

The Land of AM'RY
by: Jonathan Machtemes

note to the reader: Due to the nature of the task ahead of us, concerning OBRY, many of the proper nouns, many may be familiar with from the established translations, have been presented either in OBRY, (from left to right with their Strong's number), or phonetically based on the best possible rendering of the OBRY into English.

In the last article, "The Patriarchs, Their Livestock, the LAND", the burden of presenting the material, along with the coded OBRY, was obviously very heavy. If it seemed acceptable to just present the popular renderings of these proper nouns, that is what would have been done; however, besides the outright changing of various peoples and places, by nearly all translations, even the "phonetic" renderings are either based on the Masoretic or on factors entirely without any textual merit.

It is this author's hope that this continual insistence on either the true source words, (or at least close phonetic renderings), will lead to a wider degree of dissatisfaction with all of the dominant translations based on either a Masoretic or Greek dictation of proper nouns.

An Interesting "coincidence"

I once called a Japanese, "Asian", which they didn't like very much. They said, "There are lots of Asians. I'm not not Indian or Iraqi. I'm from Japan." This specificity of location and race is a point of contention for many: most, in fact. I understand, given the diverse nature of peoples from one so-called "continent". Even Europe, where it's said is the ancestral home of my people, Germans, there is a wide diversity there between Swedes and Spaniards. A Slav would not care to be called a Celt and vice-versa. But to identify a people with a land is necessary. Categorization is just a tool for specificity in identification. It's what separates the Indians from the Indians, the Georgians from the Georgians, and the Canaanites from the Palestinians.

Let's take a hypothetical scenario, (which has, in fact, happened). There's a land in which 10 different kinds of peoples live. A couple of these people have relatives that traveled abroad and founded places with the same name as where they were from. Let's call one of these people the "Whos". If a merchant wanted his ship to sail to the land of the "Who" and buy 3 tons of sugar, but didn't specify to his skipper which "Who", he could have a very bad year. One "Who" people live in the land of "Red", named after another people there, because of their proliferation and early trading. The other "Who" live in the land of "Blue", also named for a certain people. Now, the merchant can command, "Go to the land of Red, to the people of Who." This will then get his ship to the right place.

So, even though I'm a Hoosier, in a broader sense, I am American, as that's the name of the broader land I live in. If I want to receive my mail, say in Hebron, I'd better make sure the return address indicates Hebron, Ind., (no...the three letter designation with no zip code wasn't a mistake), and not Hebron, Palestine. A broader designation, then, is always necessary in helping the seeker to find the right place.

Eschatologically, even the least educated "Christian" knows there is something to the people being reunited with the land: or Israel being brought back to the land promised to Abreham as a perpetual possession for his seed through Yts'hok. In fact, many Zionists support the efforts of the "Jews" and their illegal settlements and aggression towards Palestinians, because of the overwhelming number of Bible passages referring to Ysh'ral being put out of the land for so long and returning to inhabit and "rebuild the waste places" as it were. They do not realize that, "a Land without a People for a People without a Land", was and is utter nonsense. It was contrived by the same people who owned the shipping companies that brought mostly Whites and sparse Blacks to the "New World": a land that

truly was so devoid of a population to fill its spaces that we still are far far away from accomplishing that to this day.

There does, however, remain a stark eschatology that demands the people be returned to the land. "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." (Hsa 1:10, kjv). "in the place" - אֶרֶץ, Strong's 4725. As in, "the same location". There is a very real geographical aspect to End Times prophecies.

Of course, most have been convinced that Palestine and the Middle East is the obvious location for the events described in the Bible. But as many have already seen in my article and video, "The Patriarchs, Their Livestock, the LAND", and as you will witness in many articles to come, well... "if the glove doesn't fit...it aint legit."

What about all those Babylonian and Assyrian artifacts? What about the Merneptah Stele? What about all the artifacts around Palestine and Egypt? I say, "What about all the 'Hebrew', Roman, 'Egyptian', 'Phoenician', Greek and Ptolemaic artifacts, archaeological locations, giant skeletons (sometimes in full armor), earthworks, and still standing ruins in America that are often either covered up, declared "Off Limits", destroyed or lost by the Smithsonian, or attested as "fakes" by, in my opinion, the most shady of characters. There are two infractions that will get any case thrown out of court: murder, extortion, or otherwise. One is planting evidence, and the other is destroying evidence. Interesting, the sorts of people, (and their affiliations), who've hit pay-dirt in the Middle East, while the Feds and UNESCO are making it a crime to even go near many sites in North America, and what isn't barred from search and discovery via the National Parks has often been declared "Native Land" or is deemed "Off Limits" by force.

I'll readily admit, it certainly seems they are pulling a whole lot of evidence out of the ground over there, but what I can't seem to find, (in all my extensive searching), is scripture to back their stories up. It amazes me how many people would prefer to accept the "evidence" of the same sorts of people, with the same sorts of connections, that brought many of the Whites to North America as slaves, hooked half of China on opium, (and are doing the same to White countries today), have been the source of usurious banks the world over, popularized Communism, and control most film studios, publishers, and "news" sources. Is it possible that this monolith could craft a story, through a multi-tiered propaganda campaign, that might fool the world? Any student of "Revisionist History" knows this is not only possible, but it's been done...in spades!

Because we know we've been fooled in more ways than have even yet been accounted for, it is an encumbrance upon those who love the truth to question the entire secular narrative. This article, like my last, was precipitated by a seemingly insignificant bit of information that didn't seem to fit the rest of the text. I've now come to realize that this sort of thing is never a mistake, but is always quite deliberate on behalf of Him who inspired the text itself.

While writing my last article, I came across this: (Gen 15:16, my tr.), "your seed will return in the fourth revolution, as the iniquity of the אֶרֶץ₅₆₇ (am'ry) is not yet full". Ah, so He means the people of the fourth son of k'non, (Canaan)? Well, yes, but that's not all. In verses 19-21 we see a list of 10 peoples dwelling in the land just promised to ab'ram. All these various peoples would be marked for eviction. "Perhaps", I thought, "the am'ry were just worse than the others.", and I could have let it alone until I went back to working on my "Nations/Lands" table.

In the course of recording all pertinent geographical information about the אֶרֶץ₅₆₇ (am'ry), I came to Gen 48:22, which required it's own appendix entry. According to the KJV, this verse reads, "Moreover I have given to thee one portion above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow.". The NASB renders it exactly the same. These are the two translations coded to Strong's. Strong's, a tool nearly as misleading as the two aforementioned translations and definitely as complicit, lists the appearance of wkm (Sh'kem), here, as H7926, which is

blatantly misleading and baseless from a textual critic's viewpoint. There is only one incidence wherein yo,qab (Jacob) gains land through violence. It is the matter of deeneh, his young daughter, found in Gen 34. A careful reading of the events in Gen 34 will reveal that not only was this land called sh'kem, but the inhabitants were hu'ee (Hivites). The proper Strong's listing would be H7927, as even many other newer translations have it rendered. But, again, for the purposes of this article, we need to ask the question, "Why are 𐤁𐤆𐤆²³⁴⁰ 'Hivites' being called 𐤅𐤌𐤓⁵⁶⁷ 'Amorites'?" This was, once again, the oddity I was presented with.

Now, a "one-off" is a shrug of the shoulders. A "two-off" is enough to raise a very real suspicion. How about three? Ok...let's do three.

The first chapter of Deuteronomy "d'bareem" recounts the events of the previous decades of ysh'ral's time in the mid'bar (wild). Verse 1:44 reads, "And the Amorites, which dwelt in that mountain, came out against you, and chased you, as bees do, and destroyed you in Seir, even unto Hormah.", (kjv). So, they were defeated by the am'ry...what's to see here? Well...thanks, TSK Cross Reference! Even if one isn't doing a thorough concordance search, the TSK Cross Reference, (found in many Bible softwares), will show other verses with pertinence to the one you are currently on. TSK will offer Num 14:45, "Then the Amalekites came down, and the Canaanites which dwelt in that hill, and smote them, and discomfited them, even unto Hormah.", (kjv). So now we see 𐤐𐤌𐤋𐤑⁶⁰⁰³ (Amalekites) and 𐤅𐤆𐤆³⁶⁶⁹ (Canaanites) being later referred to as 𐤅𐤌𐤓⁵⁶⁷ (Amorites...am'ry). I'm going to now have to quote a law that, unfortunately, many Bible expositors and Apologists don't clarify as to it's context. It's important to do so, here. In the case of a capitol offense, one witness could not seal the fate of another. If it were murder, the alleged murderer could not be condemned by only one witness. I am using this quote because of the gravity of these matters and the theory I will be supporting before this article is done. Deu 19:15, "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established.", (kjv). This is echoed and put into practice many times in both the Old Testament and New. It is a good guide to proving a matter, (any matter), scripturally, since all scriptural matters are important and scripture is NOT subject to any private interpretation.

At this point, I would boldly say there is enough proof of am'ry as a secondary descriptive to say it is quite likely that it was intended to be seen by us, of far later generations, like "Hebron, Indiana, USA". Even the k'nony (Canaanites) are called am'ry. Yes, the k'nony... as in the "Land of Canaan". Those Canaanites are assigned the broader term of Amorite (am'ry). But, for those who just won't hear it from three witnesses, I ask this, "Will you hear it from 16 witnesses?". Yes. That's correct. I said SIXTEEN WITNESSES. For those who struggle with math, that's five times more witnesses than I've just revealed...plus 1. So, now that you've heard my mouth....

Here is the money:

Number 4) Deu 4:47- "And they possessed his land, and the land of Og king of Bashan, two kings of the Amorites, which were on this side Jordan toward the sunrising;" (kjv)

Are we talking about Og, king of Bashan, of the remnant of 𐤓𐤓𐤅𐤌⁷⁴⁹⁷ (Rephaim)? The one from Deu 3:11, "For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants", (kjv)? That Og? Is it just an anomaly that he is called an am'ry king? Because, passages like Num 32:33, Deu 1:4, 1 Ki 4:19, and Psa 136:19-20 distinguish 𐤍𐤆𐤆⁵⁵¹¹ (syhoon) king of the am'ry from 𐤐𐤅𐤂⁵⁷⁴⁷ (owg) king of 𐤋𐤅𐤆¹³¹⁶ (b'shin). But, yet he is called an am'ry king in Deu 4:47, Deu 31:4, Jsh 2:10, Jsh 9:10, ect. Isn't the land he reigned over called 𐤅𐤓𐤓⁷⁷⁶ 𐤓𐤓𐤅𐤌⁷⁴⁹⁷ (land of the giants), like in Deu 3:13? Which is he? A Rephaim or an Amorite? The answer is, "Yes". "What are you, a Parisian or a Frenchman?"...indeed.

The "nay" sayer: "Og was a Rephaim, but was just a king over the Amorites." Well, remember the other am'ry king, "syhoon"? Did you know he ruled over the Midianites (Jsh 13:21), or

that he took his lands and cities from the Moabites, (Num 21:26-29)? If syhoon was an am'ry, with m'dyny princes, who ruled over mu'aby peoples, why isn't he called a king of the Moabites? It's alright though...twelve to go!

Number 5) Jsh 10:5- "Therefore the five kings of the Amorites" (kjv)

This is a list of five kings called "am'ry". Their names are currently inconsequential, and the last three have no additional textual support of them being anything other than am'ry by tribe. It's the first two to take note of: the king of yru'shalem (Jerusalem) and the king of hab'run (Hebron). These are quite clearly called "kings of the am'ry"; however, according to Jsh 15:63, 18:28, Jdg 1:21, 19:10, 2 Sa 5:6, and 1 Ch 11:4, the y'busy (Jebusites) are the inhabitants of this city, in fact, its name is Jebus before it's fully taken over, (Jdg 19:10).

Hebron, (hab'run) is interesting and a bit complex, but we'll sort it out. Gen 13:18 tells us that חל^{436} $\text{ממרא}^{\text{4471}}$ is הר^{2275} , or "the slopes of m'mra is hab'run". Gen 14:13 reads, " חל^{436} $\text{ממרא}^{\text{4471}}$ the ממרא^{567} " thus calling m'mra an am'ry. Perhaps then just the tribe? Not so fast. In Gen 23, when ab'rehm needs to purchase land for burial purposes, he has to meet with the sons of ח^{2845} , or the ח^{2850} (Hittites), and purchase land from them. These hathy know and respect him. In verse 10, they're meeting in the gate of the city. This is where administrative matters are settled. The parcel he buys adjoins the slopes of m'mra, (verse 17). If the tribes of the hathy and am'ry both lived there, where were the am'ry? Ab'rehm had a covenant with three am'ry, including m'mra, as per Gen 14:13. Why not go to them? He did go to them. They were tribally hathy and in a broader sense am'ry. No? Well, here's the thing...while they are in mxrym⁴⁷¹⁴ (mits'rym), this once hathy dominated city becomes קרח^{7153} . (Jsh 14:15, Gen 23:1). It is built by the sons of $\text{אנאק}^{\text{6061}}$ (oh'naq). The $\text{אנאק}^{\text{6062}}$ were giants and were unchallenged, (Deu 9:2). So, as per Jsh 11:21, hab'run or q'ryth arbo was an "Anakim" city, correct? Yes. And, as per Jsh 10:5, it's an am'ry city.

Are we seeing the pattern yet? A Nova Scotian is a Canadian... a Berliner is a German... a Pekingese (Beijing) is Chinese... and so on. No? No problem!

Number 6) Jsh 24:15- "or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell" (kjv)

Be careful to read the whole chapter up until that point, and pay attention to all the various peoples listed, including the tribe of the am'ry. But what if, in this verse, he is talking about just the gods of the am'ry? Deu 20:17-18 makes that quite unlikely: "But thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee: That they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against the LORD your God." (kjv). This is echoed in Deu 7:1-5, and 12:30, or Exo 23:28-33, and many others. All these nations had various gods. Many of these nations are listed before verse 15 of Jsh 24. But the text blankets "the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell".

Number 7) Jdg 1:36- "And the coast of the Amorites was from the going up to Akrabbim, from the rock, and upward." (kjv) "coast" is better translated "border" - $\text{גבול}^{\text{1366}}$.

Besides the fact that two verses prior we see they am'ry driving dan into the mountains and would not let them dwell in the valley, even though Num 13:29 tells us the am'ry dwell in the mountains and the om'laqy dwell in the south. This passage cites a place at the southern extremity of ysh'ral's new territory and, quite mechanically, states the am'ry's border was from that point up. There were many various peoples dispossessed from that point up.

Number 8) Jdg 6:9-10- "And I delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians (mits'ry), and out of the hand of all that oppressed you, and drave them out from before you, and gave you their land; And I said

unto you, I am the LORD your God; fear not the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but ye have not obeyed my voice." (kjv) w/ words stricken that don't belong.

This, of course, harkens back to the initial prophecy to ab'rm in Gen 15:13-14, "And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance." (kjv)

The "all that oppressed you" part, remember, includes the land of k'non, before mits'rym. They were only in hard bondage in mits'rym the last half of their time there, which was only about two centuries. Again, as before, there were many peoples and many gods, but here, they are directed to not fear the gods of the **am'ry** in **whose land** you dwell. Check the source text. That translation is very accurate. Everywhere ysh'ral dwells, at this point, is the land of the am'ry.

Number 9) Jdg 10:8- "And that year they vexed and oppressed the children of Israel: eighteen years, all the children of Israel that were on the other side Jordan in the land of the Amorites, which is in Gilead." (kjv)

I'm certainly surprised that this area is called "the land of the am'ry" as the sons of ysh'ral had overtaken it more than 300 years prior. If you look at the source wording, a translation more like, "the land of the am'ry in g'load". This is, most likely, a specificity, (separating it from the g'load on the other side of yrdan); however, it's very easy to do this without including a people that hadn't controlled that area for over 3 centuries. Not the strongest point, but worth taking note of. Seven to go.

10) 1 Sa 7:14- "And the cities which the Philistines had taken from Israel were restored to Israel, from Ekron even unto Gath; and the coasts thereof did Israel deliver out of the hands of the Philistines. And there was peace between Israel and the Amorites." (kjv)

Wait. Back up. There was peace with the am'ry once they had re taken control of all the pelshathym cities? The am'ry haven't even been mentioned since Jdg 11:9, and that being in a retelling of the final events of the exodus. Before that, it was Jdg 10:8, which we just covered. In fact, not even a scuffle with the am'ry is recorded since Jdg 1, and that's about four centuries prior. Everything surrounding the above passage, from 1 Sa, is about the $\text{JLWX}^{\text{ZMM}}_{6430}$, who ZWRXL_{3478} have been fighting with, almost exclusively, for a century. They had peace with the am'ry pelshathym; like the South African Zulu, or the South American Portugese. The truth is, the "tribe" of the am'ry have been so absent from the narrative that they aren't even the subject of our next entry.

11) 2 Sa 21:2- "(now the Gibeonites were not of the children of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; and the children of Israel had sworn unto them: and Saul sought to slay them in his zeal to the children of Israel and Judah.)"

This story goes back to the time when ysh'ral had first come into the land. The men of gboun¹³⁹¹ had deceived the princes of ysh'ral to strike a covenant with them. When yeusho found out about their deceit, he told them, "Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall none of you be freed from being bondmen, and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God." (Jsh 9:23, kjv). So, after the sons of ysh'ral defeated the am'ry kings, (who, by tribe, weren't am'ry), in Jsh 10, Jsh 11:19 reads, "There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel, save the Hivites the inhabitants of Gibeon: all other they took in battle." (kjv). So, who were the men of $\text{JLOY}^{\text{I}}_{1391}$ (g'boun...Gibeon)...the remnant of the am'ry? They were $\text{EY}^{\text{Z}}_{2340}$, (hu'ee...Hivites), which made what sha'ul did to them a breech of a long-standing covenant and persuaded du'eed (David) to resolve it in the manner with which he did.

They were am'ry hu'ee: like the Swedish Arabs, or Roman Swiss Guard.

12) 1 Ki 21:26- "And he did very abominably in following idols, according to all things as did the Amorites, whom the LORD cast out before the children of Israel." (kjv)

This, of course, bears resemblance to Jdg 6:9-10, and the cross-references to that verse. Remember, even 1 Ki 9:20 lets us know the am'ry, as a tribe, are still around, but once again 1 Ki 21:26 uses am'ry as a broad term to cover many peoples.

Is it strange that a whole land and various peoples would be called by the name of one tribe? Have you heard of England? Did you know the Franks were one tribe who occupied parts of France? And don't even get me started on Saudi Arabia.

13) 2 Ki 21:11- "Because Manasseh king of Judah hath done these abominations, and hath done wickedly above all that the Amorites did, which were before him, and hath made Judah also to sin with his idols:" (kjv)

Yes, this is material which echos some of what we've already witnessed; however, when building a sound and honest case, no evidence should go ignored. In fact, this truly is a pattern of noteworthiness. We, again, have seen nothing of the am'ry as a tribe in over five centuries. They are listed as tribes remaining in shalmey's (Soloman's) time: among the other sons of Canaan, but they have gotten no records of note written about them, other than their name used as a broad-sweeping term concerning the non-Israelite (ysh'raly) people of the land. Like if I said, "like all the Africans, which were before him" or "like all the Europeans, which were before him". The Bengalis are one group of people of Bangladesh. It's tribes also include the Chakma, Marma, Tripura, Tanchangya, Khumi, Mro, Lushai, Khiang, Bawm & Pankhu, and Chak. There are many stories about how a land and it's residents acquired it's name. Some more believable than others. Sometimes, all that's needed is for a popular source of records to deem a land, "the Land of _____", and it sticks. This happens quite often.

14) Eze 16:3&45- 3. "And say, Thus saith the Lord GOD unto Jerusalem; Thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan; thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite." 45. "Thou art thy mother's daughter, that lotheth her husband and her children; and thou art the sister of thy sisters, which lothed their husbands and their children: your mother was an Hittite, and your father an Amorite." (kjv)

These two passages, denouncing זרְיָוֶל מִ3389 (Jerusalem) for her whoredom, is using tribal specifications. It seems, to me, that the speaker, (זְיָוֶל מִ3068), is equating the tribe of זְיָוֶל מִ3063 (Judah) with the tribes mentioned. "of the land of k'non": the vast majority of tribes in this land were of the seed of k'non. "your nativity": Jerusalem wasn't born to the land of Israel, Judah, or Benjamin. It was born to a Canaanite. It was being said to still be a Canaanite. Its parentage, though, is of interest to us here.

"your mother was an hathy" הַיִּתִּי מִ2850 (Hittite) and "your father was an am'ry" אֲמֹרִי מִ567 (Amorite), has no basis in the records of inhabitants of yru'shalem. If one wishes to equate וֶל מִ8004 with זרְיָוֶל מִ3389, then the earliest inhabitants we know of are הַיִּתִּי מִ2340 (Hivite), and the most prolific tribe associated with yru'shalem are the זְיָוֶל מִ2982. Speculation can go on forever on why the hathy for maternity and am'ry for patronage, and I don't think any side would gain significant ground; however, one fact is clear... a Jebusite city, with arguably no other historical inhabitant than maybe the Hivite, (Gen 33:18), is said to have the Amorite as its father. If this were isolated, one may wonder why, but when seen in context with all the other passages that deem various inhabitants of the land as "am'ry", (and the land itself as זְיָוֶל מִ776 זְיָוֶל מִ567), it becomes far more clarified. The paternity used here cannot be arbitrary.

15) Ams 2:9- "Yet destroyed I the Amorite before them, whose height was like the height of the cedars, and he was strong as the oaks; yet I destroyed his fruit from above, and his roots from beneath." (kjv)

I don't know if זְיָוֶל מִ730 should be "cedar" or another species, but I do know this is saying these people were giants. The זְיָוֶל מִ567 (Amorites), however, as a specific tribe from זְיָוֶל מִ3667,

were not giants. רַפְּאִיִּם⁷⁴⁹⁷ (Rephaim), were, and the אֲנָכִים⁶⁰⁶² (Anakim), were, and I may have missed any other giant people, (like the Emims or Zamzummims, which Israel never dealt with), but the כְּנִזְנִים⁵⁶⁷, (as in sons of k'n'on), were not giants. The giants, whom אֲנָכִים³⁰⁶⁸ expelled are being blanketed as כְּנִזְנִים⁵⁶⁷. This is because they were am'ry... just as Og of Bashan... as the sons of Anak of Hebron, as the remnants of Anak among the Philistines... the giants of a land called am'ry, are am'ry giants.

16) Ams 2:10- "Also I brought you up from the land of Egypt (mits'rym), and led you forty years through the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite." (kjk) w/ words stricken that don't belong.

This is just a great passage illustrating what is going on here. Does anyone remember that from the time ysh'ral took the kingdom away from syhoon and oug (Syhun and Og), their expansion covered so much land at the time of du'eed and shalmey (Davis and Soloman) that the peoples they either encompassed or displaced was at least in the dozens. Yet many years afterward, the prophet o'mus (Amos), speaking for yeh'weh (YEUE), says that they were to possess the land of the am'ry. Not the land of all the various peoples, whose land they did, in fact, possess..... the LAND OF THE AM'RY: Gen 15:18- "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt (mits'rym) unto the great river, the river Euphrates (p'rath): (whose land? am'ry land)

Gen 26:4- And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; (which countries/lands? am'ry countries/lands)

Deu 7:1- When the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou: (what nations? am'ry nations)

Every nation or people within the boundaries of the land taken are, according to the Living God...AM'RY.

and your point is...?

For starters... if the following sixteen points have failed to convince you that at least the God of the Bible prefers the blanket term "am'ry" (Amorite) for the land of and people of "the promised land", I'd conclude that objective evidence and sober facts aren't really your style.

One must also be cognoscente of names of places being established very early. Genesis 10 early: "By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations." (Gen 10:5, kjv). Gen 10:20&31 echo as much, concerning Ham and Shem. The Bible routinely refers to the nations and locations of the world based on names of the sons and grandsons of these three Noadic, (nah'ee), patriarchs.

As late as Ezk 38, we see the names of nations and peoples: Magog, Meshech, Tubal, Gomer- sons of Japeth... Cush, Put- sons of Ham... Togarmah, Tarshish- grandsons of Japeth... Sheba, Dedan- great grandsons of Ham...

This is not a few exceptions, but the rule. Run cross-reference searches on all the names mentioned in Gen 10. You'll see that, just as it's written for each of the three houses, the nations, peoples, and lands were, for the most part, named according to these early nah'ee generations. Incidentally, I can't say enough bad things about the translations of these names and their inconsistencies, which anyone will see upon performing the aforementioned search. What you will find is twofold: 1) you'll find that these early descendants' names stick for the whole of the ob'ry (Hebrew...shudder) record, and 2) many of the original ob'ry names of nations and peoples have either been phonetically distorted or outright changed in modern translations. Examples:

k'non - altered to Canaan
hu'ee - altered to Hivite
r'pa'ym - altered to Rephaim and/or embalmer and/or medicine and/or dead
tsee'den - altered to Sidon, Zidon
pelshathym - altered to Philistines. (Today, incorrectly seen as the Palestinians)
ar'm neh'rym - outright changed to Mesopotamia
ashur - altered to Assyria
th'rash'ysh - altered to Tarshish. (and I suspect altered again to Tarsus in the NT Greek)
y'un - outright changed to Greece
mits'rym - outright changed to Egypt
ar'm - outright changed to Syria
p'ris'ee - altered to Persian
one of my personal favorites

l'bee and put'y- two distinct people/places. Both altered. Both appearing as "Libya" at some point. Both cannot be "Libya", unless Nah 3:9 ought to read, "Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite; Libya and Libya were thy helpers" (kjv) w/ "Lubim" changed to "Lybia" as they ARE represented as "Libya" in Dan 11:43. NOTE: none of the nations listed in Nah 3:9 are correct renderings. Thanks King James! He did get a lot of help from influential friends, but I digress...

Even though the world as we know it has undergone a massive identity shift sometime in it's past, we see the Bible affirming that the names of many places were attributed to the second to fourth generations from Noah. Our knowledge of these ancient peoples and places is key in our understanding of eschatology. Not many clues yet remain, so we need to do our due diligence in giving attention to what clues we have.

It's my firm belief that, in time, I and others like myself will amass such a body of conclusive evidence against the current popular model, location, and people of Biblical events that it will be undeniable that someone has tampered with not only the record, but with the nature of reality itself. My hope is to point all of those drawn to this area of study in the right direction: to the land of milk and honey, a broad land and a good land, a land promised to ab'rehm's seed forever, and given to the sons of ysh'ral on condition. The world will eventually be forced to look far and wide from the Middle East for the location of the Bible. Some already have. I, like many others, began in Africa, moved about Asia and Europe, considered Australia and various large islands, pondered the extreme North, but have now settled in America.....North America, to be exact.

The "New" World

It ought to appear as an absurdity that the Americas are a gaping black hole in the construct of accepted history. From at least the time of Solomon, empires were sailing the world, and the fact is, no one can sail the world and miss the Americas. It strikes me as dreadfully unfortunate that the great libraries of the world suffered disaster. If only the Vatican were to open her vaults to the good of Mankind. I've got a feeling if they ever did, all the right documents would be sadly absent by then. And we can't just kick the Vatican around. I believe one of the most guarded treasures in the world are the documents, in various private collections and in government vaults, revealing the true history of the land of my birth.

Much like it's vacuous history, no one has a satisfactory explanation of how the land of my own nativity came about it's name. With all the controversy, and contrived stories, I think it will be a matter that will need to be settled as part of a larger set of data: a preponderance of evidence. Some choose to believe the "Amerigo Vespucci" tale, even though it seems his name wasn't altered to "Amerigo" until after various maps and letters with the name "America" were created. Some choose to

go the "Land of the Plumed Serpent" route, as in the Peruvian god "Amaru". This doesn't explain how a Peruvian god had enough influence to get two continents named after him, or how Europeans found out about this mighty Peruvian deity. Others say the name may have derived from a Nicaraguan mountain range, the Amerrisque Mountains: said to be derived from the Mayan word(s) meaning, "the country of the wind," "the country where the wind blows constantly." With all of this intriguing speculation, I'd like to throw in my own theory:

At one time, in the history of most of the world, both Latin and Greek were at least very close to being universal languages. Both of these languages have had a marked effect on the current place names we know. The Latin suffix "icus" is said to be a successor of the Greek "ikos", and no matter if the masculine, feminine, or neutral is employed, they turn out a similar form: icus, icum, ica.

These two languages are said to be like English, having a simple lettered alphabet with combinations rendering phonetic results which have been assigned a meaning, at various times and in various ways. Place names, the world over, still bear remnants of these common Latin/Greek suffixes. When looking up the etymology of Africa, for example, some say it's root was "Afri" after a local tribe, with a later "ica" suffix that stuck. Some say "aphrike" from the Greek, meaning, "without cold". Others say it's from the Latin, "aprica", meaning "sunny". If these were the case, I'd expect either "aphr" or "apr" to be the root, but what is the proof of their respective origins? Remember, any language without inherent meaning to the character or letter leaves the observer or reader at the mercy of any given Lexicographer.

AMR could be phonetically presented as "amar, amer, amir, amor, amur", by either early or later languages, to bridge the consonantal gap, and since there is such a black-out of this sort of information pre 1500 a.d., who's to say? Depending on context, many places retained names with various forms of the "icus/ikos" suffix. Sometimes, a place or thing can be heard or seen in a certain form so often it sticks. Even the "experts" don't have the answers to why many various place names ended up with various forms of the "icus/ikos" suffix. There is a great deal of conjecture out there. Nevertheless, many places still retain their, "icus, icum, ica, ia, and a" suffixes, with etymologies and excuses out the, well, there is no shortage.

From all I've witnessed, concerning these "fiat" languages, and the absurdity of believing man could be sailing the seas without a good knowledge of the Americas, along with all of the Biblical passages I've provided at the start, I am asserting that the land known as that of the "amr" would become the "AMER", and as it was pertaining to the AMER it would likely get the feminine "ICA" to remain static, (as there are many bridges in the handing down of languages that can cause the feminine "ICA" to stick...like we see with the Spanish suffix in mexICO), thus becoming "AMERICA", which was never "the New World" as it's perceived by most today, but a land that sat in ruin for many generations awaiting the time when the children of Israel would be returned.

Eventually, there are two questions that will need to be dealt with: 1) why doesn't Palestine and the Middle East work?, 2) why does there seem to be a great gaping void where the Americas should be in history? By now, I'm quite sure that a full barrage of questions, conceptions, and conundrums are spinning through the reader's head faster than they can be kept up with. I say, "Don't worry. There will be more.". The one thing that has no fear of scrutiny is the truth. I have been suspicious of America's origins for some time, but was in no hurry to publish any theories until this am'ry puzzle was brought to my attention.

The more empathetic part of me wants to soothe the troubled mind of those who's cognitive dissonance is running wild on them at this moment by saying, "Don't worry. It's just one thing, you know. Who knows how it'll go from here.", but I know better. The truth is, before this am'ry question was revealed to me I already had a very bulky list of items linking America to the Bible. "But what if you're wrong?", you may ask. That part is easy. I simply admit my error and move forward: simple, relatively painless, perhaps relieving. The real hard part... the possibility rife with a lack of ease and

comfort... the remarkably painful, woefully fragile, and wonderfully horrifying option is not, "what if I'm wrong?". The truly difficult part of all of this is... what if I'm right?