

# JAPHETIC OR SEMITIC :

WHICH ARE WE ?

BY

CAROLINE PEARSE.



“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. xxxii. 8.

London :

ROBERT BANKS, RACQUET COURT, FLEET STREET.

PRICE FOURPENCE.





# JAPHETIC OR SEMITIC: WHICH ARE WE?

---

## CHAPTER I.

THE daily increasing interest in THE QUESTION, "Are WE a Japhetic or Semitic people?" seems to warrant a fresh statement of the case. The zeal and energy of Mr. Hine and his coadjutors have roused the attention of the public, and a theory which seven or eight years since was laughed at wherever named, now numbers its adherents by thousands. Societies for its study and extension are formed in numerous large towns in England, besides those in the colonies, and few persons are found now with courage to sneer at the growing creed.

But there is some excuse even for the sneers. The revival of religion after the deadness of the seventeenth century, by Wesley, Whitfield, and others in the eighteenth, drew the attention of newly-awakened minds to Christ as revealed in the New Testament rather than as prophesied of in the elder Scriptures, and these were unconsciously neglected and thrown into the shade. People waking up from a cold creed of mere morality, to a loving sense of a living Saviour, naturally clung to the pages which portrayed His life in the flesh, His death, His resurrection, and His return to the right hand of the Father to assume His mediatorial office in their behalf.

The next great religious influence, the so-called "High Church" movement, laid stress rather on the "Church" and the "Fathers," than on either the Old or the New Testament and the Word of inspiration ; so that the old Scriptures—those referred to by Christ Himself when He commanded His disciples to "search the Scriptures," and declared "they testified of Him"—were still lying neglected and little read when this new and startling theory that the English people were the long Lost Tribes of Israel arrested attention. No wonder that people laughed at so strange and presumptuous a notion. They were ignorant of the history of Israel as contained in the Bible, and ignorant of the prophecies which pictured the future career of Israel. Their only idea of an Israelite was that of a Jew, and the prominent idea of a Jew was not that of a Montefiore, or a Rothschild, but of the poor Jews who are pawnbrokers, old-clothes-men, and such like. "*I don't want to be a Jew,*" was a common retort when the "Anglo-Israel" subject was named. Those who made this reply forgot that the *Jew*, though his name has long been a by-word and a reproach, is one of God's chosen Hebrew people under a cloud—under a curse, now, but destined to be restored to the Divine favour, and to be again recognised by Him as part of the leading nation. They forget that the Lord and Saviour in whom they trust, *was a Jew* after the flesh, and had they studied the Old Testament, would have found there a blessing on those who blessed the Jew (Zech. i. 14, 15 ; Ps. cxxii. 6).

The new theory recalled men's attention to the elder Scriptures. It was grounded on the history and the prophecies contained in them, but it took time to open men's eyes to the truths taught in them. As these Scriptures were examined, and the theory of "Anglo-Israelism" was applied to them, it was found that what was before obscure and apparently contradictory, was flooded with light ; and many who had doubted the truth of the Bible because of its seeming contradictions, were brought

back from scepticism to belief, by the harmony which was revealed to exist in its pages.

I propose to trace the "Anglo-Israel" theory from its origin, to mark its salient points and offer a clear statement of its creed, so that the most ignorant persons may be able to judge for themselves whether there is not solid reason for adopting it.

There are two lines of argument :—First—The Scriptural. Second—The Historical, Philological and Ethnological.

1.—THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.—In examining the Scriptural evidence as to the truth of this theory, it is important to call attention at once to two points :—

(a) The distinction between the HOUSE OF ISRAEL and the HOUSE OF JUDAH, the two nations into which the Hebrew people were divided.

(b) The different character of the promises, and blessings, and chastisements foretold as destined for these two Houses respectively, and consequently the different careers it was foreseen they would accomplish; namely, that to the House of Israel, the promises were *national and temporal*; whilst to the House of Judah was given the grand distinction of the "one seed," "the Saviour," "God manifest in the flesh," the Redeemer of mankind.

Distinct as these prophecies were—on the one side, of national blessings, &c., &c., on earth, in time; on the other, spiritual blessings through eternity—it seems marvellous they should ever have been confounded; but they sometimes are, and hence a confusion of ideas which makes it often difficult to answer objectors; one feels as if fighting the air, with nothing tangible to strike.

There are evident indications of a separation between the Tribes of the Hebrews whilst, and even before, Saul was reigning as king over them. In 1 Sam. xi. 8, when Saul summoned the people to assemble to fight the Ammonites, we find a distinction drawn between the "children of Israel" and "the men of Judah."

"And when he numbered them in Bezek, the children of Israel were three hundred thousand, and the men of Judah thirty thousand."

We have this division of the Tribes mentioned again in 2 Sam. ii. 8—10.

After the death of Saul and Jonathan, "*The men of Judah* came, and there they anointed David king *over the House of Judah*. . . . But Abner the son of Ner, captain of Saul's host, took Ish-bosheth the son of Saul and made him king over Gilead, and over the Ashurites, and over Jezreel, *and over Ephraim, and over Benjamin, and over all Israel*. Ish-bosheth, Saul's son, was forty years old when he began to reign over Israel, and reigned two years. But *the House of Judah followed David*."

There was "long war" between "the House of Saul and the House of David," but at last we learn (2 Sam. v. 1) that "all the Tribes of Israel" came to David and proposed that he should be "a captain over Israel" and the "elders of Israel . . . . anointed David king of Israel."

The Hebrew nation remained a united people till the ascension to the throne of Rehoboam, after the death of Solomon, when the Ten Tribes revolted, and choosing Jeroboam for their king, established a separate monarchy in Samaria. *They were never again re-united*, but changing their religion as well as their Sovereign, they divorced themselves from the temple worship of the true God and became idolaters, worshipping Baal and the golden calves at Dan and Bethel. It is a remarkable fact, that of this final disruption, God declared to His prophet Shemaiah, "this thing is from Me" (1 Kings xii. 24).

If the separation were "of God," if it were the result of His will, and intention, then there must have been a *cause*, a *reason*, for the Divine act, and there must have been a different intention as to the future destiny of the two nations into which the Hebrew people were thus to be divided. We know that



the Saviour was in due time to be born of the Tribe of Judah, of the royal line of David, but the question of the Ten Tribes being, or not being, in unity with the Two, and their forming, or not forming, a part of the same nation, could not affect that fact. There must have been some special career intended for the Ten Tribes; some special duty to be fulfilled by them apart from that appointed for the Two Tribes, and which could only be accomplished by them *in separation from their brethren*.

In the following pages it will be our work to search out what the Scriptures reveal to us of God's will in "this thing," to examine into the career marked out for Israel, and how far she is known to have fulfilled it. And inasmuch as the prophecies concerning the House of Judah *have been fulfilled to the letter*, and are still in course of such literal fulfilment, I shall assume that the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the House of Israel must have been as literally fulfilled, and are also still in due course of such literal fulfilment.

I repeat, the reason could not have been slight which led God to countenance revolt and rebellion amongst His chosen people, and to send His prophet with a special message to the anointed ruler of the whole nation, God's chosen people, to prevent his coercing them into submission. It must have been a galling thing for the young monarch to see Ten, out of the Twelve, Tribes of his subjects rebel and separate themselves, and form another kingdom, under another king, and then to find God upholding them, and declaring, "THIS THING IS FROM ME." Surely there must be a career marked out for these Ten Tribes of no common character. Surely it must be a work of duty, of love, and of surpassing interest to trace God's dealings with them, to study their history, and endeavour to discover, if God permit, the object He had in view, the design of the Divine mind, and to watch what that career has been, and when, and where, and how their influence has made itself felt in the world at large.

Perhaps this is the most convenient place to call attention to another fact which has not been commonly noticed, but which seems to me important to the full appreciation of the subject before us. I first saw it mentioned, I think, in *The Glory Leader*.

It is this : The only portion of the Hebrew people to whom the name of "ISRAEL" rightly belongs, is that of the Two half-Tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh. We find our authority for this declaration in Gen. xlviii. 16.

"*Let my name be named upon them,*" was one of the blessings specially bestowed by the patriarch Jacob on his two grandsons, the sons of Joseph. The "name" thus bestowed must have been the name which had been specially given him by God, as related in Gen. xxxii. 28.

"Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel : for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed."

But this sacred name was not bestowed by Jacob on any of his sons—not even on Joseph. It was limited to the two "lads." And so we find that it was a title only given by courtesy to the Hebrew people whilst they remained united to the two half-Tribes ; first to the entire people, afterwards to the Ten Tribes, as including them, or, perhaps, rather as attached to them ; but it entirely ceased to belong to the Tribes of Judah and Levi when the Ten Tribes separated from them.

The Jews were, of course, "*children* of Israel," just as they were *children* of Isaac or *children* of Abraham—that is, they were literally and actually descended from him. But they were not warranted in assuming the family title ; they had not received the patent of nobility ; they were not known as "THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL."

## CHAPTER II.

As the promises on which the Anglo-Israel theory is based begin with Abraham, although they are carried on to Isaac and Jacob, and are also revealed through the prophets, our best plan will be to look into the character and extent of the blessings promised to him.

In Gen. xii. 1—5 we have the Lord's call to Abram:

“Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee.”

Then follow the two promises:—

1. “I will make of thee a great nation . . . and make thy name great.”

2. “In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

The national blessing is repeated in chap. xiii. (14—18). The great extent of land to be his future possession is pointed out, and the multitudinous descendants who were to constitute the future great nation.

“Lift up now thine eyes and look from the place where thou art, Northward, and Southward, and Eastward, and Westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, so shall thy seed be numbered.”

In chap. xiv. 19, 20, Abraham is recognised by that mysterious person Melchizedek, King of Salem, as blessed of God, “*possessor of heaven and earth.*”

This echoes the double promise already noted in chap. xii. : “possessor of earth,” in the great nation to descend from his loins—“possessor of heaven,” since Christ was to become also

his descendant in the fleshly nature, and through Him eternal blessings were offered to all the families of the earth.

Melchizedek also declared that God had "delivered Abram's enemies into his hand" (ver. 20), consequently into the hands of the great nation who were to partake his blessings.

In Gen. xv. the word of the Lord came again unto Abraham "after these things," that is, after the removal from his country, and kindred, and father's house, after his recognition and blessing by Melchizedek,

"The Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward."

And now Abram ventures to plead with God for some explanation of His promises:—

"Seeing that I go childless. . . . Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and lo, one born in my house is my heir."

Then the Lord vouchsafed to His faithful servant the direct intimation,—

"This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. . . . Look now towards heaven and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them . . . . So shall thy seed be."

*"And he believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness."*

In this chapter (ver. 18 to end) is given in more detail the defined limit of the land which was to become his in the person of his descendants:—

"From the river of Egypt unto the great river, the River Euphrates: the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites."

In chap. xvi. there is a side or branch promise to Ishmael.

He also was to increase "exceedingly, so that his seed shall not be numbered for multitude."

In chap. xvii. we meet with a remarkable enlargement of the original promise to make of the seed of Abram ONE great nation:

"A father of MANY NATIONS have I made thee, and I will make thee exceeding fruitful; and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee."

It was at this time that the Lord announced Himself to the patriarch as "the Almighty God," and made a covenant with him and changed his name to "Abraham," and Sarai's name to "Sarah."

"I will bless her and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her."

Abraham, doubtless, loved Ishmael and pleaded with God:—

"O that Ishmael might live before Thee!"

But God, in His reply, emphasised the difference between the future of Ishmael and Isaac,—

"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, I have blessed him and will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation; BUT MY COVENANT WILL I ESTABLISH WITH ISAAC," who was not to be born till "this set time next year."

In Gen. xviii. we have the Divine visit to Abraham, the promise repeated of a son, Sarah's faithless laugh, and the Lord's gracious love to Abraham :—

"Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing that Abraham shall become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him?"

This is again a statement of the twofold blessing of chap. xii. 1—5.

In chap. xxi. we have a repetition of the great distinction made between Isaac and Ishmael:—

"In Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed."

In chap. xxii. is the deeply interesting record of that act of faith, the patriarch preparing to sacrifice his son, his only son Isaac, the son of the great and glorious promises, by whom Abraham was to become "possessor of heaven and earth," "heir of the world," nothing doubting the wisdom, the truth, or the love of God in demanding so heavy a trial.

And God proved to be what He had promised to be to him, his "shield and his exceeding great reward:"—

"By Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the Gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: because thou hast heard My voice."

We must mark here that to this promise no condition is attached. It is the reward of obedience by faith already exercised, and it will in due time be accomplished to the utmost, although that time may be delayed by the sins of Abraham's posterity. But as his seed were to be thus blessed beyond all other nations, and also to be the means of diffusing blessings amongst the other nations, we know that all must inevitably be accomplished *at some time*. It might be by chastisements, it might be by mercies, it might be by patient forbearance, it might be by all in turn, but sooner or later, in His own way, and at His own time, the Lord would fulfil His promise, and make them His own people.

Only in contemplating these wonderful promises of God, and His way of working them out, we must never lose sight of their *twofold character*, and that we have consequently laid out before us two histories written in prophecy, two distinct careers, for the two divisions of one race, but yet distinct only for a time,

and during that time both tending to the accomplishment of one great purpose, fulfilling separate parts in one great drama. It is the want of a clear view of this temporary separation, its object and its end, which has led to so much confusion amongst our opponents in their mode of treating the subject before us, and to such strange charges of heresy and irreligion as have been brought against writers on the Anglo-Israel theory. It has also been cast as a reproach at us that we are only claiming earthly riches and renown, that as Christians we are inconsistent in glorying so much in worldly distinctions, though they be national ones; and all this reproach is ours because we estimate as exceeding precious what the Lord God Almighty thought gifts worthy to offer to His "friend;" and because we glory in believing ourselves to be the very seed of that friend for whom these gifts were designed; and further, rejoice in the conviction that we even now actually possess many of them, that others are continually being given to us, and that the rest will be added, when we have, as a nation, faith like our great forefather to receive them.

But for a moment let us, as Christians, see what sort of testimony St. Paul gives on the subject of Abraham.

We have already seen that the promises to Abraham were twofold:—

1. "I will make of thee a great nation," &c.
2. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

"Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness," quotes Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians. But *what did Abraham believe?* It must have been, according to the apostle, a belief in earthly blessings, a belief in a seed of *actual human beings literally descended from his own body*, who were to constitute the great nation and the many nations of innumerable beings; for in Rom. iv. 19, Paul declares that in spite of his own and his wife's old age, Abraham "considered



not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief: but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform."

Paul shows that Abraham's example is for us to copy, doubtless in eternal promises as well as in temporal ones, but certainly this faith of the patriarch, so much commended, was a *belief in earthly blessings*, and as far as we know from anything said by Moses or Paul, there is no proof that he understood how his seed, how this great nation, how these many nations, were to prove blessings to other nations.

We could hardly have doubted that God would not conceal from His friend the grand scheme of man's redemption by the Incarnate Son, to be born one of Abraham's seed after the flesh, but happily we have our Lord's gracious assurance:—

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it, and was glad" (John viii. 56).

But, because Abraham gloried in the second promise, did he therefore despise the first? Are we to cast aside as worthless what God bestows as riches? We shall see as we endeavour to track our subject by the light of Scripture, *the division of the Abrahamic gifts amongst his descendants*, and then we shall see also how these gifts and promises interweave and re-act on one another, and so evidence themselves to be parts in one and the same great and Divine harmony.

There are various ways in which the promise that Abraham should be the father of *many* nations has been fulfilled—namely,—

1. In Ishmael, who became the father of twelve sons, who were "twelve princes according to their nations," and were called by the names of "their towns and their castles." Of

their descendants it has been said, "The victorious arms of the Arabians have spread the terror of their name far and wide; they have ascended more than a hundred thrones, and have established their colonies, their language, and their religion from the Senegal to the Indus, from the Euphrates to the islands of the Indian Ocean."\*

2. Esau—"Esau is Edom."

3. The two nations into which the Hebrew people were divided—the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Samaria.

4. The spiritual children of Abraham,—

"He became the father of all them that believe though, they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also" (Rom. iv. 11).

Our present inquiry evidently lies with neither of these; they do not answer to the description given. The great nation and the company of nations we are in search of must be something very different from them, and the difference will come out more strongly when we get the further detail of minuter features from the prophecies. The blessings promised to, and prophesied of, this great nation and company of nations, the seed of Jacob, were to be temporal and national; but *not merely so*. These earthly and temporal blessings were the marks set upon the people, who having been, as we shall see, put "out of sight" for their manifold sins and iniquities, and mainly because of their forsaking the Lord and worshipping idols and false gods, were to be recognised and identified by these marks on their becoming again "the sons of the living God" (Hos. i. 10).

---

\* See "Imperial Bible Dictionary," article "Ishmael."

## CHAPTER III.

I THINK there has been a practical mistake made by the respected writer on Anglo-Israelism, who has been really the apostle of this new idea—Mr. Hine—in calling every little point on which the slightest resemblance could be found between the prophecies and the British nation an “Identification.” It is only the great leading points which should be dignified with that name. Slighter matters may help to sustain the argument, but the argument must not be suffered to *rest* on slight matters. Besides, we do not want them as *main evidence* when there is enough without them.

In these pages it is my object to draw calm attention to the salient points, and frankly to confess that I think there are difficulties still to be cleared, hoping that intelligent readers will lend their help to clear them, and nothing doubting that such points *will* be cleared in God’s own time and way.

In this spirit I shall now continue to collect the intimations of Israel’s future, to be found in the biography of the patriarchs left us by Moses.

In the passages from Gen. xxii. 15—19, already quoted, we find the pith and marrow of all that was to constitute the destiny of the seed of Abraham. The spirit of this blessing is repeated in the parting words uttered to Rebekah when she went with Abraham’s servant to be the wife of Isaac:—

“Be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them” (Gen. xxiv. 60).

In Gen. xxv. 23 there is the announcement to Rebekah,—

“Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be

stronger than the other people: and the elder shall serve the younger." The two sons were Esau and Jacob.

In Gen. xxvii. Isaac gives the blessing to Jacob instead of to Esau, carrying out the will of God by an unconscious mistake, the result of his own infirmity and the deceit of his wife and younger son:—

"God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: let people serve thee and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee."

In Gen. xxviii. we have the journey of Jacob by the direction of his father Isaac, to go to Padan-aram for a wife; his sleeping on stones for pillows by the way; the vision vouchsafed him; and the blessing given by God:—

"And behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And behold the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed: and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the West, and to the East, and to the North, and to the South: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

The promises were renewed to Jacob, now called "Israel," on his coming out of Padan-aram (Gen. xxxv. 11, 12):—

"I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins; and the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land."

Thus far we have had the promises given personally by God to the patriarchs, and I would ask the reader of the Holy Scriptures to consider whether there must not be some great object in the Divine mind to lead God to communicate one particular fact *thirteen* times by special personal revelation?

Thus far also the promises have been general to the three patriarchs and their descendants—the whole Hebrew nation; but now we come to the first hint of division and of separate destinies awaiting the divided parts.

Joseph's children are brought to Israel to receive his blessing before his death (Gen. xlviii. 13, &c.):—

“And Joseph took them both, Ephraim in his right hand towards Israel's left hand, and Manasseh in his left hand towards Israel's right hand.”

Here we should remember that “the eyes of Israel were dim with age, so that he could not see.” We shall be the more impressed by the scene which follows:—

“And Israel stretched out his right hand and laid it upon Ephraim's head who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hands wittingly; for Manasseh was the first-born.”

Joseph was displeased and remonstrated; but the inspired patriarch refused to alter his position, and in reply to Joseph's remark that Manasseh was the first-born, replied,—

“I know it, my son; I know it; he also shall become a people and shall be great; *but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.* . . . And he set Ephraim before Manasseh.”

Jacob next summoned all his sons to bless them individually; and now we find a very distinct destiny marked out for the two sons who were to be heads of the principal Tribes in the future—viz., Judah and Joseph. The “sceptre” was to be with Judah, but the outpouring of national blessings was to be on Joseph. I will not here touch on the general prophecies contained in the other books of Moses, and the promises given to the Hebrew nation, as I shall have to return to them at another time—but we will go on to the reign of Solomon, and examine what is recorded in 1 Kings xi. 8—10, 26—37.

"The Lord God was angry with Solomon because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice, and had commanded him concerning this thing that he should not go after other gods."

The prophet Ahijah met "Jeroboam, a mighty man of valour" who had won the favour of Solomon, and had been "made ruler over all the charge of the House of Joseph." He had "clad himself with a new garment," and—

"Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him and rent it in twelve pieces, and he said to Jeroboam, Take thee ten pieces; for thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon and *will give Ten Tribes to thee*. (But he shall have one Tribe for My servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the Tribes of Israel.) . . . . I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee, even Ten Tribes. And unto his 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."

In the following chapter we discover which Tribe was selected out of the Ten Tribes to be with Judah, and to have the special honour of being a light before God in Jerusalem.

"There was none that followed the House of David but the Tribe of Judah only. And when Rehoboam was come to Jerusalem, he assembled all the House of Judah *with the Tribe of Benjamin*. . . . Speak unto Rehoboam the son of Solomon king of Judah, and unto all the House of *Judah and Benjamin*" (1 Kings xii. 20, 21, 23).

We shall see also again in the book of Ezra, that Benjamin was the Tribe associated with Judah, though reckoned amongst the Ten Tribes.

After the death of Solomon, the Ten Tribes revolted from Rehoboam, and made Jeroboam king about 977 B.C. They separated also in religion, and became heathens, worshipping

B

golden calves at Dan and Bethel, instead of the Lord Jehovah at Jerusalem.

During this separation, nineteen kings reigned over the Ten Tribes in Samaria, known as "**THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL**," to distinguish them from the Two Tribes and Benjamin, who constituted the Jewish nation, and were known as "**THE HOUSE OF JUDAH**." About 743 B.C. the kingdom of Samaria began to be carried away by the Assyrians, and having been conquered at various times by them, was finally carried away captive about 722 B.C., and placed in "Halah and Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes. *The Lord removed Israel out of His sight*" (2 Kings xvii. 1—30). And the Assyrians brought a colony of Cutheans to take "the place of the children of Israel." Three times it is stated in 2 Kings xvii., that God will "remove Israel out of His sight"—and again that He had done so !

It must be borne in mind that though afterwards "the House of Judah" were taken captive to Babylon, there was a prophecy that they should return in 70 years, and they did so. They were *never removed out of sight, have never been lost sight of*. And further it must be remembered that although, when the Jews returned from Babylon, Cyrus had become master of Assyria and Chaldea, as well as of Media and Persia, yet when these captivities of the two Hebrew nations took place, Assyria and Chaldea were two distinct and independent nationalities, just as Judea and Samaria were two distinct and independent nationalities. The Assyrians were heathens, and took *heathen Israelites* captive, who were not likely to lose their idolatrous habits during their captivity amidst an idolatrous people ; and that they did not do so, we have the evidence of Tobit, a solitary example of true religion in the midst of spiritual darkness (Tob. i. 5, 6). The Israelites gave up their God and then were given up by Him. In due time, 70 years, the House of Judah returned to Jerusalem ;

but although at that time Media formed part of the great Empire of Cyrus, Darius, &c., and the decree for the Jews to return to Jerusalem was published throughout the land, we learn from Josephus (Ant., bk. xi., ch. v., sec. 2) that the Jews alone returned, "while the Ten Tribes are beyond Euphrates till now." As the decree was addressed to the worshippers of Jehovah, it could not have been addressed to the Israelite idolaters, and we have no ground for considering them as *invited* to join the Jews—at any rate, Josephus says they remained in Media, and were "an immense multitude not to be estimated by number."

Well, the question occurs—What became of all this immense multitude? It was clearly distinct from the nation amidst which it dwelt in the time of Josephus. There is no reason to suppose it has been absorbed by it since; "an immense multitude," a rapidly increasing population cannot be hidden in a corner. What has become of it? Does Scripture help us? What does it say of the *future destiny* of the "House of Israel?"

The book of Genesis begins the marvellous description of the blessings reserved by God for His chosen people. There we have seen that certain blessings were promised to the whole Hebrew nation, the Twelve Tribes; but that a distinct difference was made between those reserved respectively for the descendants of Judah and the descendants of Joseph.

It is with Joseph our present subject is concerned, and more especially with his younger son Ephraim. In the earlier chapters we find general promises to the descendants of Abraham: first, that they should be a multitudinous seed, as "the stars," as "the sand on the sea-shore," as "the dust of the earth," for multitude; second, that they should become a great nation; third, a company of nations, giving birth to kings (Gen. xii. 1—4, xiv. 18—21, xv. 1—21, xvii. 1—22, xviii. 18, 19, xxii. 15—19, xxiv. 60, xxviii. 14, 15, xxxii. 12, xxxv. 5—13, xlviii. 14 to end of chap. xlix.). But as we proceed, we find these



promises refer to a certain portion of Abraham's descendants, until gradually we are led up to the final truth that it was to *Joseph* and his sons, and especially to his *younger son* Ephraim, that the preference is given; and now the aged patriarch, speaking as the Spirit teaches, pours out the eloquent and joyous words which meets us in Gen. xlix. Here we find that the descendants of Joseph shall not only be a great nation, but an emigrating people, increasing population so fast—be such a “fruitful bough,” that the “branches shall *run over the wall*,” or, as it was stated in the preceding chapter (xlviii.), “his seed should become a *multitude of nations*,” evidently by colonisation from the mother country. We have this prominent mark of the children of Israel recognised and repeated by the prophet Hosea :

“Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered.”

Isaiah also declares in the name of the Lord (xlix. 19),

“For thy waste and thy desolate places, and the land of thy destruction, shall even be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants . . . . they shall say. . . . The place is too strait for me; give place to me that I may dwell.”

But they were to be, not merely a multitude of people; they were to be a *multitude of nations* and a *company of nations*—that is, nations united by some special bond together. Clearly this people cannot be hidden in a corner. How is it that history is silent about them ?

Alas ! they sinned, grievously sinned. They deserted the God who had led them so long, and watched over them “as the apple of His eye,” and they worshipped idols.

After the death of Solomon, the Ten Tribes rebelled against his son Rehoboam, and chose Jeroboam to reign over them ; and so the Hebrew people, from this time, were divided and formed two distinct nations—the “HOUSE OF JUDAH,” or

Tribes of Judah and Levi, to whom God gave Benjamin (1 Kings xi. 31, 32, 36 ; xii. 19—24), who remained in Judea and were faithful to the temple worship in Jerusalem ; and “THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL,” which constituted the kingdom of Samaria, and consisted of the other eight Tribes, and the half-Tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim. These fell into gross idolatry, worshipping golden calves at Dan and Bethel.\*

And now we learn why there is no further history of the *House of Israel*.

“Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and REMOVED THEM OUT OF HIS SIGHT.”

“For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did ; they departed not from them, *until the Lord removed Israel out of His sight*” (2 Kings xvii. 18, 22, 23).

“And the Lord said . . . . I will cause to cease the kingdom of the House of Israel. . . . I will no more have mercy upon the House of Israel ; but I will utterly take them away. . . . Then said God, Call his name Lo-ammi : for ye are not My people, and I will not be your God” (Hos. i.).

“I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and THEY SHALL NO MORE BE REMEMBERED BY THEIR NAME” (Hos. ii.).

“Seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children. . . . Ephraim is joined to idols : let him alone” (Hos. iv.).

“Israel is swallowed up : now shall he be among the Gentiles as a vessel wherein is no pleasure” (Hos. viii. 8).

Yet in the midst of this dread judgment there is a sound of music, mercy rejoicing against judgment.

“How shall I give thee up, Ephraim ? How shall I deliver thee, Israel ? How shall I make thee as Admah ? How shall

\* I reiterate this distinction of the two Houses constituting two distinct nations, because it is impossible to understand the claims of the Anglo-Israel argument without clearly taking in this fact ; and it is wonderful how little it has been realised hitherto, and how little it has ever been referred to by commentators as a *fact still existing*.

I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within Me, My repentings are kindled together. . . . O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but *in Me is thine help*" (Hos. xi. 8—13).

Accordingly we find the merciful and forgiving God announcing His intention to receive back His sinning people after their chastisements had been endured, and they had been led to cast aside their idols, and turn again to the worship of Jehovah.

"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*" (Hos. i. 10).

So that the descendants of Joseph's youngest son Ephraim were to be the most marked portion of the "House of Israel," and even to give it a name, were to become idolaters, to be a nation, then cease to be a nation, then become a great nation and a company of nations, to multiply till their numbers were as the sand of the sea, to emigrate in search of room, to form colonies, and to return to the worship of the true God, and be again accepted and acknowledged by Him.

Surely when they are thus re-instated in God's favour, brought again into His sight, their position before the world will be such as to prove their birth, parentage, and education. The House of Israel cannot be *lost*, though for long ages it has been *lost sight of*. It cannot be hidden in a corner; the Israelites are too numerous a people for that. They must clearly be a CHRISTIAN people, for there is no longer temple worship at Jerusalem, and yet they are to be found "sons of the living God." The Mosaic dispensation has given place to the more perfect law of Christ, having been fulfilled by Him, and the "sons of the living God" must now be looked for among the "brethren" of the Saviour.

Is there any Christian nation so fruitful in multiplying

population, so straitened for room, so addicted to emigration, so rich in colonies, and of so missionary a spirit in making known the love of God in Christ to the heathen, and so evidencing themselves to be "sons of that living God" whom they preach to the Gentiles, as to seem to warrant a suspicion, and rather more than a suspicion, that *they* are indeed "Lost Israel" restored to light in the presence of God?

But farther. The House of Israel was to be a victorious people after they left the land of their captivity and sought out new homes, under a new name. It is declared :—

"They that strive with thee shall perish . . . they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought" (Isa. xli. 11, 12).

"No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper" (Isa. liv. 17).

"And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep : who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and *none* can deliver. Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off" (Micah v. 8, 9).

What nation is there in the known world which has been so graciously protected by God, that for 800 years, although on different occasions threatened with invasion, it has seen no enemy enter its territory? Envied and hated for its liberty and its riches, no weapon formed against it has prospered, and threats and armaments have been equally harmless. Is there *more than one* such nation?

It is declared in Deut. xv. 6 : "Thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow."

Let those conversant with the modern money-market name *the one nation* which answers to this description, and let the students of history declare whether any nation of antiquity can be brought to match it.

Again, in the same place, "Thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over you."

Tell it out among the nations, and let them put in their claims for a likeness here.

The chosen race are to possess the Gate of their enemies. A Gate is a means of access; a fortified Gate is a defence against intruders. There must be many such Gates, as each enemy would have his own Gate, his own point of special defence, the one point desirable of access. Now, *what nation* has possession of those stragetical points connected with other countries which answer this description? Is there any *second* nation which owns such Gates? Take a map of the world, and track which are the main "Gates," and see in whose possession they are placed: Heligoland, Gibraltar, the Channel Islands, Malta, Cyprus, Perim, Aden, Singapore, Malacca, Hong Kong, and a score more, scattered over every portion of the habitable earth. Can these be in the hands of any people save those to whom God promised them?

But *their own Gates* are to be open continually, their defence does not rest on walls and citadels and closed entrances:—

"They shall not be shut day or night" (Isa. lx. 11).

Are any of the continental nations so accessible? Can travellers pass in and out just at their pleasure? Is there more than *one* nation where such freedom of ingress and egress exists?

A multitudinous race implies a rapid increase of population. Compare the rate of increase of the various nations and you will find that *one* utterly distances all others by doubling her population every fifty-six years, whilst her colonies do so in every twenty-five years,—but what of the others?

The chosen people were given possession of the "Heathen." In Psa. ii. 8 we find God says to His Son,

"Ask of Me and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine

inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession."

But in Psa. xviii. we find David praising God for the great things He has done for him, and numbering amongst others,

"Thou hast girded me with strength for the battle. . . . Thou hast made me *the head of the heathen*."

In Psa. cv. David declares *why* the Hebrews were to take this position:

"He remembered His holy promise and Abraham His servant . . . and *gave them the lands of the heathen*;" and again in Psa. cxi:—

"He hath shewed His people the power of His works, *that He may give them the heritage of the heathen*."

Now, the "House of Judah" has never had a great heathen empire, and is certainly not in a position to have one at present. The "House of Israel" is still, as it were, "out of sight"—and yet there is one nation, worshippers of the living God, holding a heathen empire of nearly three hundred millions of people. How came this grand heathen possession into their hands? It was promised to the Hebrews alone: "God is not a man that He should lie; hath He said, and shall He not do it?"

The heathen empire was promised to Christ and to His people. They are to hold it for Him, to publish throughout heathendom the Gospel message of reconciliation through the blood of the Redeemer. It must therefore be held by a nation of Christians, otherwise the two promises, one to the Jews, and the other to the children of Abraham, would clash and contradict each other. The House of Judah do not preach Christ, "and Him crucified;" the work must belong to the "House of Israel," the "preserved of Israel" given by God "for a light to the Gentiles" (Isa. xlix. 6); and we find that the greatest missionary nation, the great circulator of the Bible, the great preacher of Christ to the nations, is also the people which has possession of the great heathen empire. How are we to reconcile these facts and to account for them?

The Tribe of Joseph was to become an emigrating people, to overflow, its "branches to run over the wall."

"He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and *fill the face of the world with fruit*" (Isa. xxvii. 6).

"I will preserve thee," saith the Lord, "and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, *to cause to inherit the desolate heritages*. . . . For thy waste and thy desolate places, and the land of thy destruction, shall even now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away. The children which thou shalt have, *after thou hast lost the other* (America?), shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me: give place to me that I may dwell" (Isa. xlix. 8, 19, 20—a wonderful chapter throughout).

Now, what were the "desolate heritages" of the world when Isaiah wrote? Was America known? Was South Africa known? Had Australia, New Zealand, &c., been discovered? By whom are these "desolate heritages" now inhabited and "inherited?" They are God's gift to *Israel*. Can any other people have wrenched them out of God's hands and torn them from the grasp of His chosen ones?

We find in Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, that

"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*. For the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot (*cord, measuring line*) of His inheritance."

So that the whole earth was distributed and arranged with reference to the future of Israel! Now, let us again look at the map, and we shall see how the "unicorns are pushing the people together to the ends of the earth." Track the thin red line which should mark the sovereignty of one nation, and see how it girdles the earth! I will not occupy space with a mere list of names of places, but year by year the red line

creeps farther and farther, as one heritage after another is passed by God into the possession of that one nation, and curious it is to note the NATIONAL UNWILLINGNESS to receive these marvellous and splendid gifts!\* A people "blind" and unbelieving:—

"Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Who is blind but My servant? or deaf as My messenger that I sent? Who is blind as he that is perfect and blind as the Lord's servant? Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not" (Isa. xlii. 18, &c.).

And so, faithless and clinging to the thought of a Gentile origin, the high destiny which is already its own, if it would but claim it, is despised as an incumbrance, and fretted over as a burden. How wonderful is the long-suffering of Jehovah! It is well for Israel that "His ways are not as man's ways," but that He is "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious,

---

\* In Anthony Trollope's "South Africa," vol. ii., p. 147, there are the following striking remarks:—

"It is known to all Englishmen who have watched the course of our Colonial history for the last forty years, that nothing can be so little pleasant to a Secretary of State for the Colonies as the idea of a new colony. Though they have accrued to us, one after the other, with terrible rapidity, there has always been an attempt to reject them. The Colonial Secretary has been like an old hen, to whose large brood another and another chick is ever being added, as though her powers of stretching her wings were unlimited. She does stretch them, like a good old mother with her maternal instincts, but with most unwilling efforts, till a bystander thinks that not a feather of protection could be given to another youngling. But another comes, and the old hen stretches herself still wider, most painfully.

"New Zealand is now perhaps the pet of our Colonial family; and yet what efforts were made when Lord Normanby, and afterwards when Lord John Russell were at the Colonies, to stave off the necessity of taking possession of the land.

"The same thing happened, as I have attempted to tell, both in British Kaffraria and Natal. The same thing happened the other day in the Fiji Islands," &c., &c.



long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," and who "*remembereth His covenant* with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob."

The list of facts which photograph **ONE PEOPLE** and present the perfect resemblance to the subject of prophecy, might be greatly extended, but I have preferred to seize the main features, and show their absolutely literal response as a reflection in a mirror, or as the likeness when the sun has shone upon it, and ask my readers to think—to think prayerfully—and with the Word of God in their hearts, and to ask themselves whether they can conscientiously blind themselves any longer to the high destiny to which their God has called them ?

## CHAPTER IV.

2. I come now to the HISTORICAL, PHILOLOGICAL and ETHNOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

If Israel was put "out of sight," and "swallowed up," were they ever to be recovered, brought to light, brought out of their graves? And if so, in what form were they to re-appear? The worm, the caterpillar, &c., passes into a chrysalis, but does not re-appear as a caterpillar; it comes out as a moth or a butterfly. Man, the individual man, dies, and passes into the grave, but when he re-appears, he will be clothed with "a new body prepared for him."

Hosea tells us that such will be the state of Israel. In the place where they were buried out of sight, in the place of their banishment, where they had been worshippers of idols, "there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God" (Hosea i. 10).

"Go and proclaim these words towards the North, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not cause Mine anger to fall upon you: for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger for ever" (Jer. iii. 12).

"For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land" (Isa. xiv. 1).

"The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though Thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return, the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness" (Isa. x. 21, 22).

"But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and He that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name, thou art Mine. Fear not, for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the East and gather thee from the West; I will say to the North, Give up, and to the South, Keep not back, bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth" (Isa. xliii. 1, 5, 6).

But not only is Israel to be re-called into life, they are to receive a new name, and to be addressed in a new language.

"The Lord God . . . shall call His servants by another name" (Isa. lxxv. 15).

"Thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord shall name" (Isa. lxxii. 2).

"With stammering lips and another tongue will He speak to this people" (Isa. lxxviii. 11).

"For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord to serve Him with one consent" (Zeph. iii. 9).

But if Israel has lost nationality, and religion, and name, and language, and been put "out of sight" of history, *how is it to be recognised?* The ordinary mode of search into the family pedigree of a nation would surely be useless here! Critical dissertations on grammar and lingual alliances would be sheer pedantry, and I cannot see that ethnology would fare better. The one part of the Hebrew nation, it is true, were to be known by their "countenance." Isaiah declares of Judah, "the shew of their countenance doth witness against them" (Isa. iii. 9). So that even in those days it is possible there was a marked distinction, though I am inclined myself to receive the declaration as a prophecy, and think it rather describes the Jews in their dispersion after the crucifixion of Christ. We know that Jews were not known by the "shew of their countenance" when Esther and Mordecai were in Susa, the then capital of Persia. "Esther had not showed her people nor her kindred, for Mordecai had charged her that she should not shew it" (Esther ii. 10); and again, of Mordecai, "He had told them he was a Jew" (3, 4).

If they could have recognised his nationality by "the shew of his countenance," he need not have *told* them, and if Esther could also have been so easily detected, it would scarcely have availed her to attempt concealment. But the distinction between "backsliding Israel" and "treacherous Judah" seems

to me to clear the question. Israel deserted the worship of the Lord Jehovah and fell into idolatry, and was expatriated from Palestine. Judah retained the nominal worship of God at Jerusalem, but betrayed His Son to be crucified, and "treacherous Judah" was banished from Jerusalem.

"Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled" (Luke xxi. 24).

"Your house is left unto you desolate" (xiii. 35).

Comparing this fact of our Lord's declaration of judgment with the previous warnings of the prophets, "I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you and a perpetual shame which shall not be forgotten" (Jer. xxiii. 40), and looking at the position which the Jews have held since the destruction of Jerusalem—how they have been "removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse in all places whither I have driven them" (Jer. xxiv. 9), and how this terrible punishment was never executed till after their rejection and crucifixion of Jesus—I am impressed with the conviction that the threatened mark, "the shew of their countenance," was set on them at the same time. It would, in fact, be essential to the fulfilment of the solemn judgment pronounced. If they were suffered to blend with the nations amidst whom they were scattered, and to become absorbed into their population, how could they have been singled out for the terrible persecution to which they were to be subjected? But no such mark was necessary for "backsliding Israel." They were to be put out of sight, and to cease to be recognised as a people until, having been led to renounce their idolatry, they had again been brought to the worship of the true God. Now we know from our Lord's lesson to the woman at Samaria (John iv. 20—25) that it would not be the *Jewish* worship to which they would return. That Mosaic dispensation was closed when the veil of the temple was rent, and, therefore, when the House of Israel again sought to worship

the God of their fathers "in spirit and in truth," it would be under the new name of "Christians," that they would be found "sons of the living God;" and it is after their conversion that they are to return to their promised inheritance in Palestine. Of what use, then, is it to look for Israelites as having a family resemblance to Jews? Or of what use is it to attempt to limit the search for Lost Israel by the rules accepted as efficient guides in the attempt to trace the pedigree of ordinary peoples? These peoples—the two portions of the Hebrew nation—are each isolated and separated from every other people, the one by a special mark affixed, the other by the removal of every ordinary clue by which they might be hunted out. If we would find God's people, we must seek them in God's way. Surely, neither philology nor ethnology help us here. But what says history? and is it reasonable to expect *much more* help from secular history? Let us try to track it as far as we can.

We have seen the record of the Assyrian captivity as related in 2 Kings xvii. We will treat the Apocryphal books as secular history, and glean what we can from them and it, as well as from Scripture.

In 2 Chron. xxx. we find that already, in the reign of Hezekiah over Judah, a *remnant of the captive Israelites had escaped from Media*. Now Hezekiah began to reign in Jerusalem about six or seven years before the final subjugation of Samaria, 722 B.C. Evidently the Israelites were even then restless in their captivity. Hezekiah invited them to come to Jerusalem and join in the worship of the Lord God of Israel at Jerusalem and keep the Passover. But such thorough heathens were they, that they laughed his messengers to scorn and mocked them, all but a few individuals of the Tribes of Asher, and Manasseh, and Zebulun, "who humbled themselves and went to Jerusalem." But I am not writing about mere individuals. In the present day, we see that Englishmen, individuals and families, are to be found sometimes as travellers,

sometimes as settlers, in every corner of the known globe ; but no one writing of the history of England would think himself concerned to testify of them. His business would lie with the great body of the people—the *nation*—and they would be centred in England. So, my present object is to treat of the great central body of the House of Israel carried off into Media, and not with those families or individuals, who, doubtless, might be found in the person of their descendants scattered throughout the earth. Of this central body, what was their condition in Media ? Did considerable bodies of them, “remnants,” escape at different periods of time during the 800 years or thereabouts, of which we hear of their being in Media ? Tobit says, “Now all the Tribes which together revolted, and the house of my father Nephthali, *sacrificed unto the heifer Baal*” (i. 5). So that the remnant which scoffed and mocked at the invitation of Hezekiah, were only too truly the representatives of the entire lapse into heathenism of the whole House of Israel.

The religion of a people influences the whole of their national and individual life ; it affects their laws and customs, their manners and their tastes ; and these few words of Tobit explain to us how entire was the change which had passed over the House of Israel since Jeroboam the son of Nebat had “made Israel to sin.” Nearly 300 years of estrangement from the true God, the God of their fathers, had broken all the ties of race, and we can no longer wonder that they fulfilled their destiny, and lost with religion their name and language, so that history does not know them. The Jews, or House of Judah, whilst they remained themselves at Jerusalem, knew the locality of the Israelites. Josephus, who died A.D. 90, describes the Ten Tribes as being still in Media, and a great multitude ; and James addressed his epistle to “the Twelve Tribes which are *scattered abroad*,” implying that they were in different places, and not merely divided between Palestine and Media. Now this is precisely what I wish to suggest : that, during the 800

years between the earlier Assyrian captivity and the time of Josephus and James, numerous "remnants" had at various times escaped from Media and wandered away to other lands before the outcome of the main body.

Esdras, who, like Tobit, may be regarded as simply an historian, says of the Ten Tribes, "they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen and go forth into a further country where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river" (2 Esdras xiii. 41—46).

The period at which the books of Esdras were written is a disputed point, but it must have been *after Josephus*, and the history may be received as clear testimony of what was believed amongst the Jews of his day to be the position of the Ten Tribes, and we may give him as date, the early part or middle of the second century. After this we hear nothing of the "House of Israel" *as such*—we must look for them by their new name.

Let us turn now to the history of Europe and see if we can find anything to help us to discover what became of the wanderers from Media.

Sharon Turner tells us that "the most probable traditions that have been preserved in Europe concur to prove that it has been peopled by three great streams of population *from the East*, which have followed each other, at intervals so distinct, as to possess languages clearly separable from each other. The earliest of these we shall find to have comprised the Kimmerian and Keltic race. The second consisted of the Scythian, Gothic, and German Tribes, from whom most of the modern nations of continental Europe have descended. The third, and most recent, comprehends the Slavonian and Sarmatian nations, who were bordering on the second race as they spread over Germany, and who have now established themselves in Poland, Bohemia,

Russia, and their vicinities. It is from the *two first générâ* of the European population that the ancient inhabitants of England successively descended."

The leaders and principal writers advocating the Anglo-Israel theory claim the Kimmerians, or Khumri, or Cwmry, as part of the House of Israel of the Ten Tribes, of the escaped from Media, or at any rate, as those who fled from Shalmaneser when he conquered Samaria. Now here I own I am perplexed. Sharon Turner says, "It cannot now be ascertained when the Kimmerians first passed out of Asia over the Bosphorus, which they named; but that they were in Europe in the days of Homer is obvious, because he mentions them in his '*Odyssey*,' and *he appears to have lived at least 800 years before the Christian era.*"

If this were so, it would entirely destroy the Anglo-Israel theory as far as the Kimmerians were concerned, because it would represent the Kimmerians to have passed into Europe fifty years before the Assyrian captivity began.

But the period of Homer's existence is such a very undefined date, and so very vague a point of departure from which to reckon, that it would be simple folly to reject the theory on that ground alone. Suppose it were shown that Homer was born in the *eighth century* instead of 800 years B.C.; this would reopen the whole question and permit the impossible to become the possible, and even the probable.\*

On the side of the "probable" there are circumstances which warrant a very careful examination of the question, specially the fact that the early Welsh called themselves "the Cwmry." The name "Khumri" occurs on the Nimroud Obelisk (now in the British Museum, and brought from Nineveh) as the name

---

\* Sharon Turner also says, "that the Kimmerians were inhabiting these places (in the North-east of Europe) above 700 years before our Saviour's advent, we have direct historical evidence."—*Hist. Anglo-Saxons*, vol. i., p. 27.



of Jehu, king of Israel. "The 'Khumry' of Wales and Cumberland; the Cimbri of Jutland, known to the Romans; the Cimmerii of the Greeks; the Gimiri of the Assyrian inscriptions, and the 'Khumri' of the Nimroud Obelisk, are thus traced back to the land of Omri, the founder of Samaria, the ruler over the rebellious 'outcast' House of the Ten Tribes of Israel. . . . We have seen the strong grounds that exist for believing that the Cwmry of Wales were the very people mentioned on the Assyrian inscriptions as the Khumri of *Beth Khumri, or Samaria.*"

Now if the early settlers in Wales of the Celtic Tribes of the Cymric stock were not Hebrews, how can we account for the fact that their learned men, as late as the sixth century of our own era A.D., wrote in the Hebrew tongue? Taliesin expressly says in one of his poems, entitled, "Angar Cyvyndawd," "My lore has been declared in *Hebrew*" (See Philo-Israel's "Historical, Ethnic, and Philological Arguments," &c., price 2d.).

I think it is just as difficult, if not far more so, to get over these facts than to get over the question of the contradictory date through Homer.

The second wave of immigrants from the East consisted of the Scythian, German, and Gothic Tribes. Sharon Turner says, "They also entered it out of Asia. It is of importance to recollect the fact of their primeval locality, because it corresponds with this circumstance, that Herodotus, besides the main Scythia which he places in Europe, mentions also an Eastern or Asiatic Scythia beyond the Caspian or Jaxartes. . . . The Anglo-Saxons, &c., have all sprung from that great fountain of the human race which we have distinguished by the terms Scythian, German, or Gothic."

Now, I am again struck by the curious confusion of dates. Sharon Turner had just stated that the "waves" followed each other at "*intervals so distinct*, as to possess languages clearly

separable from each other," and yet he gives nearly the same dates for the arrival of the Scythians as he gave for the Kimmerians. "The first appearance of the Scythian Tribes in Europe may be placed, according to Strabo and *Homer*, about the eighth, or according to Herodotus, in the seventh century before the Christian era." And again he says, "The emigrating Scythians crossed the Araxes, passed out of Asia, and invading the Kimmerians appeared in Europe in the seventh century before the Christian era."

But if *Homer* lived "at least 800 years before Christ"—that is to say, in the *ninth century*—it seems difficult to accept him as an authority for what took place in the latter part of the eighth, or during some time in the seventh century B.C.! If we accept Herodotus as more trustworthy, then the seventh century would synchronise with the probable movements of the wandering captives from Media, and open up a fair field of inquiry as to whether they were the same people. There seems to me considerable difficulty in establishing any very strong argument on so shifting a basis as these uncertain dates, and I do not think they warrant an absolute decision *for, or against*, the theory under our consideration. There is just enough haziness to give license to objectors, and there is just enough probability to encourage advocates.\* Still I am disposed to believe that further research will prove in time, from history, that the Israelites and Saxons were the same people, because the Scriptural testimony is so remarkably clear in its descriptions, and those descriptions are correct only of the Anglo-Saxon race.

---

\* For more historical information, see "The Historical, Ethnic, and Philological Arguments in Proof of British Identity with the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel," by Philo-Israel, price twopence. W. H. Guest, 20, Warwick-lane, Paternoster-row; and Robert Banks, Racquet-court, Fleet-street.

We know from Ezekiel that the recovery of Israel to light and life will be very gradual, step by step. His vision of the valley of dry bones, he *expressly says, refers to the "whole House of Israel;"* and he also distinguishes carefully between "Israel" and "Judah."

"These bones are the whole House of Israel. . . . I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel" (Ezek. xxxvii.).

And how is this resurrection—this "life from the dead" brought about? *By degrees.* "Can these dry bones live?" Such was the natural thought, doubtless, in the heart of the prophet, and which the Lord permitted him to utter.

"Again He said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O ye dry bones, hear the word of the LORD. Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones: Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live: and I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live . . . and as I prophesied, there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone."

Now look back over the growth of England and the singular providence over her which may be traced in her history.

A small island at the North-west of Europe, a prey for a given period to successive irruptions of conquering tribes (so-called "barbarians," and for a long time "heathens")—settles down at last, finally conquered by professing Christians, and from that hour no invading force has ever succeeded in landing on her shores. For 800 years no foreign foe has trodden her soil. Gradually her people wrung from her Sovereigns equal laws, a just administration of them, respect for life and property, and personal liberty. Self-respect strengthened their natural courage, and they grew to be respected and feared by the nations on the continent. After liberty for secular affairs had been wrested, then came the desire for mental and spiritual liberty,

and at the Reformation England cast off the chains of Popery, and rested her faith on the Bible alone. The national greatness expanded from that time. America was opened up, colonisation began, English sailors carried the name, the fame, and terror of England to the New World. Fresh discoveries of "desolate heritages" were made, into which the Anglo-Saxons poured, and for 300 years they have gradually been girdling the earth with their colonies, till now the Queen of England and Empress of India reigns over an Empire which claims a large portion of the four quarters of the globe, and has added a fifth "quarter" in Australia, and the English language is becoming the dominant language of the world.

Why has England been so watched over and so preserved? Has any other country such a history? The histories of other countries are made up of wars and rumours of wars in defence of their homes from foreign invaders—ours, save civil wars, chiefly in the struggle for civil and religious liberty, are tales of conquest abroad and of additions to our Empire.

Why should so small a speck on the earth's surface as this little island in the North-west, be able to control an enormous and populous-scattered Empire on which the sun never sets? Why should England be the terror of the oppressor and the asylum of the oppressed? Why should it be the admiration and the envy of every people seeking deliverance from tyranny, the destroyer of slavery, "letting the oppressed go free?" Is not England "*set as a sign*?" Has not God declared,—

"I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the *isles afar off*, that have not heard My fame, neither have seen My glory; and they shall declare My glory among the Gentiles?" (Isa. lxvi. 19).

Surely the escaped of the House of Israel from the land of Media found their way to the isles afar off—too far off to know the wondrous tale of God's dealings with His chosen people, the

Hebrew nation, and from thence have been the great carriers of Gospel tidings, the message of God's glory in His dearly-beloved Son, the Saviour of fallen man, to the Gentiles, the heathens of every land and every clime. But what people can usurp the prerogative of God's elect? If He selects *one people* to fulfil His will, can another people snatch the privilege from them and counteract His sovereign decrees? If God has declared by His prophets the special marks which shall distinguish the "dry bones," it is His gracious pleasure to bring up from their grave, restore to life and energy, bring again into His presence, and recognise as those whom He had for so many centuries put out of His sight—can any other people simulate those marks, and make their Identity doubtful?

If the few prominent proofs of Identity I have given are not *numerous* enough to carry conviction, read Mr. Hine's "Forty-seven Identifications," or Miss Hope's interesting pamphlet, "Lost Israel," or Canon Titcomb's "Anglo-Israel Post Bag," and Philo-Israel on the "Historical Question," &c. ; but do not rest till you have carefully and prayerfully compared the prophecies respecting the "House of Israel" with the history and present position of England. I do not ask you to adopt a new and startling theory hastily and carelessly, but I do ask you to be timid in rejecting the glorious destiny which God has ordained for His people, and which He is waiting to bestow. I have heard people scoff at this prospect as being merely temporal. I deny that it is so. The outpouring of the Spirit waits for the children of Israel to come out of their grave ; the second coming of our Saviour as the Lord of glory waits the same event ; He will not reign in person till His subjects are ready to receive Him, and are eager to "see the King in His beauty ;" and His subjects on earth will be His brethren in heaven. Those who love Him here, will be loved by Him there ; a "righteous" nation will "worship Him in

spirit and in truth," and it is such worshippers who are accepted by the Father "in the Beloved."

But grant for a moment that the blessings awaiting recovered Israel are simply temporal. Is patriotism dead among us? Have English hearts ceased to beat at the thought of their country's glory? Is there no rush of blood at the sound of national disaster or national honour? Is it nothing to Englishmen whether their neighbours thrive or starve, live or die, sorrow or rejoice? Shame on such reasonings. What God in His munificence thought a fitting gift for His chosen people, what His beloved patriarchs Abraham, "the friend of God," Isaac, and Jacob, the "soldier of God," thought worth their warmest gratitude, the pledge of the future greatness of their race, can be no paltry gift to be scorned or despised, and cast aside as worthless!

Will any man call himself a *Christian* and treat the providence of God thus? Can anyone who habitually *prays*, venture to scoff at temporal blessings? I plead that such thoughts are practical infidelity, and that those who wait daily on God for health and life, and all that makes life desirable, should shrink from such impiety.

It is one thing not to see the clearness of the argument in behalf of this theory. It is quite another to treat the subject as unworthy of consideration. Yet how often may you hear people say, "I daresay I should find it interesting if I had *time to look into it*." Have they not time to read their Bibles? And again others say, "I don't see of what use it is," or, "Oh, I don't care about it—it is simply nonsense."

Now I entreat for the subject as much calm, honest consideration as you would give to the question of a *new tax*, or the chance of a *very troublesome war*, or the prospect of a *bad harvest*, or a rumour that your *bank had stopped payment*. Most people would find time enough, and eagerness enough, to make themselves tolerably well acquainted with these topics,

D

but the subject to which I ask their attention absorbs all these topics of interest, by affecting them all, and has therefore that claim over them in superiority of interest which the whole has over a part. It is a subject which will influence our views on all other subjects, and strongly bias our judgment and conduct in daily life. It will stimulate to exertion in all that is good, and check us in errors of opinion and conduct, for it will lead us to a vivid sense of the nearness of God, of the reality and literalness of His promises, and so bring us into a closer dependence on our blessed Lord who has revealed Himself to us as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." With many of us, faith is weak, because our sense of the promises is vague; we do not rest on them as we should, because we do not receive them literally. The conviction that all those grand and bountiful promises to Israel have been in course of fulfilment as literally as have been the threatened chastisements to the Jews, would throw a new glory over the pages of the Old Testament, and teach us to apply more precisely to ourselves the warnings and promises of Christ and His apostles; and that this picture is not overdrawn, but that the Bible is thus brought home to the intellect and the heart with added power, because of greater harmony and clearness, is manifest from the fact that, by the agency of Anglo-Israelite explanations, several infidels have been converted and brought to believe the truth "as it is in Jesus." The old interpretations of prophecy jumbled Judah and Israel together, and represented God as perpetually contradicting Himself. Now the promises and the threatenings belonging to each are distinguished and classified. Is it likely that such results should arise from presumptuous errors in the comprehension of God's Word? And yet if the Anglo-Israel theory be not true, it is at least a very presumptuous mistake. "Search the Scriptures" like the Bereans of old, and see whether these things are so. I plead that we are a Semitic people, and thank God for belonging to "the Tribes of His inheritance."