

CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN THE KELTS

The elder human ancestors of Europe begin in the dawn of remote prehistory. They provided the base upon which subsequent lines were built. Those ancient people did not suddenly disappear to be replaced by immigrating tribes. On the contrary, immigrants interbred and blended with the natives to produce other racial stock. One cannot exactly pinpoint the origins of European people, either in space or in time, although certain innovative episodes can be demonstrated. The threads of biology and culture produced transitions that, while barely perceptible in the archeological record, caused sudden replacement of old cultures.

The accumulation of archeological data over the past hundred years shows how the people of paleolithic and neolithic Europe were influenced by social developments in the Near East. The farming communities of Çatal Hüyük and the Anatolian regions spread their knowledge in ever widening arcs rippling through the hinterlands of Europe.

The origin of farming in Anatolia speaks of two important sources for what we now recognize as civilization. The geographical source is near the center of the original Adamic blood lines. The temporal source is demonstrated by the need to engage in intensive farming where, at one time, the earth was more bountiful. Meteorological changes were forcing man to new "civilized" techniques. The construction of buildings at Çatal Hüyük, with clay walls replicating wood panels, shows that the people were clinging to the memory of a wooded environment that had since become arid.

It is now believed that farming was brought into Central Europe by immigrants, although those people cannot be positively identified. Once begun this influence spread widely and rapidly. The immigrants brought with them not only agriculture but also new inventions in pottery and polished stone tools. They also brought a knowledge of wooden structures. There is abundant evidence from Czechoslovakia and the Low Countries that the people of the fifth to fourth millennia BC built strong, timber-framed houses with sturdy ridged roofs. Although the details of the structures, the pottery, and the tools were different from those of the Near East and Anatolia, the influence of the immigrant populations is evident^{TC}. Timber-framed houses with wood motifs certainly were known in the regions of the Near East before the great meteorological changes created those arid conditions.

Early farming communities of Europe do not display evidence for special chieftain houses, nor shrines, nor temples. This lack of cultural differentiation follows the social patterns displayed at Çatal Hüyük. Although the regular arrangement of houses in a community of several hundred people shows some form of social organization there was no distinct ruling or priestly class. On the other hand, the technological advances in pottery and tools could come about only by specialists

who devoted themselves to particular tasks. As the cultures acquired metal-working, specialist knowledge intensified. Individuals learned to mine and smelt ores while others learned how to refine, mold and smith the metals. By the middle of the third millennium BC copper-working had spread well into central Europe.

A millennium later, bronze-working had penetrated into virtually all regions of Europe.

Recent studies indicate that this period saw the immigration of two successive groups of people. The first were the so-called Bell Beaker folk, known for their distinctive drinking vessels. They brought with them new archer's equipment, including flint-tipped arrows and a stone arm-bracer to absorb the rebound of the bow-string. Small metal tanged daggers are occasionally found associated with their archeological sites. The second group brought the perforated stone battle-axe together with metal daggers and personal ornaments. The common form of burial was of individuals, accompanied by utensils of daily life, under a circular barrow or earthen mound. This same period saw the introduction of copper axe-heads of design similar to the stone axes.

These immigrations appear to have provided a nucleus from which later grew the warrior aristocratic elements. Their introduction of copper and bronze technology ended the simple self-sufficient farming life of the neolithic cultures. Philological studies coordinated with archeology now suggests that the battle-axe people were the first migrating waves of Indo-European speaking groups.

During this period, into the middle of the second millennium BC, a disparity in grave furniture between ordinary folk and aristocratic elements first appears. An aristocracy was beginning to form founded on immigrant populations, although it did not display great differences from the common folk.

Toward the end of the second millennium there was a wide-spread cultural disruption throughout Europe. This disruption corresponded to the great disruptions of the Near East, at the time of, or shortly after, the Exodus under Moses. The great Mycenaean civilization was destroyed with dramatic changes taking place in the political alignments of Mesopotamia and Syria. Out of these cultural disruptions appeared the Urnfield people of Europe, regarded by modern scholars as "proto-Keltic." The Urnfield name derives from the custom of cremation and burial of the body ashes in urns in cemeteries.

Extensive use of bronze was made by these people. Their household utensils show improvements in the quality of cooking and eating. Personal adornments of bronze became more sophisticated. Metal farming tools, such as sickles, and metal carpenter's tools become more abundant; there was a general improvement in wood-working technology. All of these advances were passed on down to the later Keltic people as an increase in the standard of living.

Briefly, this was the background for the creation of a new and distinctive group of people known to us as the Kelts. They spread over wide regions of Europe, beginning from a heartland in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Switzerland and neighboring areas of southern Germany during the sixth century BC -- the geographical locale which saw the immigration of the Kimmeri and movements of the Kimbri.

This new culture was discovered in 1846 when Georg Ramsauer, director of the

Hallstatt state mines on the shores of Lake Halstatt in Austria, began to excavate the graves of a prehistoric cemetery where a flourishing community had buried their dead in the first half of the first millennium BC. In 1876 the Vienna Academy of Sciences began to excavate a nearby prehistoric salt mine. Both the cemetery and the mine provided outstanding evidence for a culture which had lived and worked in the area roughly between 1100 and 400 BC. The salt of the mine had preserved the common everyday articles of the workers: their protective clothing, the leather sacks in which they carried the salt, and their wooden implements. Detailed evaluation of the site showed four distinct phases of culture. Halstatt A and B lasted until about 700 BC. Halstatt C falls within the seventh century. This phase saw a dramatic change with the introduction of iron. Halstatt D spanned the sixth and extended into the fifth century BC. Only the last two phases, with the appearance of iron, are known commonly among archaeologists as the Hallstatt culture; the first two phases are identified with the previous Urnfield culture.

Meanwhile other important discoveries were being made at La Tene on the banks of Lake Neuchatel in Switzerland. At the northeastern end, where the River Thielle flows into the lake, a drought in 1858 lowered the water level, revealing rows of blackened timbers projecting from the mud. Museum authorities in Zurich immediately dispatched a team of archaeologists who discovered large quantities of Iron Age metalwork including swords in their decorated sheaths, spears, shield bosses, horse gear, tools of all kinds, together with ornaments, coins, and numerous other objects. Study of these artifacts revealed three different phases called La Tene I, II, and III. The La Tene period lasted from the late fifth century BC to the time of the Romans, circa 100 BC.

Both the later Hallstatt and La Tene cultures were eventually recognized as Keltic. Together they provide evidence for the evolution of a culture that spanned nearly six hundred years. They demonstrate clearly that prior to 700 BC there was little disparity in wealth between leaders and the common people. An aristocracy had not yet developed into major cultural recognition. Not until the seventh century, coincident with the introduction of iron, did a distinct aristocracy emerge.

At the beginning of the Halstatt period, (circa 700 BC), there was a reversion from cremation to inhumation in timber burial chambers. This might have resulted simply from a change in emphasis of funerary ritual, as had occurred at the beginning of the Urnfield period -- perhaps a return to an older tradition. There is further evidence, however, which strongly suggests that it was prompted, in part at least, by external influences. This evidence consists principally of bronze harness mounts and horse-bits which have been found in Eastern and Central Europe, but less common further west, as in Glamorganshire. Most finds date from the eighth and seventh centuries BC, and thus overlap with the beginning of the Halstatt-Keltic culture. Parallels to this horse-gear may be identified in the steppes of southern Russia, particularly in a culture which are convincingly identified with that of the Kimmerians who appear to have been pushed westward by the Scythians. Further support for a derivation from southern Russia is provided by the adoption by early Keltic chieftains of wagon burial, a practice whose origins may be traced in the steppes during the second millennium BC. The evidence shows that aristocratic elements entered

central Europe to dominate certain groups of late Urnfield peoples. The impetus which this provided is documented archeologically by the beginnings of the Halstatt culture. And so the end of the Bronze Age in Central Europe is marked, as it began, by the arrival and absorption of peoples who had moved westward from their homeland on the steppes of southern Russia^{TC}.

Evidence for the early Halstatt phase, dating from the beginning of the seventh century, is found in the Upper Danube region, in Upper Austria and Bavaria, and in Bohemia. This appears to be the heartland of what we now identify as the Keltic people. From this region they eventually spread into the Iberian peninsula, the British Isles, all of France, western Germany, into Italy, Czechoslovakia, down into the Balkans, and back into Asia Minor. The possession of iron weapons and tools was a powerful aid to their settlement in those varied lands. Iron provided efficient weapons in large quantities to warrior chieftains and their armies.

The richest graves were found in the "Keltic" heartland. As this new influence spread throughout Europe the richness of the graves diminished, suggesting that the aristocratic blood was diluting^{CW}.

The availability of iron tools meant that new territory could be cleared for farming, which itself may have become more productive. This in turn may have contributed to an increase in population, always conducive to social instability and aggression. The infusion of a new aristocratic element may have provided the final stimulus (for the Keltic dispersions). Descendants of late Urnfield chieftains appear to have been receptive to the example of the newcomers, for among later Urnfield burials there is evidence of richly furnished cremation burials, indicative of high status^{TC}.

Thus we see that a new blood of aristocrats began to infuse the people of Europe in the last days of the eighth century BC. Although that blood has been identified with the Kimmerians we cannot neglect the possibility that aristocratic elements from other regions were also part of this infusion. They brought with them the knowledge of iron which permitted new techniques in both warfare and farming to create a new breed of people that spread throughout Europe.

The location of Hallstatt as the center of this new breed may not have been accidental. Salt was a precious commodity desired by people everywhere. Wide-spread trading and commerce between all regions of Europe and the Near East guaranteed that they would know of each other. The tribes of Europe could not have been ignorant of the sources of commodities from the Mediterranean, including Syria and Palestine, nor could the people of Palestine and Syria be totally ignorant of the source of amber along the Elbe and Oder rivers, of tin in England, and of iron in eastern Europe. The numerous amphorae of Greek origin are indicative of the wide-spread and heavy traffic between the two regions. It would have been natural for migrating people to be attracted to those regions most familiar from the tales of travelers. The ease of movement along river valleys may have determined their routes of travel. The Danube was an excellent choice.

Our kindergarten views of a savage and uncivilized people living in the hinterlands of Europe leaves us poorly prepared for a solid evaluation of those days. Although they engaged in human sacrifice and hung the heads of their victims of war around the necks of their horses and upon their housepoles we truly fail to perceive

them in the depth of their culture. The classical authors of Rome many times contributed to such foolish attitudes.

The Kelts practiced improved methods of farming, with enclosed cattle grazing, not much different from farming methods two millennia later. They knew advanced techniques in weaving with spindle whorls and loom weights. Numerous artifacts from their houses shows the advanced state of their home life. According to Timagenes, a writer in the reign of Augustus,

... the Gauls are all exceedingly careful of cleanliness and neatness, nor in all the country, and most especially in Aquitania, could any man or woman, however poor, be seen either dirty or ragged.

Although the record of the classical writers is sparse Pliny reported on the refinements of their personal care. He stated that they had invented a special soap for personal bathing, special ointment to improve the complexion of the woman, and fine perfumes. Other writers described refined toilette devices. Although Julius Caesar referred to them as "those trousered barbarians" other writers described the gracefulness of the female dress and the personal ornaments of both sexes. Typical of a more contemptuous view expressed by the Romans is that of Ammianus Marcellinus:

Nearly all of the Gauls are of a lofty stature, fair and of ruddy complexion. They are terrible from the sternness of their eyes, very quarrelsome, and of great pride and insolence. A whole group of foreigners would not be able to withstand a single Gaul if he called his wife to his assistance, who is usually very strong and with blue eyes; especially when, swelling her neck, gnashing her teeth, and brandishing her sallow arms of enormous size, she begins to strike blows mingled with kicks, as if they were so many missiles sent from the string of a catapult.

Note the description of their ruddy (red) complexion.

Obviously the description is exaggerated to suit an audience which was in fear of those northern and generally unknown tribes. However it finds parallel with Dio Cassius's portrait of Boudicca, queen of the Iceni tribe of eastern Britain in the first century AD:

She was huge of frame, terrifying in aspect, and with a harsh voice. A great mass of bright red hair fell to her knees; she wore a great twisted golden torc, and a tunic of many colors over which was a thick mantle, fastened by a brooch. Now she grasped a spear, to strike fear into all who watched her.

The high social status of Keltic women is attested, not only by the Roman writers but also by archeological remains and by the folk tales of the Irish. An

important site in Burgundy contained the burial of a young woman about thirty years of age who was accorded all the honor of a chieftain through rich grave accouterments. In the stories of early Irish history Maeve (Medb) was the queen and ruler of Connaught, western Ireland; her consort Ailill played a subservient role.

The outstanding bravery and courage of the Kelts led to their reputation as fierce fighters. As Aristotle wrote:

We have no word for the man who is excessively fearless; perhaps one may call such a man mad or bereft of feeling, who fears nothing, neither earthquakes or waves, as they say of the Kelts.

The ancient world recruited Keltic warriors into their armies. The Kelts first immigrated back into Asia Minor through invitation of the king of Bythnia; some 20,000 of them served under his command. Antigonus Gonatas employed Keltic mercenaries in his army, although he was defeated in 277 BC by Pyrrhus, king of Epirus. Alexander the Great had to undertake campaigns in Bulgaria in 335 BC as the result of Keltic invasions. Later they came to him to arrange terms of peace. Egyptian kings also used them as mercenaries. These examples show the high reputation of the Kelts for their fierce fighting spirit.

It is now believed by some Keltic experts that writing was known to the later Druid priest class but no evidence has been found in any of the grave sites which would demonstrate that the Kelts were a literate people. Knowledge of writing among the Druids is demonstrated by the remarkable bronze calendar of Coligny dating to the first century BC. The surviving fragments cover a five-year period but some scholars believe it originally covered a 19-year lunar cycle. Although written in Roman letters it is entirely Keltic in concept and language. On the other hand the Druids were against general literacy. They believed that writing for the common masses detracted from the development of the mind.

The advanced oral methods of the Kelts were striking to all Roman writers and historians. Both classical and medieval scholars knew them as grand masters of eloquence. Individual Kelts in Ireland and Wales, into this century, deplored the loss of the elevated oral methods among their people. Cato in the second century BC was as much impressed with their eloquence as he was with their personal bravery at war. Diodorus Siculus in the following century commented on the succinct and figurative nature of their speech with the use of allusion, hyperbole and grandiloquent language. One Latin panegyric of unknown source, and addressed to Constantine the Great, portrays a Gaulish prince of the tribe of Aedui pleading for his countrymen against the invader Ariovistus as "the Aeduan prince, haranguing the Senate, leaning on his shield." A number of ancient Gaulic orators are known to us by name. The Romans were anxious to employ them as tutors to their sons. Formal courses of instruction conducted by the Druids in the training of their successors lasted for some twenty years. In spite of the lack of books their instruction included the stars and the motion of the planets, the size of the universe and the earth, the nature and greatness of the earth, the power and majesty of the gods, and other subjects in natural and moral philosophy. They believed in the immortality of the soul.

Numerous Roman authors commented on their depth of learning. Pliny, in his *Natural History* of 77 AD, said that it "almost seems she (Britain) exported the (Druidic) cult to the Persians." Dio Chrysostom compared the Druids to the Brahmans of India and the Magi of Persia. St. Clement of Alexandria, circa 200 AD, stated that Pythagorus, the ancient Greek mathematician and philosopher, was a hearer of the Galatai and the Brahmans.

According to Pythagorus the Druids and the Magi had studied their philosophy long before the Greeks. Hippolytus in the third century AD said the Druids used Pythagorean methods in the reckoning of their prophecies. He did not mean that the Druids learned Pythagorean methods but that they used methods later taught by Pythagorus. Iamblichus in his *Life of Pythagorus* states that Pythagorus was acquainted with the Keltic mysteries. Valerius Maximus said, "...what those trousered barbarians believed is the very faith of Pythagorus himself." Sotion referred to them as the "Holy Ones." The Greeks used the word *semnotheoi* for the Druids; literally it means "revered gods^{TD}."

Popular opinion of early Christian writers agreed that the Druids did not actively resist the spread of Christianity. Richard Broughton, a Catholic historian, thought the Druids supported Christian missionaries and that Druidic teachings greatly facilitated the conversion of Britain. Early Christian scholars believed the Druids, with their arcane knowledge, were able to anticipate and interpret events of Jesus' nativity. They were alarmed by the portents of the Crucifixion and, being in touch with Rome, they soon understood what had happened. They knew from the phenomenon of natural disturbances at the time that the devils then on the loose had been overcome.

These attributes of Keltic culture cannot be neglected in any honest appraisal of those people. They had a refined social order; pictures of raw barbarism and savagery are not justified.

From inscriptions in Asia Minor it is now known that the Galatae met every five years in tribal assemblies at Ancyra where they held religious festivals together with gymnastics and sports. These traditions have come down to us through the Greek Olympics, although we no longer remember or recognize the religious ties. At these tribal meetings the Galatae settled tribal differences and elected leaders.

Their French kinsmen, the Gauls, held yearly tribal meetings at Chartres where they also observed religious ceremonies together with amusements and games. Here their tribal differences were adjudicated by the Druid priests.

In Ireland the Keltic tribes assembled every three years at Tara, the traditional center of ancient Irish kingship. Their meetings were similar to those of the Galatae and the Gauls with religious observance, games and amusements. Again business among the tribes was conducted at this conclave. This was a solemn assembly for the Irish Kelts. During this period there was universal amnesty; all indebtedness was forgiven and all criminals were released from imprisonment. But woe to any who should break the solemn sanctity of the period; such an individual was severely punished. These assemblies were held on a regular basis until the sixth century AD^{SIR}.

The assemblies of the Keltic people followed the same pattern as those of the Hebrew tribes prior to the organization of the kingdom under Saul. They would gather

on a regular basis to conduct business among the tribes and to adjudicate their differences. They gathered at Shiloh where they set up the tabernacle and the ark of the covenant, Josh 18:1, Judgs 18:31, Jer 7:12.

This brief outline of the origin and culture of the Kelts cannot encompass many aspects of their history. Numerous works have been published on the Kelts; the interested reader can search those for himself. My intent is to show that they were a people whose origins lie buried in previous ancestral stock but that their culture was stimulated by the infusion of aristocratic blood around the end of the eighth and well into the seventh century BC. They created a mighty race which fathered many of the modern people of Europe.

One of the problems which afflicts a study of this kind is the sharp boundary normally understood between the Keltic and Teutonic people. Recent scholarly work has shown that this boundary is not nearly as clearcut as previously thought. Julius Caesar classified all peoples living on the northern side of the Rhine as "Teutonic" but his designation was one of military convenience rather than of cultural differentiation. The word "Teutonic," a designation for the Germanic people, is obviously derived from *Teutone*, a name for a Keltic tribe. Caesar identified both the Kimbri and the Teutones as Germanic but he was forced into this classification by his geographical assignments. The word *Teutone* derives from the Keltic *tuath* meaning the common people, or a tribe. The personal names of all the Kimbri leaders were purely Keltic, as were those of the Teutones; therefore we must believe both groups were Keltic. Even the word German is thought to be of Keltic origin. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at the end of the first century BC, says that the parts of Keltica lying beyond the Rhine were known as Germania. It is believed that a tribe known as the Germani was Keltic. Much of this confusion was due to the cross-trading and intermarriage between the Keltic and Teutonic tribes in the region of the Rhine. There was a blurring and blending of people in that region which Caesar neatly cleared for his convenience by his artificial boundary. Undoubtedly there were people who could be rigidly classified as Teutonic; their languages show considerable difference from the Keltic tongues. But linguists today detect many connections between the two, much more so than can be claimed for people who merely traded with one another.

We come now to examination of the names of the Keltic people. The Greeks knew them as the *Keltoi*.

The Romans called them the *Galli*. Both Greeks and Romans referred to them also as *Gallati*.

The geographical distribution of the *Galli/Gallati* names covers the entire range of Europe from Spain to Asia Minor. The former province of Spain called *Galiccia* was known to the Romans as *Gallaeci*. The Keltic immigrants from Europe into Asia Minor were known as *Galatae*. The Apostle Paul later addressed letters to them which we know in our Bible as the *Book of Galatians*. In their later debased worship of Cybele, the Galatians created a class of emasculated priesthood called the *Galli*. The heart of the Keltic lands was in *Gaul*, modern France. The name is still used widely and shows in surnames, such as Charles de *Gaulle*, former Prime Minister of France. Some Keltic tribes settled in the Po river valley in Roman times; the Romans referred to the district as *Gallia Cisalpina*, the Gauls this side of the Alps,

to distinguish them from *Gallia* Transalpina, the Gaul on the other side of the Alps. The *Galata* section of Istanbul, Turkey carries a reminder of the Kelts, as does the city of *Galati* and *Galati* province in Rumania. The names of *Galitina*, *Galitone*, and *Gallipoli* in the heel of the Italian boot all reflect Celtic origins. The *Galicja* region of east central Europe northeast of the Carpathian Mountains also shows the Celtic influence.

The primary form in these names is *Gaul*. The *Galati* and *Keltoi* names are inflections of the basic root word, (with a Greek "G" to "K" shift).

If the Iberian and Kimmerian names could easily be identified in Hebrew verb roots, can the *Gaul*, *Galli*, *Keltoi*, and *Galati*?

*Ga'al*¹³⁵⁰ is a Hebrew verb root which means "to be redeemed." It is used extensively in the Bible. For individuals redeemed from death see Hos 13:14 (*ega'aleem* = "I shall redeem them"); for individuals redeemed by God, Lam 3:58 (*ga'alta* = "thou hast redeemed"); for Israel redeemed from Egyptian bondage, Exod 6:6 (*ga'altee* = "I will redeem"); for those redeemed from exile, Isa 44:22 (*ga'altenah* = "I have redeemed thee").

Ga'alee (Roman *Galli* as the inhabitants of Gaul) is the singular female imperative of the Kal = "Redeemed!"

Ga'alt, from which the Kelt form probably derives, is the singular female second person of the past tense, literally = "you were redeemed."

The first person singular past tense is *ga'altee*, literally "I was redeemed."

I know that my redeemer lives, and in the last days he shall upon the earth, Job 19:25.

The word is *go-lee*, or in a slight change of vowel intonation, *ga'alee*. God was redeeming his people.

We come now to one of the most intriguing passages in the Bible, that of Isaiah

9:

But there will be no gloom for her that was in anguish. In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali. But in the latter days he will make glorious the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations.

As we saw earlier, Zebulun and Naphtali were tribes in northern Israel, just inland from Asher. They were the first to fall to Assyrian conquests, around 845 BC, and probably were the first contribution to dispersion of the Iberi tribes. The date usually assigned to this passage is 735 BC because Isaiah had to be writing some time after that event.

The question before us concerns the phrases "*the way of the sea*," "*make glorious*," "*the land beyond the Jordan*," and "*Galilee of the nations*." Also, this is an introduction to a promise on the Messiah.

The "way of the sea" could not be inland, in an easterly direction; it had to be in a westerly direction. To make sense of the passage commentators take this to mean

"*the highway from Damascus to the sea*," thus making it mean the route by which the Assyrian invaders came marching. This would take their route out to the Mediterranean, and then south along the "Phoenician" coast to the tribal territories. Why they would take such circuitous route across difficult mountains is not explained; they could travel by much easier path straight across the land. Also, such view fails to consider the "latter times" and making this activity "glorious." The phrase "latter days" or "latter times" is always used in biblical prophecy to mean the far future, when the earth is to be rejuvenated. The context of the Messiah also show that the description is for the far future.

Therefore, it does not seem reasonable that "the land beyond the Jordan" could mean the tribes of Manasseh, Gad, or Reuben then living to the east of the Jordan. This is the view taken by all commentators. Furthermore, "Galilee of the nations" is a most strange remark. The Hebrew word translated "nations" is *go'im*¹⁴⁷¹, and almost always is understood to mean Gentiles, all those people who were not Israelites. Who could possibly be the "Galilee of the gentile nations?"

How profoundly enlightening it would be if a slight error was made on the name of Galilee.

In the Hebrew Masoretic text Galilee is spelled literally, = *G'LL*, where the "E" is the long "ee." The word "redeemed" is spelled literally = *G'AL*. If we would now engage in a simple emendation, as the scholars love to call it when they alter the text to make sense according to their views, we would propose that some scribe mistook the *aleph* "A" for a *lamed* "L" with a close *yod* "jot." This would be a very easy mistake, and quite simple to execute.

Then the passage would read "Ga'alee" of the nations.

On the other hand, perhaps he had a text before him which he did not understand. What could anyone mean by "Gaul of the nations?" There was no such thing. Nevermind that Galilee of the nations had almost equal mystery. At least the emendation made sense in the context of known words for his day.

There may be a third possibility. If, by chance, the word was mistaken when dictated by Melchizedek to some early Jewish scribe, and he wrote Galilee for Ga'ulee, it would alter a hundred human generations of understanding.

What simplicity for such profound meaning!

Who were the Celtic/Gaulic people?

The REDEEMED of the nations!