

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #50; June, 2002 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY

AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my fiftieth monthly teaching letter and continues my fifth year of publication. In the last lesson, I briefly mentioned that the queen-mother of Britain had died. I believe that this is a major mile-marker in time to where we are today on Yahweh's time-clock. I would remind you that Scripture says in no uncertain terms that there would always be a descendant of David on a throne somewhere until Messiah's Second Advent. The implication is: if the present Queen Elizabeth were to have a heart attack and die, and our Redeemer has not returned, the promise to David is a lie and our Bible is untrustworthy. I also pointed out that Queen Elizabeth's husband was not of pure blood, and because Elizabeth had taken an unsuitable mate, thus violating Yahweh's Law of kind after kind: her children by that marriage are unfit to take the throne.

There is an interesting passage in the book *The Roman And The Teuton* by Charles Kingsley, written 111 years ago, which shows an attempt to bring down this Royal line, which says this on page 22:

"[The house of] Lords and Commons have been swept away, though a number of the richest old gentlemen in London meet daily at Westminster to receive orders from Buckingham Palace. But at the palace itself has broken out one of those sanguinary [bloody] conspiracies which have of late become unceasing. The last heir of the house of Brunswick is lying dead with a dagger in his heart, and everything is in frightful confusion. The armed force of the capital are of course 'masters of the situation', and the Guards, after a tumultuous meeting at Windsor or Knightsbridge, have sold the throne to Baron Rothschild, for a handsome donation of £25 a-piece ..."

In case you're wondering about the House of Brunswick, it is referring to an Ernest Augustus, Duke of Brunswick, an Elector of Hanover which house ruled Great Britain during the 18th and early 19th centuries. In 1917, to avoid any peerage with Germany, they adopted the name "Windsor" as the royal family name. In 1947, Queen Elizabeth II married Philip Mountbatten (a Battenburg). [Expand in later *WTL*, but now another issue.]

Addressing the origins of two false doctrines: Before getting started on our walk through Daniel and Revelation, we should consider how false opinions get started. It's like the mistaken conclusion by some that Ruth was a Moabite. Today, that untrue

concept is being used by the enemy through nominal churchianity to promote multiculturalism. If one will consult Bertrand L. Comparet's work *Ruth Was An Israelite*, one will see that the Israelites had driven the Moabites out of the land of Moab 150 years previous to Ruth's time. Therefore, Ruth was only a Moabite geographically; not genetically.

Another such false teaching being promoted in some circles of Israel Identity is built on 1 Samuel 17:12 which says in part: "Now David was the son of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem-judah, whose name was Jesse; and he had eight sons ..." They incorrectly conclude from this that our Messiah was from the Tribe of Ephraim rather than Judah. Here again, it is speaking geographically instead of a genetically. This can be corroborated by the *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, pages 408-409: "EPHRATHAH ... 2. The ancient name of Bethlehem of Judah (Gen. 48:7; Ephrath, NIV) ... EPHRATHITE ... 1. A native or inhabitant of Ephrathah, or Bethlehem (Ruth 1:2; 1 Sam. 17:12) ..." This can also be authenticated by *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, page 318; *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. D-G, page 335; *The Interpreter's Dictionary Of The Bible*, vol. E-J, page 122; *The Popular And Critical Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, page 605; *Insight On The Scriptures*, vol. 1, page 755; *New Concise Bible Dictionary*, page 150; *The Westminster Dictionary Of The Bible*, page 169; *Peloubet's Bible Dictionary*, page 183; *New International Bible Dictionary*, page 318; *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible* (1890), page 181; *Nave's Topical Bible*, page 344; *Gesenius' Hebrew And Chaldee Lexicon* under #673, page 73, and *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance* under Hebrew #673.

My undated *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, which has "Miss Lilly Summerskile, St. Mark's S. S., Christmas 1890" written on the front flyleaf, says this on page 85: "**Bethlehem.** 1. One of the oldest towns in Palestine, already in existence at the time of Jacob's return to the country. Its earliest name was EPHRATH of EPHRATAH (see Gen. 35:16, 19; 48:7), and it is not till long after the occupation of the country by the Israelites that we meet with it under its new name of Bethlehem. After the conquest Bethlehem appears under its own name Bethlehem-judah (Judg. 17:7; 1 Sam. 17:12; Ruth 1:1, 2). The book of Ruth is a page from the domestic history of Bethlehem: the names, almost the very persons, of the Bethlehemites are there brought before us ... In the New Testament Bethlehem retains its distinctive title of Bethlehem-judah (Matt 2:1, 5), and once, in the announcement of the Angels, 'city of David' (Luke 2:4; comp. John 7:42) ... 2 A town in the portion of Zebulun named nowhere but in Josh. 19:15."

The next thing these proponents do is point to Genesis 49:24 where it says in part concerning Jacob's blessing on Joseph: "... (from thence *is* the shepherd, the stone of Israel) ..." They will imply by this that the "shepherd" or "stone" is Yahshua the "rock", and that He descended from Joseph rather than Judah. Note: these words are in parentheses, and represent only a notation by some copyists. *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald makes that same error. Some of these proponents go so far as to claim there was never a David nor a Bethlehem-judah; only Bethlehem of Zebulun. They might have gotten by with this, but in 1993, Seymore Gitin, digging for The W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeology, unearthed a piece of stone at Tel Dan inscribed in Aramaic "King of Israel" and "House of David." These proponents will

also point to the 15th chapter of Joshua claiming Bethlehem is not mentioned among Judah's cities. They should check the *LXX* on Joshua, for it is listed at 15:60. The reason 1 Samuel 17:12 designates Bethlehem as "Bethlehem-judah" is to distinguish it from Bethlehem-Zebulun. Had there been only one Bethlehem, it wouldn't have been necessary to make that distinction. Judges 17:7 speaks of "a Levite" of "Bethlehem-Judah." Are we also to make him of the Tribe of Ephraim? It seems that if a Scripture can be taken wrongly, there is always going to be someone out there to do it. Again, "Ephrathite" in 1 Samuel 17:12 is not speaking of the Tribe of Ephraim, but of a city.

MAKING SOME SEMBLANCE OF ORDER

Upon reviewing the first reading of the present teaching letter, I realized I had addressed a wide variety of unrelated subjects and covered a wide spectrum of historical events. Therefore, I have deleted, rearranged and added text in order to avoid confusion for the reader. What I have just presented concerning Queen Elizabeth and the unrelated topic of the false doctrine advocating that Messiah was from the Tribe of Ephraim has little to do with the present topic matter concerning our walk through Daniel and Revelation. Also, don't become confused inasmuch as I will shortly be presenting two events which happened nearly 950 years apart. The reason for bringing these before you is that they both have something in common. I hope, with this explanation, that you will now comprehend the order in which these topics appear.

We had gotten down to the toes representing the ten provinces of Rome, and began to show how it would be the Teutonic German tribes ("the stone cut out of the mountain") that would cause the image to start "breaking in pieces."

I would also point out that the quotes I will be using are biased toward the Romans, as they were the writers. They seem always to badmouth the Teutonic tribes and Celts in every way, calling them "barbarians", "pirates" etc. It might be interesting, had the Germans written this history, what they might have called the Romans. In spite of this, both the Germans and Romans were Israelites, except for a few of the imported alien slaves, later made Roman citizens.

GAULS SACKING OF ROME A PRECURSOR

While Rome had not yet established its first province, the sacking of Rome by the Gauls in 390 B.C. was a harbinger of things to come. About six hundred years later the Teutonic German tribes would engage Rome with wave after wave until the western branch of the empire was no more. I will now quote the *Cyclopædia Of Universal History* by John Ridpath, LL. D., volume 1, pages 689-691:

"In B.C. 390 the Republic suffered an invasion by the Gauls. This ... people was distributed over the greater part of Western Europe. The principal seats of their power were Gaul and Britain; but in their tribal migrations many of the race had crossed the Alps, and settled in the valley of the Po. From this position they advanced to the south until they came into contact with the Romans of Central Italy. The movement of the Gauls was in the nature of a vast marauding expedition; but their numbers were so great that the Roman army sent to oppose them was disastrously defeated in the great battle of Allia, fought in B.C. 390, eleven miles from Rome.

“The remnant of the army of the consuls escaped into the city, and the Gauls swarmed about the ramparts by thousands. The Romans were panic-stricken. The walls were abandoned; and the terrified people flocked to the Capital, carrying with them whatever they could seize. The Gauls poured in like a flood, and the city was taken without resistance ...”

We will now pick up this same story from *Rome: Its Rise And Fall* by Philip Myers (1902), excerpts from pages 96-100: “**Sack Of Rome by the Gauls** (390 B.C.). — We have already mentioned how, in very remote times, tribes from Gaul crossed the Alps and established themselves in Northern Italy. While the Romans were conquering the towns of Ethuria, these barbarian[?] hordes were moving southward and overrunning and devastating the countries of Central Italy. In the year 390 B.C. they laid siege to the city of Clusium in Ethuria. The inhabitants of the place sent an embassy to Rome to ask aid. The senate sent to the Gauls three ambassadors, chosen from the Fabian gens, who informed them that if they did not cease molesting the Clusians, the Romans would intervene. The Gauls, who it is said had never before heard of the Romans, replied that the Clusians must give up to them a part of their lands, and that if they did not do so, they would take what they wanted by force of arms. All things, they declared, belonged to the brave.

“So the siege went on. In an engagement beneath the walls of the city the Roman ambassadors, forgetting in what capacity they were present in the place, took part in the fray, and one of them, Quintus Fabius by name, killed a Gallic chieftain and stripped him of his arms in sight of the army. The Gauls were furious, and sent ambassadors to Rome to demand that the Fabii be surrendered into their hands for punishment. The senate referred the matter to the people, who instead of yielding to the demands of the Gauls, made themselves participators in the guilt of the Fabii by electing them as military tribunes for the following year.

“When the Gauls learned that the Fabii, instead of having been punished by the Romans, had been rewarded by them for their gross violation of the law of nations, they raised the siege of Clusium and marched upon Rome.

“A Roman army met them on the banks of the Allia, eleven miles from the capital. But an unaccountable panic seized the Romans, and they fled from the field without exchanging blows with the enemy. The greater part of them hastened across the Tiber and sought safety behind the walls of Veii, which were still standing. The Gauls followed the fugitives closely, and slaughtered great numbers of them at the river bank. The remainder of the Roman army retreated in great disorder to Rome. Reaching there, they crowded through the gates, and without stopping to shut them, hurried to the citadel as the only place of refuge ...

“... When the Gauls entered the city they found everything abandoned to them. The aged senators, so the Romans afterwards proudly related, thinking it unworthy of their office to seek safety in flight, resolved to meet death in a befitting way. Arriving in their splendid robes of office, each with his ivory-headed wand in his hand, they seated themselves in their chairs of state at the doorway of their palaces on and near the forum, and there sat like statues while the barbarians were carrying on their work of sack and pillage about them...”

It's a pity that the Romans and Gauls didn't understand they were kin. Julius Caesar may have been one of the few who understood this kinship. Many of the Romans were Benjamites as Rome was founded under the sign of the wolf, Genesis 49:27, and the Romans surely "divided the spoil." We must remember also that Zarah-Judah had settled early in the area of Rome. No doubt, most, if not all, of the rulers at Rome were of the Royal line of Judah. Inasmuch as Rome used the eagle as an emblem, there must have been a good number of the Tribe of Dan also among them. It must be remembered that many of Dan left Egypt before the time of the crossing of the Red Sea. While we are on the subject of "eagles", let's take a look at Matthew 24:28 where it says: "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." Futurists view this as some coming event in Palestine. I remember reading an article a few years back which stated that the eagle population was on the increase in that area, intimating that it was a sign of the fulfilling of this passage. Messiah wasn't speaking of some birds, but the soon-coming of the Romans to destroy Jerusalem in 70 A.D. After the curse of the fig tree, that nation was considered a dead "carcass", and it is just as dead today, never to be resurrected. Because the eagle is one of the main emblems of America, we must also have a considerable number of the Tribe of Dan among us.

In lesson #49, I presented an occurrence in 9 A.D. in which two Roman legions of soldiers were destroyed by German Teutonic tribes. With the foregoing, I have shown the first conflict of the Gauls against Rome in 390 B.C., which was actually before the first province was established at Carthage, and marked the beginning of the Teutonic pressure on Rome. As Alexander the Great was born in 356 B.C., we can see this pressure on Rome started even before Alexander's exploits. Many times in prophecy, one period overlaps another which is what we have here. From 390 B.C., we are going to jump 766 years to 376 A.D. As you can begin to see, the pressure applied to Rome by the German Teutonic tribes lasted for a long time. To really get a fuller perspective of this topic requires a lengthy study of which we cannot go into every detail here. The development of the Visigoths against the Roman Empire in 376 A.D. is entirely another story, for it was a different time and circumstance, but nevertheless contributed to Rome's fall and has a parallel to this last account. This is a very critical phase in history and most chroniclers do not cover it adequately, therefore, I will have to quote from several books to get an overall view. I will start with *Rome: Its Rise And Fall* by Philip Myers, page 417:

"The Alemanni (Germans) made forays across the Rhine into the Gallic provinces, — sometimes swarming over the river on the winter ice, — and, before pursuit could be made, recrossed the river and escaped with their booty into the depths of the German forests. The Saxons ... who issued from the mouth of the Elbe, ravaged the coasts of Gaul and Britain, even pushing their light skiffs far up the rivers and creeks to those countries, and carrying away spoils from the inland cities. In Britain, the Picts broke through the Hadrian Wall, and wrested almost the entire island from the hands of the Romans. In Africa, the Moorish and other tribes, issuing from the ravines of the Atlas Mountains and swarming from the deserts of the south, threatened to

obliterate the last trace of Roman civilization occupying the narrow belt of fertile territory skirting the sea.

“The barbarian[?] tide of invasion seemed thus on the point of overwhelming the empire in the West; but for twelve years Valentinian defended with signal [outstanding] ability and energy, not only his own territories, but aided with arms and counsel his weaker brother Valens in the defence of his [eastern territories]. Upon the death of Valentinian, his son Gratian succeeded to his authority [in the west] (A.D. 375).”

Switching now to the book *Early Progress* by Willis West (1931), we will continue this story on page 365: “The whole people of the West Goths (Visigoths) appeared on the north bank of the Danube, with flocks and herds and with their women and children in long lines of wooden carts, fleeing from the terrible Huns —wild nomadic horsemen from Tartary. The Goths begged to cross the river into the protection of the Empire, and Valens, one of the shadow-emperors of that period, gave them lands south of the Danube. They were to surrender their arms, while Roman agents were to supply them with food until the harvest. But these agents embezzled the funds, furnished only vile and insufficient food, while, for bribes, they allowed the barbarians to keep their arms.”

For an even better account of this incident, we will now switch to another book entitled *The Roman And The Teuton* by Charles Kingsley, pages 69-71: “So the Goths were to come over the Danube stream: but they must give up their arms, and deliver their children (those of rank, one supposes), as hostages, to be educated by the Romans, as Romans.

“They crossed the fatal river; they were whole days in crossing; those set to count them gave it up in despair ... And when they were across, they gave up the children. They had not the heart to give up the beloved weapons. The Roman commissioners let them keep the arms, at the price of many Gothic woman’s honour. Ugly and foul things happened, of which we have only hints. Then they had to be fed for the time being, till they could cultivate their land. Lupicinus and Maximus, the two governors of Thrace pocketed the funds which Valens sent, and starved the Goths. The markets were full of carrion and dogs’ flesh. Anything was good enough for a barbarian. Their fringed carpets, their beautiful linens, all went. A little wholesome meat cost 10 pounds of silver. When all was gone, they had to sell their children. To establish a slave-trade in the beautiful boys and girls was just what the wicked Romans wanted.

“At last the end came. They began to rise. Frigidern, their king, kept them quiet till the time was ripe for revenge. The Romans, trying to keep the West Goths down, got so confused, it seems, that they let the whole nation of the East Goths ... dash across the Danube, and establish themselves in the north of the present Turkey, to the east of the West Goths.

“Then at Marcianopolis, the capital of Lower Mœsia, Lupicinus asked Frigidern and his chiefs to a feast. The starving Goths outside were refused supplies from the market, and came to blows with the guards. Lupicinus, half drunk, heard of it, and gave orders for a massacre. Frigidern escaped from the palace, sword in hand. The smoldering embers burst into flame, the war-cry was raised, and the villain Lupicinus fled for his life.

“Then began war south of the Danube. The Roman legions were defeated by the Goths, who armed themselves with the weapons of the dead. Mœsia was overrun with fire and sword. Adrianople was attacked, but in vain. The slaves in the gold mines were freed from their misery, and shewed the Goths the mountain-passes and the stores of grain. As they went on, the Goths recovered their children. The poor things told horrid tales; and the Goths, maddened, avenged themselves on the Romans of every age and sex. ‘They left’, says St. Jerome, ‘nothing alive —not **even the beasts of the field; till nothing was left but growing brambles and thick forest**’ ...

“... The light Roman cavalry fled before the long lances and the heavy swords of the German knights. The knights turned on the infantry, broke them, hunted them down by charge after charge, and left the footmen to finish the work.

“Two-thirds of the Roman army were destroyed; four Counts of the Empire; generals and officers without number. Valens fled wounded to a cottage. The Goths set it on fire, and burned him and his staff therein, ignorant that they had in their hands the Emperor of Rome. Verily there is a God who judgeth the earth.

“So thought the Catholics of that day, who saw in the fearful death of Valens a punishment for his having forced the Goths to become Arians ...”

Here again, it might appear we are getting far afield from the subject of Daniel’s prophecy of the image, but it is important we cover this conversion of the Goths to Arianism. As we get further into this study, we will see it would be difficult to leave the subject of Arianism out. To understand this “Arian” connection, we must backup to pages 67-69 in this same book:

“In the year 375, the West Goths came down to the Danube-bank and entreated the Romans to let them cross. There was a Christian party among them, persecuted by the heathens, and hoping for protection from Rome. Athanaric had vowed never to set foot on Roman soil, and after defending himself against the Huns, retired into the forests of ‘Caucaland.’ Good Bishop Ulfilas and his converts looked longingly toward the Christian Empire. Surely the Christians would receive them as brothers, welcome them, help them. The simple German fancied a Roman even such a one as themselves.

“Ulfilas went on embassy to Antioch, to Valens the Emperor. Valens, low-born, cruel, and covetous, was an Arian, and could not lose the opportunity of making converts. He sent theologians to meet Ulfilas, and torment him into Arianism. When he arrived, Valens tormented him himself. While the Goths starved he argued, apostasy was the absolute condition of his help, till Ulfilas, in a weak moment, gave his word that the Goths should become Arians, if Valens would give them lands on the South bank of the Danube. Then they would be the Emperor’s men, and guard the marches against all foes. From that time Arianism became the creed, not only of the Goths, but of the Vandals, the Sueves, and almost all the Teutonic tribes ...

“... To the Goths themselves the change must have seemed not only unimportant, but imperceptible. Unaccustomed to that accuracy of thought, which is too often sneered at by Gibbon as ‘metaphysical subtlety’, all of which they would have been aware was the change of a few letters in a creed written in an unknown tongue. They could not know, (Ulfilas himself could not have known, only two years after the

death of St. Athanasius at Alexandria; while the Nicæan Creed was as yet received by only half of the Empire; and while he meanwhile had been toiling for years in the Danubian wilds, ignorant perhaps of the controversy which had meanwhile convulsed the Church) — neither the Goths nor he, I say, could have known that the Arianism, which they embraced, was really the last, and as it were apologetic, refuge of dying Polytheism; that it, and not the Catholic Faith, denied the abysmal unity of the Godhead; that by making the Son inferior to the Father, as touching his Godhead, it invented two Gods, a greater and a lesser, thus denying the absoluteness, the infinity, the illimitability, by any category of quantity, of that One Eternal, of whom it is written, that God is a Spirit. Still less could have they guessed that when Arius, the handsome popular preacher (whose very name, perhaps, Ulfilas never heard) asked the fine ladies of Alexandria — ‘ Had you a son before that son was born?’ — ‘ No.’ ‘ Then God could have no son before that son was begotten, &c ...’”

Apart from the last interesting observations concerning Arianism, with which I do not agree, nor do I agree totally with the findings of the Council of Nicaea, we can begin to get an idea of the process which was taking place to crush the toes of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-image-vision.

While we could go on at length with references to the various Teutonic German tribes which Yahweh used as instruments to bring to naught the “ iron ” Roman Empire, first we must deal with verses 44-45 of Daniel 2. We are informed that a fifth “ stone ” kingdom “ cut out of the mountain without hands ” would “ break in pieces ” the other four kingdoms which would include the “ image ’s ” toes. As the toes are also made part of “ iron ”, they also represent Rome.

Because the “ image ” had two legs and feet along with its “ toes ”, we must take into account both the western and eastern branches of that empire. As the eastern division of the Roman Empire lasted until the fall of Constantinople in 1453 A.D., the crushing of the image’s toes covered quite a long period of time. When we realize that it was the “ Fourth Crusade ” which weakened Constantinople (1202-1204) which resulted in ripe picking for Mohammed II the Great (1451-1480). Of course, most all of the Crusaders were our people. Thus, the eastern branch lasted approximately 1,000 years beyond the western branch, and the western division was weakened and finally conquered by the Teutonic tribes a thousand years earlier.

We should also take notice that this fifth “ stone kingdom ” was to begin during “ the days of these kings. ” As Daniel’s interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-image represented Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome, it can hardly be speaking of the future Second Advent of Messiah. If the Teutonic German tribes represent the beginning of that fifth “ stone kingdom ”, then the toes of that image must depict the eventual breakup of the ten provinces of the Roman Empire. If the time of the “ stone kingdom ” is placed at the time of “ these kings ” of Daniel 2:44, it would be difficult to identify the ten toes to be other than the ten provinces of Rome and the Teutonic German tribes to be other than the beginning of that “ stone kingdom ... which shall never be destroyed. ” Not only that, but that kingdom will not be left to any people other than the related **kinfolk** of those German Teutonic tribes. We should remember that this “ stone ” was to fall on the toes of that image. If you have never had a broken toe,

you have yet to experience one of life's possible excruciating events. Without the toes, it's difficult to stand.

We have now taken into account three encounters of the Teutonic tribes with the Romans. (1) In lesson #49, we covered the story of Hermann and how he led two elite Roman legions, under the command of Varus, into an ambush in the Teutoberger Forest to be annihilated and never return. (2) With this lesson, we have dealt with the confrontation of the Goths and the Romans in 390 B.C., and (3) We also noted the conflict between Rome and the Goths in-and-around Mœsia and Adrianople sometime shortly after 375 A.D. Although these last two encounters were nearly 750 years apart, they were both factors to Rome's eventual fall. Although we have gotten a good start on the description of the breakup of the image, there remains much more to be covered.

While we can begin to see Daniel's prophecy being fulfilled to a tee, there is an even greater force at work bringing about these significant events. That war is the never-ending battle for the trade-routes and waterways of the world. Space does not allow us to discuss that here, but we will address that important matter in coming lessons.

Another indication of the accuracy of Daniel's prophecy is the division of the empire. For documentation concerning this. I will use *General History* by Philip Myers, page 307:

“Final Division of the Empire (A.D. 395.” —The Roman world was united practically for the last time under Theodosius the Great. From A.D. 392 to 395 he ruled as sole Emperor. Just before his death he divided the Empire between his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, assigning the former, who was only eighteen years of age, the government of the East, and giving the latter, a mere child of eleven, the sovereignty of the West. This division was not to affect the unity of the Empire. There was to be but one Empire, although there were to be two emperors. But as a matter of fact so different was the course of events in the two halves of the old Empire that from this [time] on we shall find it [more] convenient to trace the history of each division separately.”

From this same book, on the same page, it says this concerning the eastern branch of the Roman Empire: **“The Empire in the East.** —The story of the fortunes of the Empire in the East need not detain us long here. The line of Eastern emperors lasted over a thousand years, —until the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, A.D. 1453. It will thus be seen that the greater part of its history belongs to the mediæval period. Up to the time of the overthrow of the Empire in the West the emperors of the East were engaged incessantly in suppressing uprisings of their Gothic allies or mercenaries, or in repelling invasions of different barbarian[?] tribes.”

Again, notice the Goths are affecting the outcome here! Remember the Almighty said of Israel. “Thou *art* my battle ax *and* weapons of war: for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms ...” Jer. 51:20.