

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #147; July, 2010 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and forty-seventh monthly teaching letter and continues my thirteenth year of publication. Since lesson #137, I have been presenting a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*. I had given a general overview before starting the seven stages of this story, which are as follows: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage. Already this subject has expended ten lessons, and we are still working on the marriage phase of this story. If you haven't followed this composition from its inception, you might want to obtain the ten previous issues. Without a perception of Yahweh's marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel, one simply cannot comprehend the context on which the entire Bible rests! Not only this, but without the knowledge of Israel's Identity, this marriage doesn't make any sense! That's why one will hear very little about it from nominal churchianity, no matter the denomination! Christ came to die to satisfy His own law concerning divorce and remarriage, so he could lawfully restore His marital relationship with the twelve tribes; not some hottentot tribe or individual from Africa, or any other unclean racial type, or mixture thereof!

THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 11

"THE MARRIAGE" continued:

YAHWEH'S PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL continued:

This prenuptial agreement between Yahweh and His Cinderella bride, the twelve tribes of Israel, can be found at Exodus chapters 20 through 23 (four chapters in all). With the last lesson, we got to Exod. 22:25-26 where we had to discontinue our discussion. With this issue, we will pick up the nuptial agreement at Exod. 22:28, which states: **"Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people."** If you are a pureblooded Israelite from one of the twelve tribes, your ancestors promised Yahweh that they would obey this and all the other parts of their nuptial agreement. Not only did our ancestors promise they would obey these rules for themselves, but in making these promises, they obligated all of their offspring after them forever! Being

born under contract, when we took our first breath, we became as responsible for obeying these nuptial promises as they were for keeping them! Likewise, when Abraham placed Isaac on the altar to sacrifice him, Abraham, in essence, dedicated all of Isaac's descendants on that altar after him forever! And we don't have any choice in that matter! If you thought you had a choice, think again! So, let's not take any of our promises to Him lightly, but rather zealously keep them! Just because some of our forefathers failed to live up to these obligations is no reason that we should follow suit! Besides, Christ provided us a way back to our former estate, and even beyond!

Comment on Exod. 22:28: The Hebrew word translated "god" in this verse is Strong's #430, *elohim*, and in context means a *magistrate*. Here, in our nuptial agreement with Yahweh, we promised that we would not *revile* (make light of) or curse a ruler (cf. Acts 23:5). While we are forbidden to revile or curse a true leader over us, we are admonished at Deut. 17:15: "**Thou shalt in any wise set *him* king over thee, whom Yahweh thy God shall choose: *one* from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which *is* not thy brother.**" The Hebrew word "stranger" in this verse is Strong's #5273, *nokrîy*, and is a stranger of the worst kind! There are several Hebrew words translated into the English as "stranger"; some in a good sense and others in a very evil sense, and we have to be aware of the difference. And to know the dissimilarity, one must study to show himself approved! The unmixed White Israelites in America have violated this nuptial agreement in all levels of government and will have to suffer the penalty for doing so. The foundation of government is the family husband-father, and he is not to be a nonwhite! Yet, it seems that almost every young White, Caucasian Israelite woman is jumping in bed with an alien not of her own race, while the satanic Kenite-Edomite-Canaanite-jew news agencies keep bragging about it! They bragged about it as recently as Friday, June 4th, 2010, on one of the big three TV news networks! Not to leave the reader guessing who it might be, I have documentation for this from the Internet website:

<http://abcnews.go.com/WN/Media/black-women-marry-interracial-marriage-common/story?id=10830719>

"Interracial Marriage More Common Than Ever, but Black Women Still Lag ... Pew Survey Shows One in Six New Marriages Now Between People of Different Colors ... By Linsey Davis and Eric Noll ... June 4, 2010 ...

"In 1967, the boundaries were still very black and white. The film 'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner,' about an interracial couple and their parents' angst (anxiety), was considered groundbreaking.

"Americans are more likely than ever to wed outside their racial or ethnic group. Fast forward four decades and you don't have to look to the big screen to see interracial couples. You can see the beginnings of a melting pot everywhere – just look at celebrity couples like Seal and Heidi Klum, or Tony Parker and Eva Longoria.

"And [sic] new study by the Pew Research Center found that one in six new marriages in the U.S. are interracial relationships. That makes the United States one of the most colorblind countries when it comes to saying 'I do,' second only to Brazil.

“Related [Articles:] ... Why Can't Successful Black Women Find Men? Why So Many Single, Black Females? The Pitfalls of Transracial Adoption. 'The surprising thing here is how much demographic and social change has occurred over a short time. Intermarriage was a taboo and illegal. That's a big change in a very small amount of time,' said Paul Taylor, Executive Vice President of the Pew Research Center. Based on the latest census data, the study showed record highs: 26 percent of Hispanics, 31 percent of Asians, 16 percent of Blacks and nine percent of Whites all married outside their race.

“'I think the racial barriers have almost blurred to the extent of almost being socially insignificant,' said Professor Rick Banks of Stanford Law School.

“Rates of interracial marriage among Asians and Hispanics remained steady, but there was a substantial change among black Americans, especially black men.

“'In 2008, 22 percent of all black male newlyweds married a non-black,' said Taylor.

“Black Women Left Out ... Only 9 percent of black women, on the other hand, married outside their race, making them the least likely of any race or gender to marry outside their race and the least likely to get married at all.

“We have a saying called 'the black girl curse,' said Chato Waters, a single black woman. 'A lot of our white friends are married by 25, happily married with kids by 27, and we're like, what's the deal with the 'bee gees' – that's 'black girls ...'”

This website may not have quoted ABC anchorwoman Diane Sawyer exactly word-for-word, but any variation from what I heard her say over channel 13 from Toledo, Ohio through our local Time Warner cable service is insignificant!

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would dedicate to Him the firstborn of flocks and the first-ripe of grain, vegetables and fruits, as well as the firstborn of sons on the day of firstfruits, Exod. 22:29-30. This passage states:

“²⁹ Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me. ³⁰ Likewise shalt thou do with thine oxen, and with thy sheep: seven days it shall be with his dam; on the eighth day thou shalt give it me.” Further insight on this passage can be found at Num. 28:26; 2 Chr. 31:5; Exod. 13:2 & 34:19:

Num. 28:26: **“Also in the day of the firstfruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto Yahweh, after your weeks be out, ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work.”**

2 Chr. 31:5: **“And as soon as the commandment came abroad, the children of Israel brought in abundance the firstfruits of corn, wine, and oil, and honey, and of all the increase of the field; and the tithe of all things brought they in abundantly.”**

Exod. 13:2: **“Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine.”**

Exod. 34:19: **“All that openeth the matrix is mine; and every firstling among thy cattle, whether ox or sheep, that is male.”**

Of all the designated possessions of the Israelites to be dedicated to Yahweh, the firstborn sons would be the most valuable. Not that a firstborn daughter shouldn't be highly prized, but one will notice that a daughter is not included here.

From *A Commentary* by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, vol. 1, pages 320-321, we read on Exodus 13:1-2:

“CHAP. XIII. 1-2.— THE FIRST-BORN SANCTIFIED. **2. Sanctify unto me all the first-born.** To sanctify means to consecrate, to set apart from a common to a sacred use. The foundation of this duty rested on the fact that the Israelites having had their first-born preserved by a distinguishing act of grace from the general destruction that overtook the families of the Egyptians were bound, in token of gratitude, to consider them as the Lord's peculiar property (cf. Heb. xii. 23). By that deliverance Israel, God's son, His firstborn, was brought into a new and special relationship, which gave them a national existence to be distinguished by extraordinary religious privileges; and it was proper, therefore, in accordance with this sonship, that the first-born, as representatives of all the rest, should be sanctified to the Lord. Hence the duty was specified to the leader on the earliest possible occasion; and from the place which it occupies in the record, the enactment seems to have been made at Succoth.”

For more evidence on this subject, I will cite *Nelson's New Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, page 452:

“**FIRSTBORN** – the first offspring of human beings or animals.

“In memory of the death of Egypt's firstborn and the divine protection of Israel's firstborn in connection with the EXODUS, God placed a special claim on the firstborn of man and animals (Ex. 13:11-13). This meant that the nation of Israel attached unusual value to the oldest son and assigned special privileges and responsibilities to him.

“Because of God's claim on the first offspring, the firstborn sons of the Hebrews were presented to the Lord when they were a month old. Since the firstborn was regarded as God's property, it was necessary for the father to redeem, or buy back, the child from the priest. The redemption price, established by the priest, could not exceed five shekels (Num. 18:16).

“Early Israelite laws also provided that the firstlings of beasts belonged to the Lord and were turned over to the sanctuary (Ex. 13:2; 34:19; Lev. 27:26). The clean animals – those that could be eaten under the law of Moses – were sacrificed to the Lord. The unclean beasts were either destroyed, replaced, or redeemed at a price set by the priest.

“In Israel, the firstborn son inherited special rights and privileges. His BIRTHRIGHT was a double portion of the estate and leadership of the family. As head of the home after his father's death, the oldest son customarily cared for his mother until her death, and provided for his unmarried sisters until their marriage. He was the family's spiritual head.

“The inheritance rights of the firstborn son were sometimes transferred to a younger brother. Jacob, for example, stripped Reuben of his firstborn rights because of his incestuous conduct and transferred the birthright to his son Joseph (Gen. 48:20-22; 1 Chr. 5:1) ...”

This demonstrates one aspect of our nuptial agreement with Yahweh in which we have been remiss, and were divorced as a result! I was the firstborn in my family, and neither of my parents were aware of this provision, nor was it addressed in any church we attended!

Last of all, in Exodus chapter 22, verse 31, we promised Yahweh we would not eat any animal or bird torn to pieces or mangled by a predator for fear of disease by reason of contact with an infected beast of prey, and also to prevent the eating of blood from an unbled carcass. Unless an animal or bird is bled properly, the person eating it will ingest poisonous waste products of the animal or bird flowing from its cells to its liver and kidneys. With Exodus chapter 22 completed, we will now address chapter 23.

Beginning at Exod. 23:1, in our nuptial agreement with our Husband, Yahweh, we promised we would not invent or spread abroad a false report, a sin in violation of the ninth commandment. Further, we are implored not to receive a false report from another, or join hands with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness (Prov. 11:21). Neither be the *inventor* or *receiver* of false and slanderous reports, as both are equally criminal! More can be found concerning this at Deut. 19:16-21, where it expands on this thought:

“¹⁶ If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him *that which is wrong*; ¹⁷ Then both the men, between whom the controversy *is*, shall stand before Yahweh, before the priests and the judges, which shall be in those days; ¹⁸ And the judges shall make diligent inquisition: and, behold, *if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother*; ¹⁹ Then shall ye do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you. ²⁰ And those which remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil among you. ²¹ And thine eye shall not pity; *but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.*”

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would not “follow a mob to *do evil*”, which only makes good sense. We further promised we would not ally with a majority in wickedness, nor join with a multitude to shut out justice (Exod. 23:2, cf. Charles Thomson’s LXX). Adam Clarke, in his six volume *Commentary*, states in part: “... and is so understood by some eminent critics in this place: ‘Thou shalt not follow the example of the great or rich, who may so far disgrace their own character as to live without God in the world, and trample under foot his laws’.”

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would, in passing judgment, not be influenced by compassion for the needy, cf. (Exod. 23:3, cf. Charles Thomson’s LXX). Adam Clarke states in part: “Thou shalt not favour, or show undue partiality, even in the case of the poor, to the detriment of his richer opponent. Even-handed justice must be done both to poor and rich.”

We must remember that even Yahshua Christ took this very same position at John 12:3-8: **“³ Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Yahshua, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. ⁴ Then saith one of his disciples, Judas**

Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, ⁵ Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? ⁶ This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein. ⁷ Then said Yahshua, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this. ⁸ **For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always."**

Here we have the stereotypical bleeding-heart liberal, socialist, communist Judas-jew Iscariot pleading his case for the poor. Judas was no different than his counterpart Kenite-Edomite-jews of today pleading for the poor downtrodden, so-called "afro-americans", crying for more and more welfare handouts at the expense of the hard-working middle-class Whites. When are we ever going to learn that charity is to stay at home with our own racial kind? So let's take care of the poor of our own race, and that on an "evenhanded" basis! That is what we promised Yahweh, and that is what we should do! Even our poor should be given hands up, not hand outs! As Christ said, "... For the poor always ye have with you ..." [*underlining mine*]

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would help return an enemy kinsman's ox or ass safely back to him, not causing injury to it in the process. And if the enemy's ass is lying under its burden, we would help relieve the excessive load, even if we had to place part of the overload on an ass of our own, Exod. 23:4-5:

"⁴ If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. ⁵ If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him."

Adam Clarke comments thusly on verse 4: "... From the humane and heavenly maxim in this and the following verses, our blessed Lord has formed the following precept: '*Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you;*' Matt, v. 44. A precept so plain, wise, benevolent, and useful, can receive no other comment than that which its influence on the heart of a kind and merciful man produces in his life." One thing that Adam Clarke overlooked is the fact that the enemy, in such a case, to receive such consideration, must be a racial kinsman!

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we, as rulers and magistrates, would abstain from, and take caution against misjudgment of various misdeeds and crimes at Exod. 23:6-9, which reads: "**⁶ Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause. ⁷ Keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked. ⁸ And thou shalt take no gift: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous. ⁹ Also thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."**

Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, in their *Commentary*, state the following on this passage: "**6-9. Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause:** These verses contain a series of cautions to rulers and magistrates to take careful heed that the fountains of justice should not be polluted, through favour and partiality on the one hand, through hasty and careless decisions, or through secret bribery and corruption.

7. Keep thee far from a false matter – *i.e.*, as the context suggests, from unjust judgments, inflicting capital punishment upon ‘the innocent and righteous,’ while the real criminals are allowed to escape. **for I will not justify the wicked** – or absolve the guilty, although a human tribunal may give a verdict of acquittal. **8. thou shalt take no gift** – *viz.*, from litigants whose cases are in dependence before you, **for the gift blindeth the wise** ... – *lit.* those seeing, the open-eyed, the acute and penetrating, who, through the dazzling influence of the bribe, cannot see what their sagacity in other circumstances would easily discern. **and perverteth the words of the righteous** – *i.e.*, the decisions of upright judges. Septuagint [λυμαινεται ρηματα δικαια] destroys righteous words (verdicts). The universal practice in Oriental countries still, of offering presents to magistrates to procure a favourable decision, affords a good commentary on the necessity and importance of the prohibition in this passage.” Adam Clarke simplifies it to: “Thou shalt neither countenance him in his crimes, nor condemn him in his righteousness.”

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would, as farmers, let the land rest every seventh year, Exod. 23:10-11 which says: “¹⁰ **And six years thou shalt sow thy land, and shalt gather in the fruits thereof:** ¹¹ **But the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie still; that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat. In like manner thou shalt deal with thy vineyard, and with thy oliveyard.**”

Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, in their *Commentary*, state the following on this passage: “**10, 11. six years thou shalt sow** – intermitting the cultivation of the land every seventh year. But it appears that even then there was a spontaneous produce which the poor were permitted freely to gather for their use; and what they did not eat was to be left as a feast to the lower animals, wild beasts, birds, and insects, the owners of fields not being allowed to reap or collect the fruits of the vineyard or oliveyard during the course of this Sabbatical year. This was a regulation subservient to many excellent purposes; for, besides inculcating the general lesson of dependence on Providence, and of confidence in his faithfulness to His promise respecting the triple increase on the sixth year (Lev. xxv. 20, 21), it gave the Israelites a practical proof that they held their properties of the Lord as His tenants, and must conform to His rules, on pain of forfeiting the lease of them.”

Adam Clarke makes a very interesting observation on this Sabbatical Year, volume 1, page 420. Clarke doesn’t always come up with the right answers, but his research on many subjects goes beyond the average commentator:

“It is very remarkable that the observance of this ordinance is nowhere expressly mentioned in the sacred writings; though some suppose, but without sufficient reason, that there is a reference to it in Jer. xxxiv. 8, 9. Perhaps the major part of the people could not trust God, and therefore continued to sow and reap on the seventh year, as on the preceding. This greatly displeased the Lord, and therefore he sent them into captivity; so that the land enjoyed those *Sabbaths*, through lack of inhabitants, of which their ungodliness had deprived it. See Lev. xviii. 24, 25, 28; xxvi. 34, 35, 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21. Commentators have been much puzzled to ascertain the *time* in which the

sabbatical year *began*; because, if it began in *Abib* or March, they must have lost two harvests; for they could neither reap nor plant that year, and of course they could have no crop the year following; but if it began with what was called the civil year, or in *Tisri* or *Marcheshvan*, which answers to the beginning of our *autumn*, they would then have had that year's produce reaped and gathered in."

Just because there is little record of the Israelites keeping it is no sign that it was not kept for a significant amount of time, as when things were going well, little was recorded. But Clarke is correct, for in time the practice of keeping the Sabbatical Year was completely discontinued. The two basic reasons for keeping the seventh year was for the revival of the strength of the land and the freeing of slaves. This makes an interesting combination, as the year that the sowing and reaping was paused was the very same year the servants were not needed, and let go. It would appear, under this circumstance, the land owner really had a problem getting started in the eighth year. But, on the other hand, in those ancient days the land was full of poor people who were willing to sell themselves as servants for another seven years.

Another thing that was a problem in those days was preserving the food for nearly two years, and the only method they had was to dry it, which meant sun drying. And once they had dried the food, they had the problem of storing it for two years, and the only thing they had to store it in were hard baked clay jars that the rodents couldn't chew through, with a heavy lid on the top, never to be removed, except when removing the food from them. Forget to cap the jar for one night, and there goes a good portion of one's food supply! Being they had large families in those days, how many jars of olive oil, grain, and dried fruits and vegetables would it require to feed a family of, say eight, for two years? This doesn't even take into account the amount of animal feed that one would have to put in storage for two years, although they were allowed to graze in the unsown fields! All of this was part of our nuptial agreement with Yahweh!

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would keep and honor the weekly Sabbath, Exod. 23:12, which states: **"Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed."**

There are two important parts to this verse which we should comprehend which Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, in their *Commentary* make clear in volume 1, pages 372-373:

"12. Six days thou shalt do thy work. This law is repeated (see on ch. xx. 9, 10), lest any might suppose there was a relaxation of its observance during the Sabbatical year. As it was necessary that the benefits of so wise and benevolent an institution might be universally enjoyed, the command respecting its observance was repeated in terms as precise and minute as those in which it was originally given. It secured to all classes – the freeman, the slave, and even the cattle, otherwise in danger of being overborne by incessant labour – a temporary suspension of daily toil – 'rest' for the beasts of labour, a release from the yoke, an interval of repose and 'refreshment' for the working man – not to his body only, but to his mind also, by affording him an opportunity for meditation, religious instruction, and devotional

purposes (Lev. xxiii. 3; Deut. v. 15). **the son of thy handmaid** ... The offspring of foreign [*kinsmen*] slaves, male and female, who had come into the possession of any master belonged to him (see on ch. xxi. 4). It was a person of this latter description that is meant by 'the son of thy handmaid' (cf. Ps. cxvi. 16), apparently in distinction from those of the former, who are designated in general terms, 'the sons of the house' (Gen. xv. 3; Eccl. ii. 7), and 'house-born' (Gen. xiv. 14; xvii. 12, 23). The preceding laws, of which justice, humanity, charity, and a spirit of general kindness form the prominent features, were given at the commencement of the national life of the Israelites, and the promulgation of them at so early a period was intended by the Divine Lawgiver to furnish a solid basis of good principles for the formation of their character as a people. Those precepts – all of them great moral axioms, the truth and importance of which commended them to the understanding and the hearts of all who heard them – were calculated to refine and elevate the tone of public sentiment, and, by inculcating on all classes, rulers as well as people, a conscientious regard to the relative duties and proprieties of life, to train them to the love and practice of that righteousness which exalteth a nation." [*kinsman" in brackets mine*]

I will not go into the debate on which day of the week that the Sabbath should be kept, except to say that Sunday would be the last day I would consider for it, as it's the holy day of Mithraism, and Mithras is not to be confused with the Persian Zoroaster. In the two volume work *Forerunners And Rivals Of Christianity*, by Francis Legge, vol. 2, page 232, the author states: "It [*Mithras*] is not, however, in the religion associated with the name of Zoroaster that we must look for the origin of Mithraism. The date of the sacred books of Mazdeism and the historical existence of Zoroaster himself have recently been brought down to as late as the 7th century B.C. and the appearance in Asia of the Persian tribes as conquerors, whereas Mithras was, as we have seen, worshipped in Asia Minor nearly a millennium earlier ..." This is important, as the Persian Zoroaster had a teaching that parallels the Biblical Two-seedline doctrine of Genesis 3:15, and it's not Mithraism! The only Sunday that is important for Israelites to keep is the Day of Pentecost! So count 50 days (49+1) back from that!

Francis Legge shows how the Romans accepted Mithraism to spite Persian Mazdeism, vol. 2, pp. 270-271, thusly:

"It was probably its rise to imperial favour under the Antonines, when Commodus and many of the freedmen of Caesar's House were initiated, that first suggested to its votaries the possibility of using it as an instrument of government; and henceforth its fortunes were bound up with those of the still Pagan State. Its strictly monarchical doctrine, using the adjective in its ancient rather than in its modern connotation, must have always endeared it to the emperors, who were beginning to see clearly that in a *quasi*-Oriental despotism lay the only chance of salvation for the Roman Empire. Its relations with Mazdeism in the strict form which this last assumed after the religious reforms of the Sassanian Shahs have never been elucidated, and M. Cumont seems to rely too much upon the later Avestic literature to explain everything that is obscure in the religion of Mithras. If we imagine, as there is reason to do, that Western Mithraism was looked upon by the Sassanian reformers as a dangerous heresy, the Roman

Emperors would have an additional reason for supporting it; and it is significant that it was exactly those rulers whose wars against the Persians were most successful who seem to have most favoured the worship of the Persian god. When Trajan conquered Dacia, the great province between the Carpathians and the Danube now represented by Hungary and Romania, he colonized it by a great mass of settlers from every part of the Roman Empire, including therein many Orientals who brought with them into their new home the worship of their Syrian and Asiatic gods. It was hence an excellent field for the culture of a universal and syncretic religion such as that of Mithras, and the great number of Mithraea whose remains have been found in that province, show that this religion must have received hearty encouragement from the Imperial Court. From its geographical position, Dacia formed an effective counterpoise to the growing influence upon Roman policy of the Eastern provinces, and it might have proved a valuable outpost for a religion which was always looked upon with hostility by the Greek-speaking subjects of Rome. Unfortunately, however, a religion which allies itself with the State must suffer from its ally's reverses as well as profit by its good fortunes, and so the Mithraists found. When the *[Israelite-]* Gothic invasion desolated Dacia, and especially when Valerian's disaster enabled the *[Israelite-]* Goths to gain a footing there which not even the military genius of Claudius could loosen, Mithraism received a blow which was ultimately to prove fatal. The abandonment of Dacia to the *[Israelite-]* Goths and *[Israelite-]* Vandals by Aurelian in 255 A.D., led to its replanting by a race whose faces were turned more to Constantinople than to Rome, and who were before long to be converted to Christianity *en masse*. Diocletian and his colleagues did what they could to restore the balance by proclaiming, as has been said above, the 'unconquered' Mithras the protector of their empire at the great city which is now the capital of the Austrian Empire; but the accession of Constantine and his alliance with the Christian Church some twenty years later, definitely turned the scale against the last god of Paganism." *[words in brackets mine]*