

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #7; November, 1998 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 (Revised 2-14-2001)**

This is the seventh in a series of monthly teaching letters. If you have not received any of my previous teaching letters, please send \$2.00 for each back issue you would like to have. These teaching letters are not just the average run-of-the-mill type of letter. If you really want to learn the Scripture's deepest hidden truths, you will not want to miss any of these back issues. Because of the nature of these teaching letters, they will not go out of date, so you will want to keep them in a safe place where they won't get lost. I want to thank all those who are helping to keep this ministry going financially. I am putting everything right back into the ministry that I receive in donations and sales, and I plan to continue operating in this way.

Now Continuing The Topic:

#### **JUST WHO IS THIS PATRIARCH, JUDAH? (Part 7)**

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

#### **JUDAH BECOMES A CURSE**

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

- Judah was entrapped by a Canaanite woman, Bathshua, into marrying her and having three half-breed children by her, Er, Onan and Shelah.

- Judah obtains a wife, Tamar (of pure Adamic blood), from the house of Shem for Er, but he ejaculates on the ground rather than consummate the marriage, and Yahweh kills him.
- Judah gives Onan to Tamar as a levirate for Er, whereupon he does the same as his brother, and Yahweh kills him also.
- Judah promises his third son Shelah to Tamar as soon as he reaches marrying age, and sends Tamar to her father's house.
- Shelah reaches marrying age whereupon Bathshua, his mother, marries him to a Canaanite woman causing a total breach of contract with Tamar and then Bathshua shortly dies.
- Tamar being still a maiden and Judah an eligible widower, Tamar decides upon a very daring plan to trick Judah into supplying the seed to fulfill the contract by feigning to be a common whore and twin boys were born by this union of Judah and Tamar; Perez and Zarah.

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

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

**"5 And she again conceived, and bare a son; and called his name Shelah: and he was at Chezib, when she bare him."**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**"20 And the sons of Judah after their families were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelanites: of Pharez, the family of the Pharzites: of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites. 21 And the sons of Pharez were; of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites: of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites."**

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

was: (1) Er, (2) Onan, (3) Shelah, (4) Pharez and (5) Zerah. We know that Yahweh killed Er and Onan leaving Shelah to be the next in line for the birthright and also Tamar's husband. But Shelah was bypassed completely and Pharez was considered the firstborn. This is why the midwife took special attention to mark the first one of the twins to be born. But like in the case of Reuben, when he was disqualified as firstborn of Jacob and Leah, the honor went to the firstborn of Jacob and Rachel, or Joseph. Evidently, when there was a different woman involved, and the original firstborn is dead or disqualified, the honor of firstborn went to the first born of the second union. You will remember that Ishmael was the firstborn of Abraham, but when Isaac was born to him by Sarah, Isaac was considered the firstborn. I only found one comment in all of my commentaries on the above verse which I don't think is quite right, but I will use it anyway, and it was in *A Commentary On The Holy Bible* by Matthew Pool, volume 1, page 320:

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

This may be true, but I would rather believe that Pharez simply was put in Er's stead. It is rather interesting, though, after the three families of Judah are recorded in their birth order, only Pharez's children are mentioned. I would say this is because Pharez's children were in the royal line and this is the reason they were mentioned here in this passage. Going on now to 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 2:3-5 we have Shelah's name mentioned at the beginning of a long chapter which includes verses 3 through 55. In this genealogy of Judah, it gets off to a bad start with Shelah and has a bad ending with the Kenites in verse 55. Everything in-between is the pure line of Judah. As I have covered the Kenites (the descendants of Cain) in my other writings, I will not go into that subject here although the Kenites are a very important subject and should be understood by all in Identity. We will only use verses 3 and 4 at this time:

**"3 The sons of Judah; Er, and Onan, and Shelah: which three were born unto him of the daughter of Shua the Canaanitess. And Er, the firstborn of Judah, was evil in the sight of the LORD; and he slew him. 4 And Tamar his daughter in law bare him Pharez and Zerah. All the sons of Judah were five."**

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

**"21 The sons of Shelah the son of Judah were Er the father of Lecha, and Laadah the father of Mareshah, and the families of the house of them that wrought fine linen, of the house of Ashbea. 22 And Jokim, and the men of Chozeba, and Joash, and Saraph, who had the dominion in Moab, and Jashubilehem. And these are ancient things. 23 These were the potters, and those that dwelt among plants and hedges: there they dwelt with the king for his work."**

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

"Thus, from Zarah's line came the progenitors of the Milesian civilization that was established around the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. However, although they were descendants of Judah, *they were not Jews* (as we think of Jews today). The descendants of

Shelah, who were workers in fine linen (1 Chronicles 4:21), left the rest of Israel shortly after the Exodus, and before Israel entered the Promised Land, joining with their brethren of the Zarah line in their westward trek. They became the progenitors of the linen workers in Ireland in the Isles.”

I have done some research on this last statement of Rand’s that Shelah and his descendants moved into Ireland with the line of Zerah. What Rand is doing is assuming that because Shelah and his children are mentioned in 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 4:21 as being famous for fine linen and the Irish also later becoming famous for their linen, there must be some connection. I have a lot of respect for Howard B. Rand’s writings, but I don’t believe everything he teaches. I believe this is one of the places where Rand goofed. I think I have everything Howard B. Rand ever put out in my library, and I value it very highly. To show you why I think Rand is wrong in this case, I will now quote from *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 12, page 294:

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

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

“That another is said to be the *father of the house of those that wrought fine linen*, v.21. It is inserted in their genealogy as their honour that they were the best weavers in the kingdom, and they brought up their children, from one generation to another, to the same business, not aiming to make them gentlemen. This Laadah is said to be the *father of those that wrought fine linen*, as before the flood Jubal is said to be *the father of musicians and Jabal of shepherds*, &c. His posterity inhabited the city of Mareshah, the manufacture or staple commodity of which place was linen-cloth, with which their kings and priests were clothed. ... That another family had had *dominion in Moab*, but were now in *servitude in Babylon*, v. 22, 23. ... It was found among the ancient things that they had the *dominion in Moab*. Probably in David’s time, when the country was conquered, they transplanted themselves thither, and were put in places of power there, which they held for several generations; but this was a great while ago, time out of mind. ... Their posterity were now potters and gardeners, as is supposed in Babylon, where they *dwelt with the king for his work*, got a good livelihood by their industry, and therefore cared not for returning with their brethren to their own land, after the years of captivity had expired. Those that now have dominion know not what their posterity may be reduced to, nor what mean employment they may be glad to take up with. But those were unworthy the name of *Israelites* that would dwell among *plants and hedges* rather than be at pains to return to Canaan.”

The next reference we are going to use will clear up this story of the descendants of Shelah a little more. This will give us more insight into the occupations they followed. It will also give us an idea

to what geographic area they may have migrated. It is found in *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, page 386:

"23. *These were the potters.* They were probably brickmakers; perhaps potters also, who had their dwelling in low grounds, and fabricated the clay into pots and bricks that was dugged up in forming fences in the king's domains."

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

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

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

"21-23. POSTERITY OF SHELAH. 21. **Laadah ... the father ... of the house of them that wrought fine linen** — Here, again, is another incidental evidence that in very early times certain trades were followed by particular families among the Hebrews apparently in hereditary succession. Their knowledge of the art of linen manufacture had been, most probably, acquired from Egypt, where the duty of bringing up families to the occupations of their forefathers was a compulsory obligation, whereas in Israel, as in many parts of Asia to this day, it was optional, though common. 22, 23. **had the domination in Moab, and Jashubi-lehem** — 'And these are ancient things' seems a strange rendering of a proper name; and, besides, it conveys a meaning that has no bearing on the record. The following improved translation has been suggested: Sojourned in Moab, but returned to Bethlehem and Adaberim-athekim. These are the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah [and they] were potters employed by the king in his own work.' Gederah or Gederoth and Netaim, belonged to the tribe of Judah, and lay on the southwest border of the Philistines' territory (Josh. 15:36; II Chron. 28:18)."

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

*Standard Revised Version*: "**23** These were the potters and inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah; they dwelt there with the king for his work."

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

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

**"21** The sons of Shelah son of Judah: Er the father of Lecah, Laadah the father of Mareshah and the clans of the linen workers at Beth Ashbea, **22** Jokim, the men of Cozeba, and Joash and

Saraph, who ruled in Moab and Jashubi Lehem. (These records are from ancient times.) 23 They were pottery makers who lived in Netaim and Gederah; they stayed there and worked for the king.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**“5 And of the Shilonites; Asaiah the firstborn, and his sons.”**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Nave’s Topical Bible*, page 1269:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Unger’s Bible Dictionary*, page 1015:

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

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

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

**“5 And Maaseiah the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Hazaiah, the son of Joiarib, the son of Zechariah, the son of Shiloni.”**

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

**“6 (the sons of Pharez who resided at Jerusalem were four hundred and sixty-eight in all, able-bodied men).”**

You will notice Moffatt enclosed it in parentheses ( ) indicating that it may have been added at a later date and not in the original text. Most people reading this passage will assume that because it is speaking of Perez (Pharez) in verse 4 and then again in verse 6, that verse 5 are also the descendants of Perez (Pharez), and it is not so. The subject matter goes from Perez (Pharez) in verse 4 to Shelah in verse 5, and back to Perez (Pharez) in verse 6. It is interesting to note in The New English Bible, they place verse 6 ahead of verse 5. To make some sense out of this whole matter of verse 5, I am going to quote the comments from *The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 3, page 773:

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

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

**“5 Maasiah the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Neriah, the son of Azariah, the son of Jonadab, the son of Zechariah, the son of Shelah.”**

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

*The New Jerusalem Bible:*

**“5 and Maaseiah son of Baruch, son of Col-Hozeh, son of Hazaiah, son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib, son of Zechariah, descendant of Shelah.”**

*The New English Bible:*

**“5 and Maaseiah son of Baruch, son of Col-hozeh, son of Hazaiah, son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib. son of Zechariah of the Shelanite family.”**

*The New Century Version:*

“5 There was also Maseiah son of Baruch, (Baruch was the son of Col-Hozeh, the son of Hazaiah. Hazaiah was the son of Adaiah, son of Joiarib. Joiarib was the son of Zechariah, a descendant of Shelah.”

*The Good News Bible:*

“5 Maaseiah, the son of Baruch and grandson of Colhozeh. His other ancestors included Hazaiah, Adaiah, Joiarib, and Zechariah, descendants of Judah’s son Shelah.”

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

Nehemiah 11:5:

“5 And Maaseiah the son of Baruch, the son of Colhozeh, the son of Hazaiah, the son of Adaiah, the son of Joiarib, the son of Zechariah, the son of Shiloni.”

Ezra 10:18:

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

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

“And of the Shilonites: Asaiah the firstborn, and his sons.

If the **Maaseiah** of Nehemiah 11:5, the **Maaseiah** of Ezra 10:18 and the **Asaiah** of 1<sup>st</sup> Chronicles 9:5 are all the same person, the Shelanites of Shelah had worked their way into the Levitical priesthood. I am pretty sure that this **Maaseiah** did work his way into the Levitical priesthood. When the captives returned from Babylon to Jerusalem, there was a shortage of Levites for all the needed offices, so they substituted heads of families for priestly duties. There is so much history to cover during this period, there isn’t enough space in this teaching letter to cover it all here. I do expect to cover it in the next teaching letter though. This is a very critical era of history and all the ramifications must be considered. If you don’t understand this period of time, and all that was happening, you are not prepared to study the New Testament. In showing that Shelah was well established in the time of Nehemiah, you can be sure they were still well established in the time of the Messiah as Pharisees and Sadducees, which we know today as Canaanite Jews. Of course, this is only part of the background of the Jews as there are many other factors to consider.

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

“Certain ones, both of the house of Judah that had returned from Babylon and some of the priests intermarried with the Inhabitants of the land. These intermarriages were severely condemned by both Ezra and Nehemiah. These forbidden marriages were made with the Hittites and this in time produces a distinct racial type whom we call Jews today. In other words,

the Jew as we know him today is not of pure Israel stock but, through the intermarriages in the day of Ezra and Nehemiah, has the blood of the Hittite in his veins. This intermarriage gave the Jew his dark hair and eyes and the facial characteristics by which he is known and recognized today. The origin of the Jew does not, therefore, antedate the return from the Babylonian captivity, but resulted from the admixture of Hittite blood after the return from Babylon to Palestine. Because the house of David was selected from the tribe of Judah many centuries prior to the time of these inter-racial marriages, there are no Jews as such in the house of David.”

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

**“1 Now when these things were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priest, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, *even* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. 2 For they have taken their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy (set apart) seed have mingled themselves with the people of *those* lands.”**

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

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

**SOME CANAANITES NOT CANAANITES!**

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

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

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

I then went to page 701 of this same book and it said this of Elam: "**ELAM 1. One of the five sons of Shem from whom descended 'families, according to their tongues, in their lands, according to their nations'.**"

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

**"3 Then shall perish the seed of Canaan, and a remnant shall not be unto Amalek, and all the Canpadocians shall perish, and all the Hittites be utterly destroyed."**

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