and the English (definitely Nordic in most respects) to become darker haired? This is certainly not due to a blend, but, as Professor Fleure36 infers, such as may be due to a difference which has not reached up to either a definite Nordic or to a definite Mediterranean type, or as Haddon37 seems to think, they are descendants of an ancient tribe from which both Nordic and Mediterranean have diverged. Marrett,38 on the other hand, thinks that "no biological trait is, in a strict sense, invariable," and therefore, presumably, incapable of being affected by climate and environment.

HEREDITY

The nineteenth century produced a belief in the inheritance of acquired characters (Lamarkism). This was not confirmed on research. The pendulum then swung to the 'might of the environment' and the 'melting-pot' theory in America, but Galton40 (1822–1911) showed that it is not environment but heredity which is the decisive factor for all living beings, including man. When two races are crossed the result41 is not a mixed race, but either: (1) a highly varied pattern; (2) offspring of one or other type; (3) complete difference between parents and offspring. There are other complications which are too technical to follow here. A new race can never be born by crossing,42 but only by selection, and rejection, in a secluded environment, a condition of national life to-day which is quite impossible.

"Racial Elements of European History," Günther, p. 80.

"Racial Elements of European History," Günther, p. 80.

Ibid., p. 258.

Ibid., p. 82.

Ibid., p. 83.
CHAPTER IV

ORIGIN OF THE (ARYAN) NORDIC RACE

Dr. A. C. Haddon says:

"The tall, fair, blue-eyed dolicho-cephals (long-heads) are generally believed to be a variety of the Mediterranean race (also long-heads), but there may equally well be two varieties of a common stock, the former having their area of characterization in the steppes north of the plateau of Eur-Asia."

Dr. Eduard Meyer, Professor of Ancient History in the University of Berlin, in an article on the ancient history of Persia in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, writes:

"In historical times we find the major portion of Iran occupied by peoples terming themselves Aryans. The term Iranian is understood to comprehend all these people of Aryan nationality. . . .

"Their residence must have lain chiefly in the great steppe north of the Black Sea and the Caspian, through S. Russia to Turan (Turkestan), and the Oxus and the Iaxartes. For here we continually discover traces of Iranian nationality. . . . The predatory tribes of Turan (e.g. the Massagetae) seem to have belonged to the same stock. . . .

"There were also the nomadic peoples (Daha, Dahans) of Iranian nationality, who occupied the steppes of Turkestan as far as the Sarmatians and Scythians of S. Russia (about 700 B.C.). . . . Herodotus relates that the Persians distinguished all the Scythians, i.e. all the northern nomads, as Sacae; and this statement is confirmed by the inscriptions of Darius. The Babylonians
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employ the name Gimiri (i.e. the Cimmerians) in the same sense. . . . From the region of the steppes the Aryans must have penetrated into the cultivable land of Eastern Iran: thence one part spread over the district of the Indus, then on to the Ganges: another moved westward to Zagrus and the borders of the Semitic world. The date of this migration cannot yet be determined with certainty. We know that the Aryans of India already occupied the Punjab in the Vedic era c. 1600 B.C. Aryan names appear at first in contemporary documents from the sixteenth century downwards in Mesopotamia and Syria.

"In the kingdom of Mitanni (in northern Mesopotamia) the Aryan origin of the dynasty is proved by the names of the kings. . . . Among the dynasts of Syria and Palestine . . . many bear Iranian names. . . . It was about this very period (1700 B.C. approximately) that the horse made its appearance in Babylonia, Egypt and Greece. . . . Before this it was as foreign to the Babylonians, even in the time of Khammurabi, as to the Egyptians under the XIIth dynasty. On the other hand, it had been familiar to the Aryans from time immemorial; indeed, they have always been peculiarly a people of riders. Thus it is quite conceivable that they brought it with them into Western Asia; and the quarter from which it came is sufficiently indicated by the fact that the Babylonians write the word 'horse' with a group of signs denoting 'ass of the East.' Among the Iranian tribes were Medes, Persians, Parthians, Bactrians, Sogdians."

The importance of the extracts from this article in the current Encyclopaedia Britannica will be appreciated later.

OF WHAT RACE WAS ABRAHAM?

According to Archbishop Ussher's chronology, the Flood ended in 2348 B.C., when the nations of the earth were divided by the families of the sons of
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Noah. Arphaxad was born to Shem two years after the Flood (2346 B.C.). There were thereafter seven generations to Terah. Abraham's was the eighth, and his call came in 2121 B.C. Now, of what race was Abraham? He was a descendant of Shem; about that there is no doubt. Does it follow that he was a Semite as it has hitherto been customary to suppose?

Mr. Gair discusses this ethnological problem in a paper, *Ur of the Chaldees and the Land of Haran*, read to a study group on October 8th, 1932. From this paper I will now quote freely (by his permission): Ur is called Abram's homeland in Gen. xi, 28, but in Gen. xii, 1, Haran is also expressly called Abram's homeland. This is an obvious contradiction unless Ur is in or near Haran, and, as one of Abram's clan bears the name of Haran, there is evidently close connection between Ur and Haran. Ur of the Chaldees is usually identified with the place which has lately been so brilliantly excavated by Dr. C. L. Woolley in S. Chaldea. Mr. Gair thinks that the internal evidence of the text is against this identification, and, in addition, there are other possible reasons. It is a very common name in Mesopotamia. The name 'Ur of the Chaldees' may only mean that the town owned Chaldean suzerainty, and that it was not necessarily located in Chaldea itself, just as there is an 'Ur of the Persians' in Northern Mesopotamia, having no local connection with Persia itself. The identification of Haran, too, is not as simple as it may seem. In Philip's *New Scripture Atlas* it is shown about fifty miles east of Carchemish. It must be in the region of Padan Aram (Hebrew: Aram Naharaim), usually believed to be in Mesopotamia, but Baynes (*Israel Among the Nations*, 1927, p. 17) says that Aram Naharaim "stretched westward from the Euphrates to the Orontes," while Jacob is called a Syrian (Deut. xxvi, 5), i.e. a dweller in Aram, and Isaac marries Rebecca, the daughter of Bethuel, a Syrian of Padan Aram (Gen. xxv, 20). Also Stephen, in Acts vii, 2, speaks of Abraham coming out of Mesopotamia into Charran (Haran),

ORIGIN OF THE (ARYAN) NORDIC RACE

so there is presumptive evidence of Haran being in Northern Syria, and not in Mesopotamia.

"Instead (then) of the Abrahamic clan being associated with the south and its purely Semitic world, there is a strong case for a northern origin of this people. Even if the Chaldean Ur should be ever finally settled as the origin of Abraham, this point of view is not entirely overruled. The culture of Chaldea is known to have northern Iranian elements in it from the highland peoples. As pointed out by Frankfurt, there is a distribution from the southern mountain chain, while Mr. Woolley seems to see an Iranian element with proto-Nordic characteristics as an important element in Chaldea. Therefore remembering that Abraham was a Hebrew (that is a Habiru—a member of a military caste—and more likely to be connected with hill-folk than either sedentary Semitic agriculturists, or roving pasturals from the Arabian desert) there is still every reason for considering a northern extraction possible for this people, at the place of meeting of Aryan Mittanian, Hittite, Amorite, and highland Aryan of the north-east. This north Syrian homeland was also the land of the fair Amorites, a people who are believed by many to have been of proto-Nordic, if not Nordic, ancestry. I should point out that the word Semite does not infer the conception invoked by the term Shemite. Semite is a purely ethnological usage for a branch of the Caucasian, or white, race. A people may be Semitised and so speak a Semitic language without being Semitic, or Arab-like, in race. Are there not strong Aryan elements in the Hebrew religion? The Covenant-keeping God, the legislative idea, the strong paternal aspect of the Deity, as against the mother-worship of the typical Semite, are all indications of Aryan influence and thought."

RACIAL AND CULTURAL FEATURES

In Assyria, Mesopotamia, and Arabia the population spoke a Semitic language and were Arab-like in

race. In the eastern and north-eastern mountains there were Iranian peoples with proto-Nordic characteristics. The Mitanni and the Amorites in the north were Semitic in culture, but display many features associated with Indo-Europeans. The Hittites in the north and north-west display Armenoid characteristics in the shape of their skulls, but Aryan features in language and culture.

Madison Grant\(^\footnote{44}{\text{"The Passing of the Great Race," Madison Grant, p. 253.}}\) says that:

"Aryan names are mentioned in the chronicles of the Mesopotamian empires about 1700 B.C., among the Kassites and, later, Mitanni."

Later,\(^\footnote{47}{Ibid., pp. 259, 260.}\) he says:

"The Sacae and Massagetae were, like the Persians, tall blond dolichocephs (long-heads) and they have left behind them dim traces of their blood among the Mongolized nomads of Turkestan, the Kirghiz. Ancient Bactria maintained its Nordic and Aryan aspect long after Alexander's time and did not become Mongolized and receive the sinister name of Turkestan until the seventh century. . . . The Sacae were the most easterly members of the Nordic race of whom we have definite record. One portion of them, from Samarkand, penetrated China as far as the Kunsuh province (N.W. corner of China). Here they were known by the Chinese as the Yue-chi. They were driven back westward into Turkestan, by the Hisung-nu (Huns?), about 200 B.C., where they conquered a tribe called the Wusun and lived in the basin of the Ili river (c. 175-140 B.C.).\(^\footnote{48}{Ency. Brit., 14th edit., Vol. xxiii, p. 915.}\) "Other Nordic tribes are recorded in this region. Evidence is accumulating that Central Asia had a large Nordic population in the centuries preceding the Christian era."

Again,\(^\footnote{49}{Ibid., pp. 411, 412.}\) in the documentary supplement, he says:

"The Sacae or Saka were the blond peoples who carried the Aryan language to India. Strabo (511) allies them with the Scythians as one of their tribes.

\(^{50}\) "The Aryan People of Asia and Europe," Zaborowski, p. 94. Cited by Madison Grant, as above.

\(^{51}\) Zaborowski (p. 216) also identifies the Sacae with the Persians. On this whole subject see Herodotus viii, 64, also Feist 5.

\(^{52}\) Zaborowski (i, p. 285) says:

"The first information of history concerning the peoples of Turkestan refers to the Massagetae, whose life was exactly the same as that of the Scythians (Herodotus i, 205-216). They enjoyed a developed industrial civilization while they remained nomads."

\(^{53}\) Minns (Scythians and Greeks, p. 11) says:

"The picture drawn of the nomad Massagetae seems very like that of the Scythians in a rather ruder stage of development."

Herodotus v, 215, describes them as follows:

"In their dress and mode of living the Massagetae resemble the Scythians. They fight both on horseback and on foot, neither method is strange to them."

Feist, 5, p. 471, identifies the Yue-chi and Khang with Aryans from Chinese Turkestan.

\(^{54}\) Pittard says:

"The question is always cropping up of the origin of the people who built Babylon and Nineveh. To what ethnic group did Sargon, c-i"
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Assurbanipal, and Cyrus belong? We might think that the present-day Persians, the Khurds, the Armenians, and some of the Turks are the local descendants of the people of these ancient kingdoms. But who is to prove to us that their descendants have always remained in the regions in which their ancestors developed those astonishing civilizations?"

Madison Grant also says: "In short we find both in Europe and in western and central Asia the same record of Nordic decline during the last two thousand years and their replacement by races of inferior value and civilization."

CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

The present population of central and western Europe is in part descended from prehistoric people, and in part from migrations from the East. Roughly speaking, it is at present divided into three broad bands horizontally, the Mediterraneans in the south, the Alpines in the middle, and the Nordics in the north. There are variations from these three main divisions, such as Dinaric, East Baltic, Armenoid, Negroid, Mongoloid, Australoid, but as ethnologists are not agreed in the classification of these various types they will be left out.

I. MEDITERRANEANS

This is clearly a southern type with eastern affinities and is adjusted to tropical and subtropical countries.

The Iberian Peninsula

Spain, taken as a whole, is a region of small long-heads—mean height, 5 ft. 4½ in. There is no Spanish group of any size touched by round-headedness except the Spanish Basques who, like the French Basques, have a characteristically triangular face with wide forehead and pointed chin, but otherwise differ in that the Spanish Basques are less round-headed than the French Basques, and not so tall. The people on the north-east coast-line of Catalonia (old division) and Valencia show a greater long-headedness than the rest of the country, and are taller (5 ft. 5½ in.). They may be a different race. The earliest known inhabitants of Spain were Iberians and Celtic-speaking people. Then came
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Phoenicians, Greeks, Carthaginians, and Romans. In A.D. 410 the invasions began, bringing Vandals, Suevi (Swabians), Alans, and (in A.D. 415) Visigoths. Most of these invaders were Nordics, and as the Spaniards of to-day—except the ‘blue-bloods’—are small, brunt, and dark-eyed, it is evident that they left no racial impress, and must have moved on to other lands.

In Portugal, the same invasions occurred, but the only invaders who remained were the Suevi (Swabians), who stayed for two hundred years. The country is inhabited throughout with small long-heads (5 ft. 4¾ in.), but there are racial knots, dotted about, which are not easy to explain. To account for the existing population we must believe that they are descendants of pre-historic people mixed with the Arab invaders.

Southern France

In early historic times the Mediterraneans of the south of France did not cross the Alps, but spread northwards to Britain. Those that remained were gradually overwhelmed by Alpines and, after 1000 B.C., by Nordics. They remain now on the south side of the central plateau. Their general characteristics are the same as in Spain.

Italy

The Italian peninsula is divided at the ‘calf’ by an oblique line, Ancona-Rome, into two nearly equal parts. The northern half are brunt-round-heads, related to the Alpines, while the southern part of Italy, as well as the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, are medium-heads. The mean height (as in the south of France) is 5 ft. 4¾ in. The height diminishes as you go from north to south and from east to west. The long-heads of Lucca-Massa require study. They are an island of long-heads in a sea of round-heads. The people of Lucca claim that their city was founded by Lydians, and the legends of Lydia tell us that one of their tribes, the Tyrrihians, emigrated into Italy. In addition to the Mediterraneans in the south, and the Alpines in the north, Pittard recognizes another race, which he calls Dinaric (or Adriatic), consisting of tall, moderately round-headed brunets, of great stature and strength, with considerable intellectual force, which inhabit north-east Italy from Udine all along the sea-coast to the bulge of the ‘calf,’ until stopped inland by the Etruscan Apennines. Madison Grant thinks that this race represents an ancient cross between Nordics and Alpines. The Berbers of North Africa are racially identical with the southern Italians and the Spaniards, as well as with the Egyptians and their modern descendants—the Fellahin.

GREECE

It has been said that the majority of the primitive Pelasgians were round-heads, whereas the primitive Greeks were long-heads. If so, Greece has greatly changed to-day.

“The Mediterranean Pelasgians, speaking a non-Aryan tongue, were conquered by the Nordic Achaeans, who came from the north-east probably between 1400 and 1300 B.C.” (Sir William Ridgeway, in The Early Age of Greece, Cambridge, 1901, has also contended that the Achaeans were Nordics.) “Doubtless there were still earlier waves of these same Nordic invaders as far back as 1700 B.C., which was a period of general unrest and migration throughout the ancient world.”

These two peoples, as yet unmixed, took part in the siege of Troy, 1194 to 1184 B.C. The leaders of Troy were a Nordic people who came to the coast of Asia Minor as Phrygians.

“About the time that the Achaeans and Pelasgians began to amalgamate, new hordes of Nordics, collectively called Hellenes, entered from the northern mountains and destroyed this old Homeric-Mycenaean civilization. This Dorian invasion took place a little before 1100 B.C. and brought in the three main Nordic strains of
ISRAEL’S RACIAL ORIGIN

Greece, the Dorian, the Aeolian and Ionian groups.” After long years of conflict classic Greece appears. The results of the conflict were that:

(a) What was left of the Achaeans retired to the Northern Peloponnesus;
(b) The survivors of the early Pelasgians remained in Messenia, serving as helots to Sparta;
(c) The Greek colonies in Asia Minor were founded largely by refugees from the Dorian invasion.

Later, in 338 B.C., Helas fell a prey to Macedon.

“The troops of Philip and Alexander were Nordic, and through the genius of the latter and the military power of his armies, the Levant and western Asia became Hellenized.”

The present-day Greeks are of differing races, and it is evident that a number of varieties are represented. In one examination 49 per cent. were round-heads and 34 per cent. were long-heads. The dominant shade of hair is dark brown and black, and only 1.5 per cent. are fair-haired.

South-west Britain

“The discovery that an amalgam of nine parts of copper to one part of tin produces the metal we call bronze, which has a texture and hardness suitable for weapons and tools, revolutionized the world . . . . The necessity of obtaining tin for this amalgam led to the early voyages of the Phoenicians, who traversed the entire length of the Mediterranean, founded colonies in Spain to work the Spanish tin mines, passed the ‘Pillars of Hercules,’ and finally reached the Cassiterides (the Tin Isles of Ultima Thule). There on the coasts of Cornwall they traded with the native British, of kindred Mediterranean race, for the precious tin.”

SOME OF THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

Southern England has been inhabited from very early times. The long barrows contain long-heads only. The round barrows contain a proportion of round-heads, but not sufficient to affect the race, which remains distinctly long-headed and Nordic. Cornwall and Wales show less long-headedness, while both the above, together with parts of Argyle, Inverness, and Ulster, show the dark hair of Mediterranean type, but the men of Cornwall and Ulster are tall.

II. ALPINES

The Bronze Age opened in the East about 3000–2000 B.C., and in Europe 1800–500 B.C. The value of tin for the composition of bronze necessitated the dangerous and costly voyages through the Mediterranean to the coast of Cornwall. The effect of the possession of bronze weapons on the round-headed populations of western Asia was magical. There was an immediate irruption of round-heads from there into Europe through Asia Minor, the Balkans and the Valley of the Danube, into Italy, France and Holland. The western Himalayas was probably its original centre of evolution and distribution, and the Armenoids remain a distinct subdivision of this race in Asia. There are also round-headed Mongols (not of Alpine origin) centred round Thibet and the steppes of northern Asia. Alpines constitute the majority of the upland population of central Europe. European Alpines retain very little evidence of their Asiatic origin except the skull shape. In central and western Europe there has been a strong admixture of blood of the Nordic race with which they have been in contact so long.

The Slavic-speaking nations appear to have issued late, from the Carpathian mountains, as a sub-division of the Alpines. The Slavic dialect is believed to have developed in Galicia and the Priepet swamps. It appears that, as the Nordics moved westward, the Slav-speaking Alpines filled up their places, just as the Nordics submerged the earlier Alpines in the west.
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It is to be noted that in western Asia, the civilizations of Sumer and Accad, in Mesopotamia, as well as of Elam and Media, were Alpine, whereas Babylonia and Assyria were Arabic and Semitic. ESPECIALLY IS IT TO BE NOTED THAT PERSIA WAS NORDIC AND ARYAN.

France

Historic times brought into France a succession of peoples—Iberians, Ligurians (Alpines), Aquitani and Basques, Celts (so-called then), Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Saracens, and Galli. Then came the Roman conquest (which involved no racial change) and a further contingent of Nordic races, Cimbrians, Belgae, Visigoths, Burgundians, Lombards, Franks, Saxons, Normans. Many of these tribes had a common ethnic origin. It is doubtful whether the Swabians and Alemanni were Nordics. Phoenician and Greek colonies had not much share in the make-up of the French nation.

In modern France the three main races divide the nation into three unequal parts. The great central plateau of the Vosges, Jura, and part of the Alps is peopled by the Alpines, a small (5 ft. 4½ in.) brunet race of round-heads. To the west of the line Nancy-Toulouse there are what appear to be some cross-breeds, and then, to the north again, long-heads. On the south side of the central plateau we find the Mediterranean type. France is an ethnic complex. Its exceptionally favourable situation gave facilities for its penetration from every direction, notably from the east via the valley of the Danube and the Rhine. We also know that the prehistoric people thought nothing of crossing the Alps. It is to the residual qualities of a very varied stock that she probably owes her many-sided genius and history.

Germany

The introduction of Slavic-speaking Alpines into Germany is believed to have been due to infiltration, and not to conquest. The Wends and Sorbs replaced the Nordic nations moving west at the break-up of the Roman Empire. The thirty years war (1618-1648) was the darkest time in Germany’s history. The outstanding fact was the continued replacement of the Nordics by the Alpines, especially in the south and east. Consequently the strong individualism of old Germany gave way to the mass nature of its modern reliance upon authority, and its submissiveness to strong masterful minorities.

Switzerland

In prehistoric times the Alps were not difficult for passage. They became so later. From the earliest times Switzerland was peopled by men from the east. From such records as exist it certainly looks as if the people who passed through were long-heads, and they have been replaced by round-heads, who still remain.

Austria

The Austrian population of to-day bears little resemblance to the ancient one. In the early Iron Age down to 500 B.C. the people were still long-headed. Towards the close of the sixth century the Slovenes, pressed on by the Avars, invaded Austria, as far as the Tyrol, until checked at Salzburg by Germans. In 1884 anthropological investigations were commenced which ended by breaking up the conception of racial unity in Germany, and gave a terrible shock to the idea of German long-headedness. It was found that the Bavarians were round-heads, and so were the Austrians and Slovenes. But there is one decided difference as compared with all other round-heads. The height of Czechs and Moravians in the north, of Austrians in the middle, and of Slovenes of Yugo-Slavia in the south, is greater than that of round-heads in general, and is above the European mean of 5 ft. 5 in. Professor Pittard, of the University of Geneva, says that “since the early invasions this race has been disintegrated. To-day one portion speaks a Slav and the other a German dialect.” He would add to it a large proportion of the Bavarians of the south-east, and he
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calls it the Dinaric (or Adriatic) race. Its special feature is its greater stature than the ordinary round-headed, and the steep cut-away to the back of the head.

Hungary

During historic times the flat lands between the Danube and the Tisza (Theiss) have experienced incessant human ebb and flow—Dacians, Goths, Vandals, Gepidae, Avars (from sixth to ninth century), and Huns. At the beginning of the tenth century the Magyars came from the Siberian steppes, pushed into the heart of Germany and Italy, suffered reverses, and finally settled back into present-day Hungary, and there—thanks to an extremely lively sense of 'race'—they remain. The Magyars are small people (5 ft. 4½ in.), less than the European mean of 5 ft. 5 in. The height increases as you go west, towards the Austrians and Styrians. They are round-headed and unified as to race and language.

The Slavs of Former Russia

The problem of the origin of the Slavs is a very complex one to solve. Slavists in general teach that the primitive Slav people had its cradle between the Oder and the Dnieper, north of the Carpathians. Whence did they come?

Haddon says:

"The Slavs, who belong to the Alpine race, seem to have had their area of characterization in Poland and the country between the Carpathians and the Dnieper; they may be identified with the Veneti."

In Map 1, Asia, he shows the movement of a portion of the Alpine race to this 'area of characterization' of the Slavs from a point somewhere north of Kabul and south of Samarkand, going south of the Caspian and the Black Sea, up towards the Danube, and thence to "the country between the Carpathians and the Dnieper."

Present-day Ukrainians and Ruthenians—who are said to represent the true Slavs—are moderately round-headed, with height above the mean, and dark; whereas the prehistoric skeletons show tall long-heads. This is very important.

Poles are round-headed: the nobility even more so than any other inhabitants. The Polish people are an ethnic complex. The White Russians, in the west, as a whole are moderately round-headed and small (5 ft. 4½ in.). The Great Russians, in the east, are similar, except that in the province of Perm (in the Ural Mountains) the height, in many localities, exceeds 5 ft. 6 in.

Non-Russian Slav-speaking People

Between these Slav-speaking people of former Russia and the Slav-speaking people of Yugo-Slavia is inserted the wedge of Hungary and Austria already described.

From a remarkable unity of head-forms it is quite evident that the Lusatians of Saxony and the Slovaks of Czecho-Slovakia are of one race, quite distinct from the Slav-speaking Poles and Russians. The Wends of the Luneburg area of Hanover are also probably of the same race. To these must be added the Slovenes, Croats and Dalmatians. The whole group is very decidedly round-headed and dark, but, unlike other round-heads, are tall (just under 5 ft. 7 in.). It is a distinct group among round-heads, and has been named the Dinaric race. There is no racial brotherhood with the Slav-speaking people of former Russia.

The Balkan Peninsula

There is no kind of linked descent between the present population and the early folk of the Balkan Peninsula.

Roumanians

The racial indications show that the Roumanians cannot claim the Goths and other Nordic folk as their ancestors.
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Serbians

The Serbians show ethnic mixture. It looks as if there was some linked descent with the people who in the fourth and fifth centuries invaded the lands to the south of the Save and Danube. They are certainly not racial brethren of the Slav-speaking people who inhabit Russian Poland.

The Bulgars

Bulgaria holds men of diverse origin. They are tall (5 ft. 6 in.), above the European mean, frequently long-headed with thirty per cent. of light eyes. A certain proportion of both Serbs and Bulgars are related, racially, to each other, and possibly to the prehistoric people of south Russia, who built the Kurgans of the Black Sea shore. They are not related to the Russian Slavs.

The Aegean People

The three periods of Minoan civilization indicate that human events of very great importance took place between the early period and the latest one. Low stature (5 ft. 3½ in.) and long-headedness characterize the primitive Cretans, as it did the Phoenicians. The present Egyptians (Copts and Fellahin) are also long-headed, but taller than the earliest Cretans seem to have been. The long-heads of Crete were replaced by round-heads by the end of the Bronze Age, about 500 B.C. To-day, the majority of the inhabitants of the island of Minoa (Paros) are round-heads.

III. NORDICS

"Men of Nordic blood form practically all the population of Scandinavian countries, a majority of the population of the British Isles, the northern third of France, the lowlands of Flanders, all Holland, the northern parts of Germany, Poland and Russia. . . . There is a large amount of Nordic blood in Northern Italy. . . . In the Balkan Peninsula there is little to show for the floods of Nordic blood that have poured in for the last 3,500 years, beginning with the Achaeans of Homer, who first appeared en masse about 1400 B.C., and were followed successively by the Dorians, Cimmerians, and Gauls, down to the Goths and the Varangians of Byzantine times."

The earliest Nordics crossed the Rhine into France about 1000 B.C. and were known as Gauls (Caesar called them Celts). They brought the Celtic language, and imposed it upon the 'Alpine' population which held France, except in the south. The northern third of France (above Paris) was inhabited by Belgae (Cymric) who had followed the earlier Goidels across Germany into Gaul and Britain. These were all Nordic elements and were later reinforced by Vandals, Visigoths, Alans, Saxons, Burgundians, Franks, and lastly by Danish Northmen who conquered and settled Normandy in A.D. 911. In France, as a whole, in the present day, Nordics are everywhere giving place to Alpines, and so are the Mediterraneans.

The Flemings of Belgium are Nordic Franks, and the Walloons are Alpines.

"The first Nordics in Spain also were the Galls, who crossed the western Pyrenees about the end of the sixth century B.C. and introduced Aryan speech into the Iberian peninsula. . . . The Vandals and Visigoths who conquered and held Spain for 300 years have left some small evidence of their blood— especially in the 'hidalgos' (the son of a Goth)' and in the 'blue-bloods.' As the Nordic blood faded out, through losses in wars outside Spain, the race deteriorated.

"In Britain the preponderant strain of blood was Mediterranean, before the first arrival of the Aryan or Celtic-speaking Nordics."

Some of the Peoples of Europe

The late Henri Hubert whose book "The Rise of the Celts" in the series "The History of Civilization" (Kegan Paul) has just been published (1934), says on p. 33:

"The Celts were not a race, but a group of
peoples, or, to speak more accurately, a group of societies . . . which spoke, or still speak, dialects of a certain family which are called the Celtic languages. We know of almost as many Celtic languages as separate groups of Celts. The Goidelic languages are, Irish (3 groups of dialects), Gaelic (of Scotland), and Manx (of the Isle of Man). On the other hand the Brythonic—from the name of the Brythons, the ancient inhabitants of Britain—include the Welsh (2 groups), Cornish (which died out at the end of the eighteenth century), and Breton (4 groups)."

On p. 131 he says:

"The occupation of the British Isles by the Celts, and of Ireland by the Goidels, took place long before—centuries before—the historical movements of the Brythonic people. These latter expanded about the sixth century before Christ. We must go back to the Bronze Age (1800 B.C.) for the earlier invasion."

On p. 138 he says:

"The breaking off of the Goidelic group and, probably, the first Celtic colonization of the British Isles must have occurred at the same time as the descent of the Latins into Italy, and that of the first Greek invaders into Greece."

After the Romans left (about A.D. 400) floods of Nordics arrived: Norse pirates from Scandinavia to Scotland, Angles from central Jutland, and Saxons from the base of the Danish Peninsula. The Saxons also sent invaders into Italy, Hungary and Russia. Danes invaded the east of England about A.D. 900 and at the same time occupied Normandy. "The blond Nordic element to-day is very marked in Ireland as in England. It is derived, to some extent, from the early invaders of Celtic speech, but the Goidelic element has been largely absorbed by the Iberian substratum. The combination of dark hair with blue, or grey, eyes is the result."

"Ireland, like Brittany, being situated on the extreme western outposts of Eurasia, has more than its share of generalized and low types."

The cross between these types and the Nordics seems to be a bad one, and the result appears in the unstable temperament so often found in that land. . . .

"There is, especially in Wales, and in the west central counties of England, a large substratum of ancient Mediterranean blood, but the later Nordic elements are everywhere superimposed upon it. Scotland is, by race, Anglian in the Lowlands, and Norse in the Highlands," but in the latter the Mediterranean strain is frequently associated with tall stature, and accounts for brunetness.

In Wales, "extensive blending has not taken place, though much crossing has occurred, and the persistence of the skull-shape has been particularly marked."

The language is Cymric, with ancient (underlying) Goidelic.

Unfortunately the transformation of the British nation from an agricultural to a manufacturing community and the increase of urban communities at the expense of the countryside is causing the Nordics to recede before the Mediterranean and Alpine types.
PART II

ISRAEL'S MIGRATIONS
INTRODUCTION

The question we have to consider is: To what race did Israel belong? Was it the Semitic race—as has been hitherto supposed? That is to say, did Abraham's clan come from the central Arabian desert, which is generally considered the place of origin of the so-called Semitic race? But we are now told by ethnologists that there is no such thing as a Semitic race. The current Encyclopaedia Britannica does not take a Semitic race into consideration, but only says that the Semitic (or Sibemitic) languages were so named, in 1781, by Schlozer, because most of those who spoke them were descended from Shem. So, according to current ideas, we can rule out the word Semitic, or Semite, as a racial designation, and we must reconsider the situation.

We must avoid falling into a fundamental error in thinking that the words 'Jew' and 'Israelite' are convertible terms, also that the labels Jew and Semite are synonymous, and that the so-called Semitic (or Jewish) nose is an attribute peculiar to the Jew. Weissenberg's investigations from 1904 to 1914 show that the present-day Ashkenazim Jews are predominantly round-headed, while the Sephardim Jews are largely long-headed. The nosiness and round-headedness has increased since the dispersion of the Jews, by intermarriage with types tending to increase the production of such attributes, in Anatolia, the Caucasus, Persia, and Central Asia, and especially through the conversion to Judaism of the Khazars and the subsequent world-wide dispersion of the latter. Dixon also states that:

"we are probably justified in believing the people of Palestine to have been, in the 2nd and 3rd
millennium B.C., primarily of the Mediterranean and Caspian (Nordic) types."

We must remember that Abraham was a warrior—a member of a military caste—a Habiru—and therefore more likely to associate with hill (warrior) tribes than with agriculturists and pastoralists from Arabia. The call of Abraham to Haran brought him in contact with the Iranian Aryans (who brought the horse from the East), and there he was in direct touch with the large Nordic population at that time in Central Asia. Even supposing Ur to have been in Chaldea itself, and not near Haran—as argued in this presentation of the case—and that Abraham’s clan had become Semitized by contact with Semitic culture there, then a change back into its former environment—primarily proto-Nordic, or Nordic—in the hills north and east of the Tigris would quickly restore the ancient racial bloodstream.

As Mr. Gair points out, there are strong Aryan elements in the Hebrew religion, and the whole history of the Israel people seems to indicate that a nation which was to be, and has been, God’s ‘battle-axe and weapons of war’ (Jer. li, 20), was likely to belong to the foremost human warrior race.

One thing is quite clear, that Israel is not a Semitic race, and there are good grounds for believing not only that it was Nordic, but that it actually is so, to-day.

CHAPTER VI

EARLY MOVEMENTS

The period about 2000–1700 B.C. appears to have been a time of general unrest. As we have seen, Terah1 the father of Abraham, conducted the Hebrews from Ur to Haran. The Phoenicians2 passed from the Persian Gulf to the shores of the Mediterranean, and the Assyrians3 moved up to Assyur, the first capital of the Assyrian empire. Later Shalmanezer I (1290 B.C.) founded Calah, a place and region of great natural strength and fertility. By the period 810–781 B.C. Assyria4 had attained to great power, reaching to the Persian Gulf and Egypt. By the time5 that Tiglath Pilezer obtained the Assyrian Crown (745 B.C.) Israel6 had been ruled over by a succession of idolatrous kings. In his first captivity of Israel “he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali,” but in a later one “did more grievously afflict her by way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations.”

The Assyrian Captivity

Another account of these two separate invasions is contained in 2 Kings xv, 29 and in 1 Chron. v, 26, and the date given by Archbishop Ussher is 740 B.C. Then came the capture of Samaria7 by Sargon in 721 B.C., after a three years’ siege which had been commenced by Shalmanezer IV, who died while pressing it (see page 91), in 722 B.C. Six years later Sargon led two great expeditions into the Median territory and overran it, enabling him to effect the transplanting of Israel into the cities of the Medes. It has generally been assumed that the localities of the captivity of Israel—Halah, Habor and the River Gozan—were in the region of Gozanitis

1 Gen. xi, 31.
2 Rawlinson’s “Herodotus,” Essay xi, Bk. i, Vol. i, p. 646.
3 Rawlinson’s “Ancient Monarchies,” ii, pp. 296–297.
4 “Israel Redivivus,” Danvers., p. 57.
6 “Israel Redivivus,” Danvers, p. 59
7 “Israel Redivivus,” Danvers, p. 65, citing Herodotus i, 472.
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(Mygdonia) in Mesopotamia. This was probably the case after the first captivity of 1 Chron. v. 26, but it is reasonable to conclude that they were subsequently moved on to Media. Josephus places Israel in Medo-Persia, and the Targum pseudo-Jonathan to Exod. xxxiv, 10, says that “the Ten Tribes were exiled beyond the Sambayyon” (also identified with the Gozan and the Zab). This seems to indicate the locality as Calah, the military capital of the Assyrians, at the junction of the Zab and the Tigris, and the point of normal access to Media. There are obvious reasons why, in accordance with the usual Assyrian military policy, the bulk of captive Israel should have been placed in Media. Josephus, writing of the 721 B.C. conquest, says:

“This conquest proved wholly destructive of the kingdom of Israel, Hoshea being made prisoner, and his subjects being transplanted to Media, in Persia, and replaced by people whom Shalmanezer caused to remove from the borders of Chuthah, a river in Persia, for the purpose of settling in the land of Samaria.”

Other deportations to the ‘cities of the Medes’ must have taken place after 715 B.C., when the Annals of Sargon) Khorsabad tell us that, after the second revolt in connection with Hamath, the people of Hamath were removed to Samaria, that Deioces and his Median followers were taken to Hamath, and, the presumption is, that the Israel captives were taken to the place vacated by the latter in Media. For a full discussion on this problem the reader is referred to a paper by Mr. G. R. Gair, read to a study group on October 8th, 1932, entitled Problems in Biblical and Mesopotamian Ethnography and Geography (pp. 9–22).

The Jewish historian Demetrius states that the final destruction of the kingdom of Samaria took place in 696 B.C. It is, however, more probable that the final sweeping-up was not completed till 677 B.C. Isaiah, in 742 B.C. (Ussher’s chronology) had prophesied (Isa. vii, 7, 8):

THE ASSYRIAN CAPTIVITY

“Thus saith the Lord God . . . within three score and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people.”

The only (indirect) evidence of the completion of the breaking—presumably within the sixty-five years—is contained in Ezra iv, 2, when the Samaritans (those imported into Samaria in place of the Ephraimites)

“came to Zerubbabel and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur, which brought us up hither.”

And Esar-haddon reigned (according to the Ency. Brit., 14th edit., vol. ii, p. 857) between 681 and 668 B.C., which includes the year 677 B.C. However much authorities may differ as to details and dates, the fact remains that the captivity of Israel was completed as recorded in 2 Kings xvii, 23:

“Until the Lord removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day.”

The words ‘this day’ indicate that down to the year 662 B.C., when the limit of the record of the 2nd Book of Kings was reached, Israel had not returned to its own country.

Now what became of the captive Israelites? The Encyclopaedia of Names states that the Assyrians did not call a captured people by the names they called themselves, but by the name of the founder of the dynasty. One of the earlier kings of Israel was Omri, who built the capital city of Samaria, so the Assyrians called the captive Israelites ‘Beth-Omri.’ We find on the black ‘Nimrud Obelisk’ of Shalmanezer II, now in the British Museum, this

*We have taken a long time to realize that the ages of various personages given in the earlier parts of the Old Testament are probably not the actual ages of the people named, but are the number of years indicating the length of their dynasties.
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written: "The tribute of Yahua Abil Khumri," i.e. "the tribute of Jehu, son of Khumri." Jehu is called, in the Bible, the son of Nimshi, but thinking he was the legitimate successor to the throne, the Assyrians named, as his ancestor, Omri, the founder of the capital of Samaria. So from this inscription we learn that 'Khumri' was the equivalent of 'Omri.' Dr. T. G. Pinches, in his Assyria and Babylonia, p. 339, says that the name Omri was likewise pronounced in accordance with the older system, before the 'Ghain' became 'Ayin.' Humri shows that they said at that time (Jehu's) Ghomri.

Thus we find that the Assyrian names for the captive Israelites were Beth-Ornii, Bit-Ghumri, Bit-Khumri, Bit-Humri.

Now we come to the famous Behistun Rock. The original name was Baghistan. It is on the site of an ancient Persian city, twenty-two miles east of Kermanshah, on the old road from Babylon to Ecbatana. This rock rises perpendicularly to 1700 ft. It bears inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes in three forms of cuneiform writing—Persian, Babylonian, and Median—which establish his genealogy back to Achaemenes, and recount his triumphs over his enemies.

The decipherment of these inscriptions has furnished the means for the study of Assyriology just as the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone provided the means for the study of Egyptology.

From such portions as are decipherable Column V (a supplementary half-column) appears to contain an account of two other revolts. One does not concern us, but the other, "by Saku'ka, the chief of the Sacae, who dwelt upon the Tigris," is of great importance, because by it we learn that what is shown as 'Saka Humuvasca' in the Persian text corresponds with 'Gimirra Umurgah' of the Babylonian text. So we find engraved on rock an inscription (516-515 B.C., according to Rawlinson), nearly 2,500 years old, bearing testimony to the fact that

THE BREAK-UP OF ISRAEL

Saka and Gimirra are identical names, each for captive Israel. Sir Henry Rawlinson has expressed the opinion that

"we have reasonable grounds for regarding the Gimirri, or Cimmerians, who first appeared in the confines of Assyria and Media in the seventh century B.C., and the Sacae of the Behistun Rock nearly two centuries later, as identical with Israel" (Great Britain's rank among the nations, Adams, p. 61).

THE BREAK-UP OF ISRAEL

The word for 'captive' or 'body of captives' was, in Babylonian or Assyrian, 'Galutha,' while in old Hebrew it was 'Geloth.' So the Israelites, who naturally in the circumstances in which they found themselves preferred to retain their national name in some form, called themselves thenceforward the captives from Sak, or 'Sak-Geloths.' Later the Assyrians shortened this to 'Sakhi.'

In the hill region now known as Armenia the Vanites were referred to in inscriptions as 'people of Khardis,' Khardis being the name of the local supreme god. They consisted principally of the people of the State of Urartu, and the people of a smaller state, Mannu (or Minni), the capital of which was Muzazir. They were probably deported people, from southern Babylonia, of Shumir and Kaldhu, referred to by the author of Judith as 'sons of Cheled,' i.e. 'people of Kaldis.'

In conformity with the normal Assyrian policy of deportation these 'people of Kaldis' and the Israel captives in Media were left—after they had been transplanted—very much to their own devices. During revolts of these Khardisians of Van and the near-by people of Mannu and Nairi, 719-714 B.C., it is quite likely that the Beth-Saks (Sak-Geloths) abandoned their settlements in Media and moved up to an area north of the territories of the Urartu state, about Van, into the secluded hilly region just north of the Araxes. They were flourishing there

17 "Great Britain's Rank among the Nations," Adams, p. 60.
21 "European and Other Race Origins," Bruce Hanney, p. 286.
22 Ibid., p. 281.
23 Ibid., p. 276.
24 Ibid., p. 265.
25 Ibid., p. 266, 267.
26 "Mesopotamia, Delaporte, 1925, p. 255.
27 "European and Other Race Origins," Bruce Hanney, p. 271.
a century later under the Assyrian name of Sakhi (of Mat-Gagi) in the country known as Sakland.

After Sennacharib’s assassination by his two sons in 681 B.C., Esar-haddon, his successor, was engaged in fighting in Armenia and Cappadocia, and a good opportunity arose for revolt against the Assyrian power. In 673 B.C. (Times History) Kashtarita of Kar-Kasshi joined with Mamitti-Arsu of the Medes, the Kimerians, and the Minni (Scythian Ashkuzal) in an attack on Esar-haddon. It is to be noticed that Delaporte, in his Mesopotamia, 1925, writes of this confederacy (at page 260) as Medes, Aryans, and Scyths. The Times History says that

“they took the cities of Kartam, Kishassu, and five others . . . the issue of the struggle is not given in the Assyrian records, but it appears that the Babylonian Chronicle tells of the invasion of Assyria by the Kimmiri and of their defeat.”

Now who were the Kimerians?29 Marchant says:

“Professor Sayce, in The Higher Criticism and other works, proves that archaeology reveals that a Kimerian power grew up in the old kingdom of Ellipi, which was devastated by Sennacharib about 700 B.C.”. . . .

Sayce says:

“We know its fate. The Manda had descended upon it and made it the chief seat of their power.”

Marchant continues:

“In other places they are called Umman-Manda, and in the Times History Index, Vol. 25, p. 110, it shows that Gimmirri, Gimir, Gomer, Kimmeri, are connected with Umman-Manda. In Vol. 1, p. 422 it says: ‘Kimmiri, or more accurately, the Umman-Manda.’ It was the Babylonians and Assyrians who called the Kimmeri the Umman-Manda. They were so by affiliation, recognizing that the Gimmirri, or their leaders, coming out of the Manda country, were Mandas.”

From Great Britains Rank among the Nations

THE BREAK-UP OF ISRAEL

(Adams, p. 61) we gather that, according to Sir Henry Rawlinson,30 there appeared about this period a numerous roving people, under a chief named Teuspa, on the confines of Assyria and Media. Esar-haddon’s troops called these roving people ‘Gimirra,’ which, according to Rawlinson, is Babylonian for ‘the tribes.’ He has expressed the opinion that the Gimri (or Cimmerians) and the Sacae (or Gimira) of the Behistun Rock were each identical with Israel. Sayce, after stating that Cyrus was a Manda, and that the Manda were Gimira, says31: “It would seem that the Manda of Ecbatana were the Scythians of classical history.” After their defeat in c. 673 B.C., Teuspa32 and his Cimmerians had evidently moved westward and settled in the basins of the Araxes and Halys in Asia Minor, where later, about 660 B.C., they threatened Gyges of Lydia. The latter appealed for help to Assurbanipal, who had, in 668 B.C., succeeded Esarhaddon on the Assyrian throne. This was not given, and the Cimmerians33 ravaged the southern shore of the Axine (Black Sea) up to Lydia, whose monarch, Gyges, was slain, and whose capital, Sardis, was sacked c. 656 B.C.

From an article under the heading ‘Media,’ in the Encyclopedia Britannica (14th ed.), Vol. xiv, p. 172, we get the following:34

“According to Herodotus, Phraortes, the son of Deioces, was the first who attacked Nineveh, but was defeated and slain; and when his son Cyaxares renewed the attack his progress was interrupted by an invasion of the Scythians, who founded an empire in western Asia which lasted 28 years. This invasion of Asia by the Scythians appears to have greatly shaken the Assyrian empire. From Jeremiah and Zephaniah we know that a great invasion of Syria and Palestine northern Barbarians really took place in 626 B.C. Some stories in Herodotus show the Scythian warriors in connection with Cyaxares and the Medes: so the probable explanation is that the
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Babylonian annals generally give the title 'King of the hosts of the Manda' to the Median kings: Manda is an old word for the nomadic tribes of the north, which is also applied to the Cimmerian chieftains.

'Until 1923 we knew practically nothing about the fall of the Assyrian empire. But in this year a chronicle was discovered by Gadd (the Fall of Nineveh) in the British Museum which gives us the exact dates. From it we learn that Nabopolassar, the Governor of Babylon, and Cyaxares (Uvakishtar) of Media began the war against the Assyrians (who were supported by the Egyptians) in 616 B.C. In 612 B.C. the allies "began the siege of Nineveh, which was stormed and destroyed."

An Assyrian-Egyptian army was attacked by the Babylonians, under Nabonassar, and the Scyths, in 610 B.C., and finally defeated in 609 B.C. The Assyrian empire was crushed. The Babylonian captivities of Judah followed, commencing in three stages—606, 599, 587 B.C.—and ending, after seventy years in Babylon, in 538 B.C. (Ussher's chronology). It will be remembered that the 2,520 years of punishment—since the commencing date of Judah's last captivity—ends this year, 1934.

While Ezekiel was a captive in the land of the Chaldeans (Ezek. 1, 3) he was given two commissions, one to the elders of Judah, and the other to the elders of Israel. The latter had continued to rebel, as shown in Ezekiel xx, and sentence was pronounced in verse 39:

"As for you, O house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God: Go ye, serve ye every one his idols, and hereafter also, if ye will not hearken unto me: but pollute ye my holy name no more with your gifts, and with your idols."

The national name of Isra-el, which included El, the name of God, was to be abandoned. 'Israel' was to be lost in a sea of changing names.

THE FALL OF BABYLON

The Fall of Babylon

The next event of importance was the fall of Babylon—the 'head of gold' (Dan. ii, 32, 38). After the capture and destruction of Nineveh (609 B.C.) by the Scythian army and its allies, the seat of empire was transferred to Babylon. About 550 B.C. Cyrus became king of Persia, and in 538 B.C. invaded Babylonia. Nabonidos, its king, who, near the end of his reign, associated Bel-sarra-uzar (Belshazzar, Dan. v), his eldest son, with him on the throne, fled to Babylon, pursued by Gobryas, the governor of Kurdistan (Gutium), and the soldiers of Cyrus entered Babylon without fighting.

It is to be noted that the contemporary cylinder of Cyrus calls Gobryas the governor of Gutia, while Jeremiah (l, 4) infers that the children of Israel are to come (to Babylon), and (ii, 27) indicates these to be the kingdoms of Ararat (Urartu), Minni, and Ashchenaz. From this it appears that, in addition to the areas in modern Afghanistan and Turkistan, considerable portions of Israel were occupying the highlands south and west of the Caspian, in modern Azerbaijan and Armenia.

There is nothing remarkable in this spread of material (bodily) Israel at this time, and hereafter, into every corner of the earth, if we remember 38 Deut. xxxii, 8.

"When the Most High divided to their nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel";

and also if we remember that when sentence of the loss of the Israel name was pronounced (Ezekiel xx, 39) the Lord God also said, in regard to the restoration (verse 41):

"I will accept you with your sweet savour when I bring you out from the people and gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered."

The separableness of the captivity of Israel, by
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Assyria, from the captivity of Judah, by Babylon, is to be noted in Jeremiah i, 17–19.
The people of Guta\(^3\) (Israel) had now the opportunity of joining with their brethren of Judah in Babylon in returning to Zion and to their Lord, but they evidently preferred to serve Merodach—as recorded in the cylinder of Cyrus—in spite of God’s pleading (Isa. xliii, 8–end). So the word of the Lord came to Zechariah (vii, 14):

“I scattered them with a whirlwind among all the nations whom they knew not.”

From Herodotus we learn that Cyrus,\(^4\) wishing to become king of Israel (Ezra i, 2) and of the Massagetæ, entrapped the latter when feasting, at a purposely abandoned Persian camp, and then is killed by them at the subsequent battle of the Araxes, in 528 B.C. (Jer. ii, 23, compared with Isa. xlv, 28), which battle Herodotus describes as the hardest ever fought.

---

CHAPTER VII

ISRAEL IN GREECE

We have now to go back to a much earlier period to understand what was the racial composition of the inhabitants of Greece at the period we are discussing. This is dealt with in chap. ix of Danvers’ Israël Redivivus, and will be used as the basis of our information. In the fifteenth and sixteenth dynasties Lower Egypt\(^4\) was ruled over by Hyksos kings. Manetho says that they ruled for 511 years and that they were Arabs. Africanus and Eusebius call them Phoenicians. The Hyksos were driven out, and the Theban dynasty was restored, under ‘the king who knew not Joseph.’\(^4\) This first king of the restored dynasty\(^4\) died, and the Exodus took place under the second king.

“During the troublous times, lasting for about one hundred years, whilst the war between the Theban kings and the Hyksos continued, a great number of the people of the country were compelled to seek foreign settlements.”

Greek tradition\(^4\) (History of Greece from the Earliest Period, Manual of Ancient History (p. 121), Gillies' Greece (p. 1), Historical Researches, Vol. ii, p. 122) relates the establishment of four successive colonies erected in Greece by foreigners. The principal ones were:\(^4\)

From Sais — Cecrops to Athens 1556 B.C.
From Taneia — Danaus to Argos 1500 B.C.
Cadmus (Phoenician) to Thebes (Bacotia) 1493 B.C.
Pelops’ (Phrygian) descendants (interrimmed with Danai) 1350 B.C.

\(^3\) “The Origin of the English,” Weldon, pp. 68–70.

\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 76–78.

\(^4\) “Israel Redivivus,” Danvers, p. 144.

\(^4\) Exodus i, 8.

\(^4\) Exodus ii, 23.

\(^4\) “Israel Redivivus,” Danvers, p. 151.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 152.
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The invaders introduced the Phoenician alphabet, improved agriculture, multiplied the rites of religion, taught the former inhabitants the use of metals, adopted the Grecian language and, generally, conformed to Grecian customs and institutions. Strabo describes the Pelasgians as barbarians. Thucydides regarded the Pelasgians and the Hellenes as one nation. Danaus moved first to establish his colony in the island of Rhodes, but, not being satisfied, moved thence to Argos in the Peloponnesus, where he established his sovereignty. Danvers gives the following arguments to support the case—on historical grounds—that it was Israel, and principally the tribe of Dan, which furnished the human element of classic Greece.

1. Dan, together with the other tribes of Israel, was in occupation of the very district whence the emigrations took place from Egypt to Greece, and that it is only reasonable to suppose that Danaus and his companions were Israelites, and that the leader was of the tribe of Dan.

2. That, as the Egyptians were never known to be colonists, the migration under Cecrops was also probably of the Israelite race, especially as these two migrations—after arrival in Greece—merged into one race under one name.

3. Grote, in his History of Greece, while admitting that these migrations took place, repudiates the idea that the Greeks—from an examination of their character and attitude—could have derived from either Egyptian or Phoenician ancestry.

4. Bishop Thirlwell, in his History of Greece, on the other hand, discredits the migrations, on the ground that the commonly accepted tradition that these migrations were by Egyptian colonies is incredible, because it was known that the true Egyptian was averse from migration and dreaded sea voyages.

5. That the Israelites were spoken of as Egyptians is evident from:

(a) Exodus ii, 19, where Moses is described by...
ISRAEL'S MIGRATIONS

place during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. Miletus was the most powerful colony."

Ibid., pp. 178, 179.

From there Sinope,67 the ancient Assyrian port, in the middle of the south coast of the Black Sea, was settled about 785 B.C., and all the shores of the Black Sea.

The original inhabitants of Greece have long since departed and, presumably, joined the general migration of Israel north-west. Latham, the ethnologist, says, "the whole country is Slavonized." The Greeks of to-day are not their descendants.

Herodotus tells us that the Lacedaemonians (Spartans) were in his day the most famous branch of the Danai, while the Books of the Macabees (1, xii, 21) and Josephus say that the Lacedaemonians claimed affinity with the Jews as being themselves of the stock of Abraham. This claim was admitted by the Jewish High Priest.

CHAPTER VIII

ISRAEL IN ASIA MINOR

It must be realized, as Dr. Goard has reminded us, that the history of Israel as given in the Bible is the history of Israel in Palestine. If any section of Israel, during Israel's national sojourn in 'the Land,' left the geographical boundaries of that land they ceased to find a place in its history. They are not forgotten in covenant or prophecy, but having marched out of the land they have, for that very reason, marched out of the historical record.

The story of the birth of Judah's twin sons is told in Genesis, how Zarah's68 hand came out first and had a red thread tied round it by the midwife, but that Pharez was born actually the elder. Zarah had five sons (1 Chron. ii, 6), but they are not included among the names of those who came into Egypt (Gen. xlvi, 12), though Zarah their father is included, so it seems that this important branch of the Judah tribe must have disappeared at an early date. On the other hand, the posterity of Pharez and Hezron (1 Chron. ii, 5; and iv, 1) is clearly indicated as the main element of Palestinian Judah.

It has already been shown (p. 63) that there are good grounds for thinking that a large element of Dan went to Greece while Israel was still in Egypt, but the headquarters of the tribe—later divided into two sections, northern and southern—was in Palestine up to the time of Ahijah's interview with Jeroboam (1 Kings xi, 30,31), about 984 B.C., but Eldad,69 a Hebrew writer of about the ninth century, says that in Jeroboam's time (975-958 B.C.) the

68 Gen. xxxviii, 28-30.
tribe of Dan being unwilling to shed their brethren’s blood, took a resolve to leave the country. It is to be noted that Dan is not mentioned in the genealogies of Israel (1 Chron. i.–viii). It is probable that northern Dan constituted the sea-going part of the tribe which was to “leap from Bashan,” and that southern Dan was the portion that was to “bite the horses’ heels,” i.e. to pursue after their enemy, presumably when this tribe was writing its name on the various rivers and towns beginning with the syllable ‘Dan,’ in its passage across Europe. It has already been shown in the Analysis of the Peoples of Europe, under the heading “Greece” (at p. 37), that present-day ethnologists are inclining to believe—and this is the decided opinion of Sir William Ridgeway in his Early Age of Greece, 1901—that the Achaeanots were Nordics, and that the leaders of Troy were also Nordics who came to the coast of Asia Minor as Phrygians.

In addition to Troy these Ionians occupied Miletus and all the coast line of Asia Minor as already explained (pp. 65, 66) and would have been in communication with those colonies of Israel (of the Assyrian captivity) which subsequently entered Pontus, Cappodocia and Paphlagonia (Bythinia). By St. Paul’s day a great part of Asia Minor was colonized by Israelites of the dispersion who were not Gentiles at all as we understand the term, but Israelites who had become, what the Israelites who still lived in Palestine considered to be, aliens, through uncircumcision of the flesh. Our Lord Himself said (Matt. xv, 24): “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel.” The logical presumption is that the Apostles would carry out these orders and, therefore, where they went you will find them preaching primarily to the Israelites. The Greek word ‘ethne’ and the Hebrew word ‘Goyim,’ which each means ‘nations,” have been translated ‘Gentiles.’ St. Paul addresses the audience at Antioch in Pisidia as “children of the stock of Abraham.” The distinction between the Helenized Israelites (i.e. Israelites not circum-
CHAPTER IX

ISRAEL IN CENTRAL ASIA

We have seen that one of the principal concentrations of the Israelites in the seventh century B.C. was located about Lake Van. They called themselves Sak-Geloths, but the Assyrians called them Sakhi, and the area which they occupied was known as Sakland. From here actual colonies—in addition to previous filtration from Palestine—were established in Airyan (Persia and Afghanistan) and later on in Turan (western Turkestan). Here we meet another name—that of Scythian. Who were they? Sir Henry Rawlinson in his brother’s edition of Herodotus, after saying that the term Scyth or Sacan is probably not a real ethnic name, but merely a title given to all nomads, states:

"From the mere term Scyth, therefore, we cannot conclude anything as to the ethnic character of a people."

The current Encyclopaedia Britannica, in an article on "Scythia," by V. Gordon Childe, Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology, Edinburgh, says:

"The oldest inhabitants of Scythia (country between the Crimea and the Danube) were the Cimmerii. They were perhaps of Iranian race, though others regard them as Thracian. In the seventh century B.C. these Cimmerians were attacked and partly driven out by a horde of newcomers from Upper Asia called Scythae. . . . About the same time similar peoples harassed the northern frontier of Iran (Persia), where they were called Saka (Sacae), and in later times Saka and Scyths, whether they were originally the same or not, were regarded as synonymous. It is difficult always to judge whether given information applies to Sacae or the Scyths."

Professor M. Rostovtzeff, one of the greatest modern authorities, says:

"I cannot dwell in detail on the hotly disputed problem of Scythian nationality. I believe the Scythians to have been Iranians. . . . Our information about the Ashgurzai—(N.B.: who joined the attack on Esar-haddon in 673 B.C., with Kashtartia of Kar-Kasshi, the Medes, the Kimerians, and the Minni)—who are the same as the Scythians, and about the Sacians: their close affinity with the Sarmatians, whose Iranian nationality is not disputed, and the evidence of Herodotus, confirmed by archaeology, as to the religion of the Pontic Scythians, leave no doubt that the Scythian tribes of south Russia were Iranians, nearly akin to the Medes and Persians, but belonging to another branch of the stock. It is well known that the linguistic evidence, founded on the few Scythian words transmitted to us by the Greeks, is in no way opposed to this hypothesis. But sufficient emphasis has not been laid on the archeological evidence which seems to me almost decisive. We have seen that very ancient monuments which we have every reason for assigning to the Scythians can only be explained by Iranian parallels: and that it is impossible to define the general character of Scythian art except by connecting it with Persian art of the same period."

Danvers (Israel Redivivus) deals fully with 'The Scythians' in chap. viii of that work, from which I am quoting freely:

Strabo says that "all the tribes east of the Caspian are called Scythic: the Dahae next the sea (Caspian), the Massagetae (great Getae) and Sacae more eastward, but every tribe has a particular name. All are nomadic."

During the seventh century B.C. there was a
considerable movement of tribes in an easterly and westerly direction. After conquering Bactria an irruption of the Scythians into India occurred about this time. De Guignes gives ample proof of their presence on the Indus. The first migration of the Scythians westward is recorded by Herodotus, the effect that the wandering Scythians once dwelt in Asia, and there warred with the Massagetae, but with ill success; they therefore quitted their homes, crossed the Araxes and entered the country of Kimmeria. Danvers gives an interesting account of various habits and customs of the Scythians:

(a) Making an ox boil itself by using the paunch for a cauldron and the bones for fuel (Herodotus iv, 61);
(b) abstinence from swine’s flesh (Herodotus iv, 63);
(c) soothsaying by means of staffs or wands (Herodotus iv, 67): (Compare this with Hosea iv, 12);
(d) hatred of foreign customs (Herodotus iv, 76, 81);
(e) good government, courtesy, and good manners, worthy and heroic acts (Keating, p. 54).
(f) drunkenness (Herodotus vi, 84; Isa. xxviii, 1 and 3; and in Isa. v, 11–13, as the primary cause of their sin and, therefore, of their captivity);
(g) waymarks—and the complete restoration of Israel (Jeremiah xxxi, 2–51).

The name Scythian was a name given to the wandering tribes by the Greeks. It remained till the beginning of the present era, as St. Paul used it (Col. iii, 11) and so did Josephus. Then with the decline of Greek history it disappeared.

Nearly two centuries go by, and the star of Alexander the Great (356–323 B.C.) rises. In 334 B.C. Alexander crossed into Asia, and

“in three battles—the Granicus 334 B.C., Issus 333 B.C., Arbela (Gougamela) 331 B.C.—shattered the power of Darius Codomanus, and effected the downfall not only of the Akhaimenean dynasty, but of Persian Dominion.”

“In the spring of 326 he crossed the Hindu Kush into Bactria and passed across the Oxus into Sogdiana (Bokhara). . . . Till the spring of 327 B.C. Alexander was moving to and fro in Bactria and Sogdiana, beating down the recurrent rebellions and planting Greek cities. . . . By the spring of 326 B.C. he had crossed the Indus—16 miles above Attock—and passed into the Punjab. He reached the Beas, and then the return march began, via the Indus, the sea coast of Baluchistan, Pura, Susa (324 B.C.) and Babylon (323 B.C.), where he died on June 28th (new style 13th), 323 B.C.”

“On his death all Asia, from Syria and Phrygia in the west to Sogdiana (Bokhara) and the Hindu Kush in the east, fell under the sway of Seleucus. This included Bactria and Parthia. . . . It is most important to distinguish between the original Parthians (the Parthava of the Behistun rock) and the Parni who were the later Imperial Parthians of Sakhian descent.”

“When, about 255 B.C., Dioptus had made himself king of Bactria and tried to expand his dominions, the chieftain of a tribe of Iranian nomads (Dahan Scyths) east of the Caspian, the Parni or Aparni, who bore the Persian name Arsaces, fled before him into Parthia.” Here the latter slew the Satrap Andragoras and became the founder of the Parthian kingdom (248 B.C.). “The day of his final victory over Dioptus is celebrated by the Parthians as the beginning of their independence” (Justin xli, 4). “The Scythian nomads became the ruling race: they were invested with large landed property, formed the council of the king, and appointed his successor. They were archers, fighting on horseback, and in their cavalry consisted the strength of the Parthian army.”

“European and Other Race Origins,” Bruce Han- nay, p. 390.
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It is probable that among the Parthians themselves only the dominant classes were Saghis. The conquests of Alexander in 327 B.C. had disturbed the conditions under which the Saghis had been living in Airyan, under the Akhaemenids, and they appear to have vanished eastward.

“The Skuths of Sogdiana (Samarkand) penetrated into China as far as Kan-su and there acquired the name of Yue-chi.”

From Kan-su they were driven back about 200 B.C. by the Hiung-Nu (Huns?) to Issik-kul, and then (159 B.C.), according to Chinese annals, ejected the Tokhari from Sogdiana and reoccupied their old homeland about Samarkand. In 136 B.C. the Parthians began to settle in Afghanistan, Punjab, and Guzerat, and were called Sakas (pronounced there Saghis). In 120 B.C. other Sakas occupied what is now Baluchistan. Between 112 and 88 B.C. streams of Skuths—Yue-chi and other Saghis—passed through the Crimea into Europe. Many of the ruling families and governors left behind were men of Yue-chi blood. The Parthian empire struggled on till A.D. 226, but by 20 B.C. its life-blood, “the Saghis of Central Asia,” or ‘People of Asha’ had passed on their way to Europe (via the Crimea) at the dawn of the Christian era. Here, in European Skuthia, being acknowledged as kinsmen, they were admitted into the community of the Scclotoi in the country round Kieff, which was no longer called Scuthia but Asa-land, of which the capital was Asgard.

CHAPTER X

ISRAEL IN SPAIN AND IN IRELAND

We are told that the original inhabitants of Ireland were Fomorians. They were supposed to be African pirates, but were more probably Phoenicians. Then came Partholan—according to Keating—

“originally a Scythian, who came from Greece. He is said to have divided the country into four parts. The tradition tells us that Partholan and the whole of his followers, numbering 9,000 people, were carried off by a plague. The third invasion places us on slightly firmer ground. This occupation was by the sons of Nemed. The Nemedians were the progenitors of the Firbolgs and the Tuatha de Danann. . . . The Firbolgs retained the supremacy of Ireland until they were defeated and dispersed by the Tuatha de Danann in a great battle at Moytura (also Magh Tura, p. 24, n. t.). . . . Keating states that those of them who escaped the slaughter at Moytura fled to the Hebrides, where they remained until driven out by the Picts.”

“With the disappearance of the Dananns and the arrival in Ireland of their supplacers, the Milesians, we begin to approach the fringe of genuine history. For the so-called sons of Milesius, or Miled, of Spain, are believed by Irish writers to be the progenitors of the Celtic people in Ireland.” Keating observes that the Milesians were the same race as the

“Dananns for, when the son of Breoghan arrived, the people conversed in the same language. What this language was is proved by the words of the Phoenician, or Carthaginian, slave in the Poenulus
of Plautus, being nearly pure Irish as spoken only last (18th) century. It is shown in a pamphlet printed in Dublin in 1772, 'Essay on the antiquity of the Irish language' that the Phoenician language was identical with the Hebrew. The same passage in Plautus may be found transcribed into Hebrew, in the Transactions Bib. Arch. par. ii, Vol. ii, 1874.”

I now quote from an article84 'The Gaal Sciot Iber and the Gael: an Inquiry,' by Sir Lewis E. J. Hay, Bart. He says: In the National Message, No. 54, p. 20, the editor, in a short review, calls attention to a publication (1922) entitled 'Eri: Being gleanings of very ancient Irish History,' by 'M. J.' as derived from the 'Chronicles of Eri,' translated from the Phoenician language by Dr. O'Conor, 1822. The author of the book, 'M. J.' prefaced it with the following foreword:

"The written 'Chronicles of Eri' were commenced by Eolus, who ruled the Gaal of Sciot Iber (known to some historians as the Milesian race), in Galicia of Spain from 1308 to 1335 B.C. He gives the history of his own race as, until that time, passed down from father to son. Eolus acquired his knowledge of writing in Zidon."

On pp. 33–35 the author, 'M. J.' gives the names and chronology of the rulers of the Gaal Sciot Iber in Galicia, Spain, from 1491 B.C. (incidentally Ussher's date of the Exodus) to 1000 B.C., the latter being the date the Gaal Sciot Iber emigrated from Spain and invaded Ireland, where they then encountered a golden-haired, blue-eyed, white-skinned, well-formed race known as the Tuatha Dé Danann. Mackenzie says85:

"I have thus sought to lead up to the conclusion I have formed that the so-called Milesian Scots (or supposed Scythians) belonged to the Teutonic branch of the Indo-European family (i.e. Nordics) and that the name 'Gael' was applied to a con-

84 "The Races of Ireland and Scotland," Mackenzie, p. 72.
85 "The Races of Ireland and Scotland," Mackenzie, p. 72.
CHAPTER XI

ISRAEL IN EUROPE

DIODORUS SICULUS,92 who wrote during the first century before Christ, gives information about the migration from Asia to Europe. He says:93

"This nation prospered still more and more, and had kings that were very famous; from whom the Sacans, the Massageties, the Arimaspians, and many others derive their origin. Amongst others there were two remarkable colonies that were drawn out of the conquered nations by those kings: the one they brought out of, Assyria and settled in the country lying between Paphlagonia and Pontus; the other out of Media, which they placed near the River Tanais (Don)."

He also says:

"The Scythians anciently enjoyed but a small tract of ground, but, through their valour, growing stronger by degrees, they enlarged their dominions far and near and attained at last to a great and glorious empire. At first a very few of them, and those very despicable for their mean original, seated themselves near the River Araxes."

The quotations recorded seem to indicate two points. First the words 'mean original' point to people who had, at one time, been captive. Second, the starting-point, and the settlement, of the two colonies mentioned, direct attention to the routes presumably followed by two of the main migrations of Israel. It is believed that the Kimmerians moved, after the destruction of Sardis, northward via the Bosphorus to the region of the Crimea (Kimmeria), from which they retreated on the approach of one of the main bodies of Israel (Beth-Sak or Sak-Geloth or Socoltoi). The latter had come from the neighbourhood of present-day Armenia across the Caucasus, first to the Crimea (Rawlinson fixes the date for this movement as between 650–600 B.C.), then to Arsareth, and afterwards spread themselves—progressively—over the country from the Don to the Danube, and over the present-day Ukraine. The Kimmerians, after their retreat, divided; the greater part retired westward, but part moved back to Asia Minor, the coasts of which they ravaged, from Lydia to Cilicia, for thirty years, until Alyattes expelled them, at least from Lydia.

Darius Hystaspes is said to have based his war against the Scythians on the ground that the Socoltoi had formerly been in Asia and had ravaged it. He probably knew that they had come from Sak-land and were therefore Sacae (or Sakai) which, with all Persians, is identical with Skuthai.

"In this war, about 512 B.C., he crossed the Bosphorus with a big army, subjugated eastern Thrace, and crossed the Danube. We may conclude that Darius made an attempt to secure the Danube frontier. It is known that he was much harassed by the nomad tribes, with whom he could not come to close quarters, that he suffered serious reverses and retired with loss."

Justin,100 the abbreviator of the work of Trogus, enlarging upon the military exploits of the Scythian nation, gives the following account of them:

"The Scythians were either always free from the attempts of any other nation, or came off conquerors when they were attacked. They drove Darius, the Persian king, out of Scythia, who was glad to save himself by an ignominious flight; they also killed Cyrus and his whole army."

There is no evidence in history of any movement of Scyths from this territory; there is, therefore, strong presumption that the people who appeared

92 "Israel Redivivus," Danvers, p. 95.
93 Diodorus Siculus, Bk. II, c. 3.
94 "Israel Redivivus," Danvers, p. 95.
96 "European and Other Race Origins," Bruce Han- nay, p. 310.
98 Ibid., Bk. iv, c. 11, 12.
100 Ibid., p. 187.
there later were the same race under other names. The Scythians and Getae are both mentioned by Herodotus as residing in the same district.

"The Getae on the south of the Danube, and the Scythes on the other side. Pliny and Strabo extend the Getae all over the west of the Euxine (Black Sea), and Strabo prolongs them through half of Germany."

The current edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica says:

"The Getae are an ancient people of Thracian origin, closely akin to the Daci. Their original home seems to have been the district on the right (south) bank of the Danube between the rivers Oexus (Iskr) and Iatrus (Yantra). . . . The Getae are described by Herodotus (iv, 93–96) as the most valiant and upright of the Thracian tribes: but what chiefly struck Greek inquiries was their belief in the immortality of the soul. . . . They were experts in the use of the bow and arrow while on horseback."

While of Dacia and the Dacians the current Encyclopaedia Britannica says:

"By the Greeks the Dacians were usually called Getae, by the Romans Daci. . . . The Dacians had attained a considerable degree of civilization when they first became known to the Romans. They believed in the immortality of the soul, and regarded death as merely a change of country. . . . A kingdom of Dacia was in existence at least as early as the beginning of the second century B.C."

We will now take up the story of the main body of the Kimmerians, which retired from the Crimea westward about 600 B.C., on the approach of the Beth-Sak or Scolotoi. They appear to have remained in their settlements on the Danube till 114 B.C., when they moved west along the Drave and startled the Roman troops at Noria, in 113 B.C.

A considerable amount of fighting took place in Switzerland, south Gaul, and north-east Spain, in which the Kimbri were uniformly successful. At Arausio, on the Rhone, in modern Provence, they gained a smashing double victory, but they were heavily defeated by Marius, on 30th July, 101 B.C., at Vercellae, and only a remnant escaped to north-west Germany. A century later they are found in the Kimbri Chersonese (Jutland).

"For a few years at the beginning of the Christian era the part of Germany which lies west of the Elbe was under Roman government."

The numerous tribes in that area had been giving trouble, and Augustus Caesar was determined to deal with them. Quintilius Varus, who had been appointed the Roman commander in that region in A.D. 6, had been irritating them by uprooting their customs. In the summer of A.D. 9 Varus set out with the XVII, XVIII and XIX Legions, some cavalry and auxiliaries, in all some 27,000 men, to repress a local rising. This had been engineered by Arminius, the chief of the Cheruscan (Keruscan) tribe; who was only in his twenty-fifth year.

"As the Romans reached the slope of the Teutoburg the German hordes broke in on them from all sides."

After two days’ fighting the whole force was slaughtered, and three Roman legions were lost. As a consequence of this defeat, which is included by Creasy in his Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World, the frontiers of the Roman empire were withdrawn to the Rhine and the Danube. Arminius (Hermann, the war-man) was assassinated in his thirty-seventh year. ‘Ermine Street,’ possibly, commemorates the name of the victor of this famous victory.
CHAPTER XII

THE GOTHES

DACIA was a Roman province by the Emperor Trajan in A.D. 105–107, but his hold on the province was precarious. The earlier ‘Scuthia’ was a square between the Don on the east and the Carpathian Mountains on the west. The later ‘Scuthia’ was an oblong between the Dnieper on the east and the Theiss, a tributary of the Danube, on the west.

In A.D. 256 the Goths crossed the Carpathians and drove the Romans from Dacia. It is to be noted that these Goths who invaded Roman territory came from the very same districts formerly occupied by the Scythians. This, according to Gibbon, was the first considerable occasion in which history mentions the Goths, that great people who afterwards broke the Roman power.”

Gibbon, in commenting, writes of a Gothic history (in twelve books) written by Cassiodorus,

“now reduced to the imperfect abridgement of Jornandec . . . which adorned the triumphs with many Asiatic trophies that more properly belonged to the people of Scythia.”

Gibbon also says that all the Greek writers, after this period, still uniformly call those people Scythae, whom the Latin authors denominate Goths. Jornandec always speaks of the Scythae, Getae and Goths as one people. In fact, he entitles his history ‘De Getarum, Sive Gothorum, origine et rebus gestis.’

According to Tacitus (Annals II, 62) the Goths were established towards the mouth of the Vistula—at least as early as the Christian era—subdivided into Ostrogoths, Visigoths and Gepidae. The migration of Odin with a band of followers from the banks of the Tanais (Don) is generally supposed to have taken place about the middle of the first century before the Christian era. He is stated to have come from Asa-land (capital Asgard), a district of the Tanais, and to have settled, first in Odins, in the island of Fyen, Denmark, then in Stockholm (the lesser Svitiod in Sweden, in contrast to the larger Svitiod, or Scythia, whence he came). To this Odin (or Wodin) all the Anglo-Saxon princes and chiefs (including Hengist and Horsa) trace their origin.

The Goths, who had remained in the country north of the Danube, early in the Christian era moved northwards from the Danube to the Ukraine; Dacia, formerly known as Scythia, as well as Moesia having become Roman provinces.

It is to be noted that in the current Encyclopædia Britannica although in the article on the ‘Goths’ ‘the identification, by Jordanes, of the Goths with the Getae is considered erroneous,’ yet in the article on the ‘Getae’ in the same volume this opinion is considerably modified to “the view that the Getae were identical with the Goths is not generally accepted.” Further, in an article on ‘Jordanes’ himself in Vol. xiii of the same Encyclopædia Britannica his history is considered “valuable for Jordanes’ own period.”

“The first certain references to the Goths in ancient literature go back to the first years of the Christian era. They do not enter into Roman history until the 3rd century, when their frontier seems to have been advanced considerably further south, and the whole country as far as the lower Danube was frequently ravaged by them . . . The Emperor Decius was slain by the Goths in Moesia.

“Jordanes records a victory won by Ostrogotha over Fastida, king of the Gepidae, and another by Geberic over Visimar, king of the Vandals,
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about the end of Constantine's reign. . . . Geberic was succeeded by the most famous of the Gothic kings, Hermaneric. . . . According to Jordanes he conquered the Heruli, the Aestii, the Venedi, and a number of other tribes who seem to have been settled in the southern part of Russia. . . . Hermaneric committed suicide in his distress because of an invasion of the Huns about A.D. 370, and the portion of the nation called Ostrogoths then came under Hunnish supremacy."

According to some writers19 (Kopke, p. 123, and Pulman II, p. 63) a great change took place when, about A.D. 365, the great mass of the Gothic nation began to return to God. As pagan Scythians they remained scattered and lost, as Goths (i.e. Gauthei 'the people of God') they had been gathered once more from out of the nations, as Moses had prophesied would be the case (Deut. xxx, 1-3).

From an article20 on the later history of the Goths, by Edward Freeman, English historian:

"From about this time the history of the East and West Goths parts asunder. In 376 a great part of the West Gothic people, under their chief Frithigern, crossed the Danube into the Roman province of Moesia, with the approval of the imperial government. Disputes between the new settlers and the Roman officials soon led to a war, marked by the great Gothic victory at Adrianople in 378, when the emperor Valens was killed. His successor, Theodosius the Great, made terms with the Goths in 381, and the mass of the Gothic warriors entered the Roman service as 'foederati'. . . .

"The death of Theodosius in 395 broke up the union between the West Goths and the empire. The Goths threw off their allegiance and chose Alaric as their king. Under him the Goths are an independent people, under a national king . . . and made no lasting settlement. In his second Italian war "he thrice besieged Rome (408, 409, 410). The third time he sacked the city." He died in 410. . . . "Under Theodoric I (419–451) Goth and Romans became for a time united against their common enemy Attila, king of the Huns. But they met Gothic warriors in Attila's army. By the terms of their subjection to the Huns, the East Goths came to fight for Attila against Christendom (Romans and West Goths) at Chalons. Theodoric fell in the battle (451). After this momentary meeting the history of the East and West Goths again separates for awhile. The West Gothic kingdom of Toulouse grew, within Gaul at the expense of the empire, and in Spain at the expense of the Suevi. Under Euric (466–485) the West Gothic power again became largely a Spanish power. . . . When the Hunnish power broke in pieces on the death of Attila the East Goths recovered their full independence. . . . Towards the close of the 5th century their royal house produced a great figure in the person of Theodoric, son of Theodemir. Theodoric the Great is sometimes the friend, sometimes the enemy of the empire, but in all cases alike he remains the national East Gothic king. . . . By 493 the East Gothic power was fully established over Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia and the lands to the north of Italy. . . . In Theodoric's later years the kingdoms of East and West Goths were in effect united. . . . The dominion of Theodoric was not a barbarian but a civilized power. . . . Such a system as that which Theodoric established needed a Theodoric to carry it on. On his death (526) the East and West Goths were again separated. . . . The essential weakness of the East Gothic position in Italy now showed itself. The long wars of Justinian's reign (533–555) recovered Italy for the empire, and the Gothic name died out."

Bradley in his History of the Goths11 (Story of the Nations Series, 1888) says that after their final defeat by Narses, A.D. 552:

"All they (the Goths) would promise was that


they would never again bear arms against the empire, and this only on condition of being allowed an unmolested passage out of Italy, and of receiving money for the expenses of their journey. The Roman generals held a council to discuss this proposal: they had such a terrible experience of the desperate valour of the Goths that they decided to accept the conditions. So, in March, A.D. 553 the remnant of the defeated army set out on their northward march. What became of them history does not say."

The probability is that the remnant moved north to rejoin their kinsmen, the Northern Goths, in Sweden and Jutland, and that their descendants came over to Britain with the general migration of Northmen, between A.D. 787 and 1066.

Jordanes—himself a Goth, who flourished about A.D. 550—concludes his history of the Goths with the events of A.D. 540, of which he wrote:

"And thus a most famous nation and an ancient kingdom came to its end, in almost the two thousand and thirtieth year of its existence, destroyed by Justinian and his faithful consul Belisarius."

This would bring the birth of this nation to 1490 B.C., the date given by Archbishop Ussher, in the Bible, as that of the Exodus, when the nation was formed, in one day, at Sinai.

"The West Gothic kingdom lasted much longer and came much nearer to establishing itself as a national power in the lands which it took in. But its history was long influenced by the difference of race and faith between the Arian Goths and the Catholic Romans of Gaul and Spain. . . In Spain the Gothic power outlived the Roman power, but it outlived it only by itself becoming in some measure Roman. The greatest period of the Gothic power as such was in the reign of Leovigild (568-586). . . . The next reign, that of his son Recared (586-601), was marked by a change which took away the great hindrance in the way of any national union between the Goths and the Romans. The king and the greater part of the Gothic people embraced the Catholic faith. . . . The kingdom, however, still remained a Gothic kingdom. . . . The modern Spanish nation is the growth of the long struggle with the Mussulmans which followed the overthrow of the Visigothic kingdom in 711. Nevertheless, the Goths hold altogether a different place in Spanish memory from that which they hold in Italian memory. In Italy the Goth was but a momentary invader and ruler. In Spain the Goth supplies an important element in the modern nation. And that element has been neither forgotten nor despised."
CHAPTER XIII

ARRIVAL IN BRITAIN

From the testimony of Strabo (54 B.C.—A.D. 24), Pliny (A.D. 23–79), Tacitus (A.D. 61–117), Ptolemy (A.D. 139–161) and other writers, it appears that the advanced guard of Israel was, by 58 B.C., occupying the following countries in north-west Europe, bordering the North Sea:

- The Yotar, or Gotar (called by Tacitus, Suiones), in Lower Sweden and Jutland;
- The Angli and Saxons in Schleswig-Holstein;
- The Cheruski (Keruski), the Chauci, and the Fosi, in N.W. Germany;
- The Frisii in Holland.

Here they were joined, about A.D. 220, by the main body of Israel from Asa-land (originally known as Scythia—capital Asgard, modern Kieff). There they remained, developing their power and their character, till the movements to Britain began: first the Saxons under Hengist and Horsa in A.D. 449, then the Angles in 586, the Danes in 787, and finally the Normans in 1066.

CONCLUSION

The point to be settled is this: Israel was taken captive by the Assyrians at different dates between 740 and 677 B.C. The various contingents of the inhabitants of Britain had arrived here by A.D. 1066. Can any historical connection link these two factors, as I have tried to show?

Israel, on her captivity, was placed first in Mesopotamia, and then in Media, and was re-named by her Assyrian captors Beth-Omri or Bit-Ghumri. From the record of the Behistun rock (the key-link of the chain between Palestine and Britain) the name of the captive Israelites is shown to be Gimirri in the Babylonian text and, alternatively, Saka in the Persian text. The late Professor Sayce has said that Cyrus was a Manda, and that the Manda were Gimirra, also that the Manda of Ecbatana were the Scythians of classical history. There is evidence that one of the main bodies of Israel—the Sak-Geloths (captive from Sak, from the district named after them, Sakland)—crossed the Caucasus during the period 650–600 B.C., according to Rawlinson. On the approach of the Sak-Geloths (Scoloti) to the Crimea, the Kimmeri—who had previously occupied it, after leaving Asia Minor and moving through Thrace—retired without fighting back to the Danube, and the Sak-Geloths (now called Scoloti, Sacae, and Scythians) occupied what was known as Scythia—the district between the Don and the Danube.

Previous to this, filtrations from Palestine, and colonies from the Sak-Geloths in Sak-land (Armenia), had established roving tribes of Sakae, or Scythians (White Nordics), on the plateau of Iran, and moving thence occupied India (north-west), Bactria, Sogdiana, even up to the north-west corner of China (Kun-suh province). There is nothing strange in this world-wide dispersion, because the Most High "set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. xxxiii, 8), nor is there anything strange in the continuous change of name, for it was the principal means by which Israel was to be lost, after God had pronounced judgment that His Isra-el name was to be polluted no more (Ezek. xx, 39).

The main body of these Asiatic Sakae then (probably on account of the drying-up of Central Asia) surged back, at the dawn of the Christian era, to Scythia, which was, after this, re-named Asa-land (Asia-land), Otelius says that on entering Arsareth (Scythia) the ten tribes took the name of Goths. Gibbon says that 'Goth' was the Latin version of the (Grecian) Scythic name. Irish history shows clearly that the words Scythian and Goth are
equated, and that both have been derived, as has been shown, by link from Palestine.

The Kimmeri remained on the Danube for four or five hundred years, and then moved west, and after much fighting in Switzerland and south Gaul settled in Jutland. The story of the Goths we have followed to their semi-final settlement in Sweden and Jutland and then, from the shore-lands of the North Sea, Israel under its various names, Saxon, and Angle, Jute, Dane, and Norman, settled in its island home, according to God's promise to David (2 Sam. vii, 10).

This is the story as we read it from an historical standpoint. From an ethnological aspect it is evident that Israel was not a Semitic race, and there is good ground for believing that it was, and is, a Nordic race. The archaeological side does yield evidence in the same direction (e.g. see Professor Rostovtzeff's evidence, p. 71), which is merely awaiting further development, and it is hoped that this may be forthcoming before long.

APPENDICES

I ARCHÆOLOGICAL CHRONOLOGY
(a) After Henry Fairfield Osborn, 1915. Taken from "The Passing of the Great Race" (Madison Grant), p. 132.

Late Neolithic  . . . . 3000–2000 B.C.
Orient  . . . . 3000–2000 B.C.
Bronze  
Western and Northern  . . . . 1800–500 B.C.
Europe  . . . . 1800–500 B.C.

(b) Taken from "Encyclopædia Britannica," 14th edition, Volume II, p. 254.

Early Iron  
Hallstat  . . . . 1000–500 B.C.
La Tene  . . . . 500 B.C.—A.D. 50

II KINGS OF ASSYRIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shalmaneser I</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukulti-in-aristi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal-kudur-uzur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiglath-pilesar I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur-nazir-pal III</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalmaneser II</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsi-Hadad</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pul or Tiglath-pilesar III</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became Sovereign of Asia</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalmaneser IV</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Died while pressing the Siege of Samaria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sennacherib</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed Babylon</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esar-haddon</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur-bani-pal</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur-etil-ilani</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-sar-iskun (Sin-sarra-uzur)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### III THE ACHÆMENIDS

Taken from "Encyclopaedia Britannica," Volume XVII, p. 567, and VII, pp. 59, 60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conquered the Medes in 550; King of Babylon from 539)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambyses</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smerdis</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius I</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxes I</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes I</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxes II</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius II</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes II</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes III</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arses</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius III</td>
<td>336–330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV METRIC EQUIVALENTS in feet and inches (approximate), for stature:

1 metre 60 = 62.922 in. or 5 ft. 3 in. approx.

65 = 64.961 in. or 5 ft. 5 in.

70 = 66.999 in. or 5 ft. 7 in.

75 = 68.988 in. or 5 ft. 9 in.

80 = 70.866 in. or 5 ft. 11 in.
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Tacitus 82</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Teospa 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teutobrig 81</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teutonic 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theban Kings 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoric (the Great) 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-years war 41</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrillwall 64</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van (L) 57, 70</td>
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