

22.

THE
ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY

OF

MR. E. HINE & PHILO-ISRAEL

COMPLETELY REFUTED

FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY "CLERICUS."

"Which say they are Jews and are not."

THREE HALF-PENCE.

Sold by GOODALL, Leeds ; BURDEKIN, York ;
HEYWOOD, Manchester ; BREAR, Bradford ; WOOLLARD,
Liverpool ; HAUGHTON & Co., 10, Paternoster Row, London ;
and the Booksellers.

COPYRIGHT.

THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY REFUTED.

As the gentlemen referred to on the title page and others have long been going through the country attempting to persuade us that we are the "house of Israel," or the descendants of the ten tribes who were taken captive to Assyria, and that we ought to think of going to Palestine ere long, instead of being prepared for the sudden appearing of the Lord where we are, the writer (whose previous and larger work on the subject has been nearly disposed of) has now resolved to issue, at a small cost, certain sure tests by which every man can judge for himself whether the theory is true or false, and whether, if it were true, the fact would be of any importance to the Christian portion of us.

As the burden of proof rests with them, and the theory is attempted to be based on certain promises made to Abraham and Israel concerning the future greatness of their seed, which, it is said, God must in faithfulness fulfil; it becomes necessary for any one who would prove that we are the house of Israel, to establish with absolute certainty the following points:—

First, that there are no passages of scripture which teach that the above promises to Israel shall be fulfilled after her return to Palestine, for if they shall be, God's faithfulness is not at stake in their present non-fulfilment.

Secondly, that there are no passages of scripture which teach that at the time immediately previous to their return, Israel shall be outcast, down-trodden, without a king, and nationally in unbelief of Christ; for this nation is not in that condition.

(As Isa. xviii. 7, Jer. xxx. 3—10, Ezk. xxxvii. 21—28, xxxix. 21—29, Hosea iii. 4, Rom. xi. 32, (see margin), and many others shew that there is not an absence of such passages from the Bible, the question is settled that we cannot be Israel. The ramifications of the theory, however, demand that we do not leave the matter here.)

While an absence of all such passages would have shewn our identity with Israel to be possible, the following additional matters must be conclusively established to prove it true.

Thirdly, that all historians and ethnologists, biblical and otherwise, who have written to shew that we are Gentiles (the seed of Japheth) have been and are in error on the point.

Fourthly, that the "house of Israel" which was carried captive to Assyria did not become from thence scattered into all the earth, but did as an absolute certainty leave that land and come and people England. (The mere quotation of a few opinions on the point would of course be no proof: there must be trustworthy historical evidence that is demonstrative, and will bear examining, and which we require to see.)

Fifthly, they must produce at the least one passage of scripture, which, on the admission of the great bulk of Christian men in all ages teaches that the natural Israel is to be good and great before they return to Palestine; for of course the views of a few modern believers in the identity, who cannot on many points agree among themselves, amounts to nothing as proof.

Sixthly, it must be shewn that any true proofs of our identity with Israel do not apply to any other kingdom, for if they do they have no real force with regard to ourselves alone.

Seventhly, it must be proved that Israel and Judah have never intermingled to any great extent, for if they have, the great distinction which is claimed for Israel (as against Judah) as alone enjoying God's promises, has no force.

That we may not misrepresent the views of the above advocates, concerning Judah and Israel, we give the following extract from Mr. Hine's "Ident," (pages 4 and 5) the sentiments of which are sanctioned by Philo-Israel in his "Enquiry, &c." (page 1 and elsewhere). "The most remarkable feature of the prophecies concerning Israel, is their exactly opposite character as contrasted with those of Judah. Thus, instead of being a marked people, known by all nations, Israel was to become a lost people known by none, not even to themselves. Instead of being a *small people bereft of children*, Israel was to have the 'multitudinous seed as the stars of heaven.' Instead of being a *dispersed people and no nation*, Israel was to become a fulness of nations, kings coming out of her. Instead of being a *trembling people smitten before her enemies*, Israel was to be the most warlike nation, possessing the seat of power, the gate of her enemies."

As the above seven points furnish a sound basis by which to test our identity with Israel, let us inquire a little concerning them.

THE PROMISES.

1. If because God made certain promises to Israel (merely in the future tense) we are to conclude that they will be fulfilled in this age, it follows that the numerous promises of blessing, redemption, and

salvation made to the "heathen, and all flesh," (Luke iii. 6) will be fulfilled in this age, though the Bible says—as in the case of Israel—they will not (Luke xvii. 26—30, Rev. i. 7).

2. How can the promises made to Abraham of "numerous seed which shall possess the gate of its enemies and be exalted above all the nations of the earth," belong only to the "house of Israel," when, because of the time at which they were spoken they applied to Judah as much as to it, and when some of the promises are elsewhere specially applied to Judah's seed (Jer. xxxiii. 22), but are nowhere applied to the ten tribes apart from the time of their re-union with Judah?

3. Why are such passages as Jer. xxxi. 7, 8, Ps. xxii. 27, Isa. xxvii. 6, liv. 3, Micah v. 8, and scores of a similar kind quoted as applying to the present age, when the context of all of them clearly shews that they refer only to a brighter day, when Israel shall have been restored, and is free from her sins, her wanderings and her enemies?

4. How can it be said that all (see extract) the promises of blessings belong to the "house of Israel," and the curses to the "house of Judah" in the face of the following scriptures which teach the contrary:—

Judah shall be "bowed down to by his brethren (the other tribes) and shall conquer his enemies." (Gen. xlix. 8, 9.)

Judah was the ruling tribe in Israel, and because of that was the envy of Ephraim. (1 Chron. xxviii. 4, Isai. xi. 13.)

Judah, as a tribe, was preferred before both Joseph and Ephraim, and was "the Mount Zion which God loved." (Ps. lxxviii. 67, 68.)

Judah (not Benjamin) was God's "light" in Israel. (2 Kings viii. 19, 2 Chron. xxi. 7.)

Judah was God's "pleasant plant in the vineyard" of Israel. (Isa. v. 7.)

Judah produced the legitimate Kings in Israel. (Gen. xlix. 10.)

Judah was loyal to David's throne in days of revolt. (1 Kings xii. 19, 20, 21.)

Judah was "faithful with the saints." (Hosea xi. 12.)

Judah was promised a continual royal heir till Shiloh came. (Gen. xlix. 10.)

Judah was counted worthy of restoration to Palestine. (Nehemiah.)

Judah was the honoured tribe from whom Messiah sprang. (Heb. vii. 14.)

Judah shall at the time of Israel's restoration be "saved first." (Zach. xii. 7.)

Judah shall recover Jerusalem, ver. 5, 6, &c.

Judah shall be—in his royal seed—at the head of Israel for ever. (Isa. ix. 7.)

Judah is honoured by his name (Jew) being given to all Israel. (Est. iii. 13.)

Judah's seed shall be as the stars of heaven for multitude (Jer. xxxiii. 22.)

While all the above scriptures refer to Judah, the following are

TRUTHS AND FACTS CONCERNING THE "HOUSE OF ISRAEL,"

It never ought to have existed as a separate nation. (Ex. xix. 6.)

It shall not exist as such when forgiven and restored. (Ezk. xxxvii. 21, 22.)

It came into existence through sin. (I Kings xi. 11.)

It arose by revolt, or rebellion against David's throne. (I Kings xvi. 16, 19.)

It was also (with individual exceptions) a national apostacy from the faith and worship of Israel's God. (I Kings xii. 28—30.)

Its nineteen Kings were not of the royal promised seed of Judah. (I Kings xvi.)

They belonged to nine distinct families, viz.:—those of Jeroboam (Solomon's servant), Basha, Zinri, Omri, Jehu, Shallum, Menahem, Pekah, and Hoshea. (I Kings xvi.)

They were nearly all wicked idolaters. (Kings.)

Israel as a Kingdom, and its King were destroyed from off the earth. (Amos ix. 8, Hos. i. 4, x. 15.)

Her captivity never returned.

Her Kingless and Captive condition is to be continued until they, with Judah, are restored and made one nation. (Hosea iii. 4, Jer. xxx. Ezk. xxxvii.)

Israel, termed "Ephraim" (here and elsewhere) was not to increase but be diminished in number. Hosea ix. 13—17, Ezk. iii. 4, 5, v. 4, 7, 11, 12.)

Two-thirds of the whole house of Israel were to be destroyed. (ver. 12.)

The other third was to be scattered to the winds, and be followed by the sword. (ver. 12.)

(If it should be said that the prophecies of Ezekiel apply chiefly to Judah, why do Anglo-Israelites (so called) steal its *promises of blessing for the ten tribes*, (e.g., xxxvi. 11) ?

While Judah is "the dispersed," Israel is "the outcast." (Isa. xi. 11, 12.)

Israel (as well as Judah) would reject the Lord. (viii. 14.)

She did reject him. (Rom. ix. 30—33, Comp. Isa. v. 7, vi. 9, Acts xxviii. 25—28.)

She was cast out of the Kingdom through unbelief. (Mat. viii. 11, 12.)

The only promises of blessing to the ten tribes as such during this age is, preservation from extinction. (Amos ix. 8.)

They are to be only a remnant when they return. (Isa. xi. 11, 16, Zech. viii. 12.)

They are to "know the Lord," have a new heart, be converted, and receive the Holy Spirit only when they shall have been brought to their own land, (Ezk. xxxix. 21, 22—29, xxxvi. 24—31, xxxvii. 21, 22.)

5. Why do Mr. Hine and his followers rake up the threatenings against Judah, and try to conceal the above and other promises made to him?

6. Why do they try to conceal the threatenings which apply to the house of Israel till their return with Judah to their own land, and instead thereof apply the promises which are to be fulfilled to them after that time, to the present?

NUMEROUS SEED.

7. Why do they omit to quote the passages which declare that the "house of Israel" (as the ten tribes) should not be allowed to increase, but should be diminished (Hosea ix. 13—17) and quote only passages such as *they say* predict the diminution of Judah's seed, which, however, include Israel as well? (Deut. xxviii. 62, Ezk. v. 12.)

MONARCHY.

8. Why do they quote the various promises to David that his "seed should be established on his throne for ever," (which no one disputes) without quoting others which state that that seed is Christ, and that the time when this establishment shall take place is after the Lord has come a second time (Zech. xiv. 1—4, 9, 10) and Israel has been restored to her own land? (Jer. xxxiii. 7—9, 24—26, last clause.)

9. Why do they affirm that because the Lord said that "David should never want a man (*i.e.*, an heir) to sit on his throne," one should always be reigning there?

10.—Moreover, does not every one know that many promises of God are conditional in their fulfilment, though no condition was expressed at the time they were made? (Comp. Exo. vi. 6, 8, Deuty. i. 34—38, 40, also Matt. xix. 28, John xvii. 12.)

11. How could, or can, a man be reigning on David's throne during the fulfilment of the following prophecy:—"The children of Israel shall abide many days without a King and without a Prince. . . . Afterwards, they shall return and seek the Lord their God and David their King." (Hos. iii. 4, 5.)

12. Do not Matt. i. 6—16, and Luke iii. 23—31, shew that the above promise to David of "not being without an heir" was literally fulfilled, though the separate Kingdom of Israel was destroyed from off the earth (Amos ix. 8.) and its King utterly cut off. (Hos. x. 15.)

13. As our Lord is at this moment a man, the offspring of David (Rev. xxii.) and is the "Omega" the final heir to David's throne both by promise and legitimate genealogy, how could there be another legitimate King of Israel after he was born?

14. Did not the wise men from the East, and Herod (Matt. ii. 2, 3,) and Nathaniel, the "Israelite indeed" (John i. 47, 49) and the Pharisees who said "we have no King but Cæsar," and the thousands of Israel who cried "Hosannah" recognize the fact that they had no King but Christ?

15. If it had been possible for there to have been another heir to David's throne in existence than the *final one*, do Anglo-Israel advocates suppose that their wild statements, made in support of who he is supposed to be would be sufficient proof of it, or would obtain credence for a moment with any one who is careful to distinguish between assertion and proof?

JEW.

16. How can it be said that the term "Jew" does not apply to the "house of Israel," when it is applied is Est. iii. 13, to all the captive Israelites in the Assyrian Empire. (Comp. Est. i. 1, Danl. ii. 38, Ezra i. 2, 3.) Ahasuerus succeeded Nebuchadnezzar, and Cyrus succeeded Ahasuerus to the same Empire—the whole known world. (Rom. iii. 29.)

17. If the division of the twelve tribes was anything but a temporary punishment, why do they not give us some plain scriptures to prove it?

18. If the division was intended to be permanent, why did the good and inspired King Hezekiah and others deplore it, and seek to bring the ten tribes into re-union with Judah, and did actually recover a multitude from six of the tribes who, with as many from *all* the tribes who had returned before, as "strengthened the Kingdom of Judah" continued with her? (See 2 Chron. xi. 16, 17, xxx. 1, 10, 11, 18, 20, xxxiv. 9.)

19. If there had not been as many from the ten tribes with Judah in the days of our Lord as constituted them a full representation of the separate house of Israel, how could Isaiah's prophesy have been fulfilled that "both the houses of Israel" should reject the Lord? (viii. 14.)

20. If the passages quoted in this paper concerning the present lamentable condition of Israel be true, is it not clear that Mr. Hine's and Philo-Israel's accumulated mass of evidence of England's greatness is overwhelming proof that we are not Israel?

"CHRISTIANIS CUI BONO."

21. If being natural Israelites were so important, how is it that the major portions of the epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written to teach the converted Jews in those Churches, who entertained the same notion that when a person has become a Christian

he is "neither Jew nor Gentile;" and that "henceforth are we to know no man after (*i.e.*, according to) the flesh; not even Christ." (2 Cor. v. 16.)

22. If Christians are to be so concerned about going to Palestine how is it that neither the Lord nor the Apostles mention it in the new Testament?

While the notion that we are Israel flatly contradicts the prophecies of scripture, the belief and fact of our being Gentiles—as well as the other European nations—perfectly agrees with it.

Noah spake three prophecies concerning the descendants of his three sons, "Shem, Ham, and Japheth," (Gen. ix. 25—27) which are (with universal assent) having their fulfilment in their history; Shem's in Israel, Ham's in the coloured races, and Japheth's in the civilised Gentiles. Concerning Japheth's seed he said "God shall enlarge Japheth"—we and other Gentile nations are enlarged. "He shall dwell in the tents of Shem"—Jerusalem has long been held by Gentiles, Gentiles are also members of the "body of Christ with the Jews," (I Cor. xii. 13,) and in our African and Indian subjects "Canaan is our servant."

Besides the above we can advance a great amount of evidence against the truth of the theory in question, but it is really unnecessary. Until the foregoing questions are answered and the test propositions are established, every man is bound to reject it as a blind, unscriptural, antichristian heresy of these last days; which, in comparison with the exceeding great glory to which the Church of Christ is heir, offers only pebbles for pearls, dross for gold, and the glory of Jerusalem the earthly, for the glory of being made like unto Christ at His appearing, and being in His presence for ever in Jerusalem the heavenly. (Rev. xxi.)

It will be seen from many of the passages quoted in this Pamphlet that believers in Anglo-Israel identity are not wrong in saying that Israel shall have fulfilled to her all the promises which have been made to her; they are in error in not seeing that as in the past so in the present and future God is carrying out His purpose with mankind in separate dispensations; that as this dispensation was divided from the last one by the first advent of the Lord, by the admission of the Gentiles to the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic covenant, and the destruction or dispersion of all the Jews (except the remnant of Judah and Israel who received Christ) to the four winds, where their brethren had been scattered before, so the coming dispensation, the millenium, will be separated from this age by the Lord's second advent, the first resurrection, the translation of the living saints (I Thess. iv. 16—18), the manifestation and fearful success, but final destruction of the last Antichrist, by the times of the Gentiles being fulfilled, the destruction of spiritual Babylon, the chaining of Satan, the restoration of Judah and Israel to Palestine, their conversion to the faith of Him whom their fathers crucified (Zech. xii.) and have so long despised, and their establishment in Jerusalem over the heathen race of Ham.

These are the principal events that will divide the two dispensations ; and they will doubtless occupy a number of years. The first of them will be the descent of the Lord from heaven, the resurrection of the departed and the translation of the living saints : the last of them—Israel's becoming supreme. The great cause we say of the other errors of Anglo-Israelite advocates (while holding some truth) is their ignoring any of these acts of God but *one*, the *last of the series*.

Partial views even of truth always lead to greater errors, and they lead *them* to hide (see extract, page 2) passages such as Jer. xxx. 3—10, and many others which teach that Israel and Judah are on a level before God both in regard to their troubles and the time of their salvation from them ; and that great as their troubles have been hitherto, their greatest (ver. 7) have yet to come ; and which teach also that the "breaking of the yoke off their neck, and the bursting of the bonds" of both shall occur simultaneously ; and therefore that their own statements about the previous superiority of Israel to Judah are not true.

Nor is the evil effects of their onesided views confined to the above ; as we have said they lead them to disregard the *most important event of all* and the *special* preparation necessary for it (Heb. ix. 28, last clause) and to fix their attention on, and direct their energies to another, which as Christians (who should be hourly watching for the return of their Lord,) they have nothing to do with.

It is of course flattering to our national pride to be told that we are great, and God's own people ; and the theory (like every other) will, in these days from the multitude, and even from the ministry, gain some adherents, (falling stars) but we are persuaded that none who approach the subject impartially, and will examine and believe the passages we have quoted will entertain it for a moment.

The co-operation of the reader in the circulation of the above truths is earnestly solicited.

This Pamphlet can be had also from "Clericus," Willow Cottage, Leeds, 1½d. each, 6 for 8d., 12 for 1s. 2d., or 100 for 8s., post free.