

DAVID'S GREATER SON

By
Howard B. Rand



**Contact us for details
of audio tapes and
articles by:-**

Dr. Wesley A. Swift

Rev. Dr. Bertrand Comparet, A. B., J. D.

Rev. William Gale

Captain K. R. McKilliam

Pastor Don Campbell



David's Greater Son

**By
Howard B. Rand**

JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT A JEW - AS JEWS ARE NOW DEFINED

Many have been led to believe that our Saviour Jesus Christ is of the race we designate as Jews today. Because of this conception, when the activities of certain Jews and their organizations are criticized, the immediate rejoinder is, "You know Jesus was a Jew and you must be good to the Jews, for a curse is pronounced upon those who are not."

Our Saviour was not a Jew, as Jews are now defined, and it is imperative that every Christian understand this. It is also important to know that the blessings under the covenant made with Abraham only apply to those among his descendants who conform with the covenant terms. By Jewry's rejection of Jesus Christ as their Messiah, they deliberately repudiated the covenant and became His enemies, as Jesus Himself declared.

This booklet presents irrefutable evidence proving that Jesus Christ, while He was not a Jew, was, nevertheless, of the line of Abraham, an Israelite of the seed of David, born of the Virgin Mary. Through Him, as both Redeemer and Saviour, the covenant promise will be brought to its full fruition: "In thee and in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed."

DAVID'S GREATER SON

**By
Howard B. Rand**

When an examination of the genealogy of a given individual or family is undertaken, the researcher is very careful to distinguish between the distinct and divergent branches of the family tree. A genealogist who is

not meticulous in this respect would soon find his research completely discredited.

However, when an examination is made of the genealogical facts contained in the Scriptures, Christians are notorious for their carelessness in tracing and properly identifying the ancestry of Biblical persons by establishing lines of descent. Reviewing the conclusions at which some theologians have arrived, which have been accepted as genuine ethnological findings in regard to the races and their divisions dealt with in the Scriptures, we are confronted with a veritable hodgepodge of inaccuracies.

Jesus Was Not a Jew

It is our purpose here to deal with the ancestry of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom the Bible declares was of the seed of David. When referring to Jesus Christ, the statement is in-variably made that He was a Jew. But was He? How many who make this assertion have actually examined the family tree of Judah, the son of Jacob?

Briefly stated, Jacob had twelve sons, one of whom was named Judah. It is a rewarding study to investigate the ancestral background of each of the twelve sons of Jacob, but in order to confine this study to tracing the ancestry of our Lord, we will concern ourselves with Judah only and with the many branches of the family tree of the tribe of Judah.

In the first place, up to the time of Jacob, the father of Judah, no one was called a Jew. Adam was not a Jew, nor Seth (the appointed seed — Gen. 4: 25), nor Noah, nor Abraham. Abraham was a Hebrew, quite true (Gen. 14: 13), but he was not a Jew.

Judah, son of Jacob, was not a Jew, but he was of Hebrew descent and an Israelite. Judah was a Hebrew because he was of the line of Heber, who was one of Abraham's great grandfathers (five generations before Abraham); he was an Israelite because he was the son of Jacob, who was the first Israelite (Gen. 32: 28).

The Sons of Judah

Judah had three sons by his wife Shuah, who was a Canaanite. Their names were Er, Onan and Shelah. Er and Onan were wicked and died, having had no children, leaving the remaining son, Shelah, whose mother was of Canaanitish ancestry.

After Shuah's death, Judah became the father of two sons by his daughter-in-law Tamar, the widow of Er, under deceptive circumstances (see Genesis 38). These two sons were named Zarah and Pharez, and they were twins. They were racially pure in their descent, even though they were born out of wedlock.

The descendants of Zarah (sometimes spelled Zerah) formed a distinct branch of the line of Judah. Professor C. A. L. Totten engaged in extensive research in regard to the development and migrations of the Israel peoples and he made this statement:

"It is patent from the sacred chronicles that Zarah had as yet no children when he went down into Egypt with his grandfather Jacob (Gen. 46: 12), although his twin brother, Pharez, was accompanied by two, Hezron and Hamul, who are accordingly enumerated among 'the seventy souls' who, 'besides his son's wives' (v. 26), settled in the land of Goshen with the Patriarch." (From *The Secret of History*.¹)

The descendants of Zarah, both sons and grandsons, are referred to in I Chronicles 2: 6-8 and I Kings 4: 30-31. Solomon's wisdom is said to have exceeded the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt:

"For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite [i.e., Zerahite], and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol: and his fame was in all nations round about." (I Kings 4: 31.)

There is a lack of clarity in the Biblical listing of the men whose names are given and their relationship to Zarah, the head of that royal clan. It is conjectured that this was due, partly at least, to the fact of intense rivalry

between the twin princes of Judah: Pharez and Zarah. The upshot of it all was that the Zarah branch left Egypt long before the Exodus of the people of Israel from that land. This being so, the Bible allows the records of Zarah's line to lapse. Nevertheless, secular history picks up the story and supplies some very interesting information about the children of Zarah whose wisdom was exceeded only by that of Solomon.

In Volumes 4 and 5 of his compilations under the general title of ***Our Race Series***,² Professor Totten referred to the Chronicles of Ireland where he found confirmatory evidence concerning the part the descendants of Zarah played in colonizing all the shores of the Mediterranean Sea and as far west as the British Isles and Ireland. From his painstaking study of many sources of knowledge, he arrived at the following conclusions, which have never been successfully refuted:

"For if Darda, the Egyptian, son of Zarah, was Dardanus, the Egyptian founder of Troy, and if Chalcol was the Egyptian Cecrops, or Niul, and the contemporary founder of Athens and Thebes, and if Heman, the brother of Niul, was the likewise contemporary Egyptian Agenon who inherited Phoenicia, and if Mahol, the son of Zarah, and the father of these famous Egyptians, was Scytha, or Fenesia Farsa, the Egyptian ancestor of the Milesians, whose records, full and complete, enable us to blend the whole into one continuous recital down to the present day, surely we have means at hand in Trojan, Grecian and Milesian sources, to continue out the record of the Sacred Chronicles, and lend them greater reverence as we come to understand and prize them at their worth." (***Our Race Series, Vol. 4, p. 165.***)

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.

The descendants of Shelah, who were workers in fine linen (I Chron. 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 pro-genitors of the linen workers in Ireland in the Isles. Therefore, the descendants of Judah, through two

of his sons, Zarah and Shelah, pioneered in the work of colonization. The remaining son of Judah, Pharez, became the progenitor of the tribe of Judah which entered the Promised Land with the remainder of the tribes of Israel.

Tribe of Judah Divided

Later on, in Palestine, the tribe of Judah was divided into two houses — the House of Judah and the House of David. Thereafter the Bible does not confuse these two entities but recognizes them as separate divisions within the tribe of Judah. God selected one family line of the tribe of Judah to inherit the right to the sceptre. This had been promised to Judah when his father Jacob apportioned the blessings which were to govern the inheritance of each of his sons:

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." (Gen. 49: 10.) To David the Lord declared:

"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever." (II Sam. 7: 16.)

By this Divine selecting, the Royal House of David came into being, wherein the line of the sceptre was established. In no other branch of the tribe of Judah will it be found. Therefore, in order to be given the right to rule as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, and wield the sceptre, it was mandatory for Jesus Christ to be of the House of David. In the annunciation to His mother Mary, the Angel Gabriel confirmed this:

"And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." (Luke 1: 32.)

David could not be the forefather of Jesus unless the Lord was of Davidic descent through His mother Mary. Thus, the House of David was separated from the House of Judah and was established as a separate branch of the tribe of Judah. From that time forward the Bible deals with the descendants of David as entirely separated from the remainder of the

descendants of Judah. There are also specific prophecies, directly addressed to the House of David, which cannot be fulfilled in any other branch of the tribe of Judah. A careful study of the genealogical facts discloses that there are no Jews in the line of the House of David.

Westward Movements

Long before the House of Judah was carried captive to Babylon by King Nebuchadnezzar, Sennacherib had taken over 200,000 of that House into Assyrian captivity. This occurred at the time the House of Israel, the northern ten-tribed Kingdom, was taken captive into Assyria in 721 B.C. The Assyrian captives from Judah became the progenitors of the Jutlanders (Judahlanders) and some of their descendants migrated, in later years, to Scotland. They moved westward in the Great Trek after they left the land of their captors and they were not Jews.

All of these migratory movements were ever westward, toward the appointed place of which David had been told:

"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as before-time." (II Sam. 7: 10.)

This was a Divine provision for all of the Israel of God, not the Jews, and was to have its complete fulfillment in the latter days when modern Israel — the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples — took up their national abodes in fulfillment of what was stated by Moses:

"When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." (Deut. 32: 8.)

The Wonderers

There is one other offshoot of the tribe of Judah whose mention should not be over-looked as a matter of interest. At the outset of the Babylonian Captivity, which was to take the greater part of the southern Kingdom of

Judah to Babylon to reside there for seventy years, a company of Judahites forced the Prophet Jeremiah, and a few with him, to go down into Egypt against the prophet's advice. The 42nd chapter of Jeremiah's book tells about this group who were determined to leave Palestine:

"Saying, No; but we will go into the land of Egypt, where we shall see no war, nor hear the sound of the trumpet, nor have hunger of bread; and there will we dwell." (Jer. 42: 14.)

The prophet gave a message from the Lord to this "remnant of Judah" and it was contrary to what they had made up their minds to do:

"And now therefore hear the word of the Lord, ye remnant of Judah; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; If ye wholly set your faces to enter into Egypt, and go to sojourn there; Then it shall come to pass, that the sword, which ye feared, shall overtake you there in the land of Egypt, and the famine, whereof ye were afraid, shall follow close after you there in Egypt; and there ye shall die." (Jer. 42: 15-16.)

The men of that immediate generation did die in Egypt and their posterity came under the curse pronounced in verse 18:

"For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; As mine anger and my fury hath been poured forth upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem; so shall my fury be poured forth upon you, when ye shall enter into Egypt: and ye shall be an execration, and an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach; and ye shall see this place no more." (Jer. 42: 18.)

The descendants of that cursed generation who flouted the word of the Lord are today called Gypsies, but they are not Jews. The word "Gypsy" is derived from "Egypt" because, The Columbia Encyclopaedia states, it is thought that they came "from a certain Little Egypt." They have indeed been an execration and a reproach among all peoples. They have never returned to dwell in Palestine, but have wandered throughout all lands to this day.

Origin of the Jews

Thus far we have dealt with many branches of the tribe of Judah, one of the twelve tribes of Israel, without designating any of them as Jews. Whence, then, came the Jews?

Up to the time of the captivities, the Jews, as a people, had not yet come into being. The word first appears in the Bible in II Kings 16: 6, where it is translated from Yehudim; of the tribe of Judah, i.e., Judaites. The deportations of the northern Kingdom of Israel were beginning then as the result of the invasion of certain parts of the land by Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria (II Kings 15: 29). Approximately 130 years later, the deportation of the Southern Kingdom of Judah to Babylon took place.

We now assert unequivocally, as the result of a painstaking study of the genealogical tables and an analysis of the various branches of peoples who trace their ancestry back to Judah, that in one branch of the descendants of Judah alone — and in that instance as the result of a mutation of the bloodstream — will we find the Jews. The origin of the Jews does not in reality antedate the return from the Babylonian Captivity.

Three Houses

It will be helpful at this juncture to quote from the booklet entitled Palestine: *Center of World Intrigue*.³ Under the heading, "Use of Terms," invaluable information is given:

"It is well here, perhaps, to clarify distinctions which should always be made in the use of terms. Judah, as already pointed out, was one of the twelve sons of Jacob and, in this use of the term, it merely designates a man whose name was Judah. Later, the families and descendants of each of the twelve sons of Jacob bore the name of that son as a tribal distinction, so the posterity of Judah became known as the tribe of Judah; that is, the families or clan of Judah.

"David's father's house was one of the families of this tribe. In selecting David to be anointed King, God chose a family out of the tribe of Judah

to be separated from the clan of Judah and to become a Royal House which was to furnish rulers for His people.

The remaining families of the tribe of Judah became known later on as the House of Judah. Thus, we see that the tribe of Judah was divided into two houses: the House of David and the House of Judah.

"Three houses therefore emerged as the result of the selection, separation and organization of the descendants of Jacob. The ten tribed Kingdom, or House of Israel, consisted of ten tribes, each named after a son of Jacob. Levi, the priestly tribe, remained separate from all these houses, for men of this tribe were scattered throughout all Israel officiating in their priestly capacity among all the tribes.

"As will be shown later, Benjamin, one tribe of the House of Israel, was loaned to the House of David and, along with the House of Judah, remained loyal to the Throne of David when the rest of the House of Israel revolted, setting up a government of their own at Samaria. This occurred at the time of the division of the Kingdoms into the Northern Kingdom (House of Israel) and the Southern Kingdom (House of Judah) in 970 B.C." (Page 10.)

At the end of the seventy years of Babylonian Captivity, a remnant of the House of Judah returned to Palestine, with the tribe of Benjamin and some of the royal descendants of David, as well as a few of the tribe of Levi. This group constituted the Nation of the Jews, even though they were not all Jews. The Benjamites were a separate tribe in Israel and therefore not Jews. The Royal Seed were of the House of David and therefore not Jews. The priests were of the tribe of Levi.

After the return from Babylon, certain ones of the House of Judah, and some of the priests, intermarried with the inhabitants of the land and these intermarriages were severely condemned by both Ezra and Nehemiah (see Ezra 9 & 10; Nehemiah 13: 23-29). While there were other Gentile admixtures, these forbidden marriages were mainly contracted with Hittites, who had previously constituted an influential Canaanite empire but

whose power was largely lost when the Assyrian Empire came into prominence.

In time this merging of Judaites with the Hittites produced a distinct racial type called Jews today. In other words, the Jew as we know him is not of pure Israel stock but, through intermarriages in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, has the blood of the Hittites in his veins. This intermingling gave the Jew his dark complexion and perpetuated the Hittite physiognomy, fulfilling the prophecy given through Isaiah:

"For Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen: because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory. The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! For they have rewarded evil unto themselves." (Isa. 3: 8-9.)

The Septuagint translation is of special interest:

"Because Jerusalem is forsaken and Judea is fallen, therefore their tongues concur with their transgression. They disbelieve the things relating to the Lord. Because their glory is now humbled; and the shame of their countenance is risen up against them: their sin therefore, like the Sodomites, they proclaimed and openly avowed. Alas for their souls! Because they have counselled an evil counsel against themselves, saying, Let us bind the just one, for he is disagreeable to us; let them therefore eat the fruits of their deeds."

The far-reaching prophetic import of these words is now clearly understood, for the Just One whom they caused to be bound because His words were "disagreeable" to them was none other than Jesus Christ, who was their Messiah. The Jews forfeited their right to nationhood by delivering up Jesus to be crucified. When Pilate, the Roman, saw that he could do nothing with the Jews, he washed his hands of the matter, saying:

"I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it." (Matt. 27: 24.)

Pilate realized by that time that the out-come was inescapable:

"Then answered all the people [of Jewry], and said, His blood be on us, and on our children." (Matt. 27: 25.)

Thus, Isaiah's statement was fulfilled to the letter: "They have rewarded evil unto them-selves." Throughout the Christian Era, Jewry has attempted to reverse the verdict brought upon each generation of Jews by the deliberate acts of their forefathers, but without success. They have indeed eaten "the fruits of their deeds."

After Jewry became well established as to territory, culture and religion, there were further mutations of the bloodstream by racial movements. One took place about 125 B.C., when the nation of the Idumeans was absorbed by the Jews. Later, in the eighth century, the Khazars, a non-Semitic, Turko-Finn, Mongolian tribal people who, about the first century A.D., emigrated from Middle Asia to Eastern Europe, were converted to Judaism and were also absorbed by the Jews.

House of David Racially Pure

None of the House of David was involved in all this. The genealogical table of our Lord Jesus Christ clearly indicates this to be a true fact. Furthermore, the Bible emphasizes that our Lord was of the House of David — not of the House of Judah — and certainly not of the "mixed seed" represented in Jewry. Both Joseph and Mary were of the House of David. Luke stated:

"The angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary." (Luke 1: 26-27.)

The opening sentence of Matthew's Gospel states: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Thus, Matthew positively asserts that he is giving the genealogy of Jesus Christ. This, then, would be the ancestral line of Mary, the mother of Jesus. Luke, on the other hand, is just as definite in stating that he is giving the

genealogical line of Joseph, whose father was Heli (Luke 3: 23-38). We quote from the article entitled "Let the Truth Prevail," which was published in DESTINY for April 1958 (pp. 85-87):

We will concede, however, that two major problems arise for consideration in regard to Matthew's genealogical table and these must be resolved on the basis of all the evidence that can be brought to bear upon them. In concluding the list given, Matthew makes this statement:

'So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are four-teen generations.' (Matt. 1: 17.)

Here is a positive check and there is no doubt but that there was a special reason why Matthew was inspired by the Holy Spirit to summarize his findings in this manner. This becomes evident when we apply Matthew's check and discover that, in the listing which appears in our English translations of the Scriptures, there are indeed fourteen generations given in the first two groups, but only thirteen generations given in the third group.

Added to this is the problem presented when it is stated in the 16th verse of Matthew's Gospel that ' Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary,' whereas in Luke's Gospel it is stated that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was 'of Heli'; that is, Heli was Joseph's father. Obviously there is a discrepancy here.

"Let us look first at Luke's genealogical table. The Greek word *huios*, translated 'son,' is not only used to designate a direct son of the parent, but it has also been used to indicate immediate and near relatives. Therefore, where the English translation of Luke 3: 23 is given as 'the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli,' Biblical scholars contend it may be assumed that this should be 'Joseph, which was the son-in-law of Heli.' But they entirely overlook the fact that throughout this entire genealogical table giving the father of each person named, from Joseph to Adam, the word *huios* is not used once. Rather, the table reads: 'Joseph, which was of Heli,

which was of Matthat, which was of Levi, etc.' There-fore, since the word huios, which might be translated 'son-in-law,' does not appear at all with reference to Joseph's ancestry, the only correct reading of these verses would be that in each case father and son are given; that is, if Joseph was of Heli, then he was the son of Heli, just as it is true that Seth was of Adam because he was the son of Adam. We challenge any other handling of this account as illogical, irresponsible and deceptive.

Since Heli was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, we must next deal with Matthew's genealogical table where the wording appears: 'And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary . . . ' How did this discrepancy occur? Added to this is the necessity to determine why the third group includes only thirteen generations instead of fourteen as indicated in the next verse.

"All of this leads us to ask: Did Mary's husband and father both have the same name? Is it possible that a copyist of the original manuscript, having in his mind that Joseph was Mary's husband, as referred to in the 18th and 19th verses, inadvertently inserted the word 'husband' where the word 'father' should have been placed in the 16th verse? If this is so, the entire verse should read:

'And Jacob begat Joseph the father of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.'

This at once resolves the problems involved in regard to the genealogical tables given by Matthew and Luke, for Matthew's table is the genealogy of Jesus Christ, as he states, and Luke's is the genealogical line of Joseph, Mary's husband, as he states. There is no longer a discrepancy concerning the name of the father of Mary's husband, and, more important, we have the fourteen generations required for the third group as given in Matthew 1: 17. If it were correct to list Joseph as the husband of Mary in the 16th verse, there would be only thirteen generations in the third group, but if the Joseph listed is Mary's father, then there are fourteen generations."

For clarity's sake, we are reproducing here the table that accompanied the article en-titled "The Genealogy of Jesus the Messiah," which also appeared in DESTINY for April 1958 (pp. 91-94):

First Fourteen	Second Fourteen	Third Fourteen
"Abraham,	Solomon,	Shelathiel,
Isaac,	Rehoboam,	Zerubbabel,
Jacob,	Abijah,	Abiud,
Judah,	Asa,	Eliakim,
Pharez,	Jehoshaphat,	Azor,
Hezron,	Joram,	Zadoc,
Ram,	Uzziah,	Achim,
Amminadab,	Jotham,	Eliud,
Nahshon,	Ahaz,	Eleazar,
Salmon,	Hezekiah,	Matthan,
Boaz,	Manasseh,	Jacob,
Obed,	Amon,	Joseph,
Jesse,	Josiah,	Mary,
David.	Jeconiah.	Jesus."

This conclusively supports Matthew's summarizing statement in the 17th verse of the first chapter of his Gospel.

Therefore, having established the different branches and peoples descendant from Judah, it is preposterous to indiscriminately cross over from one branch to another. The Davidic line is separate and distinct from the other branches of the descendants of Judah and we repeat that there are no Jews in this line. Every one of the prophecies concerning the Messiah, by inference or by direct mention, refer to Him as of the House of David. The Prophet Isaiah informs us:

"There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots." (Isa. 11: 1.)

The Prophet Jeremiah declares:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called. THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." (Jer. 23: 5-6.)

As recorded by the Apostle John in the Book of Revelation, Jesus announced of Himself:

"I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." (Rev. 22: 16.)

There is no question but that Jesus Christ is of the House of David and, therefore, Jesus is not a Jew.

Religion of Jewry

This introduces a question that admittedly requires clarification. Why do we find, in the New Testament, that the disciples of the Lord who were Galileans (of the tribe of Benjamin), and our Lord Himself, are called Jews? Let us quote again from Palestine: Center of World Intrigue:

"The name designating the nation as the Nation of the Jews came into being following the return of a remnant of the House of Judah and the tribe of Benjamin from Babylonian Captivity where they had been taken by Nebuchadnezzar. This nation was so designated because it became the nation of the religion of the Jews. That is, the term Jew, in addition to designating a descendant of the forefather Judah, from then on applied to all, regardless of race, who adhered to the Jewish religion." (Pages 10-11.)

Therefore, the designation "Jew" not only applied to one of a certain race, but it also designated a kind of religious belief. Even as early as Esther's time, due to unusual events which had taken place in the Persian kingdom where she became queen, the statement is made concerning the Persians:

"And many of the people of the land became Jews; for the fear of the Jews fell upon them." (Esther 8: 17.)

Those Persians did not change their race, but they did change their religious practices and went into the Synagogue to worship. Thereafter they became known as Jews.

Accordingly, it is essential to recognize the fact that in the time of our Lord upon the earth, as well as in earlier days, the word Jew had a twofold application. While primarily it designated a racial type, it was also used to express a religious belief. All those who worshipped in the Synagogue were called Jews, regardless of their race. This was clearly brought out at the time of Pentecost, for it is stated in the Book of Acts:

"And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." (Acts 2: 5.)

Then, in the 9th to 11th verses of the same chapter, the nationality of those Jews is stated (even Arabians among them), showing clearly that racially they were not Jews but religiously they were devout men of the Jewish faith.

There was the occasion when Jesus went on His way to Galilee and passed through Samaria, stopping at a well to rest. A woman of Samaria came to use the well and Jesus asked her to give Him a drink of water. This astonished the woman and she inquired:

"How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." (John 4: 9.)

The Samaritan woman judged, either by His dress or deportment, that Jesus was a follower of Judaism. However, after He talked with her, she soon discovered that He actually had nothing in common with those she knew as Jews. In the course of His conversation with her, Jesus said, as translated in the King James Version:

"Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews." (John 4: 22.)

The Ferrar Fenton translation gives a more correct rendering:

"You pay homage without knowledge; we pay homage with knowledge: because the salvation comes from among the Judeans. The time will come, however, and is even now here, when the real worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth; because, in-deed, the Father desires such to be His worshippers." (John 4: 22-23.)

In other words, there was to be a complete change in the mode of the worship of God and this truly came about with the dawn of the Christian Era.

Paul Not a Jew

Only from the standpoint of his religion before his conversion could the Apostle Paul be called a Jew. He said of himself:

"I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." (Rom. 11: I.)

Speaking of his racial background, Paul declared he was "an Hebrew of the Hebrews," but in the category of ecclesiastical law, he was a Pharisee (Phil. 3: 5). By citizenship he was a free born Roman (Acts 22: 25-28) but, due to his religious affiliation, he declared himself to be a Jew (Acts 21: 39 I Acts 22: 3). Therefore, it was only because Paul, a Benjamite, had accepted the religion of the Jews that he could be designated as a Jew.

The Galileans

What was true of Paul, in regard to his religion, was also true of all but one of the disciples of our 'Lord. The exception was Judas Iscariot, who was Judas of Kerioth and therefore a Jew, not a Galilean. The name "Iscariot" is deduced to be from Ish Kerioth; that is, "a man of Kerioth," a town in the tribe of Judah (Joshua 15: 25). The other eleven were Galileans and there were no Jews, racially speaking, in Galilee.

It was Judas who betrayed Jesus and it was the Jews who fought against the Christians, persecuting them and driving them from Jerusalem — causing the early church to be scattered abroad. John tells us what developed during the ministry of Jesus:

"After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him." (John 7: 1.)

The inference is clear. Because the Benjamites were residing in Galilee, and were therefore the Galileans, it was safe for Jesus to sojourn there. Accordingly, Jesus confined His activities to that territory for the time being and kept away from Jewry. It was not until the hour of His crucifixion drew near that He set His face to go to Jerusalem and into the territory occupied by the Jews.

The willful ignorance of the Christian world concerning the distinction between one who is a Jew by race and one who is a Jew by religion has led to much confusion where the term Jew is used in the New Testament. When Peter denied that he was one of the disciples of Jesus at the time of our Lord's trial, he was told: "Thy speech betrayeth thee." Ferrar Fenton translates this: "For your dialect proves it plainly" (Matt. 26: 73).

Why did they say this of Peter? They could do so because Peter, although by religion a Jew, was not one racially, for he was a Galilean and of the tribe of Benjamin. His dialect would be that of a Galilean and therefore not Jewish. It was known in Jewry that the men of Galilee were the followers of Jesus. Consequently, at Jesus' trial, Peter, known to be a Galilean, was immediately accused of being one of His disciples.

The Light Bearers

Furthermore, contrary to the declarations of many present-day leaders in Christendom, the Jews were not responsible for giving Christianity to the world. The phrase, "Judeo-Christian heritage," continually used by modernists, is an absurd misnomer! Here again, a careful study of what is contained in the Scriptures discloses that it was the Galileans who became the disciples of our Lord and they were of the tribe of Benjamin.

They be-came the light bearers of the glad tidings of the Gospel and our Lord said of them:

"Ye are the light of the world." (Matt. 5: 14.)

The tribe of Benjamin belonged to the Northern Kingdom of Israel, but was loaned to the Southern Kingdom of Judah for David's sake. The account states:

"And unto his [David's] son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light always before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen me to put my name there." (I Kings 11: 36.)

Therefore, the tribe of Benjamin remained with the House of David at the time the Northern Kingdom revolted from the rule of that House. This was all providentially pre-arranged so that when Jesus came later on and selected His disciples, He did so from among the Galileans, or Benjamites, constituting them the first light bearers of the Gospel.

The Prophet Zechariah gave utterance to a cryptic prophecy in regard to the thirty pieces of silver for which Judas betrayed our Lord. The silver, it will be recalled, was cast into the Temple and the priests used it to purchase the potter's field. Zechariah's pronouncement was:

"Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands [i.e., the binders], that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel." (Zech. 11: 14.)

Following the betrayal of our Lord by Judas, and the persecutions which took place after His resurrection, the brotherhood that had bound the Jews (of Judah) and the Galileans (of Israel) together was indeed broken. Jesus told His disciples:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." (Luke 21: 20-22.)

History reveals that the Christians heeded this warning and none perished in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. However, the Prophet Jeremiah tells us it was those of the tribe of Benjamin who were to respond to the call:

"O ye children of Benjamin, gather your-selves to flee out of the midst of Jerusalem, and blow the trumpet in Tekoa, and set up a sign of fire in Beth-haccerem: for evil appeareth out of the north, and great destruction." (Jer. 6:1)

Thus, the Benjamites, the Galileans and the first members of the early Christian Church were one and the same classification of people. It is a gross departure from common sense to declare our Lord to be a Jew and it is also completely false to assert that He chose Jews to be His disciples — apart from Judas who betrayed Him. The Jews, as a race, rejected Jesus Christ then and they do so now. They were against His followers then and this is equally true today.

Only One Way

There is now a movement afoot to attempt to exonerate Jewry from all implication in the death of Jesus. But surely Peter and the disciples of our Lord had full knowledge concerning those who were guilty of bringing about His crucifixion. Addressing the Jews, Peter said:

"The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and de-sired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life, whom God bath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses." (Acts 3: 13-15.)

Then Peter told the Jews what they must do:

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you:

whom. the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 19-21.)

For Jewry there is — as there has always been — a way out and it lies in their acceptance of Jesus Christ as their Messiah — He who is great David's Greater Son. In this one fact alone the solution to the centuries of tribulation the Jewish people have had to endure will be found. If they would allow the saving grace of the Lord Jesus Christ to enter into their hearts, the difficulties and troubles they have conjured up for themselves would disappear, making it possible for them to live as good neighbors among their brethren in a genuine brotherhood of peace.

Notes

- 1) Out of print.
- 2) Out of print
- 3) Out of print



**"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the
Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
(Isaiah 2:3)."**

David's Greater Son - Howard B. Rand

THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE CHURCH

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

