

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION--THE REASONS FOR THE UNCERTAINTY OF HISTORY.....	1
THE BIBLE CHALLENGES HISTORY.....	3
<u>Chapter 1</u> --THE HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITES.....	4
ISRAEL IN CAPTIVITY.....	6
GRANDEUR AND DECADENCE UNDER SOLOMON.....	6
ISRAEL DIVIDES.....	7
ISRAEL TURNS TO IDOLATRY.....	8
THE DYNASTY OF OMRI.....	8
DECADENCE CONTINUES.....	9
ISRAEL IS TAKEN INTO CAPTIVITY.....	10
<u>Chapter 2</u> --CAPTIVITY AND LIBERATION.....	11
A DEPORTATION IN SEVERAL STAGES.....	11
THE MIGRATION.....	12
WHERE DID THEY GO?.....	14
<u>Chapter 3</u> --THE ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF FRANCE.....	15
THE LIGURIANS.....	15
IDENTITY OF THE LIGURIANS ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE.....	16
THE IBERIANS.....	16
IDENTITY OF THE IBERIANS ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE.....	17
<u>Chapter 4</u> --THE CIMBRI AND THE CIMMERIANS.....	18
SOME UNKNOWN PEOPLE ARRIVE IN EUROPE.....	18
THE SCYTHIANS.....	19
THE SAXONS.....	21
<u>Chapter 5</u> --THE CELTS AND THE GAULS.....	23
THE KEY TO THE MYSTERY.....	24
RECAPITULATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITES.....	25
THE NEIGHBORS OF THE GAULS.....	26
THE CELTIC LEAGUE.....	27
<u>Chapter 6</u> --THE ORIGIN OF THEIR NAME.....	28
BIBLICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	28
HISTORICAL FACTS.....	29
THE TERMS "CELTAE", "GALATAE", AND "GALLI".....	30
THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT TERMS.....	30

LANGUAGE DOESN'T NECESSARILY INDICATE RACE.....	32
HEBREW OR SANSKRIT?.....	32
THE RIVALRY OF SANSKRIT.....	33
THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE SEMITIC AND EUROPEAN LANGUAGES....	34
THE LANGUAGE OF THE TRIBES AFTER THE LIBERATION.....	35
THE EXAMPLE OF JUDAH.....	36
<u>Chapter 8</u> --COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS.....	37
THE CHARACTER AND PERSONALITY OF REUBEN.....	37
THE COLLECTIVE PERSONALITY AND CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH....	38
<u>Chapter 9</u> --THE DRUIDS AND THE DOLMENS.....	41
THE DRUIDS AS JUDGES.....	42
THE DRUIDS IN CHARGE OF EDUCATION.....	43
THE DRUIDS WERE EXEMPT FROM TAXES AND MILITARY SERVICE....	43
THE DOLMENS.....	44
THE MEANING OF THE DOLMENS.....	45
SOME BIBLICAL EXAMPLES OF RAISED STONES.....	46
<u>Chapter 10</u> --THE OAK AND THE GODS OF THE DRUIDS.....	47
THE GAULIC GODS.....	48
BAAL AMONG THE TWO PEOPLES.....	49
<u>Chapter 11</u> --RITES AND CUSTOMS AMONG THE TWO PEOPLES.....	50
PUNISHMENT BY FIRE AND WATER.....	50
THE COUNTERFEIT OF THE FEASTS OF THE ETERNAL.....	51
HOW DID THE DRUIDS RECKON TIME?.....	51
SOME SOCIAL CUSTOMS.....	53
<u>Chapter 12</u> --THE FRANKS.....	54
THE INVASION OF THE FRANKS.....	54
THE FRANKISH TRIBES.....	55
THE SALIAN FRANKS.....	55
THE NAME OF FRANCE.....	56
<u>Conclusion</u> --THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO PROPHECY.....	57
THE DECADENCE OF FRANCE.....	58
THE REASON FOR ITS DECADENCE.....	58
GRANDEUR AND DECLINE.....	59
MODERN ISRAEL IN PROPHECY.....	60

THE FRENCH-SPEAKING PEOPLES IN PROPHECY

by Dibar Apartian

INTRODUCTION--THE REASONS FOR THE UNCERTAINTY OF HISTORY

The origins of the histories of the French-speaking countries, as those of all the nations of the world, represent an insoluble mystery for historians and ethnologists. They recognize frankly that the annals of ancient history are very obscure. "History doesn't know the origin of any people" remarked Lenormant ("Ancient History of the Orient", p. 234) adding that the further one attempts to delve into the past, the more obscure it becomes.

What then is the REASON? Better than anyone, Paul, "the apostle to the Gentiles", can give us the answer in his epistle to the Romans, written under divine inspiration:

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men, who hold the truth CAPTIVE, because that which may be known of God is manifest to them; for God has showed it to them...they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." (Rom. 1:18-21)

Unlike the theorems of geometry and mathematics, history, to such an extent as mankind has exposed it, has given us no reliable summary which will not be corrupted. Its knowledge is not only scanty, but also hypothetical. In the "Preface" of his work entitled "Encyclopedia of World History", Mr. Langer recognizes this gap and confirms the fact that a number of historical facts are themselves contested, and so little corroborated, that they could never establish the basis of any definite testimony.

History, therefore, has no POINT OF DEPARTURE. It ignores that there is a source, or rather it rejects it firmly, as we are going to see. Consequently, having no one definite source from which it can draw its pieces of information with the desired assurance, the historian tends to speak of the "possible" and of

the "probable". But this possible and this probable, by the admission of Jubainville "holds a LARGER AND LARGER PLACE which is increased proportionally as the number of centuries which separate us from the events." ("The First Inhabitants of Europe", p. VIII)

We live in an age in which man has no fear of considering "obsolete" every work or treatise, or any knowlege that is not the product of the present generation--including the BIBLE! Thus, history is doubly vulnerable, for not only does it miss necessary clues, but as well, since it refuses to consider the biblical date of the creation of man, its chronology becomes almost entirely a myth!

History, as historians tell it, depends exclusively on scientific knowlege acquired by men through the ages. To cite an example, bibliography, paleography, archaeology, chronology, paleontology, etc. are some sciences related to History; because their principles change with the course of civilization, History, in turn, remains SUBJECT TO REVISION, if not always unexpected, at least sometimes radical.

What is more, History is given an essentially inductive or logical quality, seeing that it GOES BACK THROUGH time instead of building up on data from earlier eras, and that it must RECONSTRUCT situations based on how things later became instead of the opposite. By assuming these backward roles, the inductive and conjectural part of History ends up becoming the most important part, and one is thus lost in false reasonings and relying on traditions of men, and "on the rudiments of the world" (Col. 2:8).

Another cause of the inaccuracy of History is surely due to the sometimes overly enthusiastic patriotism of historians, whose accounts are often presented with prejudice and partiality:

"Is there an impartial history? And first, what is history?" writes Anatole France. "How can a historian judge whether a fact is important or not? He judges it arbitrarily." ("The Garden of Epicure", p. 139)

No one can dispute this fact. Each nation takes pride in its past and its individual contribution to civilization. If it has some pretention to age, it tries to prove that its history dates from a time well before the actual appearance of man! So

it is that ancient nations such as Egypt and Persia, whose historical chronologies have inspired those of other nations, have an extravagant system to calculate dates, even though they offer not one historic certainty!

THE BIBLE CHALLENGES HISTORY

Where then is a compass which can guide historians and scholars in their research--the official and infallible source from which they could draw their understanding, a source from which it would be possible to verify the authenticity of their discoveries?

The answer is obvious: THE BIBLE! Unfortunately, it is discarded by nearly every modern expert in the matter of history, under the pretext that its accounts are not only vague and contradictory, but that they belong in the realm of fantasy! Nevertheless, these same experts consider in complete faith the ancient "legends", notably of the Greek world, passed on to us! This paradox is inexplicable!

Thus the scientific world rejects the authority of the Bible. It takes offense even at the idea that the Bible could have been drafted under divine inspiration. This truth affronts and insults it! At most, some consider the NEW Testament the sacred book of Christians, but the OLD Testament--after all--couldn't be but a beautiful anthology of legends or Jewish history. "The Bible is a literary work, and not a dogma", says philosopher George Santayana ("Dialogues in Limbo").

If the Old Testament is nothing but a simple history of the Jewish people, don't you think its "authors" would have been able to at least give proof of a little more chauvinism in regard to their country, reporting things a little more advantageously and a little stretched?

The fact that archaeological discoveries regularly confirm the Biblical accounts has no effect at all on the preconceived ideas of the experts. Totally rejecting divine authority, man seeks in any way to discredit the Bible; the historic events that it accounts are seen only in the light of the dogmas of History. In case of contradiction or controversy, the experts always put their trust in History--never in the BIBLE!

Would it then be reckless to say that historians, in general, do not believe in God? How could they believe in Him if they reject the truth of the events described in the Bible? The Bible

is infallible; it is the WORD OF GOD, but men don't understand it. Notice in this regard the response of the illustrious Tallyrand, when asked if he believed in the Bible. He declared that he had two invincible reasons to believe: "First, because I am Bishop of Autun; and next, because I listen to absolutely nothing"! ("Varietes", Dec. 20, 1934)

This answer is not only comic: it is especially tragic! For ourselves, we can declare that we also have two INVINCIBLE reasons to believe in the Bible; but ours are much different than Tallyrand's. First, we are not under the yoke of human doctrines and traditions; next, by the grace of the Spirit of God, we can UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE!

Chapter 1

THE HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITES

History knows, in general, that the GAULS are the true ancestors of the FRENCH; but there again, there are very divided opinions on the origin of this Celtic people.

Who then were the GAULS? Where did they come from? What is their true origin? What were their characteristic traits, their customs, their culture and their religion?

This is precisely their history that we are going to study in the light of the Bible. In doing this, we must "prove all things", in order to prove and reclaim the truth, according to divine instructions (I Thess. 5:21). Indeed, all scripture was given by divine inspiration, "to TEACH, to convince, to correct, and to INSTRUCT" (II Tim. 3:16).

We must become as the Bereans, who, having received the Word, eagerly "searched the scriptures daily, to prove whether these things be so" (Acts 17:10, 11). But once the truth is revealed to you, you must ACCEPT it honestly and without prejudice, in order to replace the false doctrines you have believed before.

The history of the GAULS, in the eyes of the world, begins around the seventh century B.C. -- but the fact is the Gauls existed long before this era! If their identity remains lost in History, it is because they carried before a different name: a

BIBLICAL NAME.

As strange as it might seem, the history of the Gauls--this people who lived under the rulership of the Druids--BEGINS at the same time as the HISTORY OF ISRAEL, and that, so the Bible tells us with great precision, begins with ABRAHAM.

To be able to really understand this story, you must first attentively read and study the sensational work of Mr. Herbert W. Armstrong, "The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy". This booklet, at once astonishing and exciting, complements ours; in other words, the two form a SINGLE STUDY. We could not overemphasize this, for without having read "The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy" you will never be able to understand the direct connection between the Celtic peoples and the Israelites. (If you have not read it, write us, and we will send you a copy free of charge. Not only do we often refer to this booklet, but it forms, we should repeat, an essential and integral part of this study.)

In the first chapter of his work, Mr. Armstrong explains in detail and with skill the promise the Eternal made to Abraham. It proves irrefutably that this divine promise has a double phase-- a double nature: one PHYSICAL, the other SPIRITUAL.

Mr. Armstrong also shows that the physical promise pertained to ISRAEL while the spiritual promise was to JUDAH. The world doesn't understand this prophecy at all, and they think that JUDAH and ISRAEL are the same nation. As Mr. Armstrong demonstrates, this grave error prevents people from understanding the truth.

The term "Jew" is only a nickname given to the people of JUDAH. It refers only to that nation, the house of Judah--never to the house of ISRAEL.

In fact, the very first time the Bible speaks of the "Jews", they were in a state of war against Israel! (II Kings 16:6) Under King Rehoboam, of the dynasty of David, the house of Judah (including the tribe of Benjamin), struggled AGAINST the ten other tribes, composed of, under Jeroboam, a SEPARATE, DIFFERENT NATION!

This alone is enough to show that the JEWS and the ISRAELITES are two distinct, separate nations. But people don't know this because they don't study the Bible.

In our time, some places inhabited by the TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL, are not Jewish! So we must note that each time the Bible prophe-

sies on "Israel" or "the house of Israel" or even on "Samaria" it does not refer to the Jews!

However, speaking of the entire TWELVE tribes, the terms "Israel" & "children of Israel" include the Jews, but they NEVER refer exclusively to the Jews. Certainly the Jews are Israelites, but not all Israelites are Jews. We can better understand this question by saying that PARISIANS, generally, are FRENCHMEN, but not all Frenchmen are Parisians.

ISRAEL IN CAPTIVITY

The second time the Bible makes mention of the name "Jew", the house of Israel is already IN CAPTIVITY, under the Assyrian empire, "distant from the face of the Eternal".

Merely glance at a map of Palestine to understand the reasons for an Assyrian invasion, who carried out the long and miserable captivity of the children of Israel. Their country was a roadway to Egypt, whose riches were greatly envied by other nations.

The success of the Assyrian invasion was due not only to the power of their army, but especially to the sad decadence of the Israelites who, "distant from the face of the Eternal", were weakened by corruption of their morals and internal struggles.

It will be interesting to briefly examine the history of this decadence which began under the reign of Solomon, when the two nations, ISRAEL and JUDAH, were still united and a single power.

GRANDEUR AND DECADENCE UNDER SOLOMON

About the year 1000 B.C. Solomon was at the apex of his glory! He dominated all the countries from the Euphrates to the frontiers of Egypt (II Kings 4:21, II Chron. 9:26). Becoming rich and powerful, he was allied by marriage with the Egyptian Pharaoh (I Kings 3:1) and maintained excellent relations with Hiram, the Phoenician king of Tyre and Sidon (I Kings 5:1, 12). Under the reign of Solomon the famous temple of Jerusalem was built.

At this time the riches and prosperity of the country was such that silver had become "as common in Jerusalem as stones" (I Kings 10:27).

However, what interests us in the present work, is the ALLIANCE Solomon made with the Phoenicians who helped him not only to build the temple, but also in foreign trade. Solomon,

rich and powerful, furnished the ships and ports, while his ally, Hiram, put at the disposition of the King of Israel his famous Phoenician soldiers, who traveled the entire world, returning every three years "bringing gold and silver, ivory, monkeys and peacocks" (I Kings 10:22, II Chron. 9:21). Peacocks originated in India; thus it was there the Phoenicians went. At that time, such a voyage at sea, round trip, took about three years.

According to the Bible, the center of commerce by transit was TARSIS. The "Petit Larousse" says the Phoenicians founded numerous branches in North Africa, "notably at Carthage, which must have eclipsed them later. In Spain, they established themselves strongly, founding cities, such as Cadiz, Malaga, Adra, and Elche. They exploited the rich mines of copper of Tharsis, in Andalousie" ("New Little Larousse", 1960 Edition, article: "Phoenicia").

Another famous port they founded is actually known under the name of Marseille (France). Ruined after the downfall of Phoenician power, this city was rebuilt, about the year 600 B.C., by a colony of Phoenicians.

What historians don't know (or was it merely rejected by them?), is that this great exploitation of enterprise by the Phoenicians was done in direct alliance with Solomon and Israel. As we will see further on, the Israelites and the Phoenicians, by royal marriages or political claims, maintained good relations on both sides during several centuries.

Even under Herod, king of Judea, the Phoenicians desired peace, because their country still took their subsistence from that of the Jews (Acts 12:20). In the end, when Israel went out of captivity, the route of retreat was totally cut off to the south by the forces of the powerful Babylonian Empire. So it is perfectly natural that the Israelites, at the end of their captivity, turned towards the NORTH, to be near their ancient colonies.

ISRAEL DIVIDES

In spite of his brilliant successes and the immense riches that he had accumulated, Solomon imposed a rude servitude on the people.

At his death, the Israelites demanded of Rehoboam, his son,

that he alleviate the heavy judgement imposed by his father. Rehoboam refused them, and the TWELVE TRIBES DISPERSED IN TWO GROUPS. TEN of them united to form a distinct kingdom (I Kings 12:19), under Jeroboam, one of Solomon's servants, while the TWO others (the tribes of Judah and Benjamin) remained faithful to King Rehoboam.

This was the beginning of the GREAT SEPARATION!

Rehoboam, king of Judah, reassembled his forces to war against the nation of Israel, in order to put them again under his rule. But the Eternal forbade him, saying that it was by Him this situation had arisen, because of their sins (I Kings 12:24). Thus the war was delayed--but not avoided: the two houses did not cease to war bitterly for the next 80 years.

ISRAEL TURNS TO IDOLATRY

Jeroboam, striving to retain two separate kingdoms, followed the pagan example of the Egyptians, and instituted the cult of the calves. This pagan holiday would replace the Holy Days of the Eternal. "Jeroboam established sacrifices for the high places, for the groves, and for the idols he had made" (II Chron. 11:15).

The Levites who were found throughout Israel quit their dwellings to join Judah (II Chron. 11:13-14). ISRAEL had TURNED TO PAGANISM.

There were, in the tribes of the North, NINETEEN KINGS who then succeeded to the throne; each of them committed himself to the worship of the golden calves! Some also worshipped BAAL, the god of the sun.

Israel had become pagan. So for this reason the ten tribes, once liberated, WERE EASILY LOST in the world as they already followed its ways, that is its pagan customs!

It is thus that Israel lost the sign that identified it as the people of the Eternal (Ezek. 20:12).

The dynasty of Jeroboam was set up with his son and followed by a series of evil kings, whose sole preoccupations seemed to be idolatry and war--notably the war AGAINST JUDAH and again Syria.

THE DYNASTY OF OMRI

It was not until the dynasty of OMRI, 50 years later (around the year 920 B.C.), that Israel recovered a little of her former

prosperity. Omri moved his capital to Samaria, a city which was centrally located and more easily defended.

Omri's reputation was so great among the neighboring peoples that even today, we find his name on several historical documents, notably on "the stone of the Moabites" as well as on some Assyrian inscriptions. After the death of Omri, for some years, the Assyrians still called ISRAEL by the name of "Bit Khumri", meaning "the house of Omri".

This also explains why the fact that a number of Israelites who appeared later, in Europe, were under the general name "KYMRI" or "CIMMERIANS".

As for Omri, in spite of the success he carried off on his neighbors, his conduct, in the eyes of the Eternal, was worse than that of all the monarchs who had ruled before him! (I Kings 16:25).

DECADENCE CONTINUES

Ahab, son of Omri, acted even worse than his father had! Not only did he worship the golden calf, but he took for a wife a Phoenician princess, Jezebel, and served the pagan gods, especially BAAL the sun god (I Kings 16:31). More, he made an idol to Ashtaroath, the Phoenician goddess of the sky, from which name the English have derived the term "Easter".

It's no wonder Ahab had so irritated the Eternal! To the list of all the abominations he had committed, even could be added "human sacrifices"! We will see later that the DRUIDS, priests to the Gauls, practiced in turn this cult based on "human sacrifices".

And so on the list of abominations continues without lapse. After the death of Ahab, his son Ahaziah associated himself with the King of Judah and strove to rebuild the ships of Solomon, but this was a lost cause. The damages (II Chron. 20:37) caused by a storm were such that it was impossible to repair them.

During the reign of Joram, second son of Ahab, one of the captains of the army, named Jehu, set himself against the house of Ahab and killed all those of that house who remained. He also exterminated Baal from the midst of Israel (II Kings 10:18-28), but even he did not abandon the golden calves which were at Bethel and Dan.

Thus "the anger of the Eternal was kindled against Israel, and he delivered them into the hand of Hazael, King of Syria, and

into the hand of Ben-Hadad, son of Hazael, all the time these kings lived" (II Kings 13:3).

It wasn't until during the reign of Jeroboam II (822-781 B.C.) that there was a momentary restoration of Israel. However, the reign of Jeroboam, followed by that of Zechariah, the last of the dynasty of Jehu, also marked the "beginning of the end" for Israel. Wars multiplied; anarchy had become almost total. It is through this state of affairs that Israel had finally been taken into captivity.

Assyria abandoned itself to pillage! During his reign, king Menahem succeeded in safeguarding some small portion of the independence of Israel, by buying the alliance of the king of Assyria. But when his successor, king Pekah allied with Syria, attacked Judah, the latter asked help from the king of Assyria. From then on they were beaten. The Assyrians were glad to help, since the enemy pillaged as well. They would conquer at the same time ISRAEL and SYRIA and would take their inhabitants into captivity.

It is important to notice here that, among the captives were not only the inhabitants of Galilee but also those of Gilead (II Kings 15:29), which we will speak of later on.

ISRAEL IS TAKEN INTO CAPTIVITY

Hoshea, the last king of Israel, did reign nine years, but he also was subject to Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and payed him a tribute.

This situation ended when the king of Assyria discovered a "conspiracy" by Hoshea, who had sent messengers to Egypt. This dealt a mortal blow to Israel. The king of Assyria scoured the entire country and took Israel into captivity. He sent them "to Halah, and on the Habor, river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (Persia)" (II Kings 17:6).

According to their custom, the Assyrians did deport at the same time OTHER PEOPLES and establish them in the cities of Samaria, in place of the children of Israel ("Halley's Handbook", p. 164). So doing, they hoped to speed up the denationalization of their prisoners.

After this conquest, the Assyrian Empire continued to be powerful for a hundred years, before being destroyed in turn by the Babylonians and the Medes.

Always we must remember that, due to the gradual and continuous weakening of the Assyrian Empire--this Empire that had so much under its grasp--a part of the Israelites, after historical facts, liberated themselves from under the yoke of their conquerers several years BEFORE the definite destruction of the Assyrian Empire.

Chapter 2

CAPTIVITY AND LIBERATION

The Israelites, at the time of the deportation which took place in SEVERAL STAGES, were successively taken into captivity, as in Assyria, or in other foreign nations, notably in the cities of the Medes. The deportation to foreign places was customary in Assyrian politics, because it permitted easier destruction of all spirit of nationalism in their prisoners, reducing them totally to slavery.

A DEPORTATION IN SEVERAL STAGES

The first stage of this deportation en masse was carried out by Tiglath-Pileser (II Kings 15:29), and took place due east of the Jordan; this territory was occupied by the tribes of REUBEN, GAD and the half-tribe of MANASSEH. The captives were taken "to Halah, to Habor, Hara, and the river Gozan" (I Chron. 5:26).

This deportation took place about 740 B.C. It affected the majority of the population of the house of Israel. Only Samaria was exempt, though its inhabitants, under King Hoshea, later became the slaves of the Assyrians.

As we have already noted, when Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, discovered the conspiracy of Hoshea, he went against Syria and beseiged it. During the seige which lasted three long years, Shalmaneser died, and his successor achieved the conquest and took the REST OF ISRAEL in captivity. The new captives were sent to Assyria, to be deported to "Halah and in Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes" (II Kings 17:6, 18:11).

The great Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, confirms this fact ("Antiquities" IX, XIV, 1), whereas Tobit, author of the book of the apocalypse of the same name, states precisely that as a member of the tribe of Naphtali, he himself was taken into captiv-

ity by the king of Assyria (Apocrypha, "Tobit", 1:3, 10).

By combining these diverse testimonies, we establish that the house of Israel, known under the name of the "house of Omri" or "Bit Khumri", by the Assyrians, was deported to the north, in regions which are actually part of the Persian or Iranian territory. These diverse places of deportation, as we can easily prove, are not at all far from the BLACK SEA and the CASPIAN SEA.

The Assyrians always strove to deport their prisoners as far as possible from their birthplaces. This method achieved a double objective: first, it rendered impossible any means of communication between the deported prisoners and their native country; secondly, it prevented them from regaining their country in case of escape.

Only consider the example of the Syrians whom Tiglath-Pileser deported to the "extreme north of Media" ("Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus, Vol. IX, Chap. 12, Sec. 3), near the Caucasus. Why did he deport them so far? For the same reasons we have just stated: the mountainous terrain, the rivers round about and the considerable distance prevented any escapee from returning home.

Therefore it is incontestable that at the time of this new stage of deportation, the Israelites were sent into captivity beyond the Tigris, in the COUNTRY of the Medes, where a part of their compatriots had already been taken in a preceding deportation.

The TRIBES OF ISRAEL DO NOT RETURN HOME after their liberation. This fact is proved by History!

Although the deportation of the Israelites took place in several stages, it must be noted that the members of one tribe were often directed towards the same place of captivity to which their compatriots had previously been taken, as indicated by Tobit. This fact is of capital importance, because not only did it permit the different tribes to retain their unity, but their respective representatives could thus retain their characteristic traits.

THE MIGRATION

Nevertheless, as a nation, Israel ceased to exist in the eyes of the world. Ever since, historians have ignored the fate of Israel; they are "in the dark" because they don't believe in the Bible and are not even able to understand divine prophecy! They

"suppose" only that all these TRIBES, with time, succeeded in returning to Palestine and ended up assimilating completely with the Jewish nation.

This supposition is FALSE and WITHOUT BASIS. It directly contradicts THE BIBLE, as well as historical facts.

"Thus saith the Eternal, who made the sun to light the day, who destined the moon and the stars to light the night...if these laws come to an end before me... the RACE OF ISRAEL also will cease from being a nation before me" (Jer. 31:35-36).

The Bible is INFALLIBLE and the divine declaration that we come to cite is categorical. Since, today, the laws of nature continue in effect, Israel of course has not ceased from being a nation before the Eternal!

In fact even the Jews openly admit that the TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL STILL EXIST IN SOME PART, but under a different name: "If the TEN TRIBES had disappeared, the literal accomplishment of divine prophecy would be an impossibility; and if they had not disappeared THEN THEY MUST ACTUALLY EXIST under a DIFFERENT NAME", states the Jewish Encyclopedia! (Article: "Tribes, Lost" emphasis ours).

The Jewish writer Esdras declares in his book of the Apocrypha that the ten tribes of Israel, after their liberation, emigrated to other countries, RATHER THAN RETURNING to their own land (II Esdras 13:40-46). It is evident that the Bible agrees with this categorically.

Why did the ten tribes resettle in foreign lands? It was surely not in order to be able to observe the divine commandments and the statutes that they hadn't wanted to observe in their own country, or that they hadn't been able to keep them during their captivity! No!

Israel has always been a "rebellious people"!

One of the most interesting historical confirmations that firmly establishes the fact of this migration of Israelites to far countries, is that of the great Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, who writes: "The Ten Tribes, forming an IMMENSE MULTITUDE, are located TO THIS DAY beyond the river Euphrates" ("Antiquities" Vol. II, Chap. 5, emphasis ours).

This testimony is far from proving that the ten tribes of Israel have disappeared or that they had returned to Palestine to combine with the Jewish nation! At the time of this historian

Josephus, that is to say in the FIRST century A.D., not only were the TEN TRIBES still in existence, separate from the house of Judah, but they formed "an immense multitude"!

WHERE DID THEY GO?

So in what direction did these tribes go after their liberation? Where are they located now? In which countries did they settle, and WHO are their modern descendants? This is what we will examine in the following chapters.

Whatever their present-day location, it is evident that these tribes have different names and that they are unrecognizable to the world, since they are integrated with the inhabitants of the foreign countries in which they settled.

The Bible clearly indicates the DIRECTION the tribes took in their migration. Speaking of the "time of the end", that is to say, the era in which we live, the prophet Jeremiah declares that the Eternal will restore Israel "from the countries to the North and the coasts of the earth, and reassemble them from the ENDS of the earth!" (Jer. 31:8).

If Jeremiah indicates the tribes had directed themselves toward the north, the prophet Isaiah states that they would be found "in the last days" in the countries situated to the NORTHWEST of Palestine (Isa. 49:12).

According to these divine declarations, it is certain then that in the last days, that is to say, in the present era, the tribes of Israel would be found to the NORTHWEST of Jerusalem; we say "of Jerusalem" because the Bible always establishes directions from the location of that city.

Let's consult then an atlas in order to determine which are the "remote" countries to the northwest of Jerusalem. If we look in the direction of the markings, where do we see they point? To WESTERN EUROPE!

Thus, according to divine prophecy, the TEN TRIBES of Israel must live, in our days, in WESTERN EUROPE. God says this is so.

"Let God be true, and every man a liar"! (Rom. 3:4).

Chapter 3

THE ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF FRANCE

Before the arrival of the GAULS in France, the country was populated with other races which History knows principally under two general names: the Ligurians and the Iberians.

When did these peoples appear in Western Europe? Where did they come from?

With remarkable nonchalance and never having furnished proof, historians hazard dates, such as six thousand, ten thousand--and even fifteen thousand years--before Christ, even though, in the admission of all, no one has ANY precise information on the arrival date of any people in Gaul.

"As for the history of France", writes Jubainville candidly, "the earliest date that the authors of antiquity have given us is that of the founding of Marseille one hundred twenty years before the battle of Salamis (500 B.C.), thus SIX HUNDRED YEARS before Christ" ("The First Inhabitants of Europe", Jubainville, p. 26).

Who then were these Ligurians and Iberians? Let's glance at their history, before studying that of the Celtic peoples.

THE LIGURIANS

Characterized by their small waistline, their slightly swarthy skin, black hair and small head, the Ligurians, sometimes called "Liguses", are of Greek origin. This fact is admitted by historians.

* "Thus small built were the Ligurian people, their origin linked with the most famous of the Greek colonies, Sicily" ("History of the Gauls", Thierry, Intro., p. 23), writes Amedee Thierry. But the knowledge of scholars and historians stops there! This is not surprising, since they never turn to THE BIBLE to pursue their research. Thus they can add nothing to the story with certainty.

Dottin writes: "The problem (the origin of the Ligurians) remains insoluble, because no one is able to determine to which family the Ligurian language belongs" ("The Ancient Peoples

of Europe", Dottin, p. 188). He should have said: "...because no one will look to the Bible for the truth"!

IDENTITY OF THE LIGURIANS, ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE

Noah had three sons: SHEM, HAM and JAPHETH. The Bible affirms that it was their descendants who, after the flood, would people the entire earth (Gen. 9:19).

One of the sons of Japheth was called JAVAN, from which we have the terms "Ionia" and "Grecia" or Greece ("Strong's Concordance"). In turn, Javan became the father of four sons: Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Rodanim. It is from their descendants that the GREEK and LATIN peoples came.

The four sons of Javan dispersed to the SOUTHWEST of the European continent, along the Mediterranean coast. Elishah, for example, multiplied in HELLAS (Greece) and in the isle of Cyprus, which the ancients called "Alisha."

As for RODANIM, brother of Elishah (his name is sometimes spelled Dodanim), he passed by the Dodecanese (a group of islands in the Aegean Sea) and the island of Rhodes, to which his descendants gave his name; then they went to settle around the mouth of the Rhone, on the Mediterranean coast; from Gaul they went to Italy, to Rome, but the center of their region was the country of the Genoese, which still today carries the name "Liguria".

There are the Ligurians which are spoken of in History-- "History" which is not able to trace their origin! They were the DESCENDANTS of Javan, by RODANIM. As we will see further on (Chapter 7), it is indeed this Greek people who later mixed with the Gauls, and it is a part of them who, under the general name of GAULS or GALLICS, established themselves in GALATIA about 280 B.C.

THE IBERIANS

History doesn't know very much about this people ("The Ancient Peoples of Europe", Dottin, p. 188). Baron von Humboldt, George Dottin, as well as the great French historian Camille Jullian, each have divergent ideas about the origins of the Iberians. But they agree that these people were among the first inhabitants of Sicily. It is equally averred that they ended up settling in the Iberian peninsula, to which they give their

name. Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica and Languedoc "appear to have marked" their successive stages before arriving in Spain.

"This much at least is certain, that the Spanish peninsula took its name (IBERIA) from the Iberians, a name of Greek origin, and that in the first century before our era, one of their groups, known under the name of 'AQUITAINS', occupying the region between the Pyrenees and the Garonne River, where the soldiers of Caesar are going to find them" ("Origins", Brentano, p. 28), remarks Funck Brentano.

Once again, in order to learn the entire truth, we must return to the Bible.

THE IDENTITY OF THE IBERIANS ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE

The Iberians descended from Japheth by JAVAN and TARSHISH. This latter, Tarshish, was one of the sons of Javan (I Chron. 1:7).

The descendants of TARSHISH settled first in ASIA MINOR, in the region of Cilicia, where they gave their name to the city of "Tarsus", the birthplace of the Apostle Paul. From there, this tribe emigrated to the West; it went just to the Iberian peninsula, to which it gave its name, as Brentano established.

Note well here that the ancient port of Tarshish famous in the time of Solomon (II Chron. 9:21), was founded by them.

History tells us that the heart of Iberian civilization was Andalusia, a province in southern Spain. The Iberians were good sailors. Their arts and industries, as shown by the excavation enterprises since the beginning of the present century, indicates a striking similarity to those of the Phoenicians and the Greeks.

The INFLUENCE of the Iberians in Gaul and the role they played there was always MINIMAL and NEGLIGIBLE.

"Of all the countries occupied by the Iberian race, Spain is the one in which this race maintained predominance in number and language for the longest period of time, thus autonomy", declares Jubainville.

To conclude, we emphasize the fact that neither the Ligurians nor the Iberians, who were enemies, WERE THE ANCESTORS, properly speaking, of the French. As both Diodorus of Sicily and Strabo affirm, the Ligurians and the CELTICS (who lived around

the Gauls) are a very different race.

The GAULS--the people of the Celtic race--are those who ACTUALLY ARE THE ANCESTORS of the French nation, since the CELTS and the ISRAELITES ARE THE SAME PEOPLE!

Chapter 4

THE CIMBRI AND THE CIMMERIANS

From a historic viewpoint, one of the clues that one has in finding the route of migration of the ISRAELITES toward Western Europe, is the name "Bit Khumri" by which they were known to the Assyrians. Many Assyrian inscriptions describe, indeed, the house of Israel as "the house of OMRI" or "Bit Khumri".

Omri also can be pronounced Ghomri, says the historian Pinches ("The Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records", p. 339).

The Israelites (called "Bit Khumri") didn't all stay under the yoke of their conquerors during the entire duration of their captivity. The Assyrian Empire, reigning over several nations, was incapable of maintaining a rigid control over all its vassals. In the course of years of captivity, revolts ensued, and detached groups successively evaded to the NORTH and the NORTHWEST.

SOME UNKNOWN PEOPLE ARRIVE IN EUROPE

During the time Sargon (who took Israel captive) was on the throne (721-704 B.C.), no power could keep him in check, since no constituted and organized power still existed as a nation ("Ancient History of the Orient", Lenormant, Vol. 4, Chap. 6, p. 235).

The greatest part of Asia Minor, according to Lenormant, was thus occupied by Hellenistic tribes which were mingled with the people of the Hittite race. At this time, ROME was only thirty years old (founded in 753 B.C.); it was neither powerful nor well-known.

In less than 100 years, that is to say about 609 B.C., the Assyrian Empire crumbled. Immediately afterwards, in Europe, a new nomadic nation, immigrants never known before, appear suddenly.

Greek historians, who tell of these unexpected migrations, admit they know nothing of the origin of these immigrants. At most they tell us these peoples came from the areas around the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea.

Some historians recognize that these peoples, in their entirety, were composed of organized tribes, these saying that they were delivered from the yoke of the ASSYRIANS!

In an irony of sorts (or is it really?) the Assyrians endured to later escape from Babylon, to go to refuge in Western Europe, becoming thus the neighbors of their former captives! Because of this ASSYRIAN immigration--principally germanic, since the Assyrians are the ancestors of the GERMANS--an influx mixed in small part with Israelites, History considers their predecessors (the Israelites who, taken into captivity previously by the Assyrians, came before them to Western Europe), people of the Germanic race. But this hypothesis is in error.

While the Assyrians used the name "Bit Khumri" for the whole of the Israelite tribes, the Greeks knew them under the name "Cymry" or "Kimmeroi", from which proceeded the terms "Cimbri" and "Cimmerians".

These people were not ALL of the Germanic race. As a group, it was the ISRAELITES who, in separate groups, came to Europe at different times. It is very interesting to note what Thierry says on the subject:

"The earliest writer who makes mention of these KIMBRI is Philemon, contemporary of Aristotle: according to him, they called their ocean Mori-Marusa, or the DEAD SEA, up to the promontory of Rubeas..." ("Histoire des Gaulois", Thierry, Intro., p. 56).

The CIMBRI and the CIMMERIANS came from the area of the Dead Sea, History tells us. Naturally, since that was the country of their fathers.

THE SCYTHIANS

A number of works have been written on the migration of the Cimmerians in Western Europe. History finds them residing first in "Scythia", to the north of the Black Sea, inhabited today by the Russians.

"The Cimmeriis are the most ancient inhabitants of Scythia... Some of them were nomads while others were farmers " ("Histoire

des Gaulois", Thierry, Intro., p. 56). The Encyclopedia Britannica article on "Scythia" adds that the Cimbri, or Cimmerians, WERE DRIVEN far from this country by a group of invaders coming from the North of Asia, about the seventh century. These invaders called themselves "Scythians".

History tells us that a little earlier around the same time, a part of the Scythians marched against the regions of the north whose people actually were connected with Persia. That part called themselves "Saka" or "Sacae"; it was later known under the general name "Scythia".

Some 100 years later, Darius I inscribed on the famous "Behistun Stone" that the Cimmerians were made to submit to him along with 22 other peoples. This "Behistun Stone" bears an inscription in three languages--Persian, Susa (Elamite), and Babylonian--in which Darius named the provinces made to submit under his authority.

The long list was written on three pillars, each of which gave the name of the country, or of the province, with their phonetic pronunciation in the three languages. Here is how the name of Scythia appeared there ("The Inscriptions of Darius the Great at Behistun"):

<u>In Persian</u>	<u>In Susa</u>	<u>In Babylonian</u>
SCYTHIA	SCYTHIA	The country of the
(phonetically:	(phonetically:	CIMMERIANS
<u>SAKA</u>)	<u>SAKKA</u>)	(phonetically:
		<u>GIMIRI</u>)

We can then prove that the terms "Saka" in Persian (Rawlinson spells it "Sacae" ("Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society", p. 27)), and "Gimiri" in Babylonian, are SYNONYMS.

Also note that Darius associates the CIMMERIANS with "Sacae", and even identifies them as the same people.

Who were, rightfully, these "Sacae" that History has ended up grouping under the general name "Scythians"? Who were their ancestors? Were they of the same race to which Darius and others associated them?

The "Sacae", as we have just seen, made up a part of a group of "peoples" called SCYTHIANS; among this mixture of peoples, the "SACAE" were of ISRAELITE ORIGIN. In other words, of all the peoples called "Scythians", the SACAE comprised a separate

group ("The History of Herodotus", Book IV, Essay I, footnote 1) who later settled in Western Europe, as History indicates ("Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society", p. 21).

It is indeed established that among the peoples known under the general name "Scythians", the Sacae were made up of a group of CIMBRI or CIMMERIANS, that is to say, of people of Israelite tribes in migration toward Western Europe, after their liberation.

Always, we should repeat that the term "Scythia", like the term "Kimri", included several different peoples, for in ancient times the inhabitants of a region often adopted the name of that area without necessarily being citizens of it or being under the jurisdiction of the government.

This name "Scythians" ended up becoming rather a geographic term, describing a specific place, and, after the departure of the first "Cimbri" or "Sacae", many other peoples, traversing that area adopted the name in turn.

Among all the peoples known under the general name "Scythians", the Sacae were the descendants of the children of Israel! Not only is it possible for us to notice a parallel by comparing the traditions of the two peoples, but History even recognizes that the majority of the peoples of the BRITISH ISLES, particularly the "Scots" and the "Saxons", are the descendants of the Scythians ("NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY", Article: "Scots"), thus of the ISRAELITES!

Among the different historical affirmations, that made by Diodorus of Sicily is perhaps the most remarkable and the most interesting. This Greek historian clearly indicates to us that certain TRIBES of the Scythians CAME both from ASSYRIA and from the areas inhabited by the MEDES (Diodorus of Sicily, Book II, Chap. 3)!

THE SAXONS

What then is the degree of parentage between the SAXONS and the SCYTHIANS?

As we have already indicated, the "Sacae", in arriving in Western Europe, notably in the BRITISH ISLES, took the general name "Saxons".

"Among the diverse nations known under the name Scythians, the SAKAI or SACAE represent the ancestors of the SAXONS...This

fact can be affirmed without violating the chances of probability. Sakal-Suna, or "SONS OF SAKAL" is the same thing as SAXONS" ("The History of the Anglo-Saxons", Turner, Vol. 2, Chap. 1, p. 81 (Emphasis Ours.)).

In all likelihood, the exact derivation of the name "Sacae"-- or "Sakae"--is from Isaac, the father of Israel. The names "Sacae" or "Isaac" have the same etymological root. Because of the fact that the vowels were mute in the ancient Hebrew language, the two names have the same pronunciation.

"Saxons"--or "Sacal-suna"--represent then a variation of "Isaac's sons". This well demonstrates the truth, for the Israelites were the sons of ISAAC, by Jacob!

The final destination of the Cimbri (or Cimmerians) is one of the most well-established historical facts, and is not a matter of the least controversy. History assures us that the CIMBRI migrated to the west, and established themselves in Wales, Great-Britain, and France.

At the close of the fourth century B.C. "a new population SPREAD IN GAUL; it didn't arrive in mass, but in the course of a SERIES of invasions; the two principal ones took place at the beginning and at the end of the period...The invaders called themselves KYMRIANS, or CIMMERIANS, where the Romans took the term CIMBRI to designate the CIMMERIANS ("France", Witt, pp. 16-17 (Emphasis ours.)).

Although the Greeks and the Romans, before Julius Caesar, had only vague notions about the origins of the peoples to the north of their countries, their own historians are unanimous in admitting that the Cimmerians figured among these peoples. Moreover, Thierry states this point in a rather remarkable way. He writes indeed:

"Two historical witnesses which date from the time of Alexander the Great attest to the existence of a people called KIMMERII or KIMBRI on the coast of the North Sea, in the peninsula which will later carry the name JUTLAND (Denmark). And besides, the scholars recognize the identity of the words KIMMERII and KIMBRI, that both belong to a different genus than the Greek and Latin languages" ("Histoire des Gaulois", Thierry, p. 56).

The famous French historian remarked that Strabo and other

Greeks, as is said by Posidonius, call KIMMERII those who would be later known under the name "Kimbri". Plutarch, in turn, adds that this change is not at all surprising, while Diodorus of Sicily attributes it to "time" and adopts the opinion of Posidonius, which, according to Thierry, differs generally among the learned Greeks.

History has then incontestably established that the CIMMERIANS, CIMBRI or KYMRY are the representatives of one and the same people who invaded France in the course of successive invasions. Notice these invasions began 100 years AFTER the deportation of the tribes of Israel by the Assyrians.

In our time, a part of these CIMBRI inhabit France; this fact is natural since the French are their descendants!

Chapter 5

THE CELTS AND THE GAULS

The origin of the Celts and the Gauls, according to the most celebrated historians, still constitutes one of the most mysterious enigmas of all History.

Dottin frankly avows that History knows nothing precise about the date of "the arrival of the Celts in Gaul" ("Les Anciens peuples de l'Europe", Dottin, p. 209), and holds that they became mixed with the Ligurians so that a special ethnic name had been created, the term "Celtoligurians", to designate the inhabitants of the region extending from Marseille to the Rhone River and the Alps.

Other historians, such as Thierry and Pernoud, have opinions more or less analogous. Generally, they all declare that the only thing historians and archaeologists can say with certainty, is that the Celts, at some time, occupied all the territory of Central Europe, from the mountains of Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) to the Baltic Sea.

As to the exact date of this occupation, the opinions are strongly divided, and often contradictory. Some speak of three or four thousand years ago, others say rightly that History KNOWS NOTHING OF WHAT TOOK PLACE BEFORE THE YEAR 500 B.C.

"At the time of La Tene" (a Celtic culture of about 500 B.C.), writes Pernoud, "the CELTS STILL HAVE NO HISTORY, PROPERLY SAID; they did not form an empire, but a sort of aggregation of peoples who seemed to have been driven enough" ("Les Gaulois", Pernoud, pp. 31-32).

According to Rolleston, NO geographer had used the term CELT before the year 500 B.C. ("Myths and Legends of the Celtic Race", Rolleston).

Consequently, the world seems to know nothing about the activities of the Gauls before their arrival in Gaul; we are told, moreover, that the Celts had previously inhabited the valley of the Danube for some time.

THE KEY TO THE MYSTERY

Once more, only the Bible contains the key to the mystery. The enigma ceases to be insoluble if one examines it in the light of the historical information found in the Bible.

The ancients used the name "Celte", or "Celtica", without much discrimination, in that which concerns language and race, to designate the INHABITANTS of the countries situated in the northwest of Europe. This term, in the history of these peoples, was then GEOGRAPHIC rather than ethnic ("France", Witt, p. 16).

There is one of the reasons why History finds itself in the dark. What is more, it will never come to understand the truth about the Celts as long as historians disdain the facts furnished by the Bible.

It wasn't until after the Roman occupation that the term "Celt", or "Gaul" was reserved for the inhabitants of Gaul. Thus, if the name of these peoples changed following the Roman occupation, it goes without saying that neither their race nor their characteristics were changed by it.

The testimony of Thierry, associating the CIMBRI with the CELTS, is remarkable:

"It is the last of these landmarks which links the KIMMERII of the Black Sea to the CIMBRI of Jutland, to the Belgians of Gaul, to the Bretons of Albion, and we go on...to recognize that in this vast people remained the nucleus of the second of the GAULIC RACES, and that its name, so ancient, so renowned, so well known, was none other than the very name of THIS RACE"

("Histoire des Gaulois", Thierry, p. 70, Introduction).

Generally, historians agree in recognition of the traits the two peoples have in common, even though each seems to express more or less divergent points of view on the details. Hubert claims that the "GAULS gave themselves the name KYMRIS" ("Les Celtes", Hubert, p. 31), whereas, according to Flavius Josephus, it was Gomer, son of Japheth, grandson of Noah, who was the father of the Cimmerians, "that is to say of the CIMBRI AND CELTICS, from which one concludes that a good part of humanity itself issued from the Celtic world" ("Les Gaulois", Pernoud, pp. 31-32).

Among the historians who claim to accept both the truth and the historical chronology of the Bible, the common mistake lies in their obstinacy, which is sometimes pathetic, to be always willing to research and trace the origin of people by means of mere resemblance or by the similarity of their names with Biblical names!

Guided by this reasoning, which becomes unbearable if it is not collaborated with other factors, most scholars suppose that the Cimmerians must have been the descendants of Gomer, for the two names show a striking resemblance. To draw such premature conclusions on such incomplete facts is inexcusable.

To a certain degree, the CIMMERIANS were included in the descendants of Gomer, as the SCYTHES were included in the descendants of the house of Israel (by the tribe of "Sacae"). It is always altogether erroneous to make a generalization.

Some descendants of Gomer joined themselves to the CIMMERIANS, since the Bible indicates that Israel lived among the descendants of Gomer! The prophet Hosea had received the divine order to take to himself a "wife" who was a prostitute to symbolize the relationship and adulterous state of Israel toward the Eternal. The prostitute that the prophet married personified Israel, but was named Gomer (Hosea 1:2-3).

However, we must repeat that the CIMMERIANS of Europe, as a whole, ARE NOT the descendants of Gomer.

RECAPITULATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ISRAELITES

To review, the Israelites were taken into captivity about the year 718 B.C., and their conquerors, the Assyrians, called

them "Bit Khumri" or the "house of Omri", from the name of the king of Israel.

In less than a hundred years, the Assyrian Empire crumbled; the captive nations revolted, and immediately afterwards History notes the appearance, around the Black and Caspian Seas, of nomadic peoples of which the most important tribe was called "Cymrri"--or "Kimrri".

This people, the CIMMERIANS, as we have already indicated, had the same ancestors as the "SACAE", or the Scythians, who appeared later in northwest Europe, in the BRITISH ISLES, and who carried the name "Saxons".

Following the invasion of the non-Israelite Scythians, the tribe of the Cimmerians was quickly forced to retire to the northwest of Europe, where it was known under the name "Kymry" or "Khumri", the name which the Assyrians had given previously to the Israelites. In the years that passed these same peoples adopted the name "Celtae" or "Galli"; the latter was given them later by the Romans.

Thus, in an unexpected and very curious manner, the prophecy came to pass that ISRAEL, during the last times, would be found "to the NORTH" and "to the WEST" of Palestine!

THE NEIGHBORS OF THE GAULS

If our efforts in this work tend rather to determining the origin of the FRENCH, to neglect the racial affinity between them and their neighbors would be to lose sight of the object we have followed, since most of the inhabitants of northwest Europe ARE OF THE CELTIC RACE and thus are part of the tribes of Israel, "in dispersion".

Indeed, the BELGIANS, the people of HOLLAND, the SWISS, and the SCANDINAVIANS belong to the same race as the FRENCH, the ENGLISH, the AMERICANS, and the CANADIANS, since, as a whole, these people are descendants of the CELTS. They all have a common ancestor: Jacob, whose name was changed to ISRAEL!

As for the Belgians and the Swiss, inhabitants of countries which in part speak the French language, History has had no difficulty establishing their direct parentage with the CELTS ("Histoire des Gaulois", Thierry, p. 36). This same parentage EXTENDS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE BRITISH ISLES, as Thierry affirms:

"There was among the ancients an opinion, or better said, a fact accepted as nearly incontestable, that the inhabitants of the BRITISH ARCHIPELAGO AND GAUL WERE PEOPLES ORIGINATING FROM THE SAME RACE." ("History of the Gauls", Thierry, p. 8).

Hipparque attests in turn that the inhabitants of the British Isles and Eire (known today as Ireland) were CELTIC.

THE CELTIC LEAGUE

As we are about to see, the CELTS formed a league. For centuries, before the Roman conquest, this league was so powerful that even Alexander the Great (about 330 B.C.), carried away by his ambition to conquer the world, did not dare challenge it. Instead of entering into a war with it, he chose the method of conferring with their ambassadors, in order to sign a treaty of peace between the two powers ("Legends of the Celtic Race", p. 23).

As it always is, by the time of the Roman conquest (58-51 B.C.), the power of the Celts had greatly diminished because of internal corruption, rather social than political. The Celts could only bow before and yield to the attacks of Caesar. They had lost their power.

This internal corruption is moreover recognized by historians. At the apex of their glory, the fifth century B.C., the CELTS, according to Hellenicus of Lebos, still practiced "justice and integrity". A century later, the customs were already confounded with those of the Greeks. And, at the time of Plato, "their great attributes were nothing but drinking and fighting" ("Legends of the Celtic Race", p. 17). Caton himself says the Gauls had but two passions: fighting and talking! ("The Origins", Brentano, p. 53).

The CELTIC LEAGUE extended to Britain, since Caesar found in Britain the same religion as in Gaul and "also a general resemblance in the mores and social conditions" ("History of the Gauls", Thierry, p. 81). Tacitus, a Roman historian, had no doubt about this similarity; he even declares that it is evident even in the IDIOMS of the language.

We can thus conclude that History has sufficient proofs, both to establish the racial affinity between the peoples who lived in GAUL and the BRITISH ISLES, and to recognize the direct parentage of these peoples, and their common families which were established

PREVIOUSLY--before the migration of the Celts.

In his work on the history of France, Thierry concludes the subject by stating that the British Isles were populated by the Gaulic family, and that there, as in Gaul, this family found itself split in two branches, the one INDIGENOUS, that is to say, established from time immemorial, the other TRANSPLANTED from Gaul to Britain, during historic times ("History of the Gauls", Thierry, Conclusion).

As we have just seen, most of these "natives" spoken of by Thierry were descended from Israelite colonies which arrived PREVIOUSLY to settle permanently. The migration of these colonies had taken place in the TIME OF SOLOMON, who had allied himself with the Phoenicians.

Chapter 6

THE ORIGIN OF THEIR NAME

The complexity of the science of etymology is a well known fact. Once it becomes a part of a language, a word evolves both in meaning and form; sometimes it even loses its original meaning. This is often the case with proper names.

The name the ancient inhabitants of the country gave themselves, or under which they were known by their contemporaries, is still one of the mysteries of the history of France. Even having recognized somewhat different pronunciations, such as "Celta", "Galli", "Galatia", "Walah", or "Gaul", which are their common names, as we shall see these are actually all derived from only one ROOT.

BIBLICAL IMPLICATIONS

In studying the Israelite origin of the Celtic peoples, one of the first questions which comes to mind is of the NAME which they carried through the centuries. One even wonders if the name under which they were known was of a historic or generic nature. Even though the Israelites lost their IDENTITY, their LANGUAGE, and, later, their NATIONALITY, their name seems to have kept the two natures.

Moses, according to the instructions of the Eternal, gave to the REUBENITES and GADITES "from Areor, which is by the river Arnon, and half of mount Gilead" (Deut. 3:12, 16), while the tribe of Manasseh received the rest of Gilead.

In the book of Chronicles (I Chron. 5:3-10) we find, in part, the list of descendants of REUBEN, of Gad, and of Manasseh, and we learn that part of the Reubenites lived "eastward...unto the entering in of the wilderness from the river Euphrates; because their cattle had multiplied in the land of Gilead".

Note already the striking similarity between the words "GALAAD" (French for Gilead, the land in which part of the Reubenites lived), and GALLI or GAUL (the land where they settled after their captivity!). Anyone who is learned in etymology would easily recognize the common base of these two terms.

Even evolving through the centuries, this name was preserved, as it is shown on Biblical atlases. In the time of Jesus, the regions to the north of Trans-Jordan (Gilead), were still called "Gaulonitis". Even today the Arabs call this land "Jaulan".

HISTORICAL FACTS

But then how does one explain the fact that the terms "Celtica", "Galli", "Galatia", or again "Gaul", had not been given to the inhabitants of Gaul until after their arrival and establishment in the land?

Several answers are possible; first, as we said in the preceding chapter, the GAULS migrated into Europe under the name "Khumri" (or Cimbri or Cimmerians). The Encyclopaedia Britannica affirms that the ancients, speaking of the Gauls and the Cimbri, always associated them with the first Cimmerians (Article "Celt").

On the other hand, it is nearly certain that the Celts gave themselves that name, under different forms, BEFORE OTHER NATIONS CALLED THEM THAT. Some historians recognize this fact:

"This name Celt, they GAVE THEMSELVES. Some also called them Galates. The Romans called them Galli", writes Brentano ("The Origins").

Naturally, from the Latin words Gallus or Galli is derived the French "Gaulois" and the English "Gaul".

THE TERMS "CELTAE", "GALATAE", AND "GALLI"

The difference between these diverse terms appears especially in the linguistic domain. They all have a common origin; in the course of years, and because of different pronunciations the people gave them, these terms have taken forms more or less varied. ("Les Celtes", Hubert, p. 25)

In other words, it was a term mainly geographic. Explaining this point, Hubert tells us that in the third century A.D., a new name, that of "GALATES", appeared for the first time in the works of the historian Jerome of Cardis, who recounts their invasion of Macedonia and Greece, before they settled in Asia Minor. But Hubert states with certainty "that the GAULS gave themselves the name KYMROIS" ("The Celts", Hubert, pp. 31-32).

All these different names then are synonyms, and apply to the same peoples interchangeably.

THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT TERMS

Some of the most esteemed French historians have already succeeded in establishing a connection between these diverse terms.

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

In turn, Jubainville states that the adjective "walahise" became Welsch in the German tongue, which is of the same derivation as Walah, Wealh, or Gaul:

"GAUL is the same as the old German WALAH; WALES (French: GALLES) is derived from Wealh" ("The First Inhab. of Europe", p.420).

But why had these Celtic peoples taken a germanic name? The answer certain linguists give us is quite surprising and harmonizes perfectly with the facts of history. Thus Pelloutier says "Waller, Galler and Galli" signify STRANGER or WANDERER; he adds that these people had given themselves this name because they had had to leave their country in a VOLUNTARY EXILE!

"It appears that the Celts...giving themselves the name Waller or Galler thus indicated that THEY HAD BEEN CHASED FROM

THEIR ANCIENT HOME OR THAT THEY HAD VOLUNTARILY CONDEMNED THEMSELVES TO EXILE", writes James Grant ("Thoughts on the Gael", p.156).

This remarkable explanation precisely describes the condition of the nation of Israel which, after having rejected the Eternal, lost the right to call themselves by the name that the Eternal had given them (Ezekiel 39:7).

see memo 8/11
But what is more interesting and remarkable still is the significance even of the term "Scyth", another name the Israelites were known under at one time. (See the chapter on the "Scythians" and the "Sacae".) Indeed, it is curious to note that the word "Scyth", in the Celtic language, has exactly the same meaning as the Celtic word ^{G-D-L}"Gael", that is to say "stranger" or "wanderer" ("Collectanea de Rebus Hebernicia", Vol. II, Beauford, p. 225).

In light of this fact, it appears evident that the diverse names that the Israelites gave themselves, after their liberation from the Assyrian captivity, signify more or less the same thing, that is, a nation in EXILE, or foreign WANDERERS, STRANGERS in a strange land!

Let us say, by way of conclusion, that in Hebrew (the ancient language of the Israelite tribes), the word for exile is "Golah", pronounced "Gau-lau"! The first Biblical mention of the Hebrew word is found in the Second Book of Kings (II Kings 15:29), where it is written that the inhabitants of the country of Naphtali, thus of GILEAD and of Galilee, were "taken away captive" ("Golah") into Assyria ("Strong's Concordance", No. 1540).

Chapter 7

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CELTS

Of prime consideration, the question of the dissimilarity between the language of the CELTS and that of the ISRAELITES constitutes the greatest hurdle to the idea of the common racial parentage of the two peoples.

The Israelites, indeed, left Palestine speaking a Semitic language, and appeared in Europe using another language which philologists class as Indo-European.

But what does this term "Indo-European" which one speaks of

with such erudition mean? Is there really such a great dissimilarity between the languages classed in the group Indo-European and those called Semitic?

LANGUAGE DOESN'T NECESSARILY INDICATE RACE

History, linguistics and archaeology offer only vague and fragile ideas upon which philologists try to reconstitute, without the aid of the Bible, the range and development of the languages of the entire world. For example, Dottin avows:

"In fact, we most often DON'T KNOW which languages were spoken by ancient peoples of Europe, and when certain of them left inscriptions" ("The Ancient People of Europe", p. 19).

This frank confession, though of a general order, in no way hinders historians in proposing all sorts of theories that they consider truths! They can even attempt to trace the origin of a people solely by the science of the linguist, all the while knowing that this is an impossibility! ("The Origins of the Aryans")

Comparative philology is a relatively new science. Previously, lacking the science of linguistics, it was the exhaustive Biblical account relative to the diversity of languages that historians accepted as truthful! But the more man progressed, the more it seems "science" takes priority over divine revelation!

HEBREW OR SANSKRIT?

Even philologists confess that the general characters of the mother language of the Indo-European class can be only vaguely reconstituted, and rightly say that there exist many opposing views on the subject ("The Ancient...", p. 65). The explanations given to prove that the languages of this group are derived from Sanskrit and Zend leave much to be desired.

While THE MOST ANCIENT Indo-European texts are the inscriptions in PERSIAN of Darius (522-486 B.C.), Sanskrit, which some consider the oldest language, does not offer any text bearing a date BEFORE the third century before our era!

How then can this language, whose origin is comparatively so recent, have become the mother of the Indo-European languages? Linguists can give no explanation. In fact, because of some recent archaeological discoveries, they are even forced to admit that the oldest language known to man is the ancient HEBREW!

Where then is the key to the mystery? In spite of apparent differences, is there a connection between the Indo-European languages and the semitic languages? What is the ONE mother language from which all the languages of the world are derived?

Unlike all of the rest of us who must learn a language in order to exchange ideas among ourselves, ADAM, the first man, received the knowledge of a language directly from God, since God spoke to man after having created him (Gen. 2:16). Moreover, God made all the birds of the sky to come "to see how he would name them, and in order that all living would bear the name given to it by man" (Gen. 2:19).

After the creation of woman, the human species multiplied in the earth; but notice well that, according to the Bible, until the construction of the tower of Babel, "all the earth had one language and the same words". In that time, there was then one mother language.

Immediately after the flood, in order to thwart the wild imagination of men, who sought to "make a name for themselves", the Eternal God descended to CONFUSE "their language, so that they could no longer understand the speech one of another" (Gen. 11:7). From that time, men were dispersed over the whole earth.

God is not a God of confusion, but of PEACE (I Cor. 14:33). Consequently, the confusion of languages took place with order, and methodically. It is interesting to note what the historian Hill says about this:

"We conclude however that the change effected in the languages was not at all universal, preventing each individual from communicating with his neighbor. This MIRACULOUS CHANGE WAS EFFECTED SYSTEMATICALLY AND WITH ORDER, separating the different families which descended from the three sons of Noah...each speaking a language unknown to the others" ("The Emigrants Introduction", p.7).

THE RIVALRY OF SANSKRIT

Today, we don't have an exact knowledge of the language people spoke before the flood. But, among the languages known to man after the flood, HEBREW is certainly the most ancient, and from all indications, it is ancient Hebrew which is most like the original language. It is, after all, in ancient Hebrew that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

Always, the entire world is deceived by Satan (Rev. 12:9), who is always attempting to counterfeit the perfect work of God. Also, in order to confuse the mind of man and to hide from him the truth about the languages, Satan diverts the attention of linguists to another ancient language--a language old as well as mysterious!

"As Hebrew was the origin of a literature particularly ancient and venerable, one will try...to find in it the roots of all other languages...(further on) Leibnitz and Adelung (in the work "Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde", by Adelung) set themselves TO DISCREDIT THIS PRESTIGE OF THE BIBLICAL IDIOM, but it could not be altogether discarded until the rivalry of a language not less respectable in age...SANSKRIT, the sacred language of the Hindus" ("The Indo-Europeans", Carnoy, p. 10).

There is the astonishing answer! This is how Sanskrit became considered the mother language of the Indo-European group! Philologists, rejecting the Bible, tried to find an excuse to utterly disregard the language of the Bible in order to replace it, with the sacred language of the Hindus!

THE RAPPORT BETWEEN THE SEMITIC AND EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Indeed, there exists a definite rapport between SANSKRIT and HEBREW, thus between the languages of the INDO-EUROPEAN family (which includes Celtic) and the SEMITIC family, but it is ancient Hebrew which is the mother language, since it is the oldest language known to man.

The philologists would have difficulty denying this fact. Prichard proves it irrefutably, and demonstrates the direct rapport between the two groups of languages, giving a long list of Semitic and Indo-European words, in which he compares their similarities.

The agreements between Hebrew and the languages called Indo-European are indeed more apparent than one might think. Prichard even adds that the Celtic language constitutes an "INTERMEDIATE LINK" between the two families; this declaration is entirely correct. ("Eastern Origin of Celtic Nations", Prichard, p. 191)

Now let us see how the Israelites, on arriving in Europe, acquired a language called "Indo-European" whereas they spoke "a Semitic language" before the captivity.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE TRIBES AFTER THE LIBERATION

During their long captivity, the tribes of Israel found themselves entirely dominated by the Assyrians, whose slaves they were. Consequently, it is very natural that the influence of the conquerors, all this time, was considerable, not only in the area of social mores and religion, but also in that of LANGUAGE.

We must remember that Israel was taken into captivity "to Halah, and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

So what language was spoken in these regions which made up part of the country of the Medes? Ancient PERSIAN, obviously! This language, which linguists class as Indo-European, is known to us by the inscriptions of the Achaemenidae kings, from Darius I (522-486 B.C.) to Artaxerxes Ochus (358-338 B.C.), when it was the official language. To be mentioned also, from a documentary standpoint, is that these inscriptions were usually trilingual: in old PERSIAN, in ELAMITE, and in BABYLONIAN.

As a result of their long captivity among peoples who spoke a language "classified" in the Indo-European group, the Israelites in the end, forgot their maternal language. At the time of their migration to Europe, as Celtic peoples, they already spoke a dialect, or a dialect language that the world recognizes as being of the Indo-European family ("The Celts of la Tene", Hubert, Pref.)

Several historians indifferently use the term Celt to indicate both the Gauls in particular, and the Celtic people as a whole. Notice the words of Zeller:

"Today one applies it especially to the races who spoke a language whose dialects existed in BRITAIN, in the country of the GAULS, in the mountains of the SCOTTS and in IRELAND, races more or less homogeneous, who...peopled not only Gaul, but most of SWITZERLAND and the BRITISH ISLES" ("Gaul and the Gauls", pp.11-12).

During the years of captivity, the ancient Hebrew spoken by the Israelites mixed gradually with the language of their conquerors and of the Medes where they had been taken for their captivity. Under this constant influence the Israelites finally lost their own language.

A comparison between ancient Hebrew and ancient Celtic is not an easy one to make, because both these ancient languages are

almost totally lost. Nevertheless, modern philologists base their theories on such groundwork and arrive at scholarly conclusions! The Gauls did not leave us one writing. Their religious literature and rites were transmitted orally by the intermediaries, the DRUIDS.

The Encyclopedia Britannica notes that the oldest poems in the Celtic language, notably the "Book of Dun Cow", (1100 A.D.) present declamatory lines and rhythms strongly resembling THE POETIC VERSES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (Article: "Celtic Literature").

In conclusion, let us repeat, during their captivity, the ISRAELO-CELTS acquired a dialect language which was nearly unknown until the Roman conquest. In literature, it was strikingly similar to Hebrew, even in style and vocabulary.

THE EXAMPLE OF JUDAH

The fact that the Israelite tribes, during their captivity, ended up losing their mother language raises doubts in the minds of skeptics. This seems to them incredible, impossible!

Let's note, however, that the change in question did not take place as rapidly as one might think; it was affected during two or three generations, in other words in the course of a HUNDRED years. Let's also remember that the Israelites were not only under total bondage to their conquerors, forced to serve them, but that they had been taken into captivity in a foreign place, far from their homeland, in areas where their mother language was not at all understood.

To demonstrate this effect, we have only to consider the example of JUDAH, who remained in captivity only about 70 years. In spite of this short length of time, the Bible declares that on their return to Palestine, "their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, AND COULD NOT SPEAK IN THE JEWS' LANGUAGE; but according to the language of each people" (Neh. 13:24).

Unlike JUDAH who, after its liberation REGAINED PALESTINE, the TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL HEADED TOWARD THE NORTHWEST of Jerusalem, as we have already indicated in previous chapters.

The question for linguists, as well as for historians, is to look at the evidence that the Israelites are NOT ALL JEWS, and that the TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL ACTUALLY MAKE UP THE CELTIC PEOPLES, whose origin has always been a mystery to History!

Philologists and historians, if they would accept the Biblical truth, would have no difficulty finding the common denominator between the Hebraic language and that of the Celtic peoples who ended up establishing themselves in WESTERN EUROPE!

Chapter 8

COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS

The patriarch Jacob, just before his death, called his sons, together to reveal to them what would become of their descendants in the course of time.

This KEY PROPHECY is found in Genesis, chapter 49. It is renewed later, with some additions, by the mouth of Moses (Deut. 33). Without this prophecy, it would be impossible for us to determine the exact identity of each tribe, after its dispersion.

More than this, the BIBLE reveals to us that each of the twelve tribes have inherited the principal traits of character of the son of Israel whose name it bears. Consequently, it is possible for us to establish the general character of REUBEN, whose descendants later were known under the name GAULS!

THE CHARACTER AND PERSONALITY OF REUBEN

According to Biblical chronology, Reuben, the firstborn of Israel, was born about 1771 B.C. Of character ardent, impetuous, generous and intelligent, this firstborn of Jacob played a predominant role in the history of the ISRAELITES, as the Gauls played a role in the foreground of that of the CELTIC peoples.

Reuben was also guilty with his brothers when the ruin of Joseph was plotted; but the plan he made to preserve the life of their young brother, proves the courage and the intelligence of Reuben: as a compromise, he succeeded in convincing his other brothers to throw Joseph into a dry cistern in the desert (Gen. 37:22), instead of shedding blood.

Reuben loved his own and others; this was easily shown when he volunteered to assume, according to the promise he made to his father (Gen. 42:37), the load of responsibility to restore Benja-

min to him.

Of course, as all men, Reuben also had his WEAKNESSES and FAULTS. Above all, he lacked modesty, the Bible tells us! The impetuosity of his character and the lightness of his moral conduct caused him to lose his birthright (I Chron. 5:1), because he "went and lay with Bilhah his father's concubine" (Gen. 35:22).

In spite of the considerable consequences which resulted, the loss of the birthright did not forever involve the total retraction of blessings that Jacob had given to his oldest son: "Reuben, thou art my firstborn, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power: Unstable as water, thou shalt not excell; because thou wentest up to thy father's bed; then defiledst thou it: he went up to my couch" (Gen. 49:3-4).

Thus the descendants of Reuben, conforming to this prophecy, lost their PRE-EMINENCE in the course of History, but kept even so--and have kept through the ages--their superiority in dignity and power.

As for their principal occupation, the sons of Reuben, all made excellent SOLDIERS, and were good in AGRICULTURE. They had a considerable quantity of flocks (Num. 32:1) and lived in a territory rich in pastures, east of the Jordan. Of independent and imaginative spirit (this trait of character was moreover quite pronounced among the Gauls!), they were hard workers, ready to fight for their rights, even when they were wrong!

Concerned about the comforts of life, the Reubenites possessed both a goodly amount of FORESIGHT and of vanity, as we see in the ensemble of the historic pieces of the Bible concerning the Reubenites. There again, we can't help but compare them to the FRENCH whose character, as says Jean de la Bruyere, "takes itself seriously" ("Encyclopedie des Citations", No. 105).

All things considered, conforming to the predictions of Jacob, the Reubenites were, among the other tribes of Israel, a group superior in dignity and superior in power.

THE COLLECTIVE PERSONALITY AND CHARACTER OF THE FRENCH

It is very difficult to make a judgement on the collective character of a large and an old nation, such as France.

Not less than other nations, the FRENCH did not keep the purity of their race. This resulted through incessant wars through the ages, or from the fact of INVASIONS and CROSSBREEDINGS with the natives and immigrants of different races. The French nation today is composed, as are all nations, of a society more or less cosmopolitan. Nevertheless, France retains a remarkable homogeneity.

In spite of the infiltration of diverse elements, greatly complicated and amalgamated, we state that France, from an ethnological point of view, is divided primarily in two distinct parts: those of the NORTH and SOUTH--in other words, the CELTS and the GREEKS ("La Gaule et les Gaulois", Zeller, p. 10).

The Celts, in coming from the east and the northeast, emigrated to the country around 600 B.C., and descended little by little toward the area of Marseille, where Greek colonies were established.

Later, most of the GREEK colonies left the country under the name Gauls (a name given to the inhabitants of Gaul), to settle in GALATIA, toward the year 280 B.C. It is for this reason that the Apostle Paul treated them as "gentiles" (that is to say non-Israelites) in the Epistle he addressed to them. Called "Galatians" or "Gauls", they were in reality of Greek origin, thus "gentiles".

These Galatians of Asia Minor, we repeat, were not Israelites. Even though certain of them, through intermarriage with the Gauls, had a little Israelite blood in their veins, the Galatians, as a whole, were a GREEK people. This fact is not only confirmed in the BIBLE, but also by historical facts.

Paul was not the apostle to the Israelites, but the "Apostle to the Gentiles" (Acts 14:27, 21:18-19, Rom. 11:13, Gal. 2:2, 7, 8, Eph. 3:1, 8, etc.) and, in his Epistle to the Galatians, he addressed himself to them as "Gentiles" or as "Greeks"--non-Israelites. He speaks to them of his "conduct in Judaism" and of the traditions of his ancestors, and not of those of the Galatians (Gal. 1:14). In fact, the entire Epistle was written to assure them they had no need of circumcision to inherit the promises (Gal. 5:2, 6:12). If these Galatians had been Israelites, that instruction would not have been necessary.

It is known that the Galatians, spiritually speaking, belong to "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16). "If you are Christ's, you are then of the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3:29).

After this migration, the few Greeks who remained in the south of Gaul disappeared through the ages, due to multiple causes and to the fact of interbreeding with the Celts. Thus, France today still has its national homogeneity. The true ancestors of the FRENCH were the GAULS who ARE ISRAELITES! It was because of this fact that Paul, "Apostle to the Gentiles", projected a voyage to Spain (Rom. 15:24-28)--a non-Israelite country, thus "gentile"-- AVOIDING France (Gaul). The conversion of the Israelites was committed to other apostles, not to Paul.

We will try now to outline, very briefly, some of the collective traits of character of the FRENCH, such as the ethnologists and historians present to us, to establish a base of comparison between the collective character of the FRENCH and REUBENITES which we have just examined.

However, instead of referring to the various works published on the subject, we will use only excerpts from the "Nouvelle Geographie Universelle", the monumental work of Elisee Reclus, in which the celebrated French geographer summarizes marvelously even the principal ideas of diverse authors.

Before the rapid industrial development which characterizes our 20th Century, and which is totally changing the aspect of France, the majority of the population is composed of AGRICULTURISTS and craftsmen. The FRENCH represent a hardworking and ingenious people.

"In spite of...the extreme difficulties" writes Elisee Reclus, "the peasant owner of his field has made the country one of the most productive on the earth" (Book II, Article: "France").

The famous geographer states that the FRENCH can express their sentiments and ideas better than other peoples:

"The French...have the special virtue of sociability...a natural sentiment of benevolence toward their fellow men, a spirit of equity guides them in their relations with all; they charm by their thoughtfulness...They like to please by dress and manners... They excell in the art of good conversation, and makes his point without discrediting others'" (op. cit.).

These traits of character are specific to the Gauls and, before them, to the ISRAELITES, especially to the descendants of REUBEN, as we have seen at the first of this chapter.

As for the FAULTS and WEAKNESSES of the FRENCH, there again

they find their echo in the Reubenites. In fact, the description of their character and personality could easily apply to Reuben.

Here is what Elisee Reclus says on the subject of the faults and weaknesses of the FRENCH:

"Able to be sociable 'par excellence', he often tries to be 'everything to everyone' and thus loses his own value...Talking easily with everyone, he risks being superficial in his judgments...Respectful to sentiment in general...man of society or diversion, he doesn't always have the courage to remain himself" (op. cit.).

One must recognize, in these traits of character, the affable REUBEN, intelligent and impetuous, who lost his birthright because of his lightness of sentiment and his love of gaiety.

Of course, if the French culture has kept its superiority, the FRENCH must not attribute it to their own merits alone. Even if they have been "the arbiters of literature, and in certain domains of art, their superiority remains uncontested" (op. cit.), the merit is not due to their own talents: they could not be otherwise, since divine prophecy, pronounced from the mouth of the patriarch Jacob, must come to pass. Reuben must retain his "superiority in dignity and power..."

Chapter 9

THE DRUIDS AND THE DOLMENS

At the time Israel was taken into captivity by the Assyrians, its religion, as we have already indicated, was already completely different from that the Eternal had given through Moses; it even differed from what the JEWS practiced at their return to Palestine.

The new and abominable religion adopted by Israel was made up of a curious mixture of pagan cults; it was greatly influenced by the diverse beliefs of nations round about, especially by those of the PHOENICIANS.

In the three following chapters, which will be devoted to the religion of the CELTS and their society, we will attempt to prove, by numerous comparisons, that the Celts (the GAULS in particular)

had a culture identical to that of ancient ISRAEL. The customs and traditions of the two peoples are strikingly similar.

THE DRUIDS AS JUDGES

Among the Celts, the religion depended principally on the Druids. One can even say it was the religion of the Druids. It was practiced not only in GREAT BRITAIN, in IRELAND, and in GAUL, but wherever the Celtic peoples had settled. The Druidic priesthood formed its head, with, according to the writings of the ancients, a power and prestige seldom equalled.

The Druids held an eminent place in Gaulic society. Mr. Pernoud declares: "The Druids...were priests and it was their priestly functions which assured their prestige. They offered SACRIFICES; Pliny recounts the sacrifice of white BULLOCKS which had never known the yoke, as a tribute to the famous CUEILLETTE DU GUI" ("Les Gaulois", Pernoud, p. 154).

Merely on the basis of these few indications, one has already established an irrefutable base of comparison between the religion of the Celts and that of ancient Israel. Other writers, ancient as well as modern, collaborate with the statements of Pernoud, and give even more ample details. Zeller says:

"They (the Druids) passed as the most just of men and WERE THE ARBITERS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DISPUTES... What especially appertained to them was the judgement of crimes and murders" ("La Gaule et les Gaulois", Zeller, pp. 37-38).

Notice that such judgements, in PAGAN NATIONS, were always in the domain of civil government or of the chiefs of state, as it is still done in our days in almost the entire world.

There is only one people, ancient ISRAEL, whose religion required that the PRIESTHOOD be the ARBITER of public and private disputes!

This striking parallel between the practice of the DRUIDS and that of the LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD is very significant, since the Eternal had given the following instruction to His people:

"If a cause relative to a murder, a dispute, a wound, appears too difficult to judge and causes a dispute in your gates...go to the SACRIFICERS, the Levites...and they will make known the sentence" (Deut. 17:8-11).

At first, ancient Israel (which includes the tribe of Judah) conformed to the sentence thus rendered, and acted as the priests taught. In spite of the fact that the JEWS (the tribe of Judah) ended up, in their turn, turning from the truth, this custom still existed among them at the time of Jesus, since it was the Sanhedrin, a body of judges composed of priests, who condemned our Savior to death!

The Druids, as the Levites, were under the orders of a HIGH PRIEST ("La Gaule et les Gaulois", Zeller, p. 39), however among the Druids succession to the post was not necessarily a question of heredity. But this should not be surprising; Jeroboam, in his time, had already succeeded in abolishing the Levitical priesthood to replace it with another group, a semblance of a priesthood who had to obey the orders and desires of the king! (I Kings 12:31).

This post of high chief ("Arch-Druid") corresponded to that of "high priest" in the Levitical priesthood.

THE DRUIDS IN CHARGE OF EDUCATION

Another interesting characteristic of the Celtic society concerns education. The Druids also assumed charge over it. It was they who taught and educated the youth. Historians tell us that instruction given by the Druids was purely oral.

This interesting custom was previously in vigorous practice in Israel, and later particularly among the Jews, where the "TORAH" (the law) ended up constituting the religious course. For centuries in ancient Israel it was the sacrificers and the Levites who formed the principal educators making up the teachers of Israel, as indicated in the Bible. (See: Deut. 31:9, 33:10; Jer. 2:8, 18:18; Mal. 2:6; II Chron. 17:7; etc.)

Let's add that, according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, Philo, a Greek philosopher of Jewish origin, called the synagogue "a place of learning".

The DRUIDS, just as the LEVITES, gave thus instruction to the people.

THE DRUIDS WERE EXEMPT FROM TAXES AND MILITARY SERVICE

Another curious fact to add to the list of our comparisons between the Druids and the Levites, is that of military service.

These two groups were exempt from this service. Moreover, historians say, the Druids didn't even pay taxes ("Myths and Legends of the Celtic Race", Rolleston, p. 37).

The exemption from military service among the Levites was dictated by the Eternal, who forbade them to carry arms. We have several examples of this, notable in the book of Numbers (Num. 1: 2-3, 47-49; etc.). When Moses counted the number of men able to carry arms, "the Levites had no part in the number".

THE DOLMENS

Historians are astonished to find no temples among the Druids! Contrary to other nations who often built temples in which to practise their cult, the Celts built none of these. The religion of the DRUIDS prohibited construction of temples and IMAGES figured as gods!

This point is of capital importance; of all the nations of the past, only ISRAEL had received the divine commandment never to make a graven image, "neither any REPRESENTATION concerning things in the sky above..." (Exo. 20:4).

The Druids practiced their cult in open air, often near oaks or carefully placed pillars such as cromlechs, dolmens, or menhirs. The famous circle of raised stones, in Stonehenge (Great Britain), is perhaps the best known example of these "outdoor temples" in the world.

These huge stones (whose number is more than 6800 only in France, while most are in Great Britain) and the approximately 200 cromlechs (groups of menhirs arranged in a circle) have always been an enigma to archaeologists. They are, as are historians, incapable of determining WHEN, WHY, and BY WHOM these stones were erected! Some attribute them to a supposed "age of stone" for the simple reason these monuments are made of stone! What brilliant logic, indeed!

In spite of the diversity of opinions concerning the origin of the dolmens, archaeologists admit that these stones, carefully arranged, play a role of first importance in the RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES of the Druids.

Isn't it significant that the pillars erected in Europe are always found in the AREAS where the CELTS were much in passage,

or many in residence on a more or less permanent basis?

In fact, these columns scattered along the route permit us to establish the itinerary the Celts followed in their migration to Europe, after their liberation from the Assyrians.

THE MEANING OF THE DOLMENS

We know that not one dolmen exists in Eastern Europe, east of Saxe (in Germany). But they reappear, in small numbers, in Crimea and northern Caucasia, from which they were transplanted to Central Asia and the East Indies, perhaps by Israelite emigrants who, in scattered groups, travelled to these places, or perhaps by people who had previously lived among the Israelite tribes and knew their customs and their culture.

To find the route that the Israelites followed, at the time of their migration to WESTERN EUROPE, we have only to mark on a map the diverse places where these megaliths are raised, and connect them by a direct line: first PALESTINE in Persia, then in the region of the Danube passing by Crimea, along the European coast, to the north, ending up in FRANCE and GREAT BRITAIN!

However astonishing that must appear to those who don't know the truth about the identity of the Celts, these stones are still there, placed as living WITNESS to the words the prophet Jeremiah addressed to Israel, under divine inspiration:

"SET UP WAYMARKS, make SIGNPOSTS, set your heart on the highway, even the way you came... Return, virgin of Israel, turn again to these thy cities" (Jer. 31:21).

But what relationship could there be between these SIGNPOSTS of stone and the tribes of Israel? The answer is both obvious and surprising: These monuments were, in a way, a mark of identity of the Israelites; they were an integral part of their customs and culture!

The Jewish Encyclopedia writes on this subject: "The cult of sacred stones constitutes one of the most ancient forms of religion; it was especially widespread among the SEMITES" (Article: "Sacred stones").

Adding that the Phoenician temples also contained such posts, called "Mozzebot", the Jewish Encyclopedia states: "These posts symbolically represented YHVH. Even the prophet Hosea advised

Israel of the terrible days to come (Hosea 3:4, 10:12) when they would be 'without statue' (Mozzebot), that is to say, withheld from their public worship".

When the Israelites turned from the face of the Eternal to worship in idolatry, these stones, which were specially chosen and cut to serve as landmarks, also became objects of the pagan cult, inducing worship to gods and offering them a refuge!

"But it (Israel) made itself guilty worshipping Baal; that is why it perished. And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the craftsmen" (Hos. 13:1-2).

SOME BIBLICAL EXAMPLES OF RAISED STONES

One of the most striking examples, in the matter of erecting dolmens, is given in the story of the famous stone Jacob used for a pillow (Gen. 28:11-22). After his dream, Jacob placed it for a monument, poured oil over it, and declared: "This stone that I have set up for a monument, shall be God's house".

At first, the Israelites erected these stones for various reasons. For example, Jacob, in the company of Laban, his father-in-law, set one up to seal their alliance of good will (Gen. 31:52). Later, he placed one on the tomb of Rachel, his wife (Gen. 35:20).

On Mount Sinai, Moses set up TWELVE stones, one for each tribe of Israel, as a witness to the ancient alliance between the Eternal and Israel (Exo. 24:4). After the death of Moses, Joshua, his successor, became head over Israel and, passing over the Jordan, "set up twelve stones he had taken from the Jordan" (Josh. 4:9-20).

Indeed, the Bible is full of these examples, which one can easily regroup with the aid of a good concordance.

Contrary to the Israelites who, at first, practiced no cult before these stones, the nations round about, notably the CANAANITES, bowed before them and WORSHIPPED them as their gods.

Nevertheless, after conquering the country of the CANAANITES, the Israelites followed the pagan example of the inhabitants of the land. Despite the formal orders of Moses to destroy these abominable altars (Deut. 12:3), and not to bow down before them (Lev. 26:1), the Israelites abandoned themselves to the practice

of this cult and sinned against the Eternal God.

In the end, the erection of these statues and the pagan cult practiced before them CONSTITUTED one of the reasons for which the ISRAELITES, according to the will of God, were taken into captivity by the ASSYRIANS! (II Kings 17:10).

Chapter 10

THE OAK AND THE GODS OF THE DRUIDS

The oak, for diverse reasons, for instance its fertility and longevity, seems to have played an important part in the religion of the Druids. In the opinion of numerous historians, it even could be said to form an essential part of the religion of the Gauls.

Could there exist a similarity of customs between ancient Israel and the Celtic peoples concerning the oak?

Remember that Israel was PUNISHED for turning away from the commandments of the Eternal and for having followed the paganism of other nations. Consequently, the customs and traditions which the Israelites introduced into Europe, as Celtic immigrants, WOULD NOT BE PART of their original religion, contained in the Pentateuch.

At the moment the Israelites were taken into captivity, their religion, as we have already indicated, had become a mixture of ABOMINABLE beliefs, while some vestiges of the original beliefs showed up under the outward appearance of paganism.

Let's see then if ancient Israel also practiced cults under the oak, as did the Gauls! As strange as it may seem, the response is affirmative; the Bible gives us ample witness.

It was thus that Joshua took a large stone and set it up under the oak "which was in the place consecrated to the Eternal" (Josh. 24:26). It was under the oak of Ophra (Judges 6:11, 19-20), that Gideon received the message of the angel in order to deliver Israel; following that, he offered a sacrifice under the same oak.

It seems that it was the custom, among the Israelites, to sometimes bury the dead under a particular oak (Gen. 35:4, 8;

I Chron. 10:12):

Then again, oaks often marked the emplacement of ALTARS. In this respect, one of the most severe divine accusations against this pagan worship was pronounced against Israel by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel:

"Then shall ye know that I am the Lord, when their slain shall be among their idols round about their altars, upon every high hill, in all the tops of the mountains, and under every green tree, and UNDER EVERY THICK OAK, the place where they did offer sweet savor to all their idols" (Ezek. 6:13).

But just who were these pagan gods who required their worship under certain trees?

THE GAULIC GODS

In his famous work known as "The Pharsalia", Lucan, the Latin poet born at Corduba in 39 A.D., mentions THREE great gods who, among the Gauls, made up a TRIAD, or a TRINITY, forming a unity. The collective symbolism of these three gods was often represented by three pillars of equal height, set up on a common base.

The Gauls called them: Teutates (the principal god of the "commoners"), Tauranus (the celestial bull), and Esus (the god of war to which they offered human sacrifices).

Remember that the Israelites, after turning to paganism, also turned to the cult of BULLS and CALVES. It is thus that Jeroboam placed calves at Bethel, and that the people offered sacrifice on the altar (I Kings 12:28-33). This abominable cult was in practice at the time the Israelites were taken into captivity by the Assyrians. The BULL and the CALF, among the Israelites become pagan, were commonly associated with the celestial elements, as was the case with the GAULS.

As for "Esus", the god of life, etymologists assure us that this name is derived from an Assyrian root, signifying "to be"; note the similarity of the meaning with YHVH, in HEBREW, which is synonymous with the term: "I AM".

At first, in spite of the usage of symbols, the Druidic religion was not made up of graven images of its gods to be worshipped! This strange and remarkable fact contrasts clearly with the customs of the surrounding nations.

"In other words...(there is) not one trace of idolatry, or of

cultural evolution in the Celtic religion, thus, their art was radically different from that of ancient greco-latin art. NOT A SINGLE STATUE OF A GOD EXISTED IN GAUL BEFORE THE ROMAN EPOCH, remarked Camille Jullian" ("Les Gaulois", Pernoud, p. 78).

This astonishing assertion, made by one of the greatest French historians, is without a doubt very significant. What is more, it is collaborated by other famous and esteemed historians, notably by Courcelles-Seneuil, who writes:

"A sort of rite seems to have precluded it (the representation of their divinities), for it was not because of a lack of craftsmanship that this abstention can be attributed" ("Les Dieux Gaulois", Courcelles, p. 61).

Once again, if the historians would only study the Bible, they would find that the religion of no other people (except that of Israel) PROHIBITED adoration of idols!

BAAL AMONG THE TWO PEOPLES

Who was then the "principal god" of the Gauls, who required them to worship under OAKS and with altars built of RAISED PILLARS, this three-part god to which they offered HUMAN SACRIFICES?

The world knows his identity. It was the COMMON god of the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, the Phoenicians, and the Greeks ("Les Dieux Gaulois", Courcelles, p. 253). The paganized Israelites worshipped it also under more or less varied names, the most well-known of which are BEL or BAAL.

Every student of the Bible knows the abominable role that BAAL played in Israel. The Eternal God punished the Israelites because they turned to Baal; they offered him incense, made statues of molten metals, built him altars, and sacrificed their children before him.

"They thought to cause my people to forget my name...as their fathers have FORGOTTEN MY NAME FOR BAAL" declares the Eternal (Jer. 23:27).

This BAAL, according to historians, was also the FOUNDER OF DRUIDISM ("Celtic Researches"; Davies, p. 190). In other words BAALISM was the religion of the Druids. Baal was considered the source of all the gifts of nature; he passed off as the god of feasts of the earth, to whom people offered their firstfruits. He symbolized wisdom and fertility, in association with Ashtaroth.

One has only to compare the abominations committed by the GAULS with those of the ISRAELITES to establish the common denominator between the religion of the two peoples. By the mouths of all of His prophets (Jer. 7:9, 19:5, etc.), the Eternal condemns without ceasing these abominations.

It is thus incontestable that the religion of the Druids is identical with that of the Israelites who turned from the Eternal. The two peoples practiced the same PAGAN RELIGION, the same rites, the same cult!

This truth is one of the most evident proofs established that the CELTIC PEOPLES are none other than the scattered TRIBES OF ISRAEL!

Chapter 11

rites and customs among the two peoples

We have just established that DRUIDISM was none other than a form of BAALISM that the Israelites, as Celtic peoples, brought with them to Europe, during their successive migrations.

The two religions, having the same source of inspiration, had nearly the same pagan doctrines, that is to say false and erroneous theories. We are now going to examine some of them to execute a quick COMPARISON between the Celtic practices and those of ancient Israel, for the truth, however masked and denatured, sometimes makes itself known through the veil of paganism!

PUNISHMENT BY FIRE AND WATER

Immortality of the soul was a predominant doctrine among the partisans of Baalism as well as among the Celtic peoples. The Druids "proclaimed the immortality of souls and that of the world, WHILE THEY NEVERTHELESS BELIEVED that a day of fire and water would prevail over all the rest" ("La Gaule et les Gaulois", Zeller, pp. 37-38).

Note that this form of punishment, "by FIRE AND WATER", is particular to the Israelites. Their prophets always had advised them of divine chastisement which would judge them by fire. Thus the prophet Isaiah wrote:

"BY FIRE the Eternal executes His judgements, by His sword He chastises all flesh" (Isa. 66:16).

Later, Malachi declares: "For behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as a FURNACE: and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble" (Mal. 4:1).

Concerning punishment by WATER, who is not familiar with the story of the flood (Gen. 7), and what happened to the evil world whose thought were only evil continually?

THE COUNTERFEIT OF THE FEASTS OF THE ETERNAL

Although punished and taken into captivity, Israel never abandoned its beliefs and pagan practices for which God had punished them. In the seventeenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings, we learn that the children of Israel ENTIRELY abandoned THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, making two calves of molten metal, prostrating themselves before all the HOST OF THE HEAVENS and servicing Baal. The Eternal even reveals that they made their children pass through the fire--a practice which was repeated by the Gauls--and that they indulged in DIVINATION and enchantment.

Each year, in May and in October, the Druids offered Baal human sacrifices by rites more or less similar to those of the Israelites.

These pagan feasts, celebrated in the spring and the fall, seem to be the Satanic counterfeit of the Feasts of the Eternal (Lev. 23), notably the "Feast of Weeks", also called the "Feast of the Firstfruits" (during the era the Israelites offered animal sacrifices "in burnt offering to the Eternal"), and the "Feast of Tabernacles", fixed at the first of autumn.

This is why there was a new captivity, this time under the Roman yoke, because these ISRAELO-CELTS took these names to their abominable pagan religion!

HOW DID THE DRUIDS RECKON TIME?

Remember that the Druids have not left one writing. Certain historians think that the responsibility for this fact falls to the Gauls who nevertheless knew writing ("Les Gaulois", Pernoud, p. 66).

The transmission of religious customs orally was a fairly common practice among the ancients. All of it was made with the

aid of symbols, and the rites were transmitted mouth to ear, from one generation to the other. Obviously, it could not have been otherwise concerning BAALISM, which has not left us one writing! These practices have come to us by traditions and national customs of the countries who adopted them.

But how did the Celtic peoples calculate time? How did they count the DAYS, the MONTHS, and the YEAR? The answer cannot but surprise you.

As for what were the DAYS, they counted from sunset to sunset! "The GAULS COUNTED THE DAYS BY THE NUMBER OF NIGHTS", states M. Courcelles-Seneuil ("Le Dieux Gaulois", p. 66). Julius Caesar, who understood neither its reasoning nor its origin, ridiculed this idea. The Roman, in general, attributed it to the pagan religion of the Celts; however, NOT ONE PAGAN RELIGION COUNTED THE DAYS from one evening to the next.

From where then did the Celts take this habit? Historians are incabable of explaining it, as they never want to admit that it could originate in the Bible! If it had been a question of the pagan religion, the Gauls would have counted the day according to the SUN, in the same manner as other nations--and NOT AT ALL from one evening to the next!

No, this Druidic custom was not of pagan origin. The Gauls had inherited it from their ancestors, BEFORE being taken into captivity by the Assyrians. This national custom was founded on the original instructions that the Eternal had previously given to the children of Israel who always counted the days "from the evening...to the following evening" (Lev. 23:32). In fact, the Jews observed it still at the time of Jesus Christ (Matt. 27:57, Luke 23:54).

As for MONTHS, it is also curious to state that the CELTS, following the example of the Israelites, COUNTED THEM ACCORDING TO THE MOON--and NOT according to the sun, as did their neighbors.

To be precise however, there was a slight difference in the manner of determining them. While the Israelites began the month at the new moon (I Sam. 20:5, 18, 24-27, etc.), the Celts, according to Pliny, counted from the fifth day following the new moon.

According to several historians, the Celtic YEAR began in autumn, at the end of the harvest ("Ancient Religions", Fredenburg, p. 27), as did the civil year among the Jews, and the Israelites.

SOME SOCIAL CUSTOMS

One of the customs of the Gauls which Caesar spoke of was their strange practice of placing their children in the homes of respectable families so that they would be thus elevated.

This interesting custom was practiced somewhat among the Israelites, especially among the nobles of the country. One may find an example of this in the book of Judges where Ibzan, who had thirty sons (Judges 12:9), "and thirty daughters, whom he sent abroad and took in thirty daughters from abroad for his sons".

Another striking example is perhaps that of Ahab, king of Israel, when his seventy sons were sent, by Jehu, to the chiefs of Jezreel, in order that all the posterity of Ahab would be destroyed (II Kings 10:1, 6). Here, this practice had a double motif!

Let's notice also, by way of curiosity, that a great similarity existed between the FAMILY LIFE of the Celts and that of the Israelites. The FATHER was the head of the family and exercised an authority little known in other nations. The WIFE submitted to him in all things, and was occupied only with her domestic concerns.

The Celtic SOCIETY, as that of the Israelites, was divided in TRIBES, of which each one kept its national traits, and particular characteristics ("The Greatness and Decline of the Celts", Hubert, p. 198).

In conclusion, we would not be ignorant of a particular custom, widespread among the Israelites as well as among the Celts, relative to the RIGHT OF REDEMPTION. According to the Bible (Lev. 25:25) if a brother becomes poor and sells some of his possessions, he who had the right of redemption, in other words his next of kin, would come and redeem what his brother had sold.

Among the Celts, the law was not very different. One had the right to redeem at any time the property sold by one of the members of his family ("Some Sources of Human History", Flinders, pp. 95-98).

Chapter 12

THE FRANKS

There still remains one last important question which we must answer: if the Gauls are the descendants of the REUBENITES who form, in essence, the FRENCH NATION, who were the FRANKS in all this? Weren't these the ones who ended up giving their name to all transalpine Gaul? The response to this question is affirmative.

Who were then these FRANKS? From whence did they come? What is the degree of parentage (if common parentage there is) between them and the Gauls? We will now briefly answer these diverse questions.

THE INVASION OF THE FRANKS

Although Tacitus and Caesar speak of some frankish tribes who inhabited the region between the River Main (in Germany) and the North Sea, it is important to note that, according to historians, the name FRANKS properly said does not appear in the pages of History before the year 241 B.C.

While remaining relatively silent on the origin of the Franks (that they don't know), historians designate them "a group of Germanic peoples" who lived primitively near the Rhine, and divide them in several distinct tribes.

But what is the exact number of Franks who entered Gaul? The answer is surprising:

"France became quite justifiably the name of a country in which there were only an IMPERCEPTIBLE MINORITY OF FRANKS", ("Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?", Renan), writes Renan, adding that in spite of the notable influence they left on the conquered country, in the course of one or two generations, the Norman invaders would not distinguish themselves any more from the rest of the population.

This opinion is both supported and shared by several other historians. Picard declares that it is not easy to determine what the great Frank invasions brought to Gaul after having destroyed a regime which was no longer viable.

The character of the Franks was essentially destructive, states

Picard. According to him, "the Germanic peoples brought of themselves nothing useful to Gaul, other than a little young blood" ("La Civilization Merovingienne", Picard, p. 53).

Nevertheless, the role the Franks played in France, although very different from that of the Celts, has a special significance. Their entrance into the country, as we will establish it, represents the accomplishment of a phase of divine prophecy.

THE FRANKISH TRIBES

One of the principal reasons History considers the Franks a group of Germanic peoples, is the RESEMBLANCE of their character and the mores with those of the Germanic peoples proper! If this comparison carries of itself a certain weight, it may not always constitute an irrefutable proof without the support of other factors.

Diverse Frankish tribes are grouped under the general term "Franks", and two of them were the most important and the most powerful: the SALIAN (pertaining to the Dutch river Yssel) Franks, and RHEINISH Franks.

To say that all the Frankish tribes were of the Germanic race would be a gross error; that is not collaborated by one ethnological or historic proof. Those among them who were of the Germanic race possessed, naturally, the character and mores of the Germanic peoples. But the fact is that all the Frank tribes were not of the Germanic root.

Remember that, as a group, there were only an "IMPERCEPTIBLE MINORITY OF FRANKS" in Gaul. The others, the main body of the Germanic tribes, established themselves in Germany on the shores of the Rhine.

The RHEINISH Franks, just as most of the other Frankish tribes, were of the Germanic race; but it is not the same concerning the SALIAN FRANKS. As a whole, the Salian Franks were not Germanic: THEY WERE ISRAELITES! And, for reasons we are going to examine, they were composed of, notably, descendants of the tribe of JUDAH.

THE SALIAN FRANKS

Of all the Frankish tribes, that of the SALIANS was the most important. Their name, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica,

is derived from LAKE ASPHALTITE (the Dead Sea known by its exceptionally strong saltiness), on the shores of which the Salians lived!

Where then is this lake "Asphaltite"? In PALESTINE, indeed, the same country previously inhabited by the tribes of Israel!

The history of the Salians is linked to legends of seas, continues the Encyclopedia Britannica, stating that the same name "Merovingians", the first royal dynasty the Franks gave to France, means "from the sea", and is derived from the name of the king Merovee who reigned in the fifth century.

If we lack the precise facts to determine conclusively what were the different Israelite tribes making up this group of Salian Franks who invaded Europe, we can at least affirm that the Salian Franks, who had come from the shores of LAKE ASPHALTITE (the Dead Sea), must have been some of the DESCENDANTS of the family of Zerah (Gen. 38:30), in other words the DESCENDANTS OF JUDAH.

Why is this? Because the Eternal declared that DAVID--who was of the descendants of the tribe of Judah--"would NEVER LACK A SUCCESSOR on the throne of the HOUSE OF ISRAEL!" (Jer. 33:17). This prophecy is explicit. (For details, see the work of Mr. Armstrong entitled: "The United States and the British Commonwealth in Prophecy".)

Indeed, it is the line of Merovingians which make up still today the government of the Israelite nations. In the light of this fact, the Salian Franks, who founded the Merovingian monarchy, must have been necessarily of the family of Judah.

The authenticity of this line can be easily verified, since the historic annals of the British royal family clearly reveal that the throne of DAVID is continuing by the dynasty of Merovingian and Carolin^gian kings.

THE NAME OF FRANCE

Historians recognize that the Frank tribes that invaded Gaul represented not only an "imperceptible minority", but also that their influence was nearly negligible on the French spirit.

Speaking of all the Frankish tribes and of the Goths, Elisee Reclus states that "the Germans did not at all notably alter the Gaulic blood, for they were small in number" ("Nouvelle Geographie Universelle", Article: France, Book II, Reclus).

For his part, Fustel de Coulanges mentions that "even the manner in which they (the FRANKS and the GOTHs) entered the country didn't permit them to change its face. All that is life in a nation and all ways of life there existed in Gaul after them" ("Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France", Coulanges).

Why then is it that the FRANKS (and not the GAULS) who, even though small in number, ended up giving their name to France?

Fustel de Coulanges gives us the answer in a simple and precise manner:

"The Franks, as is well known, ended up even giving their name to all transalpine Gaul; but this fact has far less importance than one may attribute to it. Near the end of the Carolingian epoch, the name Gaul replaced it again..." (op. cit.).

But then what happened? How did the name "France" come to the fore again? It was, the famous French historian tells us, because of the predominance that the province called "L'ILE DE FRANCE" would have much later among the other great fiefs!

The name of the country of France does not indicate the origin of its inhabitants. A strange thing: that even the REUBENITES had lost their name and identity, arriving in Europe under the name Gaul, that even GAUL lost its name following the invasion of the Frank tribes!

As the ROYAL MONARCHY that the Salian Franks gave to France, to Great Britain and to other Israelite nations, conforms to divine prophecy, the influence of the Frank tribes was almost negligible on the life and the character of the French.

The French are ISRAELITES. The true ancestors are, before all, the GAULS, who were descendants of the Reubenites.

Conclusion

THE FUTURE ACCORDING TO PROPHECY

With the exception of some passages of the Bible which refer specifically to one or the other of the tribes of Israel, the Biblical PROPHECIES relative to Israel refer as a whole to the TWELVE TRIBES. Consequently, the ultimate destiny of the French nation

is intimately linked to that of the ENGLISH, the AMERICANS, the BELGIANS, the SWISS, the SCANDINAVIANS, and some other nations descended from the tribes of Israel.

THE DECADENCE OF FRANCE

Superior "in dignity...and in power" (according to the prophecy given in Genesis 49:3), FRANCE played, during a number of centuries, an integral role in the history of nations. Called the "queen of the world", it remains the heart of all social, intellectual, and artistic activities. Poets even named it "the pride of the civilized world"!

But things changed! With the loss of Louisiana that Napoleon Bonaparte ceded to the UNITED STATES in 1803, France suddenly began to lose, and continues to lose, its past grandeur and glory!

REUBEN lost his birthright!

"Since the commencement of the (nineteenth) century", states Elisee Reclus, "France has certainly been equalled by its rivals in Europe in works of thought and in the arts of peace, not to mention the bloody game of war. One could blame it then for wanting to keep for itself alone the name "great nation" which was given it in days of yore" ("Nouvelle Geographie Universelle", Reclus, Vol. II, "France").

THE REASON FOR ITS DECADENCE

Why this sudden change toward the year 1803?

In the 26th chapter of Leviticus, we find the list of BLESSINGS and CURSINGS that the Eternal set up for the children of Israel. If they faithfully obeyed the divine commandments, which included observance of the Sabbath which is a "sign" between the Eternal and His people, they would then be abundantly blessed. On the other hand, the Eternal would punish them (and He did punish them!) SEVEN TIMES more--a prophetic time totaling 2520 years.

At several junctures, we have demonstrated in this work that the Israelites were not obedient to God's commandments. On the contrary, they turned away from Him to live in idolatry. It was for this reason that the Eternal caused them to be taken into captivity by the Assyrians in about 721 B.C. From that moment began the period of national banishment for all ISRAEL; the duration

would be, according to the prophecy, 2520 years. This national exile came to an end at the debut of the nineteenth century.

GRANDEUR AND DECLINE

Although France conserved, in the course of its history, its superiority "in dignity and...in power", the other descendants of Israel lived, during these long prophetic years, in obscurity, in servitude and in poverty.

However, at the beginning of the 19th century, with the end of the period of national banishment, most of the Israelite nations, notably GREAT BRITAIN (descended from Ephraim--chief of the tribes of Israel) and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (descended from Manasseh, the brother of Ephraim), began to enter into the possession of what had been promised to Abraham for the Israelites as a nation. Not only did they overtake France, but they surpassed it in almost every area. (See the work of Mr. Armstrong entitled: "The United States and the British Commonwealth in Prophecy".)

A curious fact: just as the tribes of Israel divided in the past and allied with their enemies to march AGAINST THEIR OWN, today some of the Israelite nations--including FRANCE and BELGIUM--blindly ally themselves to the same nations who are going to conquer them and take them in captivity a second time!

In spite of the amelioration of its economy during these last few years--an upturn which actually gives a false sense of security--France is DECLINING! Both from a cultural point of view and a spiritual point of view. Its literature, its arts, its social mores, its culture, all hurl in an avalanche on the fall of human civilization!

All Israel lives in the midst of ^{spiritual} Babylon! "Come out of her (Babylon), my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues", cries the Eternal (Rev. 18:4). But the Israelite nations incline not an ear to this divine advice.

The sudden prosperity France and the other Israelite nations inherited since the end of their period of national banishment is only ephemeral, very ephemeral, given that each of them continues to REJECT THE LAWS OF GOD. Because of this, all these nations, as MODERN ISRAEL, will be taken again into captivity (Luke 21:24).

Full of the wine (sins) of her sister (Ezek. 23:32), the nation of Israel will become "laughed to scorn, and had in derision"!

As far as the gradual loss of its colonies and to political difficulties it encountered actually to conserve its rank of "super power", France isn't the only one confronting these international problems: In this, it shares in the condition of all the other ISRAELITE NATIONS.

Because these Israelite nations refuse to turn to the voice of the Eternal, and they do not put in practice His laws, His commandments, and His statutes, the CURSINGS predicted in the Bible, notably in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, already strike THE WHOLE OF ISRAEL, and come down ever more violently.

The Eternal declared to Israel: "I will break the PRIDE of your power" (Lev. 26:19).

MODERN ISRAEL IN PROPHECY

See where France is today! The great nation which dictated, already two centuries ago, the course of History, and which dominated over European civilization, is in the midst of physical, moral, and spiritual decadence. It has lost the greater part of the acquisitions realized by the ancient regime, acquisitions especially considerable in North America and Southeast Asia. *and West Africa*

At the Treaty of Paris in 1763, France in effect abandoned New France and India; soon after, it ceded Louisiana to Spain, then lost St. Dominica, in 1804, and the isle of France of Mascarene, in 1810. The treaties of Paris of 1814-1815 left it only some small Antilles..., French Guyana, some branches of Senegal and in India...IT WAS A NEGLIGIBLE DOMAIN" ("Larousse du XXe siecle", Article: France).

If the different governments which succeeded since then reconstituted an overseas empire, France HAS LOST IN OUR TIME its new acquisitions, one after the other, at the price of its own blood! Laos, Vietnam, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria...Soon, it will again be reduced to the state of a "negligible domain"!

Also see where the UNITED STATES stands, a country whose prosperity began, so to speak, with the purchase of Louisiana! The Americans--the invincibles of the world!--are rapidly losing their pride and grandeur! Given over to the love of money, they have even become a source of degeneration in this expanding 20th century!

And see where GREAT BRITAIN is today, this "multitude of nations", this BRITISH COMMONWEALTH on which the sun never set... Stripped of its powers, of its "gates" (strategic locations of the earth), of its pride and most of its possessions, Great Britain is almost reduced to the small isles that it has always occupied!

Whether it be FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, the SCANDANAVIAN COUNTRIES, or BELGIUM who has lost the Congo, or adding SWITZERLAND or whatever other nation descended from Israel, each of them must answer before the Eternal for its own sins and its own disobedience. Each of them, individually and collectively, will fight and be beaten in the course of the THIRD WORLD WAR which already is appearing on the horizon. Each of them will fall under the yoke of the enemy--of a UNION composed of "ten kings" (Rev. 17), of which the head will be the "beast."

This union is already forming in Europe! Even though it includes at the moment, as members, nations of Israelite origin, the time will come when these, in their turn, will be TAKEN INTO THE TRAP of the enemy with whom they ally now!

As incredible as it may seem, this great divine prophecy will be accomplished to the letter. (For more details, please consult the work of Mr. H. W. Armstrong, entitled: "The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy").

We now live in "the last days", the time of the END, forecast by the Bible. Formidable events will soon succeed one another at a terrifying pace.

The end is near, much nearer than one thinks. Conforming to his formal declarations, the Eternal WILL RESTORE Israel to the countries of the north, and will reassemble it from the ends of the earth (Jer. 31:8), during the last days!

We, the ISRAELITES, are "the chosen people" of the Eternal. We are HIS PEOPLE; but He chose us to obey Him, not to walk contrary to His orders and His commandments.

"I call heaven and earth to record this day AGAINST YOU" says the Eternal (Deut. 30:19-20.). "I have set before you LIFE and DEATH, BLESSING and CURSING: therefore choose life, that both you and your seed may live: That you may love the LORD they God, to obey his voice, and to cleave unto HIM..." END

