

The Gaelic Tradition

John Davis Pilkey
May 7, 2008

Kingship at Its Source interprets the Teutates Panel of the Gundestrup Caldron as documenting a follow-up battle after the Battle of Metelis, in which members of the Gallic tetrad and vassals of Japheth under Shem avenged the murders of Ham's six sons and four vassals of Javan at the hands of Narmer. Interpretation of the Teutates Panel has been complicated by a rival interpretation of the Caldron as depicting insular Gaelic rather than Gallic traditions centering in the deeds of Irish hero Cúchullain. According to this alternative interpretation, the bearded figure I identify as the Gallic god Taranis is identified with King Fergus, an entirely different patriarch. The dominant figure in the Teutates panel is equated with Cúchullain and the Gallic god Esus (Joktan) rather than the Gallic god Teutates (Shem). My interpretation equates Esus with one of the riders, the one with a bird insignia on his helmet. My book compromises with the rival interpretation by suggesting that the Caldron was crafted by an insular artisan on the basis of a Gallic prototype. The rival interpretation emphasizes some of the details of the legend of Cúchullain including one appearing in the Teutates panel, a bed of leaves dividing the two horizontal registers of the panel.

A transparent reason for bringing the legend of Cúchullain to bear on the Gundestrup Caldron is that the name Medb appears prominently in the text of *The Battle of Ross na Ríg*, a medieval work dated about 1160, translated from Gaelic by Rev. Edmund Hogan and available on an internet Wikisource linked to the Wikipedia article on Cúchullain. I now take the Irish tradition of the Battle of Ross na Ríg as an insular version of the Battle of Teutates. This battle occurred in 2178 BCE despite the anachronistic trappings of the story derived from Ireland. The text of *The Battle of Ross na Ríg* is a goldmine, amplifying the narrative line I offer of the Battle of Teutates including new prominence given to Shem's grandson Obal under the Irish name Conchobar. The story clearly implies a sibling falling out between Inanna (Medb) and Utu (Obal-Conchobar) at some time subsequent to their appearing together in the Olympian tradition of exile to the Aegean under their names Artemis and Apollo. That exodus took place in the 2240s about sixty years before the battle.

The alienation of brother and sister arose from Shem's effort to shake off the Inanna Succession and replace it with his male-line heir Obal rather than Inanna's son Shelah-Marduk. Shem failed at this attempt, or else Genesis 10:22 and the genealogy of Genesis 11 would not read as they do. However his efforts resulted in a victory by what the Gaelic text calls the "Ulaid" over the forces of Eriu or Ireland ruled by Medb as queen and Ailill as King of the Irish province of Connacht. Once we accept the premise of insular and medieval anachronism, details fall into place. The land of Eriu figures as an anachronism for the belt of lands outlined in Genesis 10:22 and extending from Elam in the southeast to Lydia in the northwest. This belt of lands operates in Irish tradition in much the same way as the names and arrangement of German tribes in Ptolemy's Germany as explained in Appendix V of *Kingship at Its Source*.



Ancient Provinces of Old Ireland
www.users.eastlink.ca copied May 10, 2008

The story begins with the deathly illness of Conchobar. The enemy King Ailill bears a name suggesting Ellil, Akkadian variant of the god Enlil synonymous with the Semitic linguistic stock. Medb-Inanna's high Semitic importance as Ishtar suggests such a foundational alliance formed on behalf of the Semitic Akkadians in opposition to the Indo-Europeans who lost at Metelis but then won at the Battle of Teutates.

A geographic hint derives from a reference to "Medb of the Plain" together with a statement that she and her allies invaded from the western kingdom of Connacht. Because *Kingship at Its Source* places the Battle of Teutates at Carchemish, the "plain" in question might be considered the Plain of Anatolia northwest of the Upper Euphrates. Such a western orientation for Medb agrees with her having spent time in the Olympian exile to the Aegean as Artemis. Her eventual cooperation with the Akkadian regime who had exiled her is consistent with the way the Akkadians attempted to spread their empire westward both in Sargon's conquest of Ionia and Naram Sin's conquest of Lower Egypt as Narmer. The logic of the situation is that Inanna-Artemis became alienated from her brother Utu-Apollo-Obal-Conchobar at some time between the rise of the empire in the 2240s and the Battles of Metelis and Teutates by the 2170s. This sibling rivalry adds a dimension of meaning to our understanding of the two battles. In effect Inanna-Medb joined forces with the ruling Akkadians; and her brother Utu-Conchobar, with the Centum Aryans or "Ulaid" who had disobeyed the Akkadians by leaving eastern Arabia for Egypt, Phoenicia and Carchemish.

These siblings— biblical Uzal and Obal— were grandchildren of Shem through Arphaxad I (Nanna-Taranis). Obal would have been Shem's heir if it had not been for the Inanna Succession. The Hurrian *Song of Kumarbi* emphasizes how deeply Shem resented the Inanna Succession in taking his imperial heirs from the male line of his enemy Canaan. When the Centum Aryans came up from Arabia, Shem and Obal seized the opportunity to abandon the Inanna Succession by overthrowing the Akkadian regime based on it. At this attempt to reject the succession based on her son Shelah-Marduk, Inanna-Medb turned hostile toward her brother and joined the Akkadian cause as embodied in the figure named Ailill in the text.

Ailill could not have been the original Enlil, Cush, by 2178 because that son of Ham perished at Metelis in 2181. At Cush's death the Enlilship passed on to an heir, logically his son Nimrod— Sargon— founder and embodiment of the Empire. Thus the text of *The Battle of Ross na Ríg* records the last stand of the Akkadian Empire through an alliance between its founder and the great goddess Ishtar. This alliance calls to mind Alexander Hislop's book *The Two Babylons* where Ishtar and Nimrod are the hard core of evil opposition to the interests of a godly Shem. Interestingly the Gaelic text has Ailill call his ally Medb at one point "you bad woman"— an epithet reminiscent of Inanna's reference to her own "stinking deeds" in a Sumerian text.

Because Shem's grandchildren Inanna-Uzal and Utu-Obal appear in the Joktante section of Genesis 10, particular importance attaches to the internet suggestion that the hero Cúchullain is the insular version of Esus, the Gallic Joktan. Whatever Joktan's role in the Battle of Teutates, he carried off the lion's share of feudal vassals in Genesis 10.

Like Medb-Inanna and Ailill-Nimrod, Joktan figures as an important name in Semitic tradition. The bird insignia on his helmet in the Teutates panel is a recurrent sign of the Semitic linguistic stock together with the name Enlil, god of the air, home of the avian race. Joktan is the Semitic “Tyrian Hercules,” the god Baal Melqart, “King of the City” in reference to his reign at seminal Uruk at the period of the Uruk-Aratta War. I persist in believing that the principal figure in the panel is Teutates-Shem rather than Cúchullain-Joktan; but that does not mean that Joktan fails to appear in the panel. Whatever Joktan’s role in winning the battle must have been prodigious or the Gaels would not have remembered him as they do. The mysterious element in our hypothesis that the Battle of Teutates is the same event as the Battle of Ross na Ríg is that Shem has not been identified as a player in the Gaelic story. Likewise the prominent Conchobar-Obal of the story fails to appear in the panel except perhaps as the warrior being sacrificed or baptized by Teutates. We might be tempted to reason that Obal acted as Shem’s proxy in the battle; but I still have no reason to doubt that the dominant figure in the panel represents Shem rather than his grandson Obal.

Cúchullain first enters the Irish text when he offers to prepare a banquet for Conchobar while an ally prepares one for another hero of the Ulaid, Conall Cernach. In this passage as in others the story is shaped by parallel sets of three, which must have figured as a mnemonic device at a time when these stories were transmitted by oral tradition. We will see a series of spies sent by Conchobar to reconnoiter the Irish army. Later a series of heroes fail in battle before Cúchullain takes the field. When Conchobar arrives at the castle appointed for Cúchullain’s feast, he brings with him 965 men. He then “goes to the mouth of the water of Luachann” where he stops at “great royal-house” and listens to old veterans who complain of the enemy raid that destroyed much of their architecture. When the “four great provinces” came to them— a puzzling wording that Conchobar has already used in his dialogue with the druid Cathbad— the land suffered the ravages of Medb and Ailill.

Although the anachronistic Irish geography is confusing, it is difficult not to see in Conchobar’s visit with the old veterans a memorial of Obal’s having revisited Sumer where he heard complaints against Akkadian rule since the 2240s. The “mouth of the water of Luachann” might serve as the mouth of the Euphrates; the “great royal house,” some definitive edifice in Sumer; and the four great provinces, a reflection of the lands of Genesis 10:22 embodying the Inanna Succession at the root of the Akkadian regime. The words “When the provinces came to us” would mean “from the time that the Akkadians took power when Sargon-Nimrod overthrew Shem-Lugalzagesi.” After all, Nimrod himself appears in the pentad of Genesis 10:22 under the name “Asshur.”

Thus the Gaelic story sketches in the basic complaint against the Akkadians which *Kingship at Its Source* claims to have driven nearly all the original Genesis 10 patriarchs into an anti-Akkadian league. The Battle of Metelis was the first failed attempt to overthrow an Akkadian ruler, not in Mesopotamia but in Egypt where Naram Sin was attempting to extend Akkadian power as his grandfather Sargon had done in Asia Minor. The words of the Gaelic story “veterans and old champions” aptly characterize the

Genesis 10 fraternity, who were all literally older than the Akkadian emperors from the first, second and third generations of Peleg. In contrast to these “veterans and old champions,” the “Ulaid” figure as the Centum Aryan stock, who came up from Arabia to fight at Metelis. The Gaelic tradition has taught us what remains unknown in *Kingship at Its Source*— that this race came under the authority of Shem’s physical heir Obal. Of course there is no surprise in connecting Obal with Arabia, in fact, eastern Arabia where the Centum Aryans camped prior to their revolt against the Akkadians. Obal is clearly the Arabian sun god Hobal and father of the Hobaritae located firmly in eastern Arabia in Ptolemy’s chart of that land. That tribe name Hobaritae leads me to believe that Conchobar represents Obal with a variant in “r” and the element “Con” as prefix.

If the Ulaid are the Centum Aryan enemies of the Akkadians, how are we to understand the application of the name Eriu or “Ireland” to the followers of Medb and Alill or at least to the Mesopotamian land that the Akkadians held? Because Ireland was the center of the world from the perspective of the 12th century Gaels responsible for the *Battle of Ross na Ríg*, it was natural for them to equate this name with the Mesopotamian heartland that they remembered imperfectly as though it *were* Ireland. The name Eriu itself probably originated as a Gaelic term for Mesopotamia before being applied to Ireland. Sumerians referred to the core of the heartland, Akkad, as Uri. What could be more natural than for the Akkadian power of Medb-Inanna and Ailill-Sargon to be remembered as Uri or Eriu? In fact Sargon bore the same name when his conquest of Ionia led him to be known as Orion the Mighty Hunter on the island of Chios. Some Irish trace their origin explicitly back to Miletus in Ionia where they derived from the tribe of Javan, the Yavanas or Ionians.

The name Cúchullain is a title meaning “Hound of Chullain” and based on the hero’s slaying of that beast. His personal name was Setanta and he is reckoned a son of Lugh, the Celtic version of Japheth. We suggest below that Joktan-Meshech may actually have been a son of Japheth rather than of Eber. That Japhethite identity helps to explain why a variety of Joktanite tribes turn up in ancient Russia (Sarmatia), the land of Meshech. In *Kingship at Its Source* I suggest that the seven primary vassals of Japheth appear in the Teutates panel as the infantry in the lower register. Their role in the Battle of Teutates arose from a motive to avenge the deaths of the four vassals of Javan at Metelis. One of the seven Japhethites, Tubal, is Joktan-Meshech’s nominal father Eber, a member of the Semite pentad of Genesis 10:22 under the name Elam, eponym of the land of Elam. Tubal-Eber’s dual membership in both the Japhethite and Shemite lists must have complicated the loyalties dividing the powers of the Ulaid and Eriu. Unlike Joktan Eber never became a member of the Gallic tetrad; but my book places him in the Teutates panel as a vassal of Japheth. In fighting the Akkadians, the Ulaid of the Teutates panel were renewing their ancient conflict with Peleg in that Sargon was Peleg’s imperial heir Reu. Even Peleg, however, appears in the Teutates panel as Cernunnus of the Gallic tetrad. We have seen that he appears briefly in *The Battle of Ross na Ríg* under his insular name Fergus.

In the 18th section of the story an important development is that Fergus turns up in counsel with Medb and Ailill as their apparent ally. This interaction explains the rival interpretation of the Gundestrup Caldron in its assumption that the bearded figure in what I call the Taranis Panel is Fergus rather than Taranis. The obvious similarity of design between the Taranis and Medb panels is taken as a sign of alliance between the depicted figures; and these are treated as allied Fergus and Medb on the basis of the Gaelic story or of other legends like it. What Fergus' appearance in the story tells me is that Peleg was still acting as a key member of the Inanna Succession and as the predecessor of his heir Reu-Nimrod-Sargon-Ailill at the foundation of the Akkadian Empire. Nevertheless the three-cornered scene poses a challenge to *Kingship at Its Source*, which claims that Peleg, as Gallic god Cernunnus, appears in the alliance of the Teutates panel as the rider with an insignia of horns on his helmet. In the 18th section, Fergus laughs when someone suggests that they send the Ulaid's worst enemy as envoy to them. The goal of the envoy will be to offer war reparations to Conchobar for the destruction he has suffered "when the four provinces came to us."

It should be remembered, not only that Peleg was Sargon's imperial predecessor but also a co-member of the Genesis 10:22 pentad under the name Lud, Lydian complement to the Phrygians who took their name from the same Peleg as Fergus, Greek Phrixus and Teutonic Fricco. If Peleg is both a counselor on the side of Medb and Ailill and a warrior on the opposing side of Conchobar, we must see him as the same protean and elusive figure who led half the world to Aratta and then defected from that cause to the extent of returning to Sumer to fill out his ninety years as Lugalannemundu. Nevertheless that reign under a typical Sumerian name Lugalannemundu suggests that Peleg resented the way Sargon overthrew Lugalzaggesi and established the empire as a Semitic rather than Sumerian speaker. Perhaps Fergus' laughter at sending the wrong envoy to the Ulaid means that he understood how they thought after spending time with Shem during the Olympian exile when Peleg himself took on the identity of Hephaestus. Clearly no one ever commanded the unequivocal support of Peleg from the time he gave up power as ruler of First Kish and marched off to Aratta. The coincidence in date between the Battle of Teutates and Peleg's death implies that Medb and Ailill singled him out as a turncoat to their cause and either targeted him for death on the battlefield or captured him and executed him after the battle.

An envoy is sent to Conchobar to offer reparations. The wording of the offer is "reparation of territory and of his land." But what land? If the background battle in the story is the one at Metelis, we are required to identify Obal with the land of Lower Egypt. But that is no surprise at all since Obal was reckoned a universal sun god— Sumerian Utu, Akkadian Shamash, Arabian Hobal and Hellenic Apollo. Not only were the Egyptians the linguistic stock of the solar principle; but Heliopolis, "City of the Sun" was in Lower Egypt.

Next Conchobar asserts that he will not accept the reparation plan until "there has been the place of my pavilion in every province of Heriu." As Shem's male line heir, Obal is demanding control of the four lands of Elam, Assyria, Syria and Lydia as memorialized in Irish Connacht, Ulster, Leinster and Munster. When the Battle

of Ross na Ríg takes place, its main goal for Obal is to win control over all but Akkad itself as the land of the fifth member of Genesis 10:22— Arphaxad II-Shelah-Marduk. The story never names this “fifth province” because the Irish tradition originally recognized that Akkad was the one legitimate province of the Akkadian regime. The Battle of Teutates occurred because Shem and Obal sought to shift four lands of the Inanna Succession from Inanna and Nimrod to themselves.

This quest to win control of the lands surrounding Akkad and Sumer no doubt explains why the Gallic tetrad was confined to just four gods. One of these Esus is not only the conquering hero of the Gaelic story but Aram of Genesis 10:22— in effect the Prince of Syria in the eyes of Shem and Obal. Another of the Gallic tetrad Cernunnus-Peleg is the analogous Prince of Lydia under the name Lud in that list. The other two provinces, Elam and Assyria, were under the heaviest dispute since neither Eber-Tubal-Elam nor Sargon-Nimrod-Asshur belong to the Gallic tetrad. The spotlight, therefore, falls on the other two members of the Gallic tetrad as rival claimants to Assyria and Elam. These two were Shem-Teutates and his son Arphaxad I-Taranis, father of Obal-Conchobar. In the Gaelic story, Conchobar is named the son of Fachtna Fathach, a name that can perhaps be taken as the insular counterpart to Taranis even though the name Taran sometimes shows up in the insular legends.

Shem was the original claimant to the land of Akkad in the earliest years after the Flood. The logic of the four provinces, however, suggests that Shem has ceded Akkad once for all to his fifth imperial heir, Reu-Sargon. If this explanation is the true one, Shem must have desired Assyria, despite its nominal identification with Nimrod-Asshur for his son Arphaxad I. Our analysis of the Taranis Panel has placed Arphaxad I in Padan-Aram at the time of the Uruk-Aratta War. Padan-Aram lies immediately to the west of Assyria. The most probable scene of the Battle of Teutates was at Carchemish on the western border of Padan-Aram. That location figures as a flash point in Shem’s effort to win Assyria for his son. Finally Shem would have claimed Elam for himself on the basis of its eastern adjacency to Sumer, a land named for him. The design of the “Ulaid” was to confine the Sumero-Akkadian world to just that— Sumer and Akkad, the one bounded by Shem’s Elam on the east and the other bounded by Assyria on the north.

The two ceded lands, Sumer and Akkad, belonged to Inanna and Nimrod respectively. Inanna had always claimed control over Uruk in the heart of Sumer; and Nimrod was the creator of the Akkadian regime. When Shem and Obal returned from the Olympian exile (where they established their Olympian names Zeus and Apollo), they sought to confine but not to destroy the enemy Sargon-Nimrod who had exiled them in the 2240s.

Immediately after Conchobar’s demand for the four provinces, his adversaries ask where he will camp that night. He informs them to prove that he does not fear them. The camp will be located at “Ross na Ríg above the clear-bright Bóind.” With these words he discloses the site of the subsequent battle. When the inhabitants of Ross na Ríg hear that Conchobar and the Ulaid are headed their way, they appeal to Medb and Ailill to come to their aid. In verse lines Medb promises aid; and an envoy declares that, “Their shooting

will be gory-red/ in the battle of Ross na Ríg.” Medb promises that Conchobar’s “might will be lowered.”

After Conchobar speaks further with Ailill, “Then will their position be fixed and their pavilions pitched” (24). At this point Conchobar sends a nephew Féic to reconnoiter the enemy at the “Fortress of the clear-bright Bóind.” In view of the anachronistic value of these Irish locations for the postdiluvian world, an attractive possibility is that this “Fortress of the clear-bright Bóind” represents Carchemish, the location suggested for the Battle of Teutates in *Kingship at Its Source*. The *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (ISBE) interprets the Assyrian name Carchemish to mean “Fortress of the God Chemosh.”

Because the Ulaid are returning from the western world of Egypt, it makes sense for Obal to announce that he will reenter Mesopotamia at Carchemish on the Upper Euphrates, the westernmost point of greater Mesopotamia. If this detail about revealing a camp “that night” is based on 22nd century fact, Obal was inviting battle with Mesopotamian forces in a war to determine possession of Elam, Assyria, Syria and Lydia. His campaign was a reply, in effect, to Sargon’s conquest of Ionia south of Lydia at the west end of the “four provinces.”

Chemosh was the national god of the Moabites and a god of human sacrifice. The ISBE article on Chemosh suggests that, wherever this god appears in the Bible, his function and behavior bear a resemblance to the Israelite God Yahweh. In other words Chemosh, like so many of the gentile storm gods, is a paganized version of Yahweh distinguished from Him to the extent that pagan cultures differed from the culture of Israel. These associations strengthen our belief that the sacrificing god of the panel is both Teutates and Shem. The alternative view that he is baptizing a warrior rather than sacrificing a victim only means that baptism by immersion signifies death. If we take the baptized figure to be Shem’s genetic heir Obal-Conchobar, this patriarch’s universal character as a sun god implies that immersion is to sunset what his emergence is to a rising sun prepared to do battle.

On the eve of battle the spy Féic tries to return to Conchobar and the Ulaid in the north. Féic promises himself, “The Ulaid will come from the north. Each of them will take up the station of battle and conflict and combat.” The north-south polarity of the battle is probably modeled in part on the east-south flow of some Irish river as barrier; but it fits the perspective of Carchemish even better. By crossing the Upper Euphrates at Carchemish, one enters Mesopotamia, a land that lies mainly in the southeast. Therefore any approach to Carchemish from the west implies movement out of the north from the perspective of Mesopotamia.

Unfortunately Féic drowns on his way back to Conchobar’s army. Faced with Féic’s delay, Conchobar sends out another scout, who is slain with lances. A third spy Iriel makes his way back to Conchobar and reports the enemy’s position. Conchobar now asks for the advice of the Ulaid. To their support come three chariot-warriors in succession, each with 1200 men. According to another ritual sequence, three more chariot-warriors arrive with 1300 each. When the Ulaid cross the Bóand and give battle, the lesser men are all slain. After a series of failed champions claim that the odds are

impossible, the hero Cúchullain enters the scene in Section 44. He promises to “smite every man of the men of Eriu.” In early postdiluvian terms, Joktan threatens to annihilate all the manpower remaining to the Akkadian Empire around the year 2180. As so often happens in early postdiluvian war, the battle is largely determined by a single duel when Cúchullain slays the enemy champion Cairpre Nia Fer with his spear Duaibsech.

After this deed the action moves swiftly toward peace: “It is at then that Sencha son of Ailill rose and shook the branch of peace, and the Ulaid stood still” (52). Nonetheless Iriel son of Cernall Cernach pursues the enemy “cutting down the army southward in every direction.” Fidach the Wrathful offers resistance as he observes, “Long is the reach that the Ulaid are making towards us.” After resting seven days at Temair, Conchobar offers peace to his grandson Erc son of Cairpre and Conchobar’s daughter: “Take my blessing, be obedient to me,/ do not thyself make opposition to us./ If thou givest strong against strong/ I am certain that thou shalt fall by us./ War not with the Hound of the feats,/ inflict not strife on the race of thy ancestors,/ that thou mayest not be cut down about division of territories/ as is Cairpre Nia Fer.” At this the grandson Erc makes peace with Cúchullain, who gives his daughter Finscoth to Erc as a peace match.

The alternative internet view of the Teutates Panel is actually based on another text, *Táin Bó Cúailnge* or *The Cattle Raid of Cooley*. This interpretation makes much of the leafy branch or trunk dividing the two horizontal registers of the panel beneath the hooves of the four horses above. Because I have no access to the text of *The Cattle Raid of Cooley*, I cannot evaluate how convincing the case might be for confining the meaning of the text solely to that battle. Although the cattle raid falls into place as equivalent to the Battle of Metelis, I doubt that it makes any reference to that Egyptian battle. Instead many of its main features suggest a Gaelic version of the much earlier Uruk-Aratta War. The chief factor is the central antagonism between Cúchullain on one side and Medb, Ailill and Fergus mac Roich on the other. *Those four names refer precisely to the chief protagonists of the Uruk-Aratta War lacking only a counterpart to Mahadevi-Tiamat: Joktan-Meskiaggasher, founder of the Eanna dynasty and father of Enmerkar, king of Uruk and general of the main body of Erechites; Peleg, lord of Aratta; Nimrod, the champion of Aratta; and Medb, whose Gundestrup panel represents Aratta at the time of the war.* It should be remembered that the Sumerian King List presents Meskiaggasher as a son of the sun god Utu, thus treating Joktan as a vassal of Obal, hence their close alliance as Cúchullain and Conchobar of the *Battle of Ross na Ríg*. In this way both Gaelic stories reflect political alliances formed at the beginning of the Eanna regime in 2308.

With a match like this it is difficult not to conclude that *The Cattle Raid of Cooley* is the chief Gaelic memorial of the foundational war of world history. As always, a particular ethnic group retains only a piece or aspect of the war like the various local theaters of World Wars I and II. In terms of Ireland, Medb’s faction represent Connacht, the northwestern corner of the island; and Cúchullain’s faction, Ulster, the northeastern corner. In the absence of a text of *The Cattle Raid of Cooley*, we must rely on a plot summary linked to the Wikipedia article on Cúchullain:

The story proper begins with Ailill and Medb, king and queen of Connacht, assembling their army in Cruachan, their capital. In the first recension the purpose of this military build-up is taken for granted. The second recension adds a prologue in which Ailill and Medb compare their respective wealths and find that the only thing that distinguishes them is Ailill's possession of the phenomenally fertile bull Finnbhennach, who had been born into Medb's herd but scorned being owned by a woman so decided to transfer himself to Ailill's. Medb determines to get the equally potent Donn Cuailnge from Cooley to balance the books with her husband. She successfully negotiates with the bull's owner to rent the animal for a year until her messengers, drunk, reveal that they would have taken the bull by force even if they had not been allowed to borrow it. The deal breaks down, and Medb raises an army, including Ulster exiles led by Fergus mac Roich and other allies, and sets out to capture him.

Cruachan answers to Aratta, and at this point Inanna and Nimrod are reckoned man and wife in keeping with the traditions cited in Alexander Hislop's *The Two Babylons* (1853) where Ishtar and Nimrod are viewed as Shem's arch-enemies and the source of world paganism. The central focus on fertile and valuable bulls calls to mind Inanna's pivotal role in the Sumerian myth of Gilgamesh's slaying of the Gugalanna (Gutanu) or "Bull of Heaven." *Kingship at Its Source* interprets the Gugalanna as the Uralo-Altaic linguistic stock in a raid on Sumer at the start of hostilities between Uruk and Aratta. Gilgamesh is the Sumerian version of Tubal-Eber, a vassal of Japheth and therefore a staunch supporter of the Erechite cause synonymous with Ulster in the Gaelic stories. The possession of bulls in *The Cattle Raid on Cooley* symbolizes the control of linguistic stocks in general. Finnbhennach's scorn at being owned by a woman makes little sense of an animal but is quite plausible as the resentment of a proud linguistic protoplast in being governed by a woman. To be more specific, we have distinguished the eight primary Noahic stocks as either "male" or "female" in origin. The Ural-Altaiacs were precisely Noah's "male" stock that somehow passed out of the control of Noah to female Inanna in becoming the Gugalanna of the Sumerian story. The further alienation of this stock from Inanna to Nimrod also makes sense as a circumstance at the outset of the Uruk-Aratta war.

Noah lost his theocratic power to Canaan (as Alalu to Anu) in 2338, thirty-six years before the war. It was at this time that the Gugalanna or Finnbhennach was "born into Medb's herd" as the Uralo-Altaic protoplast passed from Noah to Inanna. The Sumerians of Uruk were themselves Uralo-Altaic speakers although *Kingship at Its Source* gives them separate status as the people reserved for the White Matriarch's claim land of Sumer. Transfer of the Ural-Altaiac "bull" from Inanna to Nimrod must have occurred about the time of the Aratta schism when Nimrod and Peleg conspired together to form the Aratta colony equivalent to Connacht at Cruachan in the Gaelic story. It has been noted that Inanna was claimed as chief goddess by both Uruk and Aratta on either

side of the great conflict. That dual role is probably owing to the way the Uralo-Altaiics who “went with Fergus” to Aratta remembered that they had been the property of Inanna, chief goddess of Uruk.

The two bulls of the Gaelic story figure as two halves of the Uralo-Altaiic stock—the eastern Turk-Mongol half and the western Finno-Ugric and Sumerian half. Which bull represents which half is determined by the final outcome of the story. Despite the violent efforts of Cúchullain, Medb is able to bring the bull Donn Cuailnge back to Connacht where it fights and kills the bull Finnbhennach. Wounded, it then wanders around Ireland establishing place names. These details identify Donn Cuailnge with the western, Sumerian half and Finnbhennach with the eastern Turk-Mongol half. The return to Connacht means the invasion of Aratta by an Erechite army including Sumerians. The death of Finnbhennach signifies the defeat and exile of the eastern group by the Erechites. The tour around Ireland creating place names means the Sumerian return to Sumer to reinforce and maintain the city states there.

The opening of the story implies that the eastern Uralo-Altaiics of the First Kish period were first controlled by Inanna, chief goddess of Uruk but then lost to Nimrod at a time when he and his father Cush became associated with the god Enlil. That association was anomalous in that Enlil was the Sumerian name of Elohim, proper to the Semitic rather than the Uralo-Altaiic stock. The anomaly resulted from Nimrod’s counter-theft of the Semitic stock from Shem at what amounts to the creation of Nimrod-Sargon’s Eastern Semitic or Akkadian race. This counter-theft corresponds to Sidon-Nudimmud’s overthrow of both Noah-Apsu and Shem-Mummu in the opening section of the Akkadian *Marduk Epic*. Noah’s defeat meant his loss of the entire Uralo-Altaiic race including the Sumerians. Shem’s simultaneous defeat meant his loss of the Semitic stock including the Akkadians. The change meant that Shem’s granddaughter Inanna no longer maintained her original control over Uralo-Altaiics as she had when “Finnbhennach was born into her herd.” Inanna’s original control of the eastern Uralo-Altaiics resulted from her derivation from Shem’s wife Durga, the Yellow or Asiatic Matriarch, mother of Inanna’s father Arphaxad I. Inanna is known as the “Queen of Heaven” according to the Anship proper to the Uralo-Altaiic stock and especially its eastern or Mongol half where the heaven god is known as Anu and Tengere.

Inanna sought compensation by acquiring the second bull symbolic of the western Uralo-Altaiics including the Sumerians. That half-stock originally belonged to “Cooley,” either a place or personal name suggestive of Shem’s black son Hul, the Kemur or “Black Bull” of the Egyptians. The location of Hul’s people the Colchians on the northeastern coast of the Black Sea placed them in proximity to the Finno-Ugrians or western Uralo-Altaiics of Russia. Inanna’s deep attachment to the Sumerian city of Uruk meant that she gained control of the Sumerian part of this western Uralo-Altaiic race.

The last sentence of the summary quoted above contains a revelation in the words “Ulster exiles led by Fergus mac Roich.” Clearly this detail refers to the Aratta schism under Peleg; but it reinterprets the event as an exile rather than a willful schism. To understand this claim we must observe that the two Gaelic stories interpret the Battle of Teutates as a sequel to the Uruk-Aratta War despite the lapse of 124 years from 2302 to

2178. The leadership on both sides remains the same in both accounts with Medb-Inanna, Ailill-Nimrod and Fergus-Peleg of Connacht-Aratta in opposition to Cúchullain-Joktan and later Conchobar-Obal at the head of the Ulaid or people of Ulster-Sumer. However, we have identified the Ulaid, not as Sumerians, but as Centum Aryans destined to inhabit Europe. Clearly the Gaels regarded the followers of Peleg to Aratta as “exiles from Ulster” because the fair-skinned Centum Aryans regarded themselves as legitimate heirs of their matriarch, white Uma, as original claimant of the land of Sumer in its choice position in Lower Mesopotamia. In this respect modern Europe is the Aryan counterpart to ancient to Finno-Ugrian Sumer with the two linked together by the Finno-Ugrian Finns and Hungarians of Europe. The Gaels, themselves members of the Centum Aryan stock, saw themselves as “exiles from Ulster” just as *Kingship at its Source* describes the Centum Aryans as exiles from the Mesopotamian heartland owing to the defeat of Aratta.

The ensuing summary contains an important numerical detail. Cúchullain, the lone defender of Ulster, is said to have been only seventeen years old. Because Joktan’s brother Peleg was already 85 in 2302, it is unlikely that Joktan was only 17 at this time. Instead his “birth” in this case refers to some epoch in his life and career. We might think at first that that event was the beginning of his reign as Meskiaggasher in 2308. However that explanation carries the war down to 2291— much too late. The seventeen years should be back extrapolated from the start of the war in 2302 to the year 2319. As Meskiaggasher, Joktan-Meshech is referred to as a “son” of the sun god Utu. Equivocation between Japheth and Obal in representing the solar principle means that the adoption of Joktan by Utu could refer either to Japheth’s command of the last three members of Genesis 10:2 or to Joktan’s Ulster alliance with Obal or both. The Gaels attach heroic importance to Joktan-Meshech instead of Shelah-Lugalbanda or any of the other eight heroes affirmed as a set of eight by the Sumerians. That circumstance may be owing to interaction between Joktan and ancestors of the Gaels either before the war or afterward. In all likelihood, however, Joktan’s prominence is probably owing to his founding the Eanna dynasty.

The summary continues:

The men of Ulster are troubled by a curse. The only person fit to defend Ulster is seventeen-year-old Cúchullain, and he lets the army [of Connacht] take Ulster by surprise because he is off on a tryst when he should be watching the border. Medb takes the bull [Donn Cuailgne], but Cúchullain prevents [Medb] from taking him back to Connacht by invoking the right of single combats at fords. When Fergus, his foster-father, is set to face him, Cúchullain agrees to yield to him on the condition that Fergus yields the next time they meet. Finally there is a physically and emotionally grueling three-day duel between his foster-brother and best friend, Ferdiad.

The curse on Ulster-Sumer parallels the one that afflicts Lugalbanda during his advance toward Aratta in the Sumerian legend. The legend of Lugalbanda states emphatically that the hero’s illness is the result of some malign god’s curse. The capture of Ulster through

Cúchullain's carelessness suggests the events that *Kingship at Its Source* assigns to the legend of Gilgamesh's slaying of the Gugalanna. This "Bull of Heaven" symbolizes the Turk-Mongol or eastern Uralo-Altai stock. The details of the legend clearly imply that these folk have overrun Sumer, endangering its water supply. As the original owner of this bull Finnbhannach, Medb leads it to "take Ulster," that is, to take over Sumer.

Cúchullain's invoking the right of single duels harmonizes with the Sumerian tradition that the war was eventually decided by such a duel. The summary refers Cúchullain as Fergus-Peleg's foster-son. Genesis 10 suggests that Joktan was Eber's physical offspring. The wording, however, is a bit indefinite in a context where feudal sonship is the rule. Joktan is named Peleg's brother in 10:25 where Eber is said to have begotten two sons. Joktan fails to appear along with Peleg in the genealogy of Genesis 11. Clearly there is an equivocation over Joktan's parentage in that both the Gaelic and Sumerian traditions make him the son of Japheth rather than Eber. Yielding to the wording of Genesis 10:25, I must assume that the Gaelic and Sumerian traditions—rather than the biblical—are referring to feudal sonship. Nonetheless that sonship, placing Joktan in 10:2 as Meshech, must have been particularly decisive and intensely interpreted.

Only a few of the identities assigned to Meshech-Joktan in Chapter 7 of *Kingship at Its Source* treat him as a son of Eber. None of these is irreconcilable to the view that his sonhood was adoptive. Nevertheless a consistent principle of biblical literalism demands that we regard Joktan as a begotten son of Eber. Reflection on the genetic background of Joktan bears on the Gaelic tradition of Cúchullain in a variety of ways. First it adds another major name to the basic association between the Celts and Japheth, including Japheth himself as Lugh; Gomer as Llyr; the Gaelic Christian tradition of national descent from Magog; derivation of the Irish Iverni, from Llyr's son Bran-Ibranum; Tubal-Eber's correspondence to the Celtiberians of Spain; and now Meshech as Cúchullain, the chief culture hero of the Gaelic race.

Second, the intense Gaelic and Sumerian claims that Joktan was Japheth's son clarifies Japheth's motive in connecting himself with the family of Eber. Because Eber was a mulatto son of Kali, this alliance suggests that Japheth was seeking to alleviate the disgrace of being prohibited by Noah from begetting an heir by his diluvian wife Kali as explained in Appendix II of *Kingship at Its Source*. Family alliance was the one way that Japheth could treat a feudal son of his as a descendent of Kali. Cúchullain qualifies as an arch-hero because his actual father Eber is none other than the Sumerian arch-hero Gilgamesh. When Gilgamesh and Cúchullain are placed side-by-side, Tubal and Meshech emerge as the supreme strong men of Noahic history, both descended from the black race of Adam through Kali. However the Gaels conceived of Joktan-Cúchullain purely as a white man like themselves. Genetically he was a quadroon and perhaps fair-skinned.

The four provinces of historic Ireland somehow memorialize the four lands of Genesis 10:22 exclusive of Mesopotamia. We have learned from Ptolemy's eastern Germany that the Centum Aryans committed to memory their exilic route from Lydia to eastern Arabia via Elam. If the Gaels shared in this same commitment, the Irish provinces fall into line if we assume that they landed first on the coast of Leinster and toured the

island in a clockwise circle to Munster, Connacht and Ulster in that order. Leinster served as counterpart to Lydia (Lud); Munster, to Syria (Aram); Connacht, to Assyria (consistent with an Assyrian report of crossing a River Aratta during an expedition to the northeast); and Ulster, to Elam as bordering on Sumer.

L. A. Waddell features Ireland in his account of the death of Menes, first dynastic Pharaoh of Egypt:

But Menes, the greatest admiral of the Old World, who, as we have seen, had repeatedly made with his fleet the long deep-sea voyage of about three thousand miles from the Persian Gulf and Indus Valley to Egypt by the Arabia and Red Seas, and who, as King Minos was the most famous sea-king in Greek tradition, expressly embarked on his last great voyage of exploration, as we are officially told in this label [cenotaph at Abydos] in order “to inspect the End of the Sunset Land,” in the Far West, “going in ships” (*Makers of Civilization in Race and History* 287-288).

Waddell argues that this western land lay beyond the “Tin Land” of Cornwall, “which was already a colony of the empire and all well known.” The western land of the Egyptian cenotaph is “Urani,” which Waddell matches to “Erin,” the “Heriu” of *The Battle of Ross na Ríg*. As inscriptional evidence in Ireland, he cites “prehistoric cup-marked stones at New Grange on the River Boyne, near Drogheda” (289).

The Boyne flows into Drogheda Bay in northeastern Leinster between Meath and Louth, counties shown in our Irish map above. Waddell reinforces his view of “Urani Land” with an additional inscriptional photographed in 1896 at “Knock-Many or ‘The Hill of Many,’ near Clogher on the southern border of County Tyrone” in central Ulster. A photograph of one of the stones “contains the same monogram of the name ‘Urani,’ and is written by the same sign as the ebony label [in Egypt] but on a larger scale; and the realistic pictograph of the animal which caused the death of Menes in Urani represented it as a Hornet.” Waddell disputes the conventional view that the animal stands for a hippopotamus and that “Urani Land” lies on the Upper Nile.

Menes’ Egypt stands at the nexus between two island nations on opposite sides of the earth, Eire and Japan. Ham’s son Mizraim appears in Egyptian tradition as the god Min. That name derives from the complete one given by the Japanese heaven god Amenominakanushi and the cognate Welsh Mynogan and Greek Titan Oceanus. Waddell assigns a similar name to the Greek figure King Minos of Crete. He goes to considerable lengths to show that Minos is the same person as the mariner Menes as shown in his outline of sixteen correspondences in a scanned copy on the next page:

inscription of Manis-Tusu's grandfather;¹ and it is obviously a fuller form of the diagrammatic axe-sign in Sumerian, which has the phonetic value of *Zag* or *Sag*, and is defined as "axe, sceptre, *two-edged* sword."² And significantly this axe-sign is a title in Sumerian of "The Great Lord" (Nar-gal),³ a martial reflex of the Father-god Zagg, Sakh or Sax, *i.e.* Zeus, who became latterly the "God of War" in Babylonia; and Manis' father Sargon worshipped the weapon of God Zagg as we have seen.

*Identity of Minos of Crete with Menes or
Manis-the-Warrior*

MINOS of Crete.	MENES or MANIS.
1. Son of god Zeus.	Son or descendant of Zagg or Sax (Zeus).
2. Votary and priest of Zeus.	Votary of god Zagg and ex officio high-priest.
3. Of Bronze Age, replacing Neolithic.	Of Bronze Age, replacing Neolithic.
4. Sea-emperor of Mediterranean.	Sea-emperor of Mediterranean.
5. Sailor and builder of fleets.	Sailor with fleets of ships.
6. Introducer of Civilization.	Introducer of Civilization.
7. Law-giver direct from Zeus.	Law-establisher with code credited to Zagg.
8. Built a Labyrinth.	Built a Labyrinth.
9. His son was a Bull-man (Mino-Taur).	His son was named "The Strong Wild Bull" (<i>Nar-ām</i>), and bore title "Men-Narmar" and <i>Neyāma</i> .
10. Writing on clay tablets in linear script generally resembling Sumerian and linear Egyptian.	Writing on clay tablets in linear and cuneiform Sumerian script.
11. Used seal-impressions on clay for sealing.	Used seals for clay sealing.
12. Culture and Art generally of Sumerian or Aryan type.	Culture and Art of Sumerian or Aryan type.
13. Funeral rites similar to Egyptian delta.	Funeral rites of delta similar to Cretan.
14. Double-Axe emblem of Zeus.	Double-Axe sign for Zag in Sumerian and Manis' father worshipped the weapon of god Zagg.
15. Physical type of Minoans is Aryan.	Physical type is Aryan.
16. Death tragic on sea-voyage in West.	Death of Menes tragic on sea-voyage in West.

¹ Cp. B. pl. 160, No. (?) 160.

² Br. 5573 f.; M. 3925.

³ M. 10751. Ner-gal from his fatal smiting still later became the God of the Underworld.

The phy
beautiful
face is pu
certainly
carved fig
of fine Ary

These i
with the
the-Warri
Mediterran

We thu
identity o
historical
King Mar
also gain f
date for E
recover a
of classific
and for th
affinities.

Altogeth
of the Firs
the Sumer
monarch S
Eye of Go
with King
unknown c
race and h
fixes with

As the s
are now c
Manis-the-
the Aryan
a separate

Note that Waddell's name Zagg or Sax for Zeus reinforces our identification of Zeus with Shem under the Sumerian name Lugalzaggesi or King Zaggesi. Euhemerus placed Zeus by an inscription on the island of Crete, hence our concept of an Olympian exodus from Mesopotamia to the Aegean resulting from Lugalzaggesi's overthrow by Sargon in the 2240s. I take Minos to be Waddell's admiral Menes, a "son" of Zeus-Shem only as his sixth heir Serug in Genesis 11. Egyptian Min is an entirely different figure Mizraim, named for Egypt and yet the physical patriarch of the Japanese.

Waddell evidently believed that Menes' expedition first reached Ireland from the Atlantic side and progressed by land to the site in County Tyrone. But, if Cornwall was already well known, there is no reason that Menes would not first have landed there, sailed north and landed at the site near the Boyne in Leinster. As for the site in Tyrone, Waddell suggests that the "Hill of Many" reflects Menes' own name. If a name such as that has been preserved by local tradition since the 22nd century, the legends of Cúchullain can certainly be viewed as preserving a greater share of early postdiluvian tradition. Serug-Menes lived on until 2122, more than sixty years after the Battle of Teutates— plenty of time for the main body of Gaels to arrive with him in Ireland after the Battle of Teutates.

Significantly Waddell reports that Egyptian records or Manetho attribute to Menes an Egyptian reign of sixty years down to his death. A back extrapolation of those sixty years arrives at 2182 on the eve of the Battle of Metelis when both Akkadian former emperors, Serug and Nahor, went into action in Egypt. If that reckoning is true, the Gaels arrived in Ireland as late as 2122. That chronology raises the issue of what the Centum Aryan victors at the Battle of Teutates were doing for sixty years before some of them, at least, colonized Europe. The intense Gaelic focus on the "four provinces of Heriu" suggests an answer. There are four great Centum Aryan stocks inhabiting Europe in addition to a lesser one, the Albanians. That five-fold division of Aryan Europe suggests the five provinces of Genesis 10:22 as though the victors occupied these for some sixty years before agreeing to colonize Europe.

Those sixty years would have matched the Akkadian sixty from the 2240s to the 2180s. This symmetry is all the more impressive when we consider that the Centum Aryans colonized Europe fully after the lapse of sixty years just as the Akkadians colonized Egypt after the lapse of the sixty Mesopotamian years shared by Sargon, Manistushu and Naram Sin. Careful inspection of the design of European ethnography suggests, further, that the Aryan occupation of the heartland involved more than the five lands of Genesis 10:22. Each of those lands was paired with another, raising the total from five to ten. The five pairs were Elam with Parashi-Persia (Marhashi), Sumer with Gutium, Semitic Assyria with Semitic Martu, North Semitic Aram-Syria with Padan-Aram and Lydia (Lud) with the land of the Tysenoi in Phrygia.

This pattern results from adding the Italics and Hellenics to the memorial systems ascertained for the Albanian provinces and tribes, the Teutonic tribes of eastern Germany and the four provinces of Gaelic Ireland. Ancient Italy shows a pentad of five major tribes including non-Indo-European Etruscans, the others being Latins, Sabines, Oscans

and Umbrians. *Kingship at Its Source* assumes that the Etruscans are the same people as the Tyrsenoi north of Lydia. The Latins traced their descent from Saturnus-Hadoram, Joktanite name of Arphaxad I, who established his seat in Padan-Aram during the Uruk-Aratta war. The tribe name of the Italic Sabines suggests the Cushite Seba, patriarch of the Amorites of Martu. The Oscans were known to the Greeks as Italoι, source of the name Italy. That name has always suggested Uzal (“Utsal”), the Joktanite name of Medb-Inanna. This woman’s close identification with both Sumerian Uruk and Aratta of the Medb panel connects her with the dyad of Sumer and Gutium. The Umbrians of Central Italy yield a variant name of Uzal’s brother Obal. This Joktanite name corresponds both to the Hobaritae of eastern Arabia and the Homeritae of southern Arabia. A conflation of the two names as source implies a form such as “Omber,” equivalent to Italic Umber. The region assigned to this patriarch, Parashi-Persia, lies directly north of eastern Arabia on the opposite shore of the Persian Gulf.

Thus the Italic division of the Centum Aryan stock was assigned to five lands that flanked the five of Genesis 10:22. The complementary function of the Italics and Celts in Western and Southern Europe implies that Latins garrisoned the flanking lands; and Celts, the five lands of the biblical verse. The close correlation between Celts and the Japhethites of Genesis 10:2 holds the key to the Gaelic occupying role. As noted, the Akkadian Empire was viewed as a kind of successor to the fallen cause of Aratta owing to Nimrod’s role in both. The Japhethites were synonymous with the winning side. Although the set of Genesis 10:2 is a septad rather than pentad, we have just seen that the Etruscans of the seventh Japhethite Tiras belonged to the Latin rather than Celtic group. In order to isolate a Japhethite pentad required by this theory, we must find valid grounds for eliminating one more of the Japhethites. Either we approach the problem from that angle or identify the five matches between Japhethites and the five Shemites of 10:22 and eliminate the irrelevant name. In this analysis, we are approaching a definitive fulfillment of Noah’s prophecy in Genesis 9 that Japheth would “dwell in the tents of Shem.” For sixty years after the Battle of Teutates, led by Shem-Teutates, five Celtic peoples correlative to five sons and vassals of Japheth garrisoned the lands assigned to Shem’s five vassals in 10:22.

There are two candidates for elimination from the Japhethite septad in this case. We might choose Tubal-Eber because he doubles as the Shemite vassal Elam. Or we can eliminate Madai on the basis that he perished in the Battle of Teutates as stated in *Kingship at Its Source*. The correct choice is Madai for two other reasons. A European Celtic tribe derived from Madai has always failed to materialize. His Japhethite tradition is confined to Iran precisely because he did not live long enough to divide the spoils with other victors at Carchemish. Furthermore the Media of Madai in biblical times is regionally identical to Gutium, one of the flanking territories.

Japheth’s first son Gomer, as Llyr of Wales, accounts for the Lurs who inhabited the northern part of Elam. Consequently we are to understand that Gomer’s Welsh garrisoned Elam in the period from 2160 to 2122. The Gaelic preoccupation with Cúchullain-Joktan-Aram is so intense that we are led to believe that ancestors of the Gaels garrisoned Aram-Syria over this period. The proximity of Ionia to Lydia and the

early concentration of the Javanites on coasts of the Mediterranean and Aegean implies that ancestors of the Iverni took command of Lydia over the sixty years. Presumably the Iverni were themselves Gaelic speakers; but their kinship to the Celts who held Syria falls into line with the fraternity of "Lud and Aram," Peleg and Joktan. In Ptolemy's map of Ireland the Ibernii inhabit the extreme southwestern part of the island in Munster, analogous to Lydia at the western end of the heartland and Ionia in the southwestern Asia Minor on the coast adjacent to Caria. Ptolemy's Iernus Flumen is evidently the Kenmare River and is sketched in roughly as the southernmost of three rivers including the Shannon as Senus and some river flowing into Dingle Bay as the Duris.

Assyria of Asshur and Akkad of Arphaxad II-Marduk remain to be accounted for. Eventually the Hurrians of Magog, an Indo-European but not Centum Aryan people, settled in Padan-Aram. That flanking territory lies between Syria to the west and Assyria to the east. The indication is that Magog took on Assyria. For a third time, the Gaels are implied here as said to be descended from Magog in the *Lebor Gabala Eirenn*. Ancestors of the Gaels in particular were so important to Cúchullain's victory that they were chosen to garrison three of the five lands of Genesis 10:22. That circumstance helps to explain the memorializing nature of the four provinces of Ireland and the arrival of the Gaels late in the European colonization process in 2122. That decade also saw the Abrahamic War in which Gutians and Elamites failed to hold Amorite territory. It was also the period when Sumerians gained their freedom by ending the Gutian dynasty. Those upheavals serve to explain why the Gaels finally gave up their place in the heartland; but the same result had been predetermined by a designed term of sixty years.

What generally happened in the 2120s is that Semites and Sumerians succeeded in throwing off an Indo-European yoke resulting from the Battle of Teutates and designed by the Noahic Council to last no more than sixty years. To fill out the Celtic scheme that dominated the five inner provinces of the heartland in that period, we need to consider whether the distinction between Gaels and Gauls was based on nothing more than the geography of Great Britain and Gaul or on a real difference established in the Middle East. Such a difference would explain the gap between our Gallic reading of the Gundestrup Caldron and the insular reading based on the dominance of the warrior Cúchullain rather than Gallic Shem-Teutates. As Joktan-Aram Cúchullain identifies the garrison of Syria with insular Gaels along with the Javanite garrison of Lydia and Britons who eventually made their way from Elam to Phoenicia, perhaps in the Elamite raid of the Abrahamic War.

As a distinct branch of the Celtic race both the Gauls of France and Celtiberians of Spain belonged to garrisons distinct from the insular Celts of Elam, Aram and Lud. In other words Celts of the European continent derived from Mesopotamian garrisons in Eastern Semitic Assyria and Akkad. The two respective Japhethites were Magog and Tubal. Despite the claim by insular Gaels of descent from Magog, that patriarch must have been best represented in Europe by continental Gauls. As such these Celts demonstrated an association with Assyria by sharing lands adjacent to the Rhine with

Rhenish German tribes representing non-Semitic descendents of Nimrod-Asshur. The medieval and modern nation of France combines both Teutonic Franks from that Teutonic group with Gauls and Romans of ancient Gallia.

Tubal-Eber was assigned to Sumer and Akkad because he had loomed large as the Sumerian hero Gilgamesh prior to the rise of the Akkadians. He was in fact the son and heir of Shelah-Lugalbanda-Marduk, the Arphaxad II of Genesis 10:22. Thus we have accounted for all ten lands divided by the Indo-European victors at Carchemish. They can be summed up in tabular form as follows:

<i>Genesis 10:2</i>	<i>Associated Lands</i>	<i>Garrison</i>	<i>Patriarch</i>
Elam	_____	Brythonic Celts	Gomer (Llyr)
_____	Parhashi	Umbrians	Obal (Sol)
Assyria	_____	Gauls	Magog
_____	Martu	Sabines	Seba (Adamu)
Akkad-Sumer	_____	Celtiberians	Tubal (Gilgamesh)
_____	Gutium	Oscans (Italo)	Uzal (Inanna)
Lydia-Ionia	_____	Iverni	Javan
_____	Tyrsenoi-Phrygia	Etruscans	Tiras
Aram-Syria	_____	Gaels	Meshech (Cúchullain)
_____	Padan-Aram	Latins	Hadoram (Saturnus)

In the meantime what were the other three Centum Aryans stocks doing—Hellenes, Albanian-Illyrians and Teutons? *Kingship at Its Source* affirms that Centum-Indo-Europeans were exploring and colonizing Europe much earlier than 2122. Celtic sources so dominate the Battle of Teutates that it can be questioned whether the other three stocks participated in the battle at all. The unique string of tribes in eastern Germany memorialize a history of victimization rather than victory. The Hellenes and Teutons descended from Ham and the Uma rather than Uma's son Japheth and were, therefore, more deeply implicated in the defeat of Aratta than the Celts who took their names from Japheth's victorious family. The Teutonic myth of the Ragnarok and colorlessness of *Beowulf* reveal a pessimistic streak foreign to the Celts. The Hellenes witnessed the deaths of their Hamite fathers at Metelis; and Teutons of the Sidones saw

the deaths of Sidon’s Javanite sons at the same time. All three nations inhabit regions of Europe toward the east and bordering Satem Aryan Slavs, presumably watchdogs over the defeated Centum Aryans: Hellenes on the borders of the Bulgars; Albanians next to the South Slavs; and Teutons on the borders of West Slavic Poles and Czechs.

The importance of Joktan to the Gaelic tradition in view of his Teutonic importance as chief god Odin. The Etruscans of Italy seem to have remembered him as their god Tin. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* reports that the origin of our word “tin” remains unknown despite its occurrence throughout the Teutonic languages. Given the Egyptian predilection for monosyllables, we might conclude that Menes’ acquaintance with the “Tin land” of Cornwall might have resulted in a monosyllable derived from Etruscan Tin-Joktan and applied by Teutons to the metal during one of the Atlantic expeditions. In the Satem Aryan world *odin* is the Russian word for “one” as though to designate the chief patriarch of Russia, Joktan-Meshech.

It might be useful to tabulate the Gaelic, Gallic, Teutonic and Latin names of the *dramatis personae* we have been considering:

<i>Genesis 10:</i>	<i>Gaelic:</i>	<i>Gallic:</i>	<i>Teutonic:</i>	<i>Latin:</i>
Shem		Teutates	Thor (Sig)	[Greco-Roman Jupiter]
Arphaxad I	Fachtna Fathach	Taranis		Saturnus
Obal	Conchobar		Balder (?)	Sol (?) [Greco-Roman Apollo]
Shelah				Picus
Eber				Faunus
Peleg	Fergus	Cernunnus	Frey	Latinus
Joktan	Cúchullain	Esus	Odin	[Etruscan Tin]
Reu (Nimrod)	Ailill			Mars

Less civilized than the Romans, neither the Celts nor Teutons match the completeness of the Roman stock of identities. Both stocks, however, come to focus in certain allies in the cause of the “Ulaid” in the Battle of Teutates or Ross na Ríg— Shem, Arphaxad I, Obal, Peleg and Joktan.

There is no question that in coordinating wars 124 years apart the Gaelic tradition testifies that Shem and his followers were motivated by a spirit of vengeance. Shem’s grievance aimed first by the immorality of the family of Ham and its disgrace heaped on

Noah. Both Yahweh and paganized Chemosh were deities of vengeance. That is the objective meaning of thunder and lightning coded into both Yahweh in Psalm 18 and in the storm gods Indra, Teshup, Adad, Thor, Perkuna and Ishkur. It seems likely that the ancient Arabic word for vengeance *tar* is cognate with the Prussian god Tar, a variant of Teutonic Thor. The anti-Akkadian league of the “old veterans” of the Noahic Council was a pact of vengeance. Our true human condition being what it is, nothing is more refreshing than the sound of thunder and vision of lightning as promising rain. The Aztec rain god Tlaloc was the cruelest of all the vengeful gods of that pantheon, steeped as it was in a spirit of vengeance against the murders of the Hamite and Javanite fathers at Metelis. The best that world culture has to offer testifies to the power of vengeance. Aristotle testifies that the greatest form of imaginative literature is tragedy in which vengeance falls on the head of great sinners despite their efforts to escape the wrath to come.

In Aristotle’s mind tragedy complemented epic, the one dramatic and the other narrative in form. Emphasis on heroic strength and mighty deeds is well known to have been the chief cultural and literary theme of ancient man in the time of epic. This classic gentile spirit lives on in a variety of ways in later times. A particularly intense example is the samurai films of Akira Kurosawa in the 1950s and 1960s as brought to focus in the powerful facial features and manners of actor Toshiro Mifune. One of Mifune’s best roles is as the doomed tyrant Taketoki Washizu of *Throne of Blood* (1957) modeled on Shakespeare’s tragedy *Macbeth*. Vivid Japanese memories of the feudal past bring to *Throne of Blood* an authenticity and immediacy of vengeance and doom unknown to Western culture. The following rime royal stanzas, titled “Captain Washizu” are a mimesis of Kurosawa’s heroic-tragic film:

This Cobweb Forest is a labyrinth
 where armored knights are riding round and round.
They know the breadth, they know uncertain length
 and meet a spirit on unholy ground
 where she is prophesying eerie sound.
 She chants at even pace the future’s shape.
 Washizu, Miki listen while they gape.

Washizu’s wife Asaji fans the flame
 of fatalistic, doomed ambition’s way
as though she were the evil spirit’s dame
 and speaks in keeping with what demons say
 when they mislead a mortal day by day.
 Asaji warns against her husband’s friend
 that he cannot resist an evil end.

Fear strikes down the walls of normal life,
his feudal loyalty and knightly duty
as doomed Washizu harkens to his wife,
imbibes her will more certainly than beauty
can draw his heart to grasp at tender booty.
His soul pretends resistance to the doom
but yields to the forest spirit's loom.

A throne of blood is swimming through his veins
infected by a chant and spectral wheel
that weaves the cobweb of his iron brains
and crushes friendship under heavy heel
to turn a spectral dream into the real.
Behind this incantation lies a bed
of skeletal remains, both hand and head.

I've seen Washizu pierced by flights of arrows
despite his stubborn rage to retain life.
Resembling porcupine his vision narrows
into the last compulsion of his strife,
brought on by forest demon and a wife.
Heroically he rages to the end,
the lord of Cobweb Castle without friend.



Captain Washizu and His Best Friend Miki in Cobweb Forest
www.filmint.nu copied May 11, 2008

