

THE  
ANGLO-ISRAEL POST BAG ;

OR,

“HOW ARTHUR CAME TO SEE IT.”

BY

THE REV. J. H. TITCOMB, M.A.,

*Non. Canon of Winchester ; and Vicar of St. Stephen's, South Lambeth,*

*London.*



LONDON:

W. H. GUEST, 29, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1876.





# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
PREFACE ... ..	vii

---

## BOOK I.

### SCIENTIFIC DIFFICULTIES.

I.—THE PHILOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY ... ..	1
II.—THE PHYSIOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY ... ..	23
III.—THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY ... ..	34

---

## BOOK II.

### SCRIPTURAL PROBABILITIES.

I.—THE PROMISES OF GOD TO THE HEBREW NATION ...	74
II.—THE PROMISES OF GOD TO JOSEPH ... ..	86
III.—THE PROMISES OF GOD TO EPHRAIM ... ..	93
IV.—THE PROMISES OF GOD TO THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL, AS DISTINCT FROM THAT OF JUDAH ... ..	107

---

## CONTENTS.

### BOOK III.

#### PRACTICAL CONFIRMATIONS.

	PAGE:
I.—THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY ALONE ACCOUNTS FOR THE GEOGRAPHICAL MARCH OF CHRISTIANITY ...	131
II.—THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROTESTANT UNITY OF THE TEUTONIC FAMILY, OF WHICH THE ANGLO-SAXONS ARE THE CHIEF REPRESENTATIVES...	135
III.—THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE FACT THAT THE ANGLO-SAXON NATIONS NOW OCCUPY THE SAME POSITION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT COVENANT WHICH THE HEBREW PEOPLE HELD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT COVENANT	140
IV.—THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR SOME STRIKING CORRESPONDENCIES BETWEEN THE HEATHEN MYTHOLOGY OF THE TEUTONIC NATIONS AND THE STATE OF ANCIENT ISRAEL ... ..	144
V.—THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR CERTAIN REMARKABLE CUSTOMS FOUND IN ANCIENT BRITAIN AND AMONG THE TEUTONIC PEOPLES, WHICH ARE IN AGREEMENT WITH A HEBREW ORIGIN ... ..	154
VI.—THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE CONTINUALLY ENCROACHING CHARACTER OF GREAT BRITAIN'S COLONIZATION.	162

## P R E F A C E .

---

THESE Letters were written for a friend, in order to bring the subject before him in an interesting and beguiling manner. The Author must therefore apologise for the somewhat playful turn of thought in many parts. It is a subject on which, as he has said throughout, no absolute proofs can be given. It involves, after all, a mere question of contingencies and probabilities. Accordingly, the aim of these Letters has been to shew that the Anglo-Israel Theory presents (1) no insuperable *Difficulties*, on the ground either of Philology, Physiology, or History; (2), many strong *Probabilities*, on the ground of Scripture predictions which are thus much more easily to be interpreted than on any other principle; and (3) some singular *Confirmations*, resulting from a number of independent facts. This little volume makes no pretensions to exhaust the field of inquiry. On the contrary, certain final conclusions upon the subject are still left undefined and unsettled. Its chief design is to shew the folly of those who refuse to

look into the subject, and who regard the whole Theory as ridiculous. Its spirit is neither dogmatic nor imperious; but simply painstaking, openhearted, candid, and argumentative; and, in one or two particulars, the Author believes that he has presented the subject in a somewhat new light. Whether the reasonings it contains will stand the light of freer and fuller inquiry remains to be seen. In the meantime, it is floated before the public for the purpose of receiving the most searching criticism which any of our ablest critics may condescend to bestow upon it.

*South Lambeth, Dec., 1875.*

BOOK I.

---

IFIC DIFFICULTIES.

*Respectfully Dedicated*

TO

THE COUNCIL

OF THE

LOAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY;

WHO

HAVE PERMITTED THIS SUBJECT TO BE DISCUSSED

AT

SEVERAL OF THEIR MEETINGS.



# THE ANGLO-ISRAEL POST BAG.

---

## LETTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY.

*London, January 1, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I am told by our friend Jones that you think I am getting ready for Hanwell, or St. Luke's Asylum, Old Street, or some other similar retreat, where over-heated brains find time for cooling down into a restored condition of common sense. And why? Not because I march about my house with a crown upon my head, imagining myself the King of Siam; not because I sit cross-legged on the floor, conceiving myself to be one of the seven tailors of Tooley Street; but because I have at length yielded to the belief that the Anglo-Saxons are descended from the Ten Tribes of Israel. I say "at length" yielded; for you know through how many years I argue against and resisted the opinion. I could easily recall my own jokes upon the subject, if I were disposed; and give you even a longer list of them than you would care to read. I can well recollect the banter with which I used to say that Cook's tourists must certainly represent the *Gaddites*; and how the early 'Evangelicals must undoubtedly have been *Simeonites*. My quips and querks, as you know very well, were

endless; I never lost an opportunity of throwing ridicule upon what I then considered to be an absurdly extravagant Theory. If I have changed my opinions, therefore, it is not because I have brought to the investigation any views which were pre-disposed to the reception of that Theory. Still less has it been that my brain has become softened. "I am not mad, most noble Festus." I do but now see what I could not before discover, and enjoy, as an inheritance of reason, that which was previously a dark and unresolvable riddle.

But as to the "why and wherefore." Would you like to know all about it? Would it please you to thread the track of those reasonings by which I have challenged your pleasant raileries, and run the risk of being called an idiot by many others? If so, please write by the next post and tell me; I will then take care that, in due time, Her Majesty's mail bag shall deposit at your house a series of short, common sense letters, in which I will endeavour to remove your prejudices.

Believe me, yours most faithfully,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER II.

### THE PHILOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

*London, January 10, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I find by your reply that you take me at my word. The die is cast, therefore; and I am in for what may, possibly, be a long correspondence. On your side it is only a joke. I



am quite aware of that. You wish to see, I suppose, what sort of stuff I shall write about a subject which you have condemned beforehand. Be it so. I will do my best to shew you that there is "method" in my "madness;" and that there is "more of reason than is dreamt of in my philosophy."

How, then, shall I begin? There are two methods. The one is Constructive, the other Explanatory; but both equally argumentative. As I do not wish, however, to write a set treatise upon this question (for that, I fear, would weary you, and only make you gape, and vote your friend an old bore), I shall give up the Constructive process and adopt the Explanatory. In other words, I propose to explain to you the process by which I have been led to alter my former views, and yield to new opinions. This will, doubtless, be interesting, even if it be only as a study of psychology; for there is always something pleasant in tracing out the workings of thought, though we may think them foolish: especially when there has been a transition from black to white, or a leap, as it were, from the Arctic zone to the tropics.

You will credit me, I feel sure, with sincerity; because no reasonable man will incur the ridicule of his friends, or expose himself to the charges of instability and credulity, unless he feels driven to do so from a conscientious motive. Receive what I have to say, then, with candour; and do me the justice to weigh the considerations which I shall put before you with the best powers of your mind.

After these preliminary remarks you will fully understand that I am not about to rush into any systematic Essay upon what is called the "Israelitish Origin of the Anglo-Saxon Nations." That would be the Constructive method, which I think unsuitable for a friendly and familiar correspondence. I am rather

about to take you into my confidence, and trace out, inch by inch, the steps along which I trod, in coming to my present conclusion.

You are aware, I believe, that my first and greatest difficulty in regard to this Theory, used to be the Philological one. I could never understand how a Semitic race, like that of ancient Israel, had so entirely lost their original language as to become an integral portion of the Aryan, or Indo-European family of nations. The answers to this difficulty used never to satisfy me. I was told, for example, that a very large per-centage of Hebrew roots might be found in the Anglo-Saxon and other Teutonic tongues. Doubtless, and so far, good. But, then, are there not a number of Hebrew roots in other languages also? I have traced a considerable number in the Greek, and not a few in the modern Romance group of dialects. The truth is, that common roots of certain primeval words are everywhere distributed through the nations of the world; cropping up among later roots, just as the granite does among the newer fossiliferous strata. Besides, the real test of consanguinity among languages is in their grammatical construction, rather than in their vocabulary; and certainly there is no grammatical affinity between Anglo-Saxon and Hebrew. Thus the first argument failed to convince me.

In the next place, I used to be told that there had once been a decidedly similar case of linguistic obliteration when the Jews in Babylon exchanged Hebrew for Chaldaic. But this, again, did not satisfy me; for, albeit this change in language may have been decided, yet it was merely a transition from one Semitic tongue to another; so that it seemed to me no proper parallel with the case in point, which involves a radical change from the Semitic to the Aryan.

Once more, it was alleged that the Jews in Poland have, to this day, lost their Hebrew as a vernacular, and speak in some German language. But to what purpose is that argument? For, although the Hebrew be lost as a vernacular, yet it is still retained by the Polish Rabbis in their synagogues. Whereas in the case of Anglo-Saxons, and other Teutonic peoples, there is no trace of any Hebraic form of speech whatsoever; not a vestige can be found among them, either of the Hebrew Scriptures, or of Hebrew worship. This case, therefore, appeared to be equally inconclusive.

I only recur now to these old arguments for the purpose of shewing you that I have not been led away into what you call new vagaries, through any blindfold readiness to adopt an opinion at hap-hazard, or from a willingness to be influenced by merely superficial considerations.

You will say, then, "What in the world *has* altered you?" I will tell you. I was thinking one day over the subject—*anxious* to do it full justice—and really desirous of discovering truth for its own sake, without any prejudice or bigotry, when it occurred to my mind that it would be only fair to look to what the advocates of this Anglo-Israel Theory said respecting the *state* of the Ten Tribes in their captivity. I then found, to my surprise, that Scripture evidence was adduced which attempted to prove that these Tribes became in course of time totally Paganized during their exile. Under these circumstances, I acted as I dare say you would have done. I did not think it worth while to examine, in particular, the Scripture evidences adduced; but said, "Very well. Let me assume that this was so. Will that furnish any new clue to the possibility of an entire transition of language from the Semitic to the Aryan?"

Obviously my first duty, in any such inquiry, was to ascertain the ethnic character of the people among whom the Israelites were taken captive; for, if *they* were not an Indo-European race, the last remnant of this argument must, of course, be shivered into pieces. Accordingly, I made the inquiry. And, so far, I felt bound at once to acknowledge that these sentimentalists (as I used to call them), had some slight bottom to stand upon; for, consulting Max Muller's Genealogical Table of the Aryan Family of Languages, I found "Old Armenian" among the number. There, then, it stood before my eyes, that, in the very place where the Ten Tribes were located, the language with which they must have first come into contact was Aryan! Klaproth, too, I found displaying the verbal connection of "Modern Armenian" and Indo-European idioms in a vocabulary occupying sixty-seven columns of his *Asia Polygotta*. Professor Neumann I also found referring to the *old* speech of Armenia, or part of the widely dispersed Indo-Germanic family; while, with regard to Media, the Zendic nature of its tongue proved it unmistakeably of the same family.

Such being the case, my next duty was to inquire whether the assumed fact of Ephraim or any other of these Ten Tribes having become gradually Paganised (and by that means utterly indifferent to their old Hebrew Scriptures), would account for their complete renunciation of Semitic speech. At this point I fell back upon the patent facts of the day in connection with Modern Judaism. I said to myself:—"Do we not find English Jews speaking English, German Jews speaking German, and so through most countries of their dispersion? Now suppose, for the sake of argument, all these Jews became avowedly Infidel; suppose they cast off their last hope of a Messiah, pulled down their synagogues, burnt up the Scriptures, Talmud, Gemara,

Mishna, and all Rabbinical writings, would not one or two hundred years suffice to obliterate from among their descendants all knowledge of the language of their ancestors, and make them, although Semitic in their origin and customs, Indo-European in their form of speech?" I then said, "Is it not just conceivable—is it not within the bounds of at least a *possibility*—that, while the Jews who were scattered from Palestine after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, *preserved* their Semitic speech, because they preserved their Semitic religion and religious books; many of the Ten Tribes, scattered eight centuries before, may have gradually *lost* their entire nationality and even their language also, because they abandoned their Hebraic religion, and gave themselves up to unmitigated heathenism?" The more I thought over this point, the more it occurred to me that it would be only just toward my sentimental friends, not to dismiss its consideration too hurriedly. I therefore called to my assistance a Dutch Jew, whom I knew to have been many years an avowed Infidel; and without giving him the least idea of what I was driving at, said to him:—"Tell me if you can speak Hebrew." He laughed. "Why do you laugh?" said I. "Because," he replied, "I do not believe in the Hebrew revelation; and, therefore, what would be its use to me?" "But were you never taught it when young?" I asked. "No, sir," was the answer. "For my father, like myself, laughed at our synagogues, and our Rabbis." "Well, then," I answered, "if the whole of your people came to think as you do, Hebrew would soon cease from among you, and you would become merged (as far as language is concerned) into the Aryan family." "Certainly," said he; "and the sooner the better."

After this conversation it appeared to me that the whole

problem was capable of solution, in a manner which was perfectly consistent, both with common sense, and with the soundest principles of scientific Philology, providing only it were true that the Ten Tribes, or the greater number of them, *really did become wholly Paganised*. For, in that case, we should not have to discuss the impossible problem of a Semitic tongue transforming itself into an Aryan; but simply of a Semitic tongue gradually dropping out of view from its non-necessity of employment.

My next step, therefore, was to investigate the evidence upon which this idea rested; for it became clear that, as everything turned upon that, I could never yield my Philological difficulties to the Anglo-Israel Theory, until I had first settled whether such an idea were capable of any fair proof.

You shall hear what I have to say upon that matter in my next. For the present, I hope I have written enough to shew you that I am not a candidate for a madhouse.

Yours, somewhat anxiously,

To Anthony—, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

### LETTER III.

#### THE PHILOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

(Continued.)

*London, January 18, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Thanks for your kind reply. It relieves me considerably, to know that I am still on the list of your friends

whom you consider to be sane; for I confess that I am not ambitious to be thought an imbecile.

Joking apart, however, this is a grave matter; and I am beginning to be more serious than I was at first, especially as I now come to the discussion of Holy Scripture. This is inevitable; because Scripture, it is alleged, provides us with certain statements which prove that the Tribes were to exist in a condition of absolute heathenism.

True, then, to the project I have formed, of narrating the exact order in which my mind has been exercised, let me at once proceed to tell you the effect which this part of the investigation had upon me. Every Bible reader knows that idolatry was the crowning sin of the Ten Tribes. Jeroboam commenced it upon their first revolt from the house of David. Other kings followed in the crime; and the prophets were full of its denunciation. It was on this account the people were expatriated. "But, then," said I, "why should that lead us to suppose a continuance of their idolatry? Does it not give us rather an *a priori* reason for imagining the opposite; viz., that their punishment would bring them to their senses and mend their manners? We know that it was so in the case of the Two Tribes; who, when exiled to Babylon, ever after abjured idolatry with the most fervent hatred. Why, then, should it not have been so with the Ten Tribes in Media?" Such was my reasoning.

In examining the Prophet Hosea, however (who was commissioned expressly to denounce the house of Israel), I came upon these words, "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone" (Hos. iv. 17). I put down the Bible, and reflected. "*Let him alone.*" Surely it is fair to explain this, as an indication of the Divine will, that Ephraim might now harden his heart,

incorrigibly being left to pursue his idolatry unhelpt. I afterwards came upon these words, "Because Ephraim hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him to sin" (Hos. viii. 11). This seemed a text of the same kind; predicting that the very idolatry indulged in, and which brought on their captivity, should *continue* to be their temptation, subsequently provoking them with fresh occasions "to sin."

This led me to look into the prophecy more carefully; when I found that the Ten Tribes were represented by the prophet, under three parabolic visions: (1st) under the name of "*Jez-reel*," meaning "*God disperses*" (i. 4); (2nd) under the name of "*Lo-ruhamah*," meaning, "*not having obtained mercy*" (i. 6); (3rd) under the name of "*Lo-ammi*," meaning, "*not My people*." This involved a distinct covenant repudiation: "Ye are not My people, and I will not be your God" (i. 9). In other words, they were to be nothing better than heathen—a statement the more remarkable when put in contrast with what was said in the same breath to Judah,—"*But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah*" (v. 7). After pondering over this, I exclaimed, "There is something undoubtedly very striking in the prophet thus so distinctly separating the judgment of God upon these two kingdoms; making *Judah's* punishment temporary, and ending in a restoration to covenant favour—which was fulfilled at the close of the Babylonian captivity; whereas *Israel's* was to be utter repudiation, and an abandonment to the condition of absolute heathenism." I then read the 10th verse, in which, notwithstanding their repudiation, as members of the old covenant, it is written—"Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or 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 God.' " Thus it appeared that, although the Ten Tribes were never to be restored to their *old* covenant, but were to be cast out into captivity as heathen; yet they should find God, in that captivity, and be restored to Him by *some other means*—i.e., through the new covenant, within which they should obtain salvation, but only as Christian believers, not because they were Israelites after the flesh.

I was debating this point, when I remembered the passage in Rom. ix. 26, where Hosea i. 10, is actually quoted by St. Paul as fulfilled in the *literal Gentiles*. It then struck me as marvellous that the very passage in which Hosea predicts the *conversion of the Ten Tribes to God*, should have been selected by St. Paul as a proof of the *conversion of the heathen*! From that moment I became irresistibly impressed with the fact that (whether the Anglo-Israel Theory were true or false) there could be no question about the gradual extinction of Hebraism among the Ten Tribes in their captivity, and of their final lapse into Paganism. I could not discover, nor do I suppose it possible for any one to discover, the exact length of time which it may have taken in order to effect this final obliteration of Hebraism from the mass of the captives. Ephraim and some others may very likely have led the way at an earlier period than the rest. But it appeared, from all this, that, in some manner or other, after a less or greater number of centuries, the bulk of Israel, originally carried into Armenia and Media, must have apostatised wholly from their fathers; although they may have long retained a memory of some of their old traditions and customs.

Conscientiousness would no longer allow me to hold out on the question. I, therefore, ejaculated, "This Philological Difficulty has at last vanished!" It turned upon the investiga-

tion of Israel's lapse into a gradual state of Paganism. If Scripture predicted this, why should I refuse to believe it? And if this were historically true, why (as I proved in my last letter) should not a Semitic speaking people have learned to speak an Aryan tongue, and to develop a number of new Indo-European dialects through the onward course of centuries?

I hope you comprehend my reasoning; and that I have not wearied your brains by thoughts so queer and novel.

Yours, with all good wishes,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER IV.

### THE PHILOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

(Continued.)

London, January 25, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I do not wonder at your objection to my last letter, if you suppose Hosea (iii. 4) to be speaking of the Ten Tribes; for he says, "The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim." Now if they were to abide in captivity, "*without an image*" (or, as some translate it, "*without a pillar*," but in either case some idolatrous object), how could they be heathenised? Besides, as you very properly remark, the words are introduced by a fourth parabolic vision which expressly precludes all possibility of idolatry; inasmuch as, under the

figure of a wicked woman betrothed to him, the prophet says, "Thou shalt abide *for me* many days; thou shalt *not* be for another man" (v. 3).

The force of this reasoning is so cogent, that one of two consequences must follow: either the Anglo-Israel Theory tumbles to pieces, or the passage has exclusive reference to the Jewish people, *irrespective of the Ten Tribes*.

I am aware that some of the Anglo-Israel propagandists quote it in an opposite sense. But this only shews the superficial manner in which enthusiasts often treat texts of Scripture, without any careful exercise of the critical faculty; and how rashly they refer to passages which make as much, or more against them, as for them. I fully allow, indeed, that at first sight it does seem contrary to all our notions of uniform and consistent criticism, to take the words "children of Israel" in this text one way, and then in chap. i. 10, 11, another way. You may say—"There is an end to all just criticism, if we hold ourselves at liberty thus to jump about with opposite meanings for the same terms; especially when found so near to each other, as here."

But is there not a cause? and does not a close investigation of the whole context actually necessitate such a change of interpretation? I thought like yourself for a while, and began to clap my hands over the bursting of this Anglo-Israel bubble. But when, with a generous desire to do it justice, I carefully looked through the continuity of the three first chapters in Hosea, I perceived that the prophet was standing, throughout his third chapter, in a totally altered position to that in which God had called him to stand through the two first chapters. In those two chapters he passed through three parabolic visions—each having exclusive and universally-admitted re-

ference to the Ten Tribes. By the teaching of these he had declared that the Ten Tribes were "*Lo-Ammi*," or "no more a people." Now what was this but to say they were no more children of the covenant, *no longer "children of Israel"*? They had been cast off and repudiated; they had lost their name and title; were put historically out of view in a heathen land, and there "left alone." It is true that, in chapter i. 10, these Ten Tribes are again called "children of Israel;" but that, you see, was spoken only of the prophetic future—of a time when they were to be "afterwards" converted, and to resume their place in the covenant. Whereas, the prophet stands, at the opening of chapter iii., not in the prophetic future, but in the actual and historical present, after the Ten Tribes had been denounced as the "*Lo-Ammi*," and were, therefore, no longer recognised as "children." Read Hosea iii. 1—5 attentively, and tell me if, as an honest fellow, you are not convinced that I am right. You will observe that the prophet, after having sketched out the dealings of Jehovah with the kingdom of Israel, under the three parabolic children of "Gomer" (for Jezreel, Lo-Ruhamah, and Lo-Ammi were all the daughters of that one adulterous woman); after having sketched out this, I say, in exclusive reference to the *Ten Tribes*, the prophet is there instructed to pass from "Gomer," under a new and distinct parabolic vision—to a *second* woman. Here he obviously passes from the house of Israel to the house of Judah. How could he be possibly referring to the same people? For, in chapter iii. 1—5, the "children of Israel" are represented as betrothed to Jehovah, although for many days separated. "Thou shalt abide *for Me*; *thou shalt not be for another man*" (verse 3). How, in the name of common sense, could this apply to the children of "Gomer," of whom

he had been speaking in the two first chapters in terms of distinct repudiation—of whom it had been said, “She is *not* My wife, neither am I her Husband” (ii. 2)?

Let us not be deceived by this similarity in title, then, when we find the term “children of Israel” first given to the Ten Tribes and afterwards to the Two. The nature of the visions explains this change of parties. The predictions concerning the Ten Tribes, under the symbols of “Gomer” and her three children, has now passed. “The children of Israel” (as used in the previous sense of the word) are known no more under that title; they are exiled as such, and lost to view, and repudiated. The *only* “children of Israel” left, therefore—the only people who could be now understood *as surviving under that name*—were the Two Tribes; that is to say, the whole Hebrew people, *minus* the kingdom of Ephraim.

Does not this make it plain to you? and is it not consistent with the language of our Lord Himself, who used almost this identical phrase when He sent forth the twelve, “without purse or scrip,” saying, “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. x. 5, 6, 9, comp. xv. 24). That these words were spoken with reference to the *first* ministry of the twelve in Palestine, and not to their *subsequent* mission in the world after the resurrection, is abundantly clear from Luke xxii. 35, in which place our Lord refers to the occasion as past (“When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing”). It is, therefore, certain that the “house of Israel” here means the Hebrew people among whom Jesus dwelt—not the Ten Tribes in captivity; and, therefore, Matthew Poole, in his Annotations, very properly says, “By Israel, He here meaneth

the *Two Tribes* that clave to the house of David; for the *Ten Tribes*, ever since their captivity, *had lost their share in that name.*" The moment I read these words, I exclaimed, "What an unconscious testimony to the truth of Hosea's prediction in chapter iii., where the Two Tribes, after having lived as "children of Israel," "without a prince, and without an image," &c., for many days in Babylon, at length found mercy (i. 7), and were brought back to Palestine under the same title. And how wonderfully has this prediction been perpetuated in the same Jewish people, as exhibited throughout the whole of their present long dispersion under the Roman exile!

I was going on in this strain, when I thought it might be well to consult Hurptenburg's Christology, with a view to see what *he* would say about the point. I then found that he not only took precisely the same view, but declared it to be the general one. His words are these (Vol. II., p. 279), "As regards the historical fulfilment of this prophecy (*i.e.*, chap. iii. 4) interpreters are divided, referring it either to the Assyrian, the Babylonian, or the Roman exile. The greater number of these, however, refer it to the *latter*." So, indeed, say the Jews. Rabbi Kimchi writes on it:—"These are the days of the exile in which we now are."

Of course this general confirmation of my own reflections was very gratifying and conclusive. I could resist no longer. Without, therefore, in the least degree, yielding to the Anglo-Saxon Theory (which I still looked upon as absurd and impossible on other accounts), I, nevertheless, felt that, as a candid and honourable inquirer after truth, I could not deny the final lapse of the *Ten Tribes*, or the greater portion of them, into actual Paganism. Hence, upon the reasonings

which I gave you in my second Letter, I could no longer deny the possibility of a transition, among such a people, from Semitic forms of speech to Aryan.

You know you like sifting things to the bottom, old fellow; so here I shake them down to your very boot-soles. Tell me what you think. If you agree with me, I will give you full leave to laugh at me, on all sorts of *other* grounds; but, at any rate, confess that *one* scientific difficulty has been got over. Put the Philological query upon your shelf; label it as number 1, settled; and, after having taken a reasonable amount of rest, be ready to start fresh and hunt down another scientific difficulty, about which, in former days, you and I have often talked and laughed together.

Yours, in first-rate spirits,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER V.

### THE PHILOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

(Continued.)

*London, February 1, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I perceive, by your last Letter, that you are not going to let me off as easily as I imagined. You cannot deny the validity of my reasonings upon Hosea iii. 4; and yet you raise new objections.

You refer me, in the first place, to a passage in Josephus, where he says:—"The entire body of the people of Israel

remained in that country. Hence, there are but Two Tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the Ten Tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, not to be estimated by numbers" (Jewish History, Book XI.). You say, "This proves that they were recognised 800 years after their captivity as a distinct people; and that, therefore, they had neither changed their religion, nor lost their language, nor migrated from their place of exile."

In the second place, you quote me a passage from St. Jerome, who wrote in the 4th and 5th centuries (or about a thousand years after the exile), who, in his commentary on Hosea, says:—"The Ten Tribes inhabit to this day the cities and mountains of the Medes," upon which you graft a similar argument.

Now, allow me to observe, when writing to a scholar like yourself, that I am surprised at your rashness. For you surely know that the integrity of the text of this 11th Book of "The History of the Wars" has long been disputed. Casaubon, Brinch, and others, as collected in Havercamp's Edition, Ann. 1726, have shewn this, "And even Bayle could not repress his indignation that one professing himself a Jew could so contradict the books of Moses, and other sacred writings."\*

Again, any one who is acquainted with the science of historical criticism, must be fully aware that no dependence can be placed upon the loose and casual statement of a theologian like St. Jerome, when speaking about events taking place in distant lands, especially at a time when such statements were often only founded upon traditional beliefs, or vague rumours, and when literary accuracy was not studied as it now is.

---

\* See Kennedy's Ethnological Essays, p. 195.



Your *third* argument is, perhaps, more to the point, when you adduce certain evidently Hebrew archæological remains which are found in the Crimea, and on the Asiatic side of the Cimmerian Straits, and which shew that, long after the exile, some of the Ten Tribes were still in possession of their own language. I allow that the connection between these Crimean graves and the Ten Tribes is indisputable, for Hebrew inscriptions have been discovered, running thus:—"This is the tombstone of Buhi, the son of Izchak, the priest; may his rest be Eden, at the time of the salvation of Israel. In the year 702 of the year of our exile." Facsimiles of three of the grave-stones have been taken to St. Petersburg. Dr. Geige, of Frankfort, Tischendorf, and Olshausen, all support their true antiquity (See Vol. III. Part I. of the Transactions of the Biblical Archæological Society). But this only proves what I have assumed all along, that the lapse of Israel into absolute and final Paganism was gradual, rather than instantaneous. Nothing would be more natural than that some of them should have retained their hereditary opinions and language longer than others. Now, is there anything to shew that these Crimean graves were more than the work of a portion of the exiles, while other portions may still have been in Media and Armenia, or even wanderers in separate directions?

A *fourth* reason which, at first sight, has considerable weight, is that which you deduce from a passage in Acts xxvi. 7; where St. Paul speaks of the "Twelve Tribes" as continually *serving God*, "*day and night*" (See also Jas. i. 1). I used often to urge those verses for the purpose of proving that the Ten Tribes had all come back from exile, and were located along with their other brethren in various countries round about Palestine. I abandoned this idea, however, in consequence of

discovering from 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9, that a "remnant" of these Tribes must have escaped from the power of Assyria, before Shalmanezar carried away the main body of them into the North (See Hale's Chronology). Thus we have no difficulty in accounting for existing representatives of the Twelve Tribes in the time of our Lord. Notwithstanding which the main body of exiles may have still remained in Armenia and Media, or have even commenced some migratory marches in a Paganised state among the Indo-European races of Europe and Asia.

You will now most likely urge your *fifth* and last objection; saying, that the account which St. Luke gives of the great day of Pentecost (in Acts ii.) proves the existence of a periodical communication between the Israelites of the Median captivity and Jerusalem. For among the Hebrew worshippers at that feast were "*Parthians* and *Medes*," the very people of whom we are now speaking. "What Medes could be in Jerusalem at this feast, unless they were descendants of the Ten Tribes who still retained their faith, and had come up to the holy city for worship?" Well, my dear friend, and what if they did? That would shew, indeed, that many of the descendants of the Israelitish exile still remained faithful to the religion of their fathers. But it would by no means be inconsistent with the fact, that the main body of the Israelites had been gradually lapsing into Paganism; and that, possibly, large numbers of them had already drifted away from their original place of captivity in lines of separate migration. Ephraim, for example, might have, centuries before this, wandered off in apostacy (as the Anglo-Israelite advocates contend), along the shores of the Caspian or the banks of the Danube; and yet a remnant may have survived in Armenia and Media, who continued in their

old place of exile for awhile longer, and retained their Hebrew faith and tongue.

Recollect that, while all these *pros* and *cons* passed through my mind, I was by no means a convert to the Anglo-Israel Theory. I only felt that, in justice to these Theorists, I ought no longer to ridicule the possible transition of a Semitic speaking people into the Indo-European speaking family. I still had the great Physiological Difficulty facing me; and that kept me laughing at the whole thing as heartily as ever.

Now, will you so far pack up your prejudices, and do me the honour to say that I have thrown a little light upon your poor old brains? We will enter into the Physiological Difficulty by-and-bye. For the present, weigh these answers; and prove your greatness of soul by acknowledging frankly that at least one of our old bugbear objections has fallen to pieces.

Yours, in hope of success,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER VI.

### THE PHYSIOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

*London, February 8, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Thanking you sincerely for the generous confession that *one* of your scientific stumbling-blocks has been removed, let me now try to remove *another* which, you see, I have placed at the head of this Letter. To this end I shall simply relate how my own difficulties vanished. Our old views were, you

know, identical. Hence, if I have been myself satisfied, without any act of insane credulity, I see no reason why your difficulties should not equally be satisfied, and on the same conditions.

What fun it used to be to talk to old Jones about his Hebrew physiognomy! Do you recollect how angry we once made him, when we told him that if he had only been among the ten spies on their return from Canaan, they might have carried home the grapes of Eshcol across the bridge of his old Jewish nose? I am afraid he thought us very profane, and really it was too bad. But high spirits, and the love of banter, do sometimes betray us into indiscretion.

To be serious, however, let me now tell you how I changed my opinion. It happened on this wise. A friend of mine had just returned from a tour in the East, and had brought home with him a handsome Turkish pipe which he produced with the greatest admiration. This circumstance led us into a very interesting conversation upon the manners and customs of the Turks, and on some of the differences which are found between them and the Tartar tribes of Central Asia. "And this," said he, "is the more extraordinary, because the Turks came originally from the Tartar country, and are of the same race with them. Nevertheless, they have lost, during their residence in Europe, all that peculiar cast of feature which belongs to the Mongolian race, and become, in physical characteristics, perfectly Indo-European."

Had you seen me at that instant; you would undoubtedly have voted me a suitable candidate for Hanwell or St. Luke's. The face of dear old Jones, and the nose of which we had once made such fun, immediately rose up in front of me, before which I forthwith burst out into a hearty laugh, and shouted,

“Jones for ever! That’s one for the Israelites!” My friend instinctively recoiled from me with mingled feelings of curiosity and alarm, feeling persuaded that, during his sojourn in the East, I must have suffered from a sunstroke, or otherwise lost my head. I perceived in a moment the comical picture I must have presented; and, therefore, wishing to extricate myself from the equivocal position in which I had placed myself, I explained to him, with more than my usual calmness, the extraordinary Theory of Jones respecting the Israelitish origin of the British and other Saxon nations; apologising to him for my seeming rudeness, and remarking that his statement respecting the physical change which had passed over the Mongol Tribes by their residence in Europe, had suddenly flashed upon my mind as a possible ground for believing that some of the Ten Tribes of Israel might have thus, in a similar manner, migrated from Armenia into Europe, and have so lost all trace of their Hebrew physiognomy.

This conversation ended by my returning home with new ideas; and, let me add, ideas which affected me not only intellectually, but morally. For I perceived that we might, after all, have been treating poor Jones with injustice. I felt rebuked for having indulged in what might ultimately turn out to be nothing better than a piece of mere empty-headed effrontery. In short, I went home thinking very anxiously whether we were right in maintaining so defiant an antagonism to this Anglo-Israel Theory on scientific grounds; and whether, after all, there might not be something in it which would be worthy of careful consideration.

Up to the present moment, you will remember, I was still a sceptic upon the subject. How could it be otherwise? for I had no notion of its true meaning; and I cared still less. But

I *did* care not to be unjust. Consequently, I went home resolved to study this problem in Ethnology, in order that I might judge for myself how far our old Physiological Difficulty did, or did not, put an insuperable barrier on the reception of Jones' creed. The result I will give you in my next.

Yours, in pursuit of truth,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER VII.

### THE PHYSIOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

(Continued.)

*London, February 15, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I am glad to find, from your reply to my last, that you are beginning to be really interested in this subject; and that, like myself, you do not wish to be unjust toward its advocates. It is so completely new and foreign to one's former line of thought, that I cannot be surprised at any one's first unbelief of it. Not that we are now engaged in the investigation of its actual *evidences*; for you must understand that, at present, I am only giving you an account of the manner in which my own prejudices gradually melted away. I am simply shewing you the grounds upon which I think we may allow it to be not absolutely and insuperably impossible. The Philological barrier has already disappeared. We are now examining the Physiological barrier. Even if these be both removed, there will still remain the Historical Difficulty. Should all three

be got rid of, we may, perhaps, then see our way cleared up for further inquiry.

What, then, about this Ethnological problem? I can only give you my own conception of it after having honestly searched into it, by the aid of such books as are usually deemed classical and authoritative upon such points. The first work which I consulted, and the only one from which I shall quote, was "Prichard's Researches into the Physical History of Mankind;" and I am bound to say that, before going any further, this great writer completely satisfied me. I turned at once to his 4th volume in which he treats at large upon the Turks; and there I found that what my friend, who had just returned from the East, told me, was every whit confirmed. The fact appears indisputably settled that this race came originally from the confines of Eastern Tartary; and that they are fundamentally of the Mongol stock. He says:—"The identification of the Hiong-nú (a purely Mongol people) with the Turkish race is a matter of great importance in the history of the latter people. On this subject no doubt seems to be entertained by any of the writers, either of olden or later times, who have investigated the accounts of the Hiong-nú in the works of Chinese historians" (p. 310). Again, "It hence appears that soon after the period of the migration of the Hiong-nú towards the West, a series of invasions commenced in the eastern parts of Europe. The Hunns were the first of these invaders; the Kiptschaks were the last who acquired a footing in the Pontic countries, previously to the events which changed the political and social condition of all Asia. In the meantime other Turkish bodies had settled at various periods in Transoxiana, whence they had passed into Khorassan, and thence westward into Media and Persia; and eastward, joined with Affghans, into Hindustan"

(p. 328). He afterwards proceeds to investigate the physical characteristics of these Turkish people, observing—"All those Tribes who speak pure Turkish dialects, spread over immense spaces in Central Asia, have generally a conformation of body and features resembling those of the Mongolian race. Very different are the Turks settled in European Turkey, who occupy towns or lands in Thrace and Bessarabia, and the stationary inhabitants of the cultivated countries of the Crimea. In many of these districts the population is entirely Turkish. In the Russian provinces of Kasan, Oremberg and Oufa, and the countries on the Wolga, the same observation may be made. In all these countries it is well known that the Turks (or Tartars, as they are termed in Russia) have nearly the features and make of Europeans. How can this have been produced, if we adhere to the supposition that the Turks were originally a broad-faced Turanian race? Intermixture of the stock may have modified the Turkish physiognomy in the cities and towns of the Grecian Empire; but in Kasan, Oremberg, and other parts of Russia, it is probable that the difference of religion and other circumstances always prevented intermarriages. On the whole, no such amalgamation of the Turkish and the old Christian inhabitants, either in Turkey or in Russia, can be imagined, as would be capable of transmuting the physical character of the whole Turkish nation in these countries. The practice of purchasing foreign women for the harems may have produced an effect; but this must have been always limited and confined to the richer orders. It could have no result on the great mass of the population. Is it not probable that a change of climate, and of the whole manner of life, may have had greater influence? The mild climate of European countries favour a different development of the bodily structure



from that which takes place in the snowy and frozen regions of Mongolia" (p. 417).

When I read all this, and much more to the same purpose, which I have not transcribed, I said to myself, "Why should I pursue this problem any further? For, account for it how we may, here is evidently the transmutation of a Turanian race into the physical conformation of an Indo-European race. Let it be the effects of climate or intermarriages, the result equally is, that a whole nation has become physically changed, and that, while it still retains its own distinct nationality. Why, then, may not the same Physiological agencies have concurred to produce similar results in the case of Ephraim or any of the other of the Ten Tribes of Israel, if they migrated into Europe, and settled down as a separate people among the Aryan race of that continent?"

Interested, however, in this inquiry, I pursued the same line of thought with regard to the Hungarians or Magyars. Prichard writes (Vol. II., p. 324), "It has appeared to many persons incredible that a people so full of energy and courage, and so superior generally in physical and intellectual qualities, as the Hungarians, should have originated from the same stock as the stupid and feeble Ostiaks, and the untameable Laplanders. Yet this opinion has long gained ground, and seems now to have become the general conviction of those who have studied the history of Eastern Europe. The evidence on which it rests is partly historical, and it has been confirmed by Philological investigations." On p. 326, he then adds, "Different as the modern Hungarians are from the wild Arabian race, the description of the old Magyars, at their first arrival in the central parts of Europe, accords precisely with that of the Vogouls and Ostiaks, their nearest kinsfolk. It

seems, on the whole, established as an historical fact, that the Magyars are a people of the Aryan race, who inhabited the country on the southern part of the Uralian mountains, whence they were expelled by the Turkish Tribes of Petchenegers and Chasars, and that they sought refuge in the plains near the Lower Danube. In this region they first made their appearance between A.D. 829 and 842. It seems that their own national appellation is Magyar. By the Russians they were termed Ugri, as originating from Ugria; and this name has been corrupted with Angri and Hungarians." He then goes on to say, "The principal causes of the great differences which exist between the Magyars and other Tribes of the same race must be sought in the influence of external circumstances exercised during ten centuries, and by the change of habits induced by the events of their history. They have become a handsome people, of fine stature, regular European features, and have the complexion prevalent in that tract of Europe where they dwell."

Here, then, was another physical transformation, of much greater extent than that which we should be required to believe in the case of the Israelites. I must honestly confess to you, Anthony, that I rose up from these investigations with a feeling of deep regret at our past treatment of dear Jones. So I went to him, and told him of my discovery; and, like a man, I asked him to forgive me.

Write soon, and give me your own opinion upon these matters; for I am anxious to see what you will say.

Yours, waiting for the reply,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER VIII.

## THE PHYSIOLOGICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)**London, February 23, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I am not surprised, nor am I discouraged by your answer. It is a mixture of frank sincerity, with conscientious reserve which equally does honour to your moral sentiment and to your intellectual keenness. You admit the power of my argument and allow that it appears decisive; yet you hesitate to receive it finally, unless I can clear up two other difficulties which still stand in your way.

In the *first* place, you ask me how it could come to pass that any of the Ten Tribes of Israel should thus lose their Hebrew features by residence in Europe, while the Two Tribes, as represented by the modern Jews, though living in the same countries, have everywhere retained them?

This question is to the point, and deserves the most serious consideration. The answer which Jones gives to it is this: that the Two Tribes were destined by special Providence, as a part of their curse for the sin of the crucifixion of their Messiah (from which the Ten Tribes in captivity were preserved), to continue, by the public recognition of their old nationality, “a bye-word and a hissing” among the nations. In Psalm cix., which predicts this curse, it is written: “Let his children be continually vagabonds.” How could this be fulfilled unless they were perpetually marked out physically as a separated and proscribed race? Then, again: “I will deliver them to be removed to all kingdoms of the earth; to be a curse, and an astonishment, and an hissing, and a reproach among all the

nations whither I have driven them" (Jer. xxix. 18). This is distinctly spoken of the Two Tribes, not of the Ten. How, then, could it be accomplished unless they were capable of being visibly recognised by outward characteristics?

If it were the determined purpose of God that there should be this great distinction between the exile of Israel and the exile of Judah, viz., that one should be merged among the Gentiles and be lost to view, while the other should be perpetually separated and marked off for reproach; there seems no great difficulty in the matter. Now if you will re-peruse my letter upon the first two chapters of Hosea, I think you will see evidence on the former point; and if you consider well what I have just now quoted from Psalm cix., and from Jeremiah, equally evidence on the other point. It follows, therefore, that this Anglo-Israel Theory is, so far, quite consistent. The Ten Tribes, or the greater part of them, may have migrated toward the north-west of Europe; and either through climatological causes, or by intermarriages among the heathen in their apostacy, may have lost their Hebrew features: while the Two Tribes, preserving their old faith and refusing to be intermingled with the heathen, may have retained them. All I am contending for is, that it is possible. Mind, I go no further at present; for that was my state of mind at the period of which I am speaking. I simply promised, you will remember, to give you a narrative of the manner in which my views became altered; and, so far, I merely tell you how I gradually became more and more interested in the subject. It seemed to me, at this point, putting all things together, that neither the Philological nor Physiological Difficulty could be properly pressed, as any *a priori*, or insuperable barrier to the possibility of Jones' curious creed. Whether there is anything

further worthy of *positive* evidence in it, we shall see as we go on.

In the *second* place, you say, "Why is it that the gipsies, who have been roving for centuries over Europe, do not pass through some similar transmutation of physical appearance as these Turks or Hungarians?" That, also, is a fair question; but I think it admits of an easy answer; for if there be one Tribe on the face of the earth more than another, which maintains its Tribal exclusiveness, it is this. Then, again, see the difference of the cases by a consideration of their roving habits and unsettled localization. According to the Theory we are now examining, the Israelites, although they wandered from Media to the Isles of the North West, took at least sixteen centuries to do it in; and, meanwhile, were, from time to time, located, during centuries together, in various resting-places, such as the Caspian borders, the Danubian shores, and the like. So that the two illustrations are wholly dissimilar. Do you not perceive this? You must be honest and just, even to an enemy, my dear old fellow; so put on your considering cap, and go to bed; and, without robbing yourself of too much sleep, rest your eyes in the morning, and let the Post Bag bring me the result of your meditations.

Your affectionate

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER IX.

## THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*London, March 2, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Thank God, you've obtained a victory over yourself! Let me ask for your last photograph, that I may hang you up in my study as the portrait of a virtuous and honest man. Like myself, at the time of which I am writing, you do not yet believe in Jones one whit more than I did. Only you allow that there is light in the darkness; and just a vague *possibility* that what he holds need not be looked upon as any senseless violation of linguistic or Physiological law. That is all I want for the moment.

To-day I enter upon what struck me as an inquiry which would prove even more hopeless than the last, since it appeared to me a thing without either rhyme or reason to turn the Ten Tribes, or even any portion of them, into our old school-boy friends, the Goths. I said to myself, as I sat down to consider it, "This is jumping about with a vengeance!"

Before I enter upon that question, however, let me call your attention to the limitation which I have just made. For, even assuming the Anglo-Israel Theory to be true, it does not, at first, appear probable that *all* the Ten Tribes could have travelled into Europe; seeing that very satisfactory evidence exists for believing a portion of them went eastward, where they are capable of being still traced among the Afghans, if not among the Burmese, and other people. It is a remarkable fact, for instance, that in the territories of Bombay an un-

doubted Israelitish Tribe still exists, who profess to derive their ancestry from the family of Reuben. They are called Beni-Israel; and, from remaining in a state of hereditary idolatry, are marked out in many patent ways as of genuine Hebrew extraction. In the very midst of the Burmese, too, there crop up certain wonderful traditions of a purely Hebrew origin. Here is one of them. "God created man; and of what did He form him? He created man at first from the earth. He created woman; and of what did He form her? He took a rib from the man and created the woman." \* \* \* "Our Father God spoke and said, 'My son and My daughter, I shall make for you a garden; and in the garden will be seven different kinds of trees, bearing seven different kinds of fruits. But among the seven different kinds of fruits, there will be one not good for you to eat. If you eat of it, sickness, old age, and death will come upon you. Eat not of it.'" \* \* \* After this Mukanlee came and asked them, "Why are you here?" &c. Then follows a long conversation about the fruits, ending in his persuasion of the woman to eat of the tree which had been forbidden, and giving to her husband, &c. (See Latham's *Descriptive Ethnology*, Vol. I., p. 171). Now it is perfectly true that this may have been imparted to the Karens by ancient missionaries; for they are otherwise a heathen people. But it is no less fair to allow that it may possibly indicate the presence of one of the Israelitish Tribes, which has still preserved some of its primeval traditions, after having otherwise lapsed into Paganism. Of the Afghans, and especially that branch of them called the *Eusof-zyes* (or children of Joseph), and of the Nestorians, I need not write, because evidences of no mean authority with regard to them have long been before the public.

The *Eusof-zyes* have a tradition among themselves that they came from the West. There are also other Afghan Tribes, bearing marks of true Israelitish origin; such as *Ishak-zye* (or Tribe of Isaac), *Esau-khail* (or the clan of Esau), *Moosa-khail* (or the clan of Moses), *Dawiod-zye* (or the Tribe of David), *Solimaun-khail* (a clan of Solomon). I take this from Mr. M. Elphinstone's work on the Afghan race, and from Mr. Forster's work on the Monuments of Assyria. They are statements which only need to be named to carry with them conviction; and they show, I think, that a celebrated passage in Esdras, though apparently mixed with fable, is not altogether devoid of foundation (see 2 Esdras xiii. 39—47).

I do but allude to these facts, to shew you that there is at least almost a certainty of some of the Ten Tribes of Israel having wandered in other directions than that of Europe; and because I am not willing you should think that I am being carried away with any false idea respecting a novel theory. For anything that I have shewn you at present, the whole of the Ten Tribes might have wandered away toward the East. Or, to put it another way, there is nothing to shew that they may not most of them have gone in a westwardly direction;—the Israelitish remains of these Eastern Tribes having been only produced by the departure of an originally small and insignificant detachment from the general mass. Whether there be any compatibility with authentic history, in our belief that some of them went into Europe, is the problem really before us. And here, as I have several times had occasion to remark, the question is only one of compatibility with history. For, I suppose, there is nothing in the nature of the case which will admit of actual demonstration. All I had to do at this period of my investigation of the subject, was to test it by historical analysis, with



a view to see whether the Theory could possibly fit into facts ; or rather, whether there were any patent facts which rendered it demonstrably absurd and untrue. I confess to you freely that, when I commenced the inquiry, I was as great a sceptic as yourself. It is true I had thrown off the Philological and Physiological Difficulties; and, so far, my course was very much clearer. Yet I retained, as firmly as ever, my old opinion, that Israelites and Goths were as perfectly unidentical as oil and water. I not only believed that any such identification was radically and fundamentally ridiculous; but that facts would be turned up proving it so. With what results you shall see in my next.

Yours confidingly,

ARTHUR.

P. S.—I write briefly in each letter, because I do not wish to bore you.

To Anthony —, Esq.

---

## LETTER X.

### THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)*

*London, March 9, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Your last letter has taken me by surprise. You have suddenly stopped me, and thrown me back upon a point which I had no idea you would dispute. And yet you have a perfect right to do so. You now raise the preliminary difficulty,

as to whether the whole body of the Ten Tribes did not return with the Two Tribes to Palestine, when Cyrus issued his celebrated decree for their liberation from Babylon.

Let me give you my reasons for believing that it was not so.

In the *first* place let me refer to Ezra ii. 1, "Now these are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity, of those which had been carried away, whom *Nebuchadnezzar*, the king of Babylon, had *carried away unto Babylon*, and came again unto Jerusalem and Judah." You see, he makes no mention at all of the exiled Israelites. So again, in chapter iv. 1, "Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple," &c. Here, again, he evidently and expressly limits the return to the Two Tribes; and makes no mention of the Ten. It is true that in the 6th chapter, "during the reign of Darius, this old decree of Cyrus was referred to, and a fresh edict then sent forth," by which new powers were given to the Jews to go on with the rebuilding of the temple, and by which "the rest of the captivity" were permitted to go up to Jerusalem (see v. 16). But "the rest of the captivity" must surely refer to the same captivity which had been described previously, viz.,—the captivity of Babylon, not of Assyria; for we know that large numbers of the Jews still remained with Daniel in the province of Babylon. I admit that these Jews are, in the verse, called "children of Israel," which, at first sight, may seem to imply that they came from Assyria also. But, then, you must remember what I shewed you in my third Letter (viz.), that, from the time of the Israelitish exile, the Ten Tribes were "*Lo-Ammi*" ("not my people"), they were excommunicated, and not reckoned any longer as "children of Israel;" from which moment the Two Tribes, as in our Lord's time, alone went by that name. Thus

Ezekiel, who undoubtedly prophesied to the Two Tribes in Babylon, everywhere calls them by the same title. Israel, therefore, in the Book of Ezra, just as in the Book of Ezekiel, must be taken as a generic title, to express the covenant people of God who had returned from Babylon, and of whom Ezra was expressly speaking.

In the *next* place, we read in 1 Chron. v. 26, that "The God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria; and He carried them away, even the Reubenites and Gadites, and the half Tribe of Manasseh, and brought them to Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, *unto this day*." This was the first expatriation, when the Transjordanic Tribes were carried captive. But, observe, the captivity continued "*unto the day*" when the 1st Book of Chronicles was written. Now when was this? No modern critic places it before the time of Ezra or Nehemiah; while some assign it to a much later date (see the Speaker's Commentary, Vol. III., pp. 157, 158). It is consequently evident that there was no known restoration of these Tribes at the time of the Babylonian captivity.

In the *third* place, we read from the pen of Zechariah (who, as every one knows, wrote some time after the return from Babylon), "I *will* save the house of Joseph, and I *will* bring them again to place them; for I have mercy upon them; and they shall be as though I had not cast them out" (x. 6). How could this promise have been made to the Ten Tribes by Zechariah, if they had all returned from captivity with the other Two Tribes? The bare supposition is so at variance with these evidences that I have scarcely patience to reason about it. That some few of the Israelites may have returned to Palestine at that time, as well as afterwards, during the Maccabæan wars,

I make no doubt. But that Zechariah, in his own day, recognised them as still in exile is manifest. *Hengstenberg*, writing on this passage, says,—“The great body of Israelites were still in exile; though a *very small fraction* of them had joined the children of Judah on their return from Babylon” (see *Jahn's Archæologie* II. i. p. 236). Indeed, Micah seems to imply that a small remnant of Israel should return with Judah at that time, when he says (ii. 12), “I will assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will gather the *remnant* of Israel;” which may either mean the remnant that had already escaped before Shalmanezar's last conquest of Samaria, spoken of in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9, or the few who came back under the decree of Cyrus. But this is totally at variance with the idea that the whole body of the Ten Tribes had then returned. How could it possibly have been so, when, as I have proved before, in my third Letter, from Hosea, that they were not only expatriated, but *heathenised*?

You will point me, perhaps, to a remarkable prediction in Jer. l. 1—20; in which Israel and Judah are described as contemporaneously restored at the period of Babylon's destruction. But, in consistence with the Scriptural testimonies just given, that passage must necessarily be referred only to that portion of Israel which was more or less mingled with the Two Tribes at the time of the Babylonian captivity, the part being put for the whole, as is not at all uncommon in the Bible. For the Word of God cannot contradict itself; and any other supposition evidently would make it do so. Beside which, take notice, good Anthony, of two distinct sorts of prophecy respecting the Restoration of the Jews; a distinction which you will find very useful in enabling you to determine the period to which it refers. One set of passages, either expressly by announcement, or in-

directly by the context, limits the Restoration spoken of to the time of the captivity of Babylon, as this place does in Jer. l. 1—20. But another and far more glorious set of passages may be found in the midst of Messianic predictions; evidently proving that, however they may have been fulfilled in a preliminary manner by the Babylonian Restoration, they wait their final accomplishment. An example of this kind occurs in Isa. xi., which every commentator allows to be unfulfilled. Another in Ezek. xxxvii. 18—28, which is unmistakeably capable only of realisation under the government of the Messianic David, and therefore could not have been accomplished five centuries before Christ was born. Well, this being so, you perceive that the "*whole house of Israel*" is still regarded as distinct, and in a separate state of exile from the house of Judah, even up to the last days not yet come. They are described as "*in their graves*"—*i.e.*, lost and out of sight—and in a divided state of nationality, until both shall become united under the one kingdom of Christ (see 6—24).

If this does not satisfy you, I know not what will; in which case, we had better give up our correspondence. Anxious, therefore, to hear what you will say upon the subject, I remain

Yours, in a waiting attitude,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XI.

## THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)**London, March 16, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

So you do not wish me to give up the correspondence. I am very thankful. And you really see that there is force in my last Letter. I am still more thankful. 'We can now proceed, then, with our main topic in peace.

But here let me observe that, before we go into the question of the Ten Tribes, or any part of them, having traversed Europe and reached Great Britain, there is one important point which can much more easily be decided on. I mean the possibility, not to say probability, of some members of these Tribes having escaped from the threatened attack of Assyria into Europe, by ships bound for Tarshish—just as others fled into Judea (2 Chron. xxx. 6).

I call this an important point; and if you will allow me to repeat myself, I say—it is *most* important. For, in the *first* place, the way was clear and direct. Ships of commerce traded regularly between Tarshish and the coasts of Israel; as we learn from the voyage of Jonah, who found a vessel ready for the voyage at Joppa, the very moment he wished to set sail (see Jonah i. 3).\* It cannot but be supposed, therefore, that Tribes like those of Dan, and Asher, which were used to navigation, and familiar with ships (see Judges v. 17), should not have availed themselves of that means of escape, as Jonah did, when

---

\* The geographical position of Joppa shews that the Tarshish reached from the port of Ezion-gebir was a totally different place.

he wished "to flee from the presence of the Lord." In the *second* place, there were Hebrew colonists in Spain, even as far back in the history of Israel as Solomon's reign. Perhaps I am speaking too positively when I say that it actually was so. But, at any rate, it is difficult to conceive how it could be otherwise; seeing that "Solomon had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once in three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks" (1 Kings x. 22). There are some who think Tarshish was Tarsus in Cilicia. But almost every modern scholar holds it to have been Tartessus in Spain; for Tarsus in Cilicia was not a place of merchandise, nor was it actually a port, nor was it near any silver mines; whereas Tartessus in Spain was rich in silver and gold (see Pliny's Natural History, Vol. III., p. 3), and the "apes and ivory" were commodities easily obtainable from the opposite coasts of North Africa. Put, then, these two facts together (viz.): that Solomon traded with Spain, and that every third year he received its imports, is it not reasonable to suppose that he must have had in that country a colony of Hebrew merchants? In confirmation of the fact let me mention what I once remember to have read in a learned Latin work of one of the Jesuit Fathers, Vilalpandus, in his Commentary on Ezekiel. I took an extract of it at the time, long before I was thinking of this subject. And though I do not purpose to give you his words, I will relate their general sense. After quoting from Philo, Josephus, Seneca, and Cicero, on the subject of Hebrew colonisation in Spain, he mentions the remarkable fact that a stone had been found at Saguntum, having an inscription in Hebrew characters sculptured upon it, running thus:—"This is the Tomb of Adoniram, the servant of king Solomon, who came to collect tribute and

died here" (see 1 Kings iv. 6). Whether this be a trustworthy fact, I cannot say. But it is curious; and I see no reason why, in the face of what has gone before, it should be deemed incredible.

If, then, Hebrew colonists were already in Spain, and Jonah was on his way thither, what more likely than that fugitives from Dan and Asher, who inhabited the northern coasts of Palestine, should have sought refuge, through the ships of Joppa, or other seaports, in the same country?

Such is the firm belief of our old friend Jones. How can I blame him for credulity? He holds, and I think reasonably, that large numbers of these Tribes may have fled to Tarshish, and thus have greatly increased the Hebrew colony in Spain. He also thinks that, in company with the Phœnicians from Zidon, they may even, before this time, have assisted in the colonisation of the coasts of the Mediterranean and Black Sea, and, very possibly, be traceable in the *Danai*, of whom the Greeks write, if not in the *Dannans* of Scandinavia. It is certainly curious that *Dan* and *Javan* (*i.e.*, Greece) should be *associated together* as trading with Tyre, in Ezek. xi. 19, xxvii. 19. Why should this one Tribe be thus represented as "going to and from" the merchant fairs of Tyre with the early colonisers of Greece, if they had not some ethnic relationship? But, be this as it may (and there is nothing absolutely *impossible* in it), he then goes on to maintain that these fugitives of Dan and Asher, being a trading people, and knowing that their home in Israel was no more, found their way, in course of time, to Ireland and the western shores of England; and that, having intermarried among the Kelto-Iberian race, they gradually lost their Hebrew language and physiognomy, and became merged in the Keltic family. It is certainly a very remarkable fact that Spain stands connected



with the traditions of the ancient Irish. Prichard (Vol. III., page 140) says, "A very prevalent opinion, supposed to be founded on ancient tradition, derives the people of Ireland from Spáin." Whether these old Irish chronicles are to be believed, I do not determine; for, whether true or not, they are evidently mixed up with fables, and they certainly lack the evidence of contemporary history. Still the coincidence is striking; and the fact that Israelitish colonists, now become Paganised, were thus in Spain, eight centuries before Christ, helps us the better to credit it. For, whereas Prichard (Vol. III., page 146) seems to think the Spanish Kelts were too barbarous to have ships capable of transporting themselves beyond the seas, this fact would explain its possibility. For, assuredly, navigators who could master the seas between Joppa and Tarshish may well be conceived as capable of voyaging between Tarshish and Cornwall or Ireland.

Tacitus says that the Silures, or inhabitants of Wales, in his time, resembled the people of Spain, whence he concluded that they were of Spanish origin (Vit. Ag. § 11). Strabo, too, says of the Aquitani, on the opposite shores to Britain, that they resembled the Iberi, or people of Spain, more than they did any other Gauls, in language and appearance (Lib. IV. § 1, 2). But the best evidence is one which Prichard supplies me with (viz.); the identity of names which occur in Spain and Britain signifying towns, beginning with the word *Sego* or *Sege*. Thus in Spain we find *Segobriga*, *Segontia*, *Segessamo*, *Saguntum*, *Segeda*. In Britain we have *Segontium* (Silchester) *Segedunum*, *Segelocum*, and *Segontium* (near Anglesey). The same with places containing the syllables *Cant* or *Con*. Thus in Spain, *Canaca*, *Cantabri*, *Concana*, *Contestani*, &c. In Britain, *Cantabri*, *Concanguium*, *Canonium*, *Are-conium*, *Urio-conium* (Wroxitter),

*Veroconium*, and *Conway* in Wales (Vol. III. 121, 122). All of which, I think, proves that there was a direct historical connection between Spain and Britain, and, therefore, in all probability, with Ireland; and, through Ireland, with the north of Scotland. The evidence, indeed, of an ethnological connection between the Irish Gaels or Kelts, and those in the west of Britain, may be also traced etymologically. For the Gaelic of Ireland and Scotland for water, is *uisge*; and *Isca* is the word which we find for river throughout the West of England (*e.g.*); *Isca Silurum* and *Isca Dumnoniorum*. The Exe, from which Exeter is named, may be also adduced: and the Esk, Axe, or even Ouse, or Isis may not be inappropriately referred to. I may here quote from a Paper read before the Ethnological Society, July 8, 1857, by C. M. Kennedy, "On the Ethnology of the Ancient Britons,"\* who says:—"That the Irish Gael came originally from Spain is fact substantiated by history, as well as by tradition; and now may be further proved by those reasonings which Ethnology teaches us to have recourse to in investigating the origin of Nations. Not only do the Irish historians and traditions assert this fact, but the Spanish also; and, still more, the earliest English writers, for Nennias distinctly declares it.—§ 13."

Well, dear Anthony, when I found out all these facts, I said to myself, "Here are two things proved: (1) That the Israelites, or at least some of them, may have escaped about B.C. 720 from the coasts of Israel to Tarshish in Spain, where a Hebrew colony already existed, if not in other parts of Spain also, as at Saguntum. (2) That some of the Spanish Kelts (and if so, why not the Israelites' branch resident among them?) migrated

---

\* I am indebted to this Paper for some of my arguments.

to Cornwall and Ireland." I then said, "Why not? They were a maritime people. If they left Joppa for Tarshish, why should they not afterwards have left Tarshish to settle in our own North West Island"? And here I was forcibly struck by a fact which is indisputable (*viz.*); that one of the oldest seaport towns on the coast of Cornwall has a Hebrew name, being called *Marazion*; and another called *Port Isaac*. I was no less struck with the fact that in Lloyd's *Cambria* there are three old British kings named *Solomon*. This may be thought by some persons to be an argument against the Israelites having lost the knowledge of their language; but it should be remembered that they must have lost it gradually, and that proper names would naturally survive the longest. I threw up both my hands with astonishment, and exclaimed, "Upon my word, there is something in it! It is true this has nothing to do with the Goths or Anglo-Saxons. I will investigate that part of the argument by-and-bye. But, at all events, there is nothing unscientific or impossible in supposing that the early Gaelic settlers in Great Britain may have come through Spain from some of the house of Israel."

Recollect, I had not at this time come to any *belief* upon the subject. All I had discovered was, that it did not deserve to be laughed at. I, therefore, laid it by on the shelf and waited for further evidence. But enough. I stop for the present; having given you much to think about.

Yours, without any joking,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XII.

## THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)**London, March 23, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

This is my birthday; and, therefore, in wishing me many happy returns of the day (as I feel sure you do), I make no less doubt you will wish me also many happy returns of the same success as that which you acknowledge me to have achieved in my last. You are good enough to say that I have thrown quite a new light upon the subject. To tell you the truth, I am not surprised; for the same flood of light was first thrown upon myself. I was really startled by the discovery that there could be an approach, however small, even to the remotest possibility of a connection between British Kelts in the early centuries before Christ and the people of ancient Israel. I walked about for some time after as if I were in a dream; and, until I recurred to the solid reasonings upon which this possible contingency of events was based, I involuntarily looked at myself in the glass to see whether my head was still quite straight.

Finding at last that it was so, I ventured to proceed with my inquiry. What was to be the next step? The subject was so new to me that I confess I was at a loss. I, therefore, went to Jones, and asked him to suggest the next best topic for investigation. He said, "After the arrival in South Britain of the Kelts from Spain, there came another arrival (*viz.*), the Cimbri from Denmark. These you will find ultimately in Wales, where

they are known as Cymri; and they are of the same race as the Cimmerii, who occupied the country around the north and west of the Mœotic Lake, not above a few hundred miles from the place of the Israelitish exile. The Theory is that some of the Israelites escaped from exile, and joining themselves to the Cimmerii, migrated along with them, and are to be looked upon as the ancestors of the Welsh Cymri.

Here, then, was a new problem to be worked out. I resolved to see whether it could be made at all compatible with true historical criticism.

My first duty was to study the map, and compare the relationship of northern Media and Armenia, whither Israel had been taken into exile, with the Lake Mœotis, where these Cimmerii abode. I found the distance by land to be about 600 or 700 miles. Assuming, therefore (entirely for the sake of argument), that one or two of these restless Tribes of Israel had escaped from their exile and travelled northward in the direction of the Lake Mœotis—an assumption which, if Herodotus be correct, is very probable; since he tells us that Media at that time chiefly consisted of scattered villages;\* and calculating the rate of their progress in migration as that which Latham gives in his work, called “Man and his Migrations” (see p. 154)—viz., ten miles a year; I said to myself:—“This would have taken about seventy years, from about B.C., say 721—701; which would bring it to B.C. 651—631.” I then said, “Suppose these Israelites to have made an alliance with the Cimmerians. Was there anything in the state of the Cimmerian people at that time which would favour the supposition?” I then discovered that just about that period, viz., B.C. 650—630, they

---

\* Herod., Lib. 1. ch. 96.

were being very hard pressed by the Scythians who had crossed the Tanais and were attacking them from the east. It seemed, therefore, not an unreasonable idea that these Cimmerii should have accepted such an alliance in their hour of weakness, with a view to strengthen their resources. "If so," I said, "what does history show in the sequel?" I then turned to an essay in the third volume of Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, on this very Cimmerian people; when I found (p. 152) that the result of this Scythian invasion was to drive them in a westerly direction. Rawlinson afterwards goes on to identify this people with the Kelts, "one of the main divisions of which race has always borne the name of Cymri as its special designation." He says, "Niebuhr's conclusion from an elaborate analysis of all the materials which can be brought to bear on the early history of the Keltic people (see his *History of Rome*, Vol. II., p. 520) is, that the two nations, the Cymri and the Gael, may appropriately be comprised under the common name of Kelts."

Here, then, I found a rational and historical ground for believing that it was quite possible for some of the Israelites to have become identified with the Keltic Cimmerians, fleeing with them westward.

Still consulting Rawlinson, I then discovered that he went on to identify this Cimmerian people with the Cimbri, who subsequently dwelt in Denmark, and on the coast between the Elbe and Rhine, observing "These Cymri, or Cimbri (as the Romans called them), play, on several occasions, an important part in history." Kennedy also (whom I have before quoted) says that Strabo, on the authority of Possidonius, connected these Cimbri with the ancient Cimmerians on the Mæotic Lake (p. 30).

There is also equal evidence to shew that waves of the same

Keltic race made their way into Britain long before its conquest by the Romans; and that, occupying at one time a great part of the British Isles, they were driven back ultimately to the fastnesses of Wales, where they are still known by their old title of Cymri. Rawlinson acknowledges this. He says (p. 153): "The identity of the Cymri of Wales with the Cimbri of the Romans seems worthy of being accepted as an historic fact, upon the grounds stated by Niebuhr and Arnold." Wales still continues to be known as *Cambria*; and one of our northern counties is *Cumberland*. In like manner the Cimmerii left their name to the peninsula where they dwelt, which has continued to be known as the *Crimea* to the present day.

We have thus found, I will not say *positive*, but certainly *possible*, grounds for believing in the advent of a second Keltic branch into Great Britain (*viz.*, the Cymri), equally allowing an introduction of the stock of Israel; just as we previously saw it to be possible in the case of the Gaels. Whether it was of the Israelitish stock thus intermingling with the Cimmerii, whose descendants penetrated into England, and are now preserved in Wales, it would be beyond the power of any man to prove. But, remember, we are not looking for *proofs*; we are only in search of facts which would render such a thing conceivable and possible. All I can say is, that if God, in His wonderful Providence, had determined to bring such an event about, I believe the historical circumstances herein related would render it quite compatible with such a design. That is the most I can say of it, except that, in the course of my reading, I found one fact which greatly astonished me, and which certainly confirmed the thought (*viz.*), that, according to Pliny, the Cimmerians named the Baltic, *Morimarusa*, which signifies "*The Dead Sea*"! I said to myself, "Could that have been

an allusion to the Dead Sea of Palestine? And then I fell into a muse, during which I dropped off to sleep.

What do you think of all this?

Yours, in search after truth,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

### LETTER XIII.

#### THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)*

*London, March 30, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

So you think I have got into a muddle; and that my ingenuity is getting the better of my logic! I am sorry you entertain such an opinion; for I graduated at the University of Cambridge, where I studied a wide range of mathematics, and obtained mathematical honours. It is perfectly true that, owing to indisposition, I took a lower degree than I was entitled to; but, in point of actual attainments, I had mastered many of the higher subjects of reading, and had certainly learnt how to distinguish between things that differ. It goes against my grain, therefore, to be told that I have got into a muddle in this simple reasoning. And what are your grounds for this assertion? You say that, "even if one or two of the Tribes of Israel did thus join themselves to the Gaels or Cymri, they must soon have become so intermingled as to have lost their identity; just as the waters of the Rhine and Moselle, after preserving their streams for awhile, soon coalesce in one



mighty river, and become inseparable." Your illustration, I grant, is a happy one, and appears to make out your point. But allow me to observe that bad arguments are often covered by happy illustrations. A simile which seems to be correct, may really contain very bad logic. And so it is here. For two rivers coalescing in one stream *must* ultimately lose all their individuality, seeing they have no powers of volition, and follow merely the blind forces of nature. But with nations, or clans in the midst of nations, it is not so. In this lies the difference between my position and yours.

To prove to you how foreign clans may become incorporated with new nations, and yet retain their permanent individuality, let me refer you to the Kenites who joined themselves to the Hebrew commonwealth, yet were reckoned one with it in its national genealogy.

The union of the Kenites with the Hebrews began in the time of Jethro; after which they openly allied themselves with the covenant people, as you may see from Judges i. 16. Evidence of the same fact occurs also in Judges iv. 11. And, once more, in 1 Sam. xv. 6. As time went on, this people became more closely incorporated into the Hebrew nation—so much so, that in the days of Jeremiah, the Rechabites, who belonged to the Kenites (see 1 Chron. ii. 55), were evidently dwelling among them, and were reckoned of their own stock; for Jeremiah was commanded by God to "bring them into the house of the Lord" (see Jer. xxxv. 3, 4), which would not have been allowed, had they not become completely nationalised. But more than this. If you carefully study 1 Chron. ii. 55, you will find that these Kenites were even admitted among the "Scribes" of Judah, and were registered as a part and parcel of the nations in the Jewish genealogies. It seems incon-

ceivable that you should ponder over this case with your usual sagacity, and not perceive how possible it is for a portion of a foreign nation to become incorporated with another by long alliance, even through successive centuries, and yet not to lose their own individuality.\*

You have only, then, to apply this interesting example to the case of Israel among the Iberian Kelts or the Cimbri, and (*mutatis mutandis*) the same principle may have been preserved.† For if in this way they were identified with those people, and yet in the main were distinct, they may have arrived in Britain by themselves, as separately emigrating clans of one original stock, notwithstanding they went by the name of Kelts and Cimbri. Once, indeed, grant that it was historically within the range of possibility for any of the Ten Tribes to find their way to Britain as an off-shoot from the Kelts of Europe, and, though climate and intermarriages may have altered their Physiognomy, and a change of religion may have led them to drop their ancestral language, they may still have preserved their general distinctness.

I will say no more at present, except to add, that

I am, ever yours,

Faint though pursuing,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

\* It is clear that, if mixed marriages on *both* sides had been *perpetual*, the individuality of the Kenites must have been utterly lost. The irresistible inference, therefore, is that, so far as they intermarried at all with the Hebrews, their Tribal identity must have been preserved by the preponderance of such marriages taking place with Hebrew women.

† Apply this to the above note.

## LETTER XIV.

## THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

*(Continued.)**London, April 6, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I thought you would be satisfied. It is well; because the way is now cleared for further investigation.

We have seen how the Scythians drove the Cimmerii from their peninsula and border habitations on Lake Mæotis, B.C. 660—630. It appears that afterwards they overran Media for some time, but were unable to hold the country; because meanwhile Cyaxares also had invaded Media, coming from the direction of Khorassan (see Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. I., p. 332); elevating it into an independent kingdom by the conquest of Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, B.C. 625; and thus establishing an Aryan supremacy in the land. This Median kingdom, however, lasted in its integrity but a short period; for at the close of the Lydian war B.C. 610, or soon after, Darius (probably the same as Astyages) succeeded to the throne, when the kingdom fell by the arms of Cyrus B.C. 558; after which it completely lost its independence and became merely a satrapy of the great Persian empire.

We naturally ask, What were the exiled Tribes of Israel doing all this while? Were they merely passive observers of what was going forward, carried helplessly on by the current of events? Or were they active sharers in these struggles? Or did any of them take advantage of the commotion so as to effect their escape, and migrate northwards toward the Crimea,

where we now find their graves? Herodotus and others, who have written of this period, make no mention of them. Are we not justified, therefore, in taking this archæological evidence, as a ground for the latter opinion? What discrepancy would there be in this, with the facts before us? What would there be in this at all inconsistent with the nature of historical criticism? Without these Hebrew graves in the Crimea there might be. It would then be mere guess work. But with these before us, I submit there is no discrepancy in the argument. On the contrary, there seems everything to justify it. And if one Tribe settled in the Crimea, why may not others have gone still farther northward, and settled among the Getæ on the Ister, from whom came Odin, who lived, according to M. Mallet, B.C. 70? I confess to you, my dear Anthony, that it was here I felt bound to acknowledge some degree of plausibility, if not of reasonableness, in the assertion of our friend Jones. I went to him and told him how far I had gone in my researches, arguing, however, against his conclusions on the ground that there were no similar evidences from archæology in this case as there were in reference to the Crimea. He replied, "I am not so sure of that, Arthur, for burying-places have been found also to the north, which, though not actually containing Hebrew inscriptions, are of the same general character; and as the Hebrew inscriptions are wanting, it goes the more to prove that, as time went on, these Tribes were gradually losing their ancestral language and religion, as we contend they did. But, at any rate, there are other evidences just as consistent with scientific criticism, considering that we are dealing with prehistoric peoples." I asked him what he meant. "I allude," said he, "to the topographical and etymological evidences which appear to have

been left behind by these people in their onward marchings. For we can trace the Hebrew termination *Dan* (which they may have carried along with them in their route from the recollection of their beloved *Jordan*), through all the great rivers of southern and central Europe (*e.g.*), the *Don*, the *Danube*, the *Dan-eister*, and the *Dan-eiper*. And why should not *Den*-mark be derived from the same origin?" All this was like a new field of thought to me, and afforded me material for very much reflection.

I allow that some of his arguments did not strike me as very brilliant. For instance, he wished to prove that the Getæ must have been originally a portion of Israel, because they are described as believing in immortality. But so did Pythagoras. And so did the Ancient Egyptians. Then, again, he laid great stress upon their having a god named *Za-molxis*, whom he endeavoured to identify with Moses. But that I could scarcely credit, because Herodotus describes the Getæ with this belief, B.C. 700—600 (*i.e.*), in times so immediately concurrent with those of which I have just been speaking, that there could not have been possibly any time for the uprising of a new belief such as this. It must have existed, I think, antecedently to any junction between the Getæ and any of the Ten Tribes who may have allied themselves to them. The only connection I could at all allow possible between them was that the Getæ lived on the Ister; and that, by some means or other, the upper part of the river was not only afterwards called the *Donubius* as early as the Roman Emperor Augustus, when Strabo lived (see Strabo, p. 304); but that, wherever the Getæ went, the rivers on which they settled had the same etymological character.

We have thus a certain amount of evidence, indistinct, it is

true—yet, as far as it goes, reasonable, for bringing Ephraim and Manasseh, in their wanderings, into a possible connection with the Teutonic or Gothic family. For, that these Getæ were the Goths of later times, seems to be pretty generally admitted. Rawlinson says, “The identity of the Getæ with the Goths of later times is more than a plausible conjecture. It may be regarded as historically certain” (Vol. III., p. 69). Again, he says, “It is almost certain that the *Getæ* are the *Gothi* or *Gothones* of the Romans, who are the old German *Guthai* or *Guthans*, and our *Goths* (See Grimm’s *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache*, Vol. I., pp. 178—184). The one name superseded the other *in the same country*, and there are not wanting ancient writers who expressly identify the two forms.”

Here, then, for the present, I shall leave you. The research is by no means over. But, believe me, that when I had got so far, I lifted up my hands in mute astonishment to find myself even upon the *border* of any intellectual assent that the Goths and Israel could have possibly been mixed up together in so early a stage of European history.

I remain, yours,

In the lively remembrance of my first surprise,  
To Anthony —, Esq. ARTHUR.

## LETTER XV.

## THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTY.

(Continued.)

London, April 13, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

You tell me very wisely that your judgment is suspended. I can scarcely blame you; for, at this period of the investigation, my own judgment was also suspended. I could only sit still and marvel, that while I had hitherto considered all this a childish Theory of vain speculatists it should have come within the reach of anything like *an appearance* even of credible thought. Yet so it was.

I therefore now determined to begin at the other end of history, and see what could be made of the matter. In doing which, I began by considering who were the next people that came to the shores of England from the continent of Europe. For this purpose, I turned to Thierry's Works, which I happened to have in my own library; where I found that the *Jutes*, from Jutland, arrived here about A.D. 449; and afterwards the *Angles*, A.D. 547; from whom our national title is derived. This brought me, of course, to the great Anglo-Saxon race. I then thought I would turn to Sharon Turner's celebrated work on the History of the Anglo-Saxons; which, being written on purely historical principles, and without the least idea of the particular Theory which we are now considering; seemed to me to afford a thoroughly independent, and satisfactory testimony. "Now," said I to myself, "I shall soon discover whether Jones' ideas will hold water; for, if these Anglo-Saxons are not traced back in their origin to the same quarters as those from which

the Israelites were dispersed, the whole thing will necessarily fall to the ground." Judge my intense surprise, therefore, when I discovered that, without the slightest reference to this Theory, Sharon Turner unmistakably declared that the first birthplace of the Saxon Tribes must be traced to *the very neighbourhood where the Israelites were taken captive*. He says, "They were a German or Teutonic, or Gothic race. Of the various (so-called Scythic) nations which have been recorded, the *Sakai* or *Sacæ* are the people from whom the descent of the Saxons may be inferred, with the least violation of probability. They seized Bactriana, and the most fertile part of Armenia, which, from them, derived the name of *Sakasina*. That some of the divisions of this people were really called *Sakasuna* is obvious from Pliny; for he says that the Sakai who settled in Armenia were named *Sacassani*, which is but *Sacasuna*; and the name which they gave to that of Armenia which they occupied is nearly the same sound as *Saxonia*. It is also important to remark, that Ptolemy mentions a Scythian people, sprung from the Sakai, by the name of Saxons."

All this was really very striking; for it appeared to connect the two ends of the chain together; showing me, more than ever, how it was not at all beyond either the reach of reason, or the facts of history, to believe that some, if not most of the Ten Tribes, may have been capable of incorporating themselves with these elementary Gothic or Teutonic people, and of ultimately losing both their religion and nationality, so as to have been possibly represented by them on their first arrival in Britain. As I have said all along, I had not yet come *really* to believe it; but it was enough, for my present purpose, that I should have discovered it to be even apparently compatible with *any* aspect of sober truth.



This, however, was not all. For after the Saxons, there followed an invasion of the Danes, A.D. 787. Now who were these people? They undeniably mingled with the other inhabitants of the country; and helped to make up one constituent element of the present English nation. Hence, if they had been discordant in origin with the rest, it would so far vitiate the idea of there having been anything like an homogeneous compound of Israelitish stock among us. Was it so? You see I am writing honestly, and with a fair wish to get to the bottom of facts. Now Thierry says, in his History of the Norman Conquest (Book II.), "Such was the first appearance in England of the northern pirates, called Danes or Normans, according as they came from the islands in the Baltic sea, or from the coast of Norway. They descended from the same primitive race as the Anglo-Saxons." The earliest inhabitants of Scandinavia were, no doubt, Iotuns of the Finnish family; but these people were driven back by Teutonic invaders. Prichard confirms all this, and says:—"That the Northmen were a people allied to the German race is sufficiently testified by the affinity of their language" (Vol. III., p. 383). On this and other evidence, therefore, I came to the conclusion that the advent of the Danes and Normans, did not materially affect the logic of this question; and so I retired within myself for further thought.

The chief difficulty I felt, in spite of all which I had as yet discovered, was the apparent improbability that these converging lines of Kelts and Teutons into one focus in Britain, should so neatly and trimly have represented that particular portion of them which had originally descended from Israel; unless, indeed, the *whole* of the Teutonic people, including Germans and Scandinavians, were the offspring of the Israelitish stock. But of

that, though remotely possible, I saw no distinct probability; nor did Jones urge it. I therefore said, "Even admitting an Israelitish *incorporation* into these stocks, it seems almost miraculous to conceive that the only part of those stocks which penetrated our shores, should have happened to belong to these incorporated Israelites, *and to no other*. No, no! This is too cut and dried to be true! It is a mere fine-spun Theory; based upon abstract possibilities, but attended with too many contingent and remote improbabilities ever to be believed."

In this state of mind I went to Jones once more, and told him of my reflections. He looked very solemn, and remarked, "Having got so far, Arthur, you must now view the subject from another stand-point. Recollect you are considering the history of a people who were the subjects of Divine prophecy. The case, therefore, is not to be judged by ordinary analogies. In any instance of common ethnic migrations, I should agree with you. But, if you are a believer in revelation, and if Scripture can be shewn to indicate a fact such as this, you may feel sure that He who guides the course of Providence would be fully able to work out His own designs, and bring these masses of Israelites (now Kelts and Saxons by virtue of their Ethnological incorporation) into such forward lines of movement, as would place them just where He meant them to be collected together." What was I to say to this, Anthony? I could not repudiate the sentiment as a Christian believer. Even as a scientific unbeliever, though I might doubt its probability, I could not deny its abstract possibility. But when, over and above this, I was appealed to on the ground of God's prophetic declarations, and secret purposes, I could only say to Jones: "Well, my friend, of course the power of God could have so ordained it, if He pleased. I will, therefore, again

suspend my judgment, and wait until you have shewn me those prophecies which you think prove it." He promised to do so.

The case, therefore, now stood thus. My scientific set of objections to the *a priori possibility* of the Anglo Theory were gone. But I still remained an unbeliever in it, on the ground of its apparently *absurd improbability*. Nevertheless I waited to see what new light the Bible could throw upon this subject. And, perhaps, for the present, you will allow me to leave it there. For I sadly need a holiday; and am going to the seaside. So farewell.

Yours, in all honesty of purpose,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.



BOOK II.

---

SCRIPTURAL PROBABILITIES.

Dedicated

TO

THE MEMORY

OF

THE LATE J. WILSON, ESQ.,

WHO

FIRST BROUGHT THIS INTERESTING INQUIRY

BEFORE

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.



## LETTER XVI.

BRITAIN KNOWN TO THE PROPHETS, AND CONNECTED WITH  
THE ISRAELITISH EXILE.*London, July 1, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Here I am again in my comfortable home, after having enjoyed the sea breezes, and become mentally invigorated with pure ozone. It will not be the fault of kind Nature, therefore, if I fail to write clearly upon the subject which I now take up my pen to resume.

We have passed from the region of Scientific Difficulties, and are turning to the question of Scripture Probabilities. At this point of my investigation you must still regard me as an incredulous inquirer. I was just as you are at present, impressed, but not convinced. It will be my duty, therefore, to inform you of what followed.

The very first thing I did was to call upon Jones, and ask for an interview. Unfortunately I found him out; but I left my card, and named a time at which, if convenient, I should be pleased to see him at my own house. True as a clock, he came to the time appointed, when, after a few preliminary salutations and remarks, we sat down to have a serious talk about this business. We commenced by opening our Bibles, for, as Scripture Probabilities was to be the theme, it is obvious that we had no other standard of reference; unless you include Commentaries under the same title.

Knowing my critical tendencies, he began by observing that, when he quoted from the Old Testament, I need not make any difficulty about the time at which any of the books were

written, "For," said he, "if the Pentateuch had not been fully compiled even till the days of Jeremiah, as the Rationalistic critics contend, yet it will equally suit my purpose to quote it. And if the prophecies of Isaiah or Ezekiel had not been published till after the return from Babylon,—false as I contend the opinion to be—it will not matter. In either case, the passages I shall adduce will serve to shew that Britain was known and marked out by the prophets as early as the 6th or 5th century before Christ." I felt rather hurt at the remark; for I had no wish to be put down as one of the Rationalistic school of critics; nor did I care to dispute the old and orthodox date of the publication of any of the Hebrew writings. "Still," replied Jones, "it may be all the better that I should commence by standing on that platform; because if we take the most adverse situation we can, and yet prove our point, *a fortiori*, it will be proved from the old, orthodox platform." I, of course, assented to this proposition; and accordingly proceeded to ask him on what Scripture texts he based his opinion that Britain was clearly referred to in Scripture.

"Before I do so," he replied, "we must first have a conversation about the ethnography of the ancient world in relation to *tin*. I take for granted, in the first place, that you will not dispute a fact, which is on all hands admitted (*viz.*), that the Phœnicians visited these islands for the purpose of getting tin from its former inhabitants several centuries before the Christian era. Whether it was imported into Egypt at a much earlier period from Malacca, as some have contended, I leave an open question, though I may remark, in passing, that the best modern critics doubt it (see Sir G. C. Lewis, *Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 457). At any rate, the voyage to Britain was not beyond the power of Phœnician ships.



For the circumnavigation, even of Africa, by a Phœnician vessel, B.C. 610, is not only credited by A. Von Humboldt, Heeren, Grote and Rawlinson, but is "generally received as an historical fact." So says Sir G. C. Lewis—no mean authority. He adds, "The voyages of the Phœnicians to Cornwall for tin, and to the southern coast of the Baltic for amber, pass as almost equally certain" (p. 448). It is true that tin was indigenous to a certain spot in Spain; yet the quantity was so insignificant, that it never could have supplied the world with the vast amount of metal of which we read in ancient days. To prove how prodigiously plentiful it was I may refer to a passage (*e.g.*), in Ecclesiasticus, 47, 18, in which the writer apostrophises Solomon, saying, "Thou didst gather gold as *tin*." "We are, therefore, driven to conclude that it was from the tin districts of Britain, rather than from the limited supply of Spain, that the Phœnicians obtained the great bulk of this commodity" (See Article, *Tin*; Smith's Dictionary of the Bible).

Not only, however, was this the case. The tin trade between Tarshish and Phœnicia was evidently known to the *prophets of Israel* also. That is my present point. Ezekiel said to Tyre, "Tarshish was thy merchant, by reason of the multitude of all kinds of riches; with silver, iron, *tin*, and lead, they traded in thy fairs" (ch. xxvii. 12). Is it not probable, then, that Britain was known in the times of the prophets of Israel?"

"It is not altogether so clear as you think," I replied; "for although tin may have been brought from Britain by the merchants of Tarshish, yet ancient history (if I recollect rightly) informs us that the place of the treasure was kept for a long time secret, so that it is by no means certain the inhabitants of Israel knew from whence it came."

"That may be possible," returned Jones; "but, for my part,

I think it extremely unlikely. At all events, if they did not know Britain, or the coast of Cornwall, or the Cassiterides by name, it is far from probable they should have been ignorant of the general fact that the Phœnicians traded with some distant *island* beyond the Mediterranean, situated in the extremity of Europe. I will shew you that presently from other passages; as soon as you are sufficiently satisfied to allow me to proceed. I am in no hurry, however, if you desire to make any other remarks."

"Pray, go on," I said; "and I promise you my best attention." He then turned to Isaiah xxiii. 1, 2, when we read aloud together the following words: "The burden of Tyre. Howl, ye ships of Tarshish; for it is laid waste (*i.e.*, Tyre), so that there is no house, no entering in: from the land of Chittim it is revealed to them." Here stopping short, he said, "Is not this a notification to the merchants of Tarshish that Tyre was to be destroyed, and that their merchandise with it must cease? In the following verse, however, he addresses another place which was to partake of the same ruined traffic, and which is not described as a city, but as an *island*." "Be still, *ye inhabitants of the isle*; thou whom the merchants of Zidon, that pass over the sea have replenished." Again, in the 6th verse, "Pass ye over to Tarshish; howl, *ye inhabitants of the isle*." Now, once granting that the inhabitants of Britain sent tin by the Phœnicians to the markets of Tarshish, and that this was imported to Tyre and Zidon (which no one, I believe, denies), what can be more reasonable, or consistent with historical criticism, than to understand Britain as the island here spoken of? I am well aware that Tyre itself may possibly be meant, because the port of Tyre was on an island in front of the Tyrian coast. But this coincidence of the ruin of the trade of

Tarshish and of the Tin Island of Britain, is so singular that, like many other prophecies, I see no reason why it should not have a double fulfilment.

"Upon my word, Jones," I replied, "you are a clever fellow. I never saw this before; and I cannot resist your logic. I shall take this to bed with me, and think it well over in solitude; for it really does appear after all, that this Western Island of Britain may have very probably been alluded to."

"Yet that will not do by itself," returned Jones. "What if I can show you that Scripture predicts it, as the purpose of God, to convert and bring home Israel out of captivity from the *West*? And that He also speaks of their being converted in the '*Isles*.'"

"If you can do that," I replied, "you will, indeed, stagger my old convictions; and, perhaps, end by making me a convert to your views. Yet you must not be too sanguine; for I shall be sure to raise every difficulty in my power."

"Well," said Jones, "I will produce you two passages, which appear to me to be conclusive. The first is from Hosea xi. 9—11, in which the prophet is avowedly speaking of God's final mercy to apostate Ephraim. 'I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee: and I will not enter into the city. *They shall walk after the Lord: he shall roar like a lion: when he shall roar, then the children shall tremble from the west. They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria: and I will place them in their houses, saith the Lord.*'" Pausing for a moment, and looking at me full in the face, Jones said:—"Arthur, do not trifle with this business; remember that you are here listening to the message and the mind of God toward

the Ten Tribes, whom He had distinctly repudiated and uncovenanted in the first chapter of this prophecy. Is it not like life from the dead, then, to see Him now returning toward these Tribes with promises of mercy?" Observe. He says, "*They shall walk after the Lord.*" Is not this a promise of their conversion? Again, "*They shall tremble from the west.*" The Hebrew word here used for "tremble" is found in Deut. xxviii. 26; Jer. vii. 33; where it is applied to birds frightened away from dead bodies. Hence this passage seems to mean, "They shall fly away *from the west* like alarmed birds by the force of exciting circumstances." "Now, remember that Media, their original land of captivity, was in the *north*; so that between that period and the time of their restoration, they *must certainly have gone to the west*. Is not this remarkable? If you will not allow it to be an actual *proof* of the Anglo-Israel Theory, you surely must allow that it lends to it an aspect of *probability*."

I remained silent; for I was too much struck with astonishment to speak. Seeing the impression he had made, Jones then went forward to his other passage. This was Isaiah xxiv. 13—15, which I will now write you out verbatim. "When thus it shall be in the midst of the land among the people, there shall be as the shaking of an olive tree, and as the gleaning grapes when the vintage is done. They shall lift up their voice, they shall sing for the majesty of the Lord, they shall cry aloud from the sea. Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires, even the Name of the Lord God of Israel *in the Isles of the sea*;" or, as it might be rendered, "*in the Isles of the West*," for *sea* is sometimes used for the *west* (Comp. Gen. xii. 8, in the Hebrew). Now who is here spoken of? That the "earth" desolated in the previous part of the chapter is

Palestine, the fifth verse makes manifest; for it is described as having "transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." Hence it is after the utter desolation of Palestine (the land of the "transgressed covenant"), that another branch of the same people is declared to be glorifying God "*in the Isles of the sea.*" When the "vintage" is over in the one place, there is a "gleaning of grapes" in the other.

Now what portion of the Hebrew people could be thus singing glory to the Lord "*in the uttermost parts of the earth*" (see verse 16), in this unexpected way, if it were not the *Israelitish* section; seeing that the *Jewish* section, or the Two Tribes, are not even yet converted? And, if so, where can this Israelitish section be found but in the *west*; from whence they are to be restored? And what Isles of the West so probable as Great Britain?

Again I was confounded; for I felt that dear Jones had practically got hold of my better judgment. What do *you* think, old fellow?

Yours, more interested in the subject than before,  
To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XVII.

## THE PROMISES OF GOD TO THE HEBREW NATION.

(Continued.)

London, July 15, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

While admitting the force of the former part of my last Letter, you object to the latter part; you say, "There is nothing to show why the persons named in Isaiah xxiv. 15, 16, may not have been intended to represent the converted Gentiles, as I take to be the case in Isaiah xlii. 4—"The *isles* shall wait for His law;" and in Isaiah li. 5—"The *isles* shall wait upon Me, and on Mine arm shall they trust." Besides, I have read in all commentaries that this expression, '*The isles*,' was merely intended to denote Europe in general, from the fact of maritime parts of that continent being studded with various islands."

This is ingenious; but (if you will forgive me) not critical. I should have said so myself, if I could have done it; for I had no wish to be driven into the arms of Jones, and to run the risk of being counted an idiot by the world. But only consider the matter a little more carefully. Observe (First), That Europe, as *a continent*, is always denoted by the word "*Chittim*" (see Numbers xxiv. 24; also Daniel xi. 30). There is, therefore, no reason why these words should not be received in their plain and literal signification, denoting some *particular* islands; especially when you remember that the *maritime* parts of Europe are called "*The Isles of Chittim*," not "*Isles*" without specific designation (Jer. ii. 10). (Secondly) Observe,

that in Isaiah xxiv. 13—15, the prophet is describing one and the same people throughout. This is unmistakeably proved by the 13th verse; where the people who are afterwards portrayed as “singing in the isles of the sea,” are compared to “grapes” gleaned off the field when the “vintage” is over. They are, therefore, the people of one and the same land,—grapes from the same original vineyard; otherwise there seems no point in the illustration. Now, if you refer it to Gentiles who have no connection with the Hebrew race, the whole point of the comparison is lost. I take it, therefore, we are *compelled* to refer this “glorifying of God in the Isles” to another branch of the same people as those among whom the vintage had been effected. And hence my previous conclusion is sustained. For the vintage had desolated Palestine; and the Jewish people were cut off. Yet when this was over, the prophet heard a branch of the *same* people (grapes off the same vineyard) singing “*in the Isles of the sea.*” I ask you again, Who could these be? Those who had been desolated by the vintage of judgment were condemned for unbelief, and were scattered in a state of unconversion. Who else, then, could this passage refer to, but the other brethren of the Hebrew family—the house of Israel?

Nevertheless, dear Anthony, there is, perhaps, more force than you imagine, in your maintaining that these people of the “Island,” so often spoken of by Isaiah, were Gentiles. For do you not remember how I proved in my third Letter, that the house of Israel, when in captivity, were to become actually heathenised? It would, therefore, quite fall in with the Anglo-Israel Theory, that some of the exiled Tribes, having found their way to the Islands of Britain, should be not only “converted Gentiles,” but at the same time “converted

Israelites " also. And, by this means do you not see how there would be a unity in the terms used by Isaiah throughout his prophecy, which would greatly add to the beauty and propriety of his language?

I shall make this letter a short one, and say no more for the present, because I am particularly busy to-day. So try to digest my remarks as comfortably as you can.

Yours, ever anxious for your welfare,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XVIII.

### THE PROMISES OF GOD TO THE HEBREW NATION.

(Continued.)

London, July 22, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I do not wish to triumph over you; but I thought I should bring you to your knees. I would that we might both be brought to our knees in a better sense, and pray God for His Holy Spirit to guide us into the truth; for I can assure you, I feel more and more with Jones, that, now we have turned to the scriptural part of the evidence, our subject is becoming very serious and solemn. It will not do to laugh and sneer at it, as we did formerly. We have already acknowledged the *possibility* of this strange Theory; and now even the *probability* of it is appearing. Let us be reverent.

In this Letter, which will be longer than my last, I propose to give you the result of my second interview with Jones, in



which he called my attention to the remarkable attempt of Balaam to curse the Hebrew people.

I have no doubt you will remember the circumstances. Balak, king of Moab, profoundly alarmed at the prosperity of the Hebrews, and wishing to avert their onward course of victory, sends for Balaam, a celebrated diviner, saying, "Come, curse me this people." Balaam, for his part, was quite willing to execute this commission; but, knowing the irresistible character of Divine Inspiration, warned Balak that he could not speak otherwise than as he might be directed and impelled by God. Meanwhile the Twelve Tribes of Israel lay encamped on the plains of Heshbon, in perfect ignorance of the plot. Even if they had known it, why should they have feared? Were they not safe within the bonds of an everlasting covenant, having a mission and a destiny in the world which nothing could possibly hinder? So much so, that this very attempt of Balak only brought out more gloriously the inscrutable purpose of God to bless them. For, on three separate occasions, a higher power than Balak's overruled his words to another end; so that he actually blessed the nation, instead of cursing it.

(Prophecy I.) "How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied? For from the top of the rocks I see Him, and from the hills I behold Him: lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations. Who can count the dust of Jacob, and the number of the fourth part of Israel? Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his" (Numbers xxiii. 8—10).

Now I want you to notice that this prophecy was not spoken concerning any of the sons of Jacob as individuals. It was, from first to last, a promise of *national* greatness and per-

petuity. Bear this clearly in mind, because it will prove of vast importance in the sequel.

(Prophecy II.) "Behold, I have received commandment to bless: and He hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel: the Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them. God brought them out of Egypt; He hath as it were the strength of an unicorn. Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel: according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought! Behold, the people shall rise up as a great lion, and lift up himself as a young lion: he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey, and drink the blood of the slain" (Numbers xxiii. 20—24).

Here, again, you must observe that Balaam speaks not of One Tribe, nor of any number of Tribes in particular, but of the nation as a Hebrew people. This seems strange, at first sight, because Moses had previously spoken of the nation as possibly being exiled and desolated, and cast away from God's presence (Levit. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.). It is hard, therefore, to see how both eventualities could cohere, except on the principle that, while one portion of it might possibly be so forsaken, the rest of it should be still prospered and made illustrious; so that, on the whole, the Hebrew race should never be without some national existence. This fact, indeed, was positively declared by Jeremiah, who says, "Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The Lord of Hosts is His Name. If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a

nation before me for ever. Thus saith the Lord; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord" (Jer. xxxi. 35—37). If you doubt the meaning of Balaam's prophecy, therefore, as to its setting forth the *continuous* and *perpetual* preservation of an Israelitish *nationality*, you can have no doubt about *this* Scripture. Put Balaam and Jeremiah together, and must we not believe that, however *one* part of the Hebrew people may have been cast out of home and country, some *other* part of it must still have continued to represent the elements of national greatness and victory; otherwise this prophecy has failed? Go on, then, with the words of Balaam in this sense.

(Prophecy III.) "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside the waters. He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters, and his king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted. God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn: he shall eat up the nations of his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows. He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion: who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee" (Numbers xxiv. 5—9).

Read these words of Balaam, as well as his former words quoted, in the light of Jeremiah's prophecy; and do you not perceive that, by some means or other, the blessing of a powerful national existence is guaranteed *in perpetuity* to Israel? Does not all this prove that the nation was not only to be under

the special protection of heaven; but that it was destined to continue in power as a lion among the people of the world, even to the end? It was in vain, therefore, that Balak said, "Come, curse me this people." Egypt had tried that experiment, only to find the flower of its armies drowned in the depths of the sea. Amalek, Edom, and Philistia had done the same; but to no purpose (Psa. cviii. 9). Babylon did its best also; yet God brought back His people to Palestine in peace.

What the enemies of the covenant people, however, could not effect, Palestine brought about by its own folly. For, in crucifying their Messiah, and saying, "His blood be on us and on our children," the Jews drew upon themselves the curse, and lost their nationality. So completely did this curse come upon them, indeed, that St. Paul quoted the language of prophecy in Rom. xi. 9, 10, saying, "Let their table be made a snare and a trap and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them. Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see; and bow down their back alway."

Seeing, then, that this portion of the Hebrew people had thus lost their nationality, we are driven to ask, What had become of Balaam's and Jeremiah's predictions? For, observe, the people of Palestine in the days of the Roman conquest by Titus, were, apparently, the last representatives of the Hebrew nation. As for the great body of the exiled house of Samaria, it had been lost to view for eight centuries, while the remnant of Israel then mixed with Judah, shared the same ill-fated curse as the rest of the House of David, in the final break up of the Jewish polity. What, then, was left? It is quite true that the converted Jews, under the new kingdom of Christ, were (together with the converted Gentiles) called *spiritually* a "holy nation" (see 1 Pet. ii. 9). But the continuity and perpetuity of

the nation of Israel, as portrayed by Jeremiah and Balaam, can scarcely be satisfied with this adapted and accommodated form of interpretation. Those prophets were obviously speaking of a *literal* and *temporal nationality*. Hence, if at all possible, some new conditions of history must be found which will answer to their prophecies. Otherwise Balak's curse became absolutely fulfilled, and the power of evil had literally triumphed! Of course, if no such conditions of history are either probable or possible, we must necessarily fall back on the spiritual adaptation of a New Testament kingdom or nation, in order to satisfy the predictions of these prophets. But, I fancy you will quite agree with me, that, if a literal explanation of the promise can be shewn as lying within the bounds of historical probability, the Word of God will be more abundantly honoured, than by our being driven to accommodate the Word to a spiritual meaning only.

Now it is just here where Jones introduces his Anglo-Israel Theory with a force, which, I cannot but allow, is extremely interesting and striking. For he says that, if we suppose the Israelitish exiles had been working their way westward to the British Isles, during these eight centuries previous to the last destruction of Jerusalem, there would then have been the up-rising of their nationality under a new form, in the most exact and literal sense, and in a manner which would accurately carry out the words of Balaam and Jeremiah. It is true that the full completion of this new nationality of Israel in our Isles was not accomplished until several centuries later. But, to match that, the full establishment of the ancient Hebrews in Canaan required also several centuries of war between the age of Joshua and David, nevertheless it was dated from the days of Joshua. In the same way, then, though the British nation

was not consolidated till ten centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, yet the process of a re-nationalizing of Israel may have been unconsciously going on, during which time the promises of God by Balaam and Jeremiah were gradually being made good. By this means we see that the faithfulness of God to His covenant, even in a literal sense, was being fulfilled, and all is made plain.

I cannot, of course, argue logically that this is any *proof* of its having been historically the case. As I have said before, I do not think that the nature of the circumstances will ever allow of anything like an actual demonstration. But it really does appear to lend a *probability* to the Theory. I mean to say that it thus falls in, and harmonises with Scripture, in a manner which I never understood before. Will you take it into your best consideration? I feel sure it will give you abundant food for thought, even if it does nothing else.

Yours, with increasing seriousness,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XIX.

### THE PROMISES OF GOD TO THE HEBREW NATION.

(Continued.)

London, July 29, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I now undertake to reply to your two criticisms on my last Letter. They are very reasonable; so that I cannot find the least fault with you for making them. At the same

time I think the shield which I shall have held up to receive them will easily turn them aside, and allow them to fall harmlessly to the ground.

You say, in the *first* place, that assuming the first, second, and third sets of British invaders or colonisers to have represented successive waves of the old Israelitish stock under new names, it cannot be held probable that God should have recognised these as His own people in the same covenant sense, as that in which Balaam and Jeremiah spoke; inasmuch as the Christian covenant was not brought to the Anglo-Saxons till the sixth century after Christ; and, without some such re-covenanted relation to Himself, they must still have been regarded in their "Lo Ammi" condition, and therefore not scripturally re-nationalized.

My reply to this argument is, that, although the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons may thus have left a break of five or six centuries from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; yet the re-nationalization of God's ancient people in Britain commenced with the conversion of the earlier Keltic settlers, whom history fairly shews to have been Christianised in the first century—not long after, if not before the destruction of Jerusalem. I will not burden you with the evidences of this fact, because you may read them for yourself in Stillingfleet's well-known work, entitled "*Origines Britannicæ*." I will only observe that English Ecclesiastical History always recounts the fact of an ancient British Church having existed prior to the arrival of Augustine and his monks from Rome. If you look into Stillingfleet's work you will find that he quotes Eusebius, as affirming that "*some of the Apostles preached the Gospel in the British Islands*" (Eusebius, Dem. Evang. Lib. III., c. 7). He quotes also Theodoret and Jerome to the same effect; and then

proceeds to argue that the circumstance of St. Paul going to preach the Gospel in Spain (see Rom. xv. 24), as well as other considerations in connection with the Apostle's life, perfectly justify such a belief.

My reply, therefore, to your argument is this:—If Eusebius, Theodoret, and Jerome each expressed their belief in apostolic evangelization to the “Isles of the West;” and if Stillingfleet (without the slightest reference to any Theory such as that we are now discussing) reasoned upon the probability of this fact from Scripture, surely *we* may be excused for assuming that probability, when it is further seen, by other considerations, to satisfy the fidelity of God to His promises through the words of Balaam and Jeremiah. For, as I have before had occasion to remark, we are not now discussing any absolute and unanswerable *proofs*, but only the *balance of probabilities*. Hence, on such grounds, I venture to hold that the re-nationalization of a Keltic Israel may have very likely commenced in Britain, even during the first century.

In the *second* place, you argue, that Balaam's prophecy concerning the Hebrews renders all identification of England with that nation improbable, because of those words:—“Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.” You say “England is reckoned among the nations. She has played an important part in the great confederacy of European nations throughout many centuries; and, therefore, how can this prophecy be possibly applied to her?”

I confess this sounds rather plausible. Consider, however, that the same statement might have been made concerning the ancient Hebrew people. For did not they also play an important part in the great confederacy of Asiatic nations? Think over their wars with the Ammonites, the Midianites, the



Edomites, the Moabites, the Syrians, the Ethiopians, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Greeks, and the Romans. Think of their political treaties and alliances with Hiram king of Tyre, with Rezin king of Syria, and others. Think of their commerce with Tarshish, and of their fleets at Ezion-gebir, which traded along the Red Sea to India. Think of their historical records, also, which are found among the ruins of Karnak (deciphered by Champollion), and among the ruins of Nineveh (now verified by Layard and Rawlinson). Yet, for all this, it is said that "they dwelt alone," and were "not reckoned among the nations!" How, then, could it be? Is it not evident that the interpretation of these words must be looked for along a different line of thought from that upon which you have fixed? Must it not rather be looked for in their national spirit of exclusiveness, and in their practical isolation from the rest of the nations, by reason of their religious independence? And, if so, does not exactly the same things hold good of the British people? Have we not for centuries been regarded by the European nations as an insular people, separated from the continent, not only geographically, but socially also? Have not our manners and customs been characterised as proud, boastful, and independent, and as altogether different in kind from other people? And is not the same thing true of religious as much as of social questions? When Augustine and his monks came over to convert the Saxons, did not the ancient British Church resist the authority of Rome, and refuse the western custom of observing the season of Easter? And, subsequently to that period, even throughout all our pre-Reformation time, was not the crown of England in perpetual conflict with the encroaching despotism of the Papal power? And, since the glorious Reformation,

has not our insular independence in religious matters been more than ever distinct? We certainly are not reckoned among the Papal nations. Nor are we, in one sense, to be reckoned among the Protestant nations. I refer to our stricter observation of the Christian Sabbath; a point of distinctiveness in our British nationality, which is too well known to be enforced, and which marks us off even from Germany, Holland, Norway, and Sweden, as a people peculiar to ourselves.

Surely after this recapitulation of facts, Anthony, you will not dispute that Balaam's description of ancient Israel may be applied even to us Britons: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." So far, indeed, from this being any argument *against* the Anglo-Israel Theory, I confess that, to my mind, it rather seems an argument *in favour of it*.

Are you satisfied?

Yours, with renewed desires for your growth in knowledge,

To Anthony —, Esq. .

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XX.

THE PROMISES OF GOD PARTICULARLY MADE TO JOSEPH.

*London, August 5, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I am afraid, from the tone of my last Letter, you may suppose that I had by this time become a full convert to the opinions of our friend Jones. Nothing of the kind. I was, no doubt, moving quietly in that direction; but I was not

so hasty as to come to any direct change of views in a hurry. On the contrary, the next time I met him, I said:—"Jones, you must not think you have convinced me. I allow that I am staggered at the force of your arguments; but, after all, they only amount to probabilities, and the counter-probabilities still seem too great to be removed. You must bring forward many more reasonings on this subject before you will be able to carry away my judgment finally to your side of the question."

He said, "Very well, Arthur; be it so. I have other arguments in reserve; and if you will only have patience with me to listen to them, I hope they may even yet accomplish the purpose I desire. But remember," he added, "we are now dealing only with Scripture. We are considering the testimony of God, and not that of man. Hence, though human reasonings may fairly enter into the matter, as far as right interpretation is concerned; yet when this interpretation is settled, we stand upon the platform of faith. The true Christian must take God at His word, and bow before the Divine predictions, whether they square with his previous conceptions or not."

To this I, of course, assented; observing, however, that, on his own part, he must take care not to let his reasonings and interpretations be too easily swayed by any antecedent fancies and preconceptions. "I can assure you," he replied, "that it was formerly with myself as with you. I opposed these views, and thought them foolish. All my antecedent prejudices were against them; and I only became an Anglo-Israel convert by the force of slow and silent conviction."

This at once disarmed me; and I again became a willing listener. He then went on to those promises of Scripture which were distinctively given to Joseph; from whom, you know,

came Ephraim and Manasseh, the two leading heads of the future Ten Tribes.

(Prophecy I.) "Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall: the archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him: but his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:) even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb: the blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren" (Gen. xlix. 22—26).

Jones then observed, "Do you not think it reasonable to trace in these words a promised blessing to Joseph's descendants, generally based upon the blessing which Joseph had received himself? He had been separated from his brethren, yet was prospered by God in his exile, and received all possible blessings. Such, then, should be the final outline of his descendants. The archers should shoot at them, and separate them from their brethren; nevertheless they should be like a fruitful bough, and prosper in their exile, and enjoy the blessings of Providence. Now if this parable be true, see how it illustrates the view for which I am contending. See Joseph, once more, in the Tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, shot at by the archers, separated from his brethren, exiled into a far country, made fruitful in population, and prospered with all riches. On the Anglo-Israel Theory it has been literally fulfilled. But, on any other, the

best we can say is, that it still waits for a fulfilment, either among the Afghans, or some other Tribes in which Joseph's descendants may now be lying concealed. Which is the most probable? That is all I ask."

I replied, "That may be very well as far as it goes; but is there not another interpretation? Was not Joseph, in the person of his descendants, a '*fruitful bough*,' by reason of his branching off into *Two* tribes; while the other sons of Jacob were each represented by but *One* Tribe? And was he not '*separated from his brethren*' in the land of Israel? And had he not in Palestine the largest and richest portion of Jacob's inheritance? Why should we carry out the prediction beyond his history in Palestine, into an unknown and dubious future, when it has thus been already satisfied?"

He said, "Because they do not reach to the end of Joseph's destiny, as shewn by other prophecies. We must, therefore, look beyond the life of Joseph's descendants in Palestine. This is evident, indeed, on independent grounds. For, how was Joseph in Palestine made a partaker of blessings, '*unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills*?' You cannot refer this spiritually to the Person and Work of Christ; because *He* came from *Judah*, and not from Joseph. Yet, you see, Joseph was to have an inheritance of prosperity extending to the '*utmost bounds*' of the world. Now no one will contend that this was fulfilled in Palestine, or in the ancient history of Ephraim and Manasseh. It, therefore, waits, I say either to be fulfilled by their descendants, arising *hereafter* out of the Afghans, or other inferior nations; or else our own Theory is true (*viz.*), that it has long been in the course of fulfilment by Joseph's representatives in Britain, whose possessions actually do cover the whole of the earth's surface. Which of these two suppositions is most probable?"

Finding that I was silent (for I really did not know how to answer him), Jones then went on to call my attention to the very remarkable contrast, which he told me would become more and more noticeable as we proceeded, between the "*One Seed*" (i.e., Christ), which was promised to Judah, and the "*multitudinous seed*," or *seed of nations*, which was promised to Joseph, and which, though only hinted at here, under the term "fruitful bough," would be stated more explicitly in the covenant promises given to Ephraim.

"Meanwhile," said he, "let us now turn to another covenant promise, bestowed on Joseph's posterity by Moses. Here it is."

(Prophecy II.) "And of Joseph, he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, And for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, And for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, And for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh" (Deut. xxxiii. 13—17).

Now, *in the first place*, I wish you to notice, Arthur, that throughout the whole of this passage there is nothing but un-mixed benediction. We do not read a word of rebuke for sin. Ephraim and Manasseh have not here a single frown from God.

The two descendants of Joseph are blessed as being in full covenant favour. Where was this fulfilled? It could scarcely be within Bible history. For, during that period, we find no such state of things. It is true that Joshua (who was of the Tribe of Ephraim) may, in a certain partial and primary sense, have given some fulfilment to the words; but surely not so as to have exhausted their fulfilment. If so, Joseph's was a blessing of far shorter duration than Judah's; and so far from completing a sketch of his final destiny, it must have ended with the age of Solomon. For, between that time and the Assyrian captivity, Samaria was the stronghold of all evil, and Ephraim under the perpetual anger of God. No one in his senses can affirm that this prophecy of Moses, on Joseph's descendants, was fulfilled during the kingdom of Israel, when it was marked by curses instead of blessings!

"At any rate," replied I, "it could not have been fulfilled afterwards, when they were driven away from God's presence in a 'Lo Ruhamah,' and 'Lo Ammi' condition."

"You forget," said he, "that a promise remained subsequently, when the whole of that condition of things was to be changed; when 'the seed of Israel should be *numbered as the sand of the sea*;' and when 'songs of glory' to God should be heard among them from the '*isles of the sea*' (see Letter XVI.). We believe that the spirit of prophecy in these words of Moses looked onward to this final destiny of Joseph's descendants; when they should receive their last and full blessing, under the covenant of Christianity, and be established in a land of prosperity, and be filled with riches and honours."

"And you think that land to be Great Britain! Upon my word, Jones, you credit your countrymen with a fine piece of ancient heraldry! Excuse me, old fellow; but I cannot help

laughing when the subject comes home to one's own door like that."

"Well," said he; "but laughing, or no laughing, what else can you make of it? If this be not the fulfilment of the words, they have never yet been finally accomplished. Nor can I well see how they will be; for I know no other way."

"Why not await the future?"

"Let me reply by begging you to look, *in the next place*, to the seventeenth verse, where the glory of Joseph, in this final state of blessing, is described as such, that he '*pushes the people together to the ends of the earth*,' even as with '*unicorns' horns*.' It is all very fine to say, Wait for the future. But why do that, when the preceding probabilities which we have been reviewing lead us up to Britain as Joseph's home; and the Anglo-Saxons, ever since their conversion to Christianity, have been actually doing this very thing? Have they not conquered lands far and wide—spread over seas and continents—pushed out peoples and nations along all the coasts of the world—and planted their colonies in '*the ends of the earth*?' What can be a truer reflection of the prophecy than this? Why wait for an unknown future, when so many circumstances combine to make this an adequate fulfilment?"

I could say no more. So I hoisted down my flag and surrendered. What would you have done?

Yours, in the remembrance of my defeat,

To Anthony——, Esq.

ARTHUR.



## LETTER XXI.

THE PROMISES OF GOD DISTINCTIVELY GIVEN TO EPHRAIM.

*London, August 12, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

The subject on which I am now to write will bring us to five different prophets (*viz.*), to Jacob, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Zechariah. For the sake, therefore, of simplifying my correspondence, I propose to take each in a separate Letter; as I would not on any account have you wearied, by giving you too much to think over at once. I shall not, however, introduce any of my conversations with Jones into these Letters, but simply give you their results; for I must, now frankly acknowledge that I was being more and more drawn toward the increasing probability of his views.

You have not answered my last. Why was this? Is it that you have given me up as hopelessly erratic? or because you secretly think I am right, and do not like to confess it? Whichever of these suppositions may be correct, I throw myself once more upon your indulgence, and begin from a new starting point.

The first prophecy we meet with concerning Ephraim is from the lips of his grandfather Jacob; who, on his death-bed, blessed the two sons of Joseph,—setting Ephraim the younger before Manasseh the elder, transferring to him the birthright, and saying:—“*His seed shall become a multitude of nations*” (Gen. xlviii. 19). Now here you must observe, Anthony, that Joseph, “the fruitful bough,” was to inherit the “multitudinous

seed" *through Ephraim* only—who afterwards stood at the head of the Ten Tribes of Israel. The first thing I investigated, therefore, was whether this multiplication promised to Ephraim might not have had reference to his headship over the Ten Tribes. But of the fallacy of that notion I soon became convinced; first, because those Tribes did not belong to Ephraim by way of lineal posterity, which is the uniform sense in which we are to understand Jacob's blessings on his own children; and, secondly, because the Hebrew word "*gaim*," which is here used for nations, is properly to be understood of nations *foreign* to the Hebrew people. I speak of its use, as here, in the *plural* number; that being the only form of the word ever used in Old Testament Scripture to express "*the heathen*." Thus I found in this passage a very singular and unexpected light thrown upon the view that Ephraim was amalgamated with heathen people. Such an idea, however, seemed scarcely to satisfy the terms of the prediction. For it was a promised *blessing*; and the fact that Ephraim's descendants should be heathenized, could, in no way, be regarded as a blessing. I, consequently, felt there was a considerable probability in favour of Jones' view, viz., that Ephraim may have passed through a long stage of heathenism; and afterwards being settled in Britain, have become converted to Christianity, with large national Christian offshoots, such as we know we possess ourselves in Canada, India, New Zealand, and Australia.

I was the more led to believe in the probability of the blessing taking this form, from the fact of Sarah having been originally promised to be "*a mother of nations*" (Gen. xvii. 16). Now Sarah was personally the mother only of *two* nations, viz., of the Hebrew Tribes through Jacob, and of the Edomites through Esau; for the Ishmaelites were no part of Sarah's pos-

terity; and the Edomites, in respect of multiplied nationalities, count for nothing. Through this view of Ephraim's covenant promise, therefore, Sarah's maternity of nations would receive a much grander fulfilment; and it would further coincide with the promise made to Jacob, by which it was said that he should become "*a company of nations*" (Gen. xxxv. 11); the fulfilment of it being, *not through Judah*, to whom the promise was especially made of the "*one seed*," but *through Ephraim*, to whom the promise was specially made of the "*multitudinous seed*."

But, added to this thought, was another consideration to which Jones called my notice. He shewed me first, from the marginal reading in Gen. xlviii. 19, that the word translated "multitude," might be rendered "*fulness*;" so that the promise would be read, "Ephraim shall become *the fulness of the Gentiles*." He then referred me to Rom. xi. 25, where these words occur: "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until '*the fulness of the Gentiles*' be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved;" pressing upon me that St. Paul, in that text, was actually referring to this old promise of Ephraim; and that he meant to teach the utter impossibility of the full salvation of God's ancient covenant people under Christ's government, until Israel, or the Ten Tribes (which were at that time as a nation unconverted) should have become the inheritors of this great promise. The effect produced upon my mind by the argument was very forcible. For, although I could not affirm that, of itself, it was conclusive; yet, taken in connection with all which Jones had said before, it appeared to be in the highest degree probable.

Upon the whole, I confess honestly, that this gave me greater confidence in his views; and, though I was not even yet a true

convert, I began to feel more and more that he was not such a vain dreamer as I had taken him to be.

Yours, in the love of honest research,  
To Anthony —, Esq. ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XXII.

### THE PROMISES OF GOD DISTINCTIVELY GIVEN TO EPHRAIM.

*(Continued.)*

*London, August 19, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

We now come to the prophecy of Isaiah; but before I enter upon this, I must first answer one of your criticisms. You call my attention to three verses in Hosea ix., which seems to be opposed to the idea of Ephraim's multitudinous increase. "As for Ephraim, their glory shall fly away like a bird, from the birth. Though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave them, that there shall not be a man left. Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit" (verses 11, 12, 16). I reply that this must be understood of the Tribe of Ephraim's cessation *in their own land*, where "not a man" should be left; and where they actually were utterly bereaved of children. It is impossible to apply it to them after their exile; not only because Jacob had said, "Ephraim shall become a multitude of nations;" but because Zechariah, long after that exile, said, "They of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man, and their heart shall rejoice as through wine: and *their children* shall see it, and they *shall increase, as they*

*have increased*" (Zesh. x. 7, 8). We shall come to this prophecy presently. Meanwhile, take notice that it not only excludes your interpretation, but perfectly neutralises your criticism.

Let us now proceed to Isaiah xi. 10—14: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again *the second time* to recover the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west; they shall spoil them of the east together: they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them."

I think there are four conclusive reasons why the "*second*" restoration here spoken of cannot possibly refer to that which took place out of Babylon. *First*, because it is described in direct connection with the times of Messiah. The whole chapter is Messianic. However, therefore, the deliverance from Babylon may be included, I do not see how it can be intended as the main and ultimate scope of this prophecy. *Secondly*, because in the return from Babylon, there was no *complete* restoration of all the Twelve Tribes, as here described. Now

this there had been in the exodus from Egypt; and therefore, in respect to that deliverance, it was well called the second restoration. *Thirdly*, because when the people returned from Babylon, they came back only from one quarter; whereas this passage speaks of many different places out of which the restoration is to be gathered. *Fourthly*, because at the time of the return from Babylon, there were no military achievements, as here portrayed. There was no "spoiling of the east," no "laying hands on Edom," no "conquest of Ammon." Still less were there any of those marvels in Egypt, of which the last verses of this chapter speak (see v. 15, 16).

Putting all these considerations together, I believe you will agree with me that this prophecy speaks of the great restoration which is yet to come; and that it therefore includes the restoration of the Ten Tribes of Israel—pointing, moreover, to a time of *union* between Judah and Anglo-Ephraim; when both shall go together to Palestine in perfect peace and harmony. But if so, how is the language of the 14th verse to be understood? As an honest searcher after truth I could not help marking a point of apparent discrepancy between Hosea's statement, that Ephraim was to be restored "*from the west*," and Isaiah's here, that it should take place "*toward the west*." "They shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west." The difficulty was unriddled thus. "Shoulders of the Philistines" is a geographical expression, meaning "frontier districts;" for so the word is to be understood in Joshua xv. 11. Again, "toward the west" is identical in Hebrew with "seaward." Hence the words may be rendered, "They shall fly upon the frontier district of Palestine seaward." Thus the very passage which my conscientiousness led me to examine as an argument against the opinion toward which I was gravitating,

eventually proved quite in its favour. For, if Ephraim returns to Palestine from Britain, the people *will* arrive there *seaward*, or *on its western coast*.

Yours, progressing slowly,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

### LETTER XXIII.

#### THE PROMISES OF GOD DISTINCTIVELY GIVEN TO EPHRAIM.

(Continued.)

*London, August 26, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

As I could only find one passage in Isaiah properly bearing upon this subject, we will now proceed to a passage in Jeremiah which demands attention. "There shall be a day that the watchmen upon the mount Ephraim shall say, Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion unto the Lord our God. For thus saith the Lord; Sing with gladness for Jacob, and shout among the *chief* of the nations: publish ye, praise ye, and say, O Lord, save Thy people, the remnant of Israel. Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the *coasts* (or sides) of the earth; and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child, and her that travaileth with child together: *a great company* shall return thither. They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a Father to Israel, and *Ephraim is my firstborn*" (Jer. xxxi. 6—9).

There are four things in this interesting passage which are worthy of your closest consideration. 1st. You will observe that Ephraim is distinctly spoken of; and that in direct relation to the covenant promise of Jacob, in Gen. xlviii. For, strictly speaking, Ephraim was not "the firstborn." He was only constituted such by way of covenant blessing on Jacob's death-bed. The blessing of Jacob, therefore, here comes on Ephraim in his latter end, when the predicted promise of Gen. xlviii. 19, has been accomplished, and he has become "a multitude of nations;" i.e., when he has become a great power in the world, as the centre of a vast colonial empire or of confederate peoples. 2nd. He returns, under this condition of things, as "*a great company*;" a promise which, you see, is in perfect harmony with his having inherited "the multitudinous seed." 3rd. He returns, not only from the north, but from the "*coasts (or sides) of the earth.*" Now we have previously seen that Ephraim is to return from the *West*, and from "*the Isles of the sea.*" Put all this together, and does it not prove the probability of Ephraim's return to Palestine out of an Island Empire, in the North West, *having possessions along the coasts of the world?* And what Empire can be identified with this description but Britain, whose coastward possessions are known to lie along all sides of the earth? 4th. Is not this identity confirmed by its being also said that Ephraim is to return with a shout from "*the chief of the nations?*" Is it too much to say, that, taken in connection with what has gone before, no country save our own can possibly answer to this? For if Great Britain be not the "chief of the nations" in reference to her standing armies, or to her progress in the arts, she is certainly so in her colonial possessions along the "*coasts or sides of the earth.*"

I venture to submit these four considerations to you with the



greatest confidence. Do not think that I urge them with any idea of their proving absolutely conclusive; for I know the difficulties of this intricate subject. But do they not throw light upon it? Do they not help you to see that, if the scientific difficulties of the question are but once put aside, there is much in the Bible to render the Anglo-Israel Theory *probable*?

Yours, increasingly satisfied,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XXIV.

THE PROMISES OF GOD DISTINCTIVELY GIVEN TO EPHRAIM.

(Continued.)

London, September 2, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I thought my last Letter would make an impression upon you. Let us now see what this will do. I am about to take you to a passage in Hosea, in which the prophet winds up his predictions against Ephraim with very signal promises of mercy, exclaiming, "Ephraim shall say, What have I any more to do with idols?" Now this, as a promise to Ephraim, was very significant; for Judah soon cast off his idolatry. The Two Tribes never returned to that sin after the Babylonian captivity. But Ephraim, as we have before seen, long continued in idolatry:—"Ephraim is joined unto idols; let him alone," had been the voice of destiny in a previous chapter. That branch of Israel was to "mix among the Gentiles" (chap.

vii. 8). They were, in passing along their future course, to become "a multitude of 'goyim.'" Nevertheless, the time was at last to arrive when they should abjure idolatry, and be re-converted to the God of their fathers.

I am fully aware that this is no contribution to the Anglo-Israel argument. It is an illustration of it, however, supposing the Theory to be true. For observe the appropriateness with which English Christianity, and, I may add, the Christianity of all the Teutonic nations, stands out in the midst of Catholic Christendom. Save, with these exceptions, are not both the Eastern and Western Churches given up to the idolatry of pictures and images? Now against this corrupted form of the true faith, Germany, Scandinavia, and Britain remain noble and enduring witnesses. Do they not then, in this respect, fulfil that great mission of the Hebrew race, of which Isaiah had written—"Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord" (Isaiah xliii. 10)? The great Reformation of the sixteenth century turned, amongst other doctrines, on this very point. It was exactly as if Ephraim had then arisen, and said, "What have I to do any more with idols?"

As this would be too brief a Letter if I were to end here, let me now call you to notice how the context in this chapter, speaking of Ephraim under the name of Israel, says, "*I will be as the dew unto Israel*" (verse 5). Now "dew" in the Old Testament is a simile applied to Divine doctrine, or the sound teaching of revelation; in other words, to the Scriptures (*e.g.*), "My doctrine shall drop as the rain; My speech shall distil as the dew" (Dent. xxxii. 2). The condition of Ephraim, therefore, in his final blessing, seems to be that of a nation which will be marked by love for the Scriptures; a nation filled with Bible knowledge. Is not this, also, a more especial sign of

British Christianity? What nation in the world has so much of an open Bible, or has done so much to print and circulate it as our own?

Again,—“*He shall grow as the lily*” (i.e.), “with *Rapidity*”; “*And cast forth his roots as Lebanon*” (i.e.), with *Strength*; “*His branches shall spread*” (i.e.), with *Extensiveness*; “*His beauty shall be as the olive tree*” (i.e.), with *Productiveness*; “*And his smell as Lebanon*” (i.e.), with *Recognised Favour and Reputation* (verses 5, 6). Now take these four characteristics and see if any nationality can combine them with so much harmoniousness as Britain. Recall her position in the days of Henry VIII., and mark the *rapidity* of her growth from the days of Elizabeth to Victoria. During the same interval, note also her growth in *productiveness*, both commercially and in respect of population. Test it again, with relation to *extensiveness*; seeing that, within that period, she has covered the whole world with colonies more vast than any nation which ever flourished upon the face of the globe. May we not say the same of her *strength*? For, during this period, her soil has never been invaded; and she has scarcely ever lost position in a single foreign campaign. And may we not assert, with equal assurance, that, in *recognised favour and reputation*, she has been at once the envy and jealousy of the nations of Europe?

I do not, of course, mean to assert that these striking correspondences with the prophet's predictions of Ephraim's future greatness *proves* the identity. But, taken with other evidences, do they not seem like a commentary upon it?

Yours, with brightening light,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XXV.

THE PROMISES OF GOD DISTINCTIVELY GIVEN TO EPHRAIM.

*(Continued.)**London, September 9, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

You congratulate me in a playful manner upon feeling so comfortable. Believe me, dear friend, I should feel far more comfortable if I found you viewing this interesting question with greater seriousness. You might, perhaps, fairly treat it with indifference if you found me writing in a strong dogmatic spirit which forced these various passages into positive *proofs* of the Anglo-Israel Theory, and which disdainfully scorned any other interpretation. But that I am not doing. I am only urging them to prove that, while my first set of Letters exhibited the *possibility* of this Theory being true, this set of Letters inclines toward a proof of its *probability*. I do not hold it to be within the nature of the case that we can positively and dogmatically assert the *necessity* of this belief. It is a field of enquiry on which good men, equally conscientious, may reasonably differ. But surely it is worth consideration. It cannot be beyond the just limits of our reasoning faculties to ask whether Scripture lends its sanction to an opinion, which, however new, is one of the deepest and widest interest to those who are in search after truth.

With this view, therefore, before us, I will now lead you to the prophecy of Zechariah, the last prophecy bearing directly upon Ephraim by name (Zech. x. 6—10), “I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them again to place them; for I have mercy upon them: and they shall be as though I had not cast them off: for I am the Lord their God, and will hear them.

And they of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man, and [their heart shall rejoice as through wine: yea, their children shall see it, and be glad; their heart shall rejoice in the Lord. I will hiss for them, and gather them; for I have redeemed them: *and they shall increase as I have increased them.* And *I will sow them among the people: and they shall remember Me in far countries;* and they shall live with their children, and turn again. I will bring them again also out of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria; and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon; and place shall not be found for them."

The first thing to be remarked in this passage is that Ephraim was never carried captive to Egypt. It is true that some of the Ten Tribes fled before the captivity into Egypt. But they did not survive in that country; for Hosea says (chap. ix. 6), "They are gone because of destruction: Egypt shall gather them up: Memphis shall bury them." Hence these fugitives could not be literally referred to as surviving to the end, and being finally restored out of Egypt in the last days. When, therefore, it is here said, "I will bring them again out of the land of Egypt," it can only be understood in a figurative sense. That is to say, Egypt can only stand, for the power of the world within those particular quarters in which Ephraim had been held captive during his unconverted state, be they where they may. In other words, the expression of the quarter from whence Ephraim shall be restored is not here geographical, but symbolical. I think no one can doubt this. On the other hand, when it is said, "I will gather them out of Assyria," the expression must, no doubt, be taken in a strictly geographical sense. Does this require us, then, to believe that Ephraim must be stationed in Assyria at the very time of his return to Palestine? It may appear so at first sight. But

why? The question of time is not here at all referred to. It is simply said:—"I will gather them out." Now if the Anglo-Israel Theory be correct, this exodus from Assyria commenced before the time of Christ, by the migrations of the people north-west to the isles of the sea; from which latter place the final return is to happen. I want to know whether that is consistent with Zechariah's prophecy. If not, it becomes a decided argument against Mr. Jones and his friends. In justice, however, to their views, I cannot see that it is so. For the prediction would still be satisfied,—“I will bring them out of Assyria.”

If my discussion of this part of the prophecy be correct, the whole fulfilment of it will have to be regarded as in a course of chronic continuousness from the time of the prophet himself. Why not? Why should not God have commenced the gathering out of Ephraim from Assyria before the time of Christ? Why should not the making of Ephraim like “*a mighty man*” have been accomplished afterwards in the history of our Western Isles, between the reigns of Elizabeth and Victoria? Most assuredly the rest of the prediction has received its accomplishment within that period, on the supposition of Ephraim and Britain being identical. Remember I am not, as I have said before, urging this as a proof of its being so. But would it not fall in with the Theory? Does it not lend a sanction to its probability! For when it is written, “*They shall increase, as I have increased them,*” is not this marvellously illustrated by the overflowing population of the Anglo-Saxon race? And when it is said, “*I will sow them among the people, and they shall remember Me in far countries,*” does it not receive confirmation by the scattering of British Colonies and English Christianity over the most distant parts of the earth's surface?

I ask you to consider these points, and not to disdain them by telling me that you are "glad I feel so comfortable."

I remain, yours most devotedly,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

P.S. If the final outcome of the "Eastern Question" should be to place British power in Egypt and Assyria, what would you say?

---

## LETTER XXVI.

### SOME OF THE COVENANT PROMISES DISTINCTIVELY MADE TO THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.

*London, September 16, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

As you now seem more disposed to listen to my homilies with patience, I begin a fresh division of my subject with renewed earnestness. I will endeavour, however, to avoid prolixity, and spare you as much as possible. Were I writing as an avowed advocate of the Anglo-Israel Theory, I might be tempted to put in all sorts of side arguments and questionable passages, as the manner of some is. But such is not my object, as you know. Indeed, if I had been asked at the present stage of my inquiries whether I had fully arrived at a conclusion upon this subject, I do not think I could have answered in the affirmative. I should only have said, "I am strengthened in my belief that the Theory has a strong ground of *probability*. Nothing more."

I mean, therefore, now but to select a few of the more salient and striking prophecies in which the Divine mind was

revealed concerning the Ten Tribes, under the name of Israel. You are aware that this word Israel is often used to denote the whole Hebrew nation. There is, consequently, a great danger of taking up some passages which were intended to apply to the whole people, and transferring them to the Ten Tribes of Israel exclusively. I shall be on my guard against that danger; for I am free to confess that I have found our friend Jones falling into it several times; and I have not unfrequently met with instances of the same kind in books professedly written upon this subject. Such mistakes do much harm by misleading superficial thinkers, as well as by deterring others from further investigation.

If I begin, then, with Hosea, who unmistakeably had a mission to the Ten Tribes of Israel, I shall, for the present, be treading upon very safe ground.

1. Now here I must press upon you at once what I consider to be most remarkable (*viz.*), that when Hosea represents the Ten Tribes under the figure of three children, Jezreel, Lo Ruhamah, and Lo Ammi (all these names being symbolical of their approaching condition of exile, when they were to be judged, cast off, and uncovenanted as Gentiles), their *mother's* name is called GOMER (chapter l. 3). Gomer, however, is not an Asiatic or Semitic appellation, but *European*. In Gen. x. 2, we read that Gomer was a Japhetic title; he was one of his first sons. We read there of Gomer, Magog, Tubal, and Meshech; all of them being names indented with Europe instead of Asia. In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible I read, "Gomer is generally recognised as the progenitor of the early Cimmerians, of the later Cimbri, and of the modern Gael and Cymry." What, then, are we to make of this identification of Israel in exile with the Gomerian or early European family?



Are we to suppose that this name was given to Hosea under inspiration for nothing? You will bear in mind that these exiled Tribes were first deported to Assyria, which was not a Gomerian country. Is not the inference plain, therefore, that they were to quit Assyria and travel westward into Europe, so as to mix thus with Gomer, and become identified finally with that stock, rather than with the Semitic? In other words, that they were to lose their Semitic nationality, and become European? I confess, in all sincerity, I can make nothing else of this fact; and it appears to me to lend more probability to the Anglo-Israel Theory than almost anything I have yet discovered.

2. The next passage to which I draw your attention is in chapter ii. 14: "Therefore, behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her." This expression, "I will speak comfortably," being the same as that found in Isaiah xl. 1, 2, "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem," is evidently a promise of the conversion of the Ten Tribes to Christianity. And it is here described as taking place in "the wilderness." The Hebrew word is *midkar*, and is often used in the Bible to denote "an open space affording pasture," as (*e.g.*) in Isaiah xlii. 11; Jeremiah xxiii. 10; Psalm lxv. 12; Joel i. 19, and ii. 22. It must, therefore, describe some country in which they should settle and be converted after a long course of wandering and punishment. See also ver. 18, "I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and will make them to *lie down safely*." Now where can this place of settled habitation be looked for? Parallel prophecies given to Ephraim have already led us to fix this country in the Isles of the West. Is there anything here to

contradict it? Certainly not. On the contrary, being designated the children of Gomer, we have every reason to look for the place in some part of Europe where the descendants of Gomer dwelt. And if so, what place so probable as the British Isles, where the Keltic and Teutonic races are now fused into one great Anglo-Saxon nation, where they have obtained safety and freedom from invasion for so many centuries, and where they have long since been evangelised and God-fearing people?

3. The next and only other passage to which I will draw your attention is in chapter ii. 23:—"And I will sow her unto me in the earth." Does not this fall in exactly with what has just been said? For have not the Anglo-Saxon people, since their conversion to Christianity, been "*sown unto God in the earth*"? Think of our Christian colonies, and of our missionary settlements in every part of the globe. The sun does not shine in any latitude where British Christianity is not represented. Go where you will, and you shall find it impossible to reach a soil where the enterprise and activity of British civilisation has not, in some way or other, penetrated. Add this feature, then, to what has gone before in the prophecy, and ask what other interpretation better befits them? What section of the children of Gomer can unite these various characteristics as Great Britain does? In the light of such considerations I venture to think, dear Anthony, that the Anglo-Israel Theory, which we once despised and laughed at, is, after all, not unworthy of credit. At any rate, I hope you will not deem this Letter unworthy of being placed among some of the best arguments for its probability.

Yours, ever truth loving,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XXVII.

SOME OF THE COVENANT PROMISES DISTINCTIVELY MADE TO  
THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.*(Continued.)**London, September 23, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

That you should have pronounced my last Epistle the most striking I have yet written is very re-assuring to my mind; forcibly bringing to my recollection a passage written by Isaiah, in which he speaks of truth being learned by degrees, "Precept must be upon precept, line upon line, here a little, and there a little" (Isaiah xxviii. 10). And, in passing, I may remark that those words were addressed to Ephraim; for the chapter begins, "Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim" (verse 1). By the way, if this Anglo-Israel or Anglo-Ephraim Theory be true, do you not see a fitness in this sad reminiscence of the old sin of Ephraim, when you remark that drunkenness is the besetting sin of our own nation? Of course this is no proof that we are of Ephraim; but it is a remark which quite harmonises with its probability; the more so, because all national sins are known to be hereditary.

After this introduction to the Prophet Isaiah you may very likely expect me to comment upon some of his wonderful proclamations of Israel's future restoration. If so, I shall disappoint you; for, though many advocates of this Theory (who write as if they had taken a brief from their friends; in order to make out their case by every conceivable text of

Scripture which they can turn to their purpose) quote unsparingly from the latter part of Isaiah's prophecy, I find, on a critical examination of their writings, that they often spoil their cause by working out doubtful texts. I mean to say that, on the ground of Israel being named in certain passages, they take it for granted the Ten Tribes were meant; whereas the whole Hebrew family was frequently designated by that title, and the covenant promises contained in such passages were no more intended for the Ten Tribes than for the other Two, but were given to the nation as a whole. At all events, the handling of such doubtful passages raises such a host of side issues, that I prefer taking up only such texts as are unequivocally referable to the subject in hand.

I will, therefore, now lead you to Jeremiah; for of his addresses to the House of Israel, in its more limited sense, there cannot possibly be two opinions. Read, for example, Jer. iii. 6, 7, and see how Israel is spoken of, in direct contrast with Judah. "*Backsliding Israel*" is first referred to; and, it is added, "*Treacherous Judah* saw it." Again (ver. 11), "*Backsliding Israel* hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah." When this distinction of meaning is given to Israel in contrast with Judah, how can we resist the conclusion that Jeremiah is here dealing with the Ten Tribes exclusively?

Now bear in mind, from the first, that Jeremiah wrote *after* Hosea. He flourished in the days of Josiah, when the Ten Tribes were already banished. What, then, could he mean by saying that "*backsliding Israel*" had "*justified herself more than treacherous Judah?*" Israel was at this time in her "*Lo Ruhamah,*" "*Lo Ammi*" condition; whereas, to use Hosea's words—"Judah" yet "*ruled with God,*" and was "*faithful with the saints*" (Hosea xi. 12). Not referring, therefore, to

the time then being, we can only relegate it to the future, on the ground that Israel should be converted to God in her exile *before* the conversion of her sister Judah. It seems, indeed, impossible to understand it on any other principle of interpretation. Judah was "treacherous" in betraying and slaying her promised Messiah, and was cursed and exiled accordingly; under which curse she still lies. The fact that Israel bore no part in that transaction could not, of itself, justify her. According to the language of Scripture, there can be no justification but by faith. Hence I argue that Israel's justification consisted in *her* acceptance of the Messiah, through the reception of Christianity, before that acceptance on the part of Judah. Well, then, under such circumstances, see how the Anglo-Israel Theory agrees with the prediction. I do not say that this prediction proves it; but—as I am remarking throughout these Letters—it illustrates and throws light upon it. For, in that case, the house of Israel, through the Anglo-Saxon race, *has* been justified "more than treacherous Judah;" seeing that Judah still abides in her treachery, while Anglo-Israel has welcomed and accepted her crucified Messiah.

Let us now go on to the fourteenth verse:—"Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; for *I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family; and I will bring you to Zion.*" Once more I ask you to remember that, when Jeremiah wrote these words, "backsliding Israel" was exiled and uncovenanted. In other words, the Lord was *not* at that time married unto her. Hosea had written (chapter ii. 1, 2), "Say ye unto your brethren, *Ammi*; and to your sisters *Ruhamah*. Plead with your mother, plead: for *she is not my wife, neither am I her husband.*" It is, therefore, quite evident that Jeremiah could not have been alluding

to the time *then existing*, when he said, in the name of the Lord, "I am married unto you." This must obviously have been a prophecy of a future time, when Israel was to be converted and restored to covenant favour. Now we have just seen that this conversion was to take place *before* the conversion of Judah. Hence this verse must clearly be treating of a time which is to be *previous* to the grand restoration to Palestine. I speak positively, because Scripture everywhere declares the *final* return of the whole house of Jacob to *Palestine* as coincident and contemporaneous. No one disputes that; and this event has not yet taken place. What, then, can the promise mean which is here given to converted Israel (*viz.*); that God "will take *one* of a city, and *two* of a family; and bring them to Zion"? It necessarily indicates the return of a very small and feeble representation of the Ten Tribes to their land *before* the final and main return of the whole nation. Now, if the Anglo-Israel Theory be correct, this has been already fulfilled in a very remarkable manner (*viz.*); by the joint establishment of a Christian Church and Bishopric on Mount Zion, under the protectorate of Great Britain and Germany. Does not that fact throw immense light on the prediction? Is it not striking? Does it not fall in with all our preceding thoughts? Does it not harmonise with the whole bearing of the prophecy? For, observe, here is Israel once more "married" in the covenant of grace; and is initially restored to Zion (from a "city" and a "family," so to speak), while "*treacherous Judah*" *still continues unjustified*, just as Jeremiah had declared!

The more you ponder over this the more do I think you will be struck by it. For it is surely no slight marvel that after eighteen centuries of desolation, during which Palestine has

been "trodden under foot of the Gentiles," the time should now have arrived when a Christian settlement, with land legally conveyed to it by the Turkish Government, should be occupying Mount Zion; and when British and American explorers should be scientifically surveying the country, with a view to identify its holy places, and bring the ancient sites of its cities into open daylight. Nor is it less striking that this earnest return of Christian inquiry toward the land of our fathers should be chiefly in the hands of Anglo-Saxons. Why should not this be the first faint fulfilment of the final re-occupation of Palestine, and of the full restoration of Israel? Jeremiah here predicts it as being scanty and partial in its commencement. Why, then, should the application of this fact be deemed unnatural?

Yours, still trustful and hopeful,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XXVIII.

SOME OF THE COVENANT PROMISES DISTINCTIVELY MADE  
TO THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.

(Continued)

*London, September 30, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

You may be surprised that I do not, in this Letter, go on with any more of the sayings of Jeremiah. But those in chapter xxxi., you will remember, we have already considered in connection with Ephraim; and of the rest, one is to be re-

garded as in strict connection with the return from Babylon, in which Israel had a certain share, although not in full nationality; and the others seem to call for no remark, either one way or the other, as bearing upon this especial inquiry.

I shall, therefore, now bring you to Ezekiel. Here, too, my reference will be only to one chapter in which the prophecy undisputedly bears upon the Ten Tribes; for I am determined not to trouble you with questionable passages. Of these, the 39th chapter is an example (verses 22—29); for I need scarcely tell you that, after the exile of Samaria and her Tribes, the Hebrew people remaining (consisting as it did of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, and some of the Ten Tribes who had escaped before the Assyrian captivity) were called the "House of Israel." The Ten Tribes exiled were then out of view, because they were in their Lo-Ammi condition. They were expatriated, uncovenanted, and lost from the prophetic sight, until the Messianic times, when they were to be afterwards converted and restored. Any reference of the 39th chapter to these Ten Tribes, therefore, would be very uncertain and doubtful.

Upon this principle, I prefer to limit myself to the 37th chapter which is too explicit to be misunderstood. Look at the 19th verse. The mention there made of "the stick of Joseph in the hand of Ephraim, and the Tribes of Israel his fellows,"—as distinct from "the stick of Judah,"—leaves us in no possible uncertainty that the prophet is now expressly dealing with the Ten Tribes who had been expatriated and uncovenanted, and lost to view previously. That this chapter speaks of them also in the Messianic times, when they had become converted, is no less clear. For, in their predicted union with the house of Judah, it is said, "David My servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd" (verse 24). The vision



with which the chapter opens, therefore, becomes extremely valuable, as throwing light upon the fact that the Ten Tribes were to continue in their graves, or lost, up to the time when they shall be reunited with Judah, as one people. That, however, makes nothing for the Anglo-Israel Theory; because, on any view we may take of the Ten Tribes, it is obvious that the conditions are the same. The whole point of interest is in the question of the opening up of these graves of Israel. It is here represented under the distinct simile of a resurrection; agreeably with a prediction in Hosea, which I have reserved to this place. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction" (Hosea xiii. 14). Now, although St. Paul adapts this passage to the future resurrection of the Church of Christ generally; there can be no doubt that, in its primary sense, it refers to the same disinterment or resurrection of Israel, as Ezekiel speaks of in the chapter we are now considering. It, therefore, confirms the idea of Israel being a nation dead and lost to view; yet ultimately being brought to light, and publicly recognised as entitled to its long-promised inheritance. That, indeed, seems to be the bearing of the closing words of the verse. "Repentance shall be hid from mine eyes" (see verse 14). And upon those words St. Paul most probably had his eyes fixed, when he said, in direct connection with God's faithfulness to Israel:—"The gifts and callings of God are without repentance" (Rom. xi. 29).

Coming back, then, to Ezekiel's vision, the first thing I notice is its evident division into three parts; one part being contained in verses 1—8, the second in verses 9, 10, and the third in verses 11—28. Let us take them in their order. Clearly understand, however, that I am not about to note this

prophecy as any absolute indication of the truth of the Anglo-Israel Theory. I must not assume to be a propagandist of that doctrine, for I had not even as yet avowed myself one of its disciples. All I aim at, is, to shew an open unbeliever such as you that the leading prophecies distinctively given to Israel are perfectly consistent with it. In this chapter (*e.g.*) I think I shall be able to shew that (assuming the history of the exiled Israelites to have been what we discussed in my first set of Letters) there is nothing in it which does not harmonise with such a line of events.

Take, for instance, the first eight verses; in which the Ten Tribes are compared to dry bones in the valley of vision. Here, however, I must refer to the 21st verse, which evidently points to them as having "*gone*" from their original place of exile into foreign and heathen nations. Matthew Pool notes this in his Commentary, saying:—" '*Whither they be gone.*' The expression seems to look to them that were gone among the heathen by a *voluntary* peregrination; whether before the captivity, or after it, I will not venture to determine. But it is likely enough to me that, among those carried away, and their children, there were some that were uneasy when they went against their wills, who would *ramble* and *range over countries*, HOPING TO FARE BETTER. And, perhaps, THOSE WANDERERS may be the persons meant by this '*gone.*' " These are remarkable words, considering they were written more than 200 years ago, when the Anglo-Israel Theory was never so much as even dreamt of. Yet they exactly agree with it. For they premise that the Ten Tribes voluntarily started off on a line of migration into other heathen lands out of Assyria, where they lay as "dead bones," in all the darkness of idolatry, unknown, and unblessed of God. Assuming this to be the

case, therefore (which is just what the Anglo-Israel Theorists maintain), we should have a representation of the Teutonic and Keltic races, or, at least, a large portion of them, lying in Britain, Gaul, Germany, Denmark, and Scandinavia, waiting to be collected in one compact and nationalized mass; their various parts having to be brought together by some *violent shaking*, and clothed in distinct bodies, as one assembled whole; yet still without any breath of divine life, or, in other words, still in *some heathen form of existence*. Now would not this portion of the prophecy perfectly agree with the invasions, one after the other, of the Saxons, Danes, Jutes, Northmen, and Normans, all of whom came together, bone to his bone, by their amalgamation in Britain, in a state of heathen nationality? Read those first eight verses over again, and judge for yourself. No one could have thought of such a fulfilment, I grant, judging from the words taken as they stand. But having been deemed probable upon other grounds, are they not quite consistent with it?

2. Now go to the 9th and 10th verses, where a new page of the vision presents itself. The "bones" here brought together, clothed with skin and flesh, and yet remaining dead, represent Israel reformed, but without conversion to God. At this point of the vision Ezekiel is then told a second time to prophecy; when "*breath came into them and they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army.*" It is not said whether this quickening into life was sudden, or slow; but, at any rate, it was complete. In other words, this awakening of Israel to a national re-existence, was now represented as a true conversion, a real spiritual revivification; and as nothing less than "*life from the dead*" (Rom. xi. 15). Now in a vision of this kind I regard the element of time to be an unexpressed and

unknown ingredient. Nothing is here said respecting it. Considering, therefore, that the 21st verse starts the period of its commencement from the "going forth" of the children of Israel out of Assyria among other heathen nations, I consider it perfectly justifiable to look upon these three sections of the vision as occupying in their accomplishment a space of three lengthened intervals. Hence, on the Theory we are now testing, these two verses might well run from the time of the full evangelisation of Britain, to the completion of its more modern national Christianity, as the result of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. Is there anything inconceivable, impossible, or improbable in this? It would have been so *a priori*; i.e., without any previous line of evidence to guide our thoughts in that direction. But, having been so directed, upon grounds which we think otherwise reasonable, does this vision place any barrier to our belief of it? On the contrary, is it not silently in keeping with it; and, though expressed in the vaguest and most general terms, is it not quite agreeable to the idea? Tell me honestly, if you think otherwise.

3. We now come to the third section of this vision, which is contained from verse 11 to the end of the chapter. Here we have a third command of the prophet to "prophecy;" the remarkable part of his message being, that the Ten Tribes, notwithstanding their re-nationalization and conversion, are still represented as in their "*graves*"! "Therefore prophecy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord; Behold, O my people, *I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel*" (ver. 12). You must observe that this was said to Ezekiel in the most distinct manner possible, *after* "the bones had come together and been reformed into bodies;" and *after* they had, subsequently to

that process, been revived by the "breath" of the Holy Spirit. It was, therefore, a plainly third period in the process of God's purposes toward Israel. Nevertheless, at its point of commencement, you see that Israel nationalized and converted (wherever their location may be), are still *lost to the world's view*, as such, being practically in their "*graves*." Now is not this perfectly consistent with our present line of interpretation? For, between the time of the Reformation and our own times, Israel has been buried, unseen and unrecognised, among the Anglo-Saxons. Even now, when the "prophesying of those who see (or think they see) the truth are beginning to proclaim the fact, their testimony is received with general incredulity and laughter." Yet the conviction is making way; and the "resurrection" here described has commenced. The full manifestation of it (if true) will of course require time for development. Nor will the end be brought about till that manifestation has been publicly acknowledged. Then will follow events, upon which it would now be idle to speculate, but which the times we live in might very naturally give rise to; such as an European readjustment of the "Eastern Question" (as it is often termed), when nothing would be more probable than that the Turkish Empire should break up, and be divided into three parts; Palestine and Syria falling into the hands of this country, while Egypt and European Turkey falls to the lot of two of the other Great Powers. In this case, the Jews, or Two Tribes, might very probably be invited to settle in their old land; England colonising Syria as an important half-way settlement along the great highway to its possessions in India. Far be it from me to turn prophet, and predict this state of things with anything like dogmatic assurance. But, most undoubtedly, there is nothing impossible or improbable in the conception.

And, if so, then this prophecy of the junction of the "two sticks" (16, 17) would be abundantly verified.

Yours, somewhat fascinated and edified by these thoughts,  
To Anthony —, Esq. ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XXIX.

SOME OF THE COVENANT PROMISES DISTINCTIVELY MADE TO  
THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.

(Continued.)

*London, October 7, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Your remarks upon my last Letter are not altogether unsatisfactory; for they prove that, while they have not produced conviction in your mind, they have, at any rate, made an impression; and that they have, so far, helped to remove some of your old stumbling-blocks. I do not think that you will be able to laugh, after this, at our friend Jones, as a mere visionary who has simply followed a phantasy of his own brain. The Theory he holds may possibly be found untrue; but, at all events, it is not without some shew of *probability*. Will you not honestly confess so much?

Proceeding now with the minor prophets, I shall have to exclude Joel; inasmuch as he addressed only the people of Judah, scarcely ever alluding to the Ten Tribes. Amps, on the other hand, distinctly prophesied to the house of Israel, being a contemporary of Hosea and Jonah. His message to them was one of judgment, for the most part; the last chapter

alone containing promises of mercy and deliverance. And here I must frankly confess that I, at first, found a difficulty. For the language in ix. 11, is quoted—as you will, perhaps, remember—in Acts xv. 15—17, as having been fulfilled in the proclamation of the Gospel by the Apostles. On pondering over this fact, I said, “Does not this appear to imply that Israel’s restoration from captivity is to be simply spiritual, and neither national, nor temporal?” I was much exercised by the consideration, and almost felt impetuously inclined to throw up the subject as inexplicable; when I suddenly became impressed with the further fact, that this quotation by St. James in the Council of Jerusalem, connected the prophecy with the conversion of the *Gentiles* (verses 12—14). I then remembered the similar identification of the exiled Tribes of Israel with the Gentiles, in St. Paul’s quotation of Hosea ii. 10, and in Romans ix. 25, 26; and also his statement in Romans xi. 25, that the *final* restoration of Israel could only be brought about when the “*fulness of the Gentiles*” (or, in other words, Ephraim’s “*multitude of nations*”) had “come in.” I then saw clearly how the *spiritual* fulfilment of God’s purposes might have commenced with the first proclamation of Christianity; and yet, how its final accomplishment must wait for the more complete conversion of Israel in a *national* sense, according to the predictions already considered. With that key of thought to solve the enigma all my difficulty vanished.

Let me, therefore, now beg you to mark what Amos says in chapter viii. 12. Speaking of the Israelites in their Assyrian exile, he uses these remarkable words—“They shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east.” Does not this prove what I have been saying all along (*viz.*); that it was the destiny of the Ten Tribes to emigrate from Assyria

—some of them (a small part, probably) going eastward to the Afghans, to Burmah, or to India—and others (the main part, probably) travelling westward to the northern sea? Thus the passage throws additional light, you will observe, on this Anglo-Israel Theory; for, according to that view, Ephraim and Manasseh and other Tribes *did* travel in this direction.

Yours, in a brief letter,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

### LETTER XXX.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE PROBABILITIES FROM SCRIPTURE.

*London, October 14, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

If Jones had been writing to you I have no doubt he would have produced a great many more passages from the Old Testament prophecies than I have done. But I wish to be cautious, and not press any arguments upon your notice which will not bear the closest examination. There are texts, for example, in Micah and Zechariah which he has adduced to me as bearing upon the promises of God to Israel. They are, however, so indefinitely mixed up in general terms with promises given to the whole house of Jacob, that I will not trouble you with them. I think I have said enough, at any rate, to shew that this subject has a solid and satisfactory basis. You may not be convinced; but there is, you must confess, a strong degree of probability in its favour.

In the first place I met the Scientific Difficulties, and shewed



that, in the crucible of free and honest inquiry, these all melted. In the next place, I have looked into Scripture evidence; and while, I dare say, there may be some things on the other side which have escaped my notice, I, nevertheless, feel sure that, whether we listen to the promises which God gave the Ten Tribes, under the name of Joseph, Ephraim, or Israel, they are all to be fulfilled by a nation which inhabits the north-west; which occupies the Isles; which owns a vast colonial empire running round the coasts of the earth; which is rich in minerals, prosperous in commerce, multitudinous in population; which is "chief of the nations;" which is converted to Christianity; which is active in the work of evangelisation; and which, though lost to view in a "grave" of unrecognised Israelitish nationality, is destined to have a "resurrection" in that particular that will ultimately result in its re-occupation of the land originally given to its forefathers. If you cannot see a picture of Great Britain and the Anglo-Saxon people, in connection with this outline of facts, all I can say is, that I pity your want of discernment.

There is, however, one argument you have urged which I cannot but notice, before I conclude this part of my subject. You object to this Anglo-Israel Theory on the ground that, if the Anglo-Saxons are the ancient Israel of Scripture, their numbers are too great (especially when added to the Two Tribes of Judah and Benjamin) ever to be found re-occupying the promised land, even though it should extend from the Mediterranean to the river Euphrates.

My reply to this is extremely simple. Would you say that *England* is not occupied by the Anglo-Saxons *now*, because there are vast numbers of the same race scattered in other parts of the world? In the same way Syria and Palestine would be

occupied, and the return of the Hebrew people would be accomplished, notwithstanding large numbers remained here or elsewhere. You must remember that, even in the days of the old Hebrew nationality, when the people still possessed Palestine, multitudes of the Hebrew race were scattered throughout the realms of Greece and Rome. Did that fact prevent it being said with propriety, that the Jews then occupied their own country? Why, then, should it be otherwise in the future?

I know the stronghold you will fall back upon, and which you regard as an impregnable fortress,—where Ezekiel says—“And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who caused them to be led into captivity among the nations, when I shall have gathered them unto their own land, and *have left none of them any more there*” (xxxix. 28)—a passage which, though it was not spoken exclusively of the Ten Tribes, certainly seems to include them, and is therefore quite to the point. I almost see you putting on one of your knowing looks, and hear you saying:—“Arthur, old fellow, now be conscientious, and acknowledge yourself wrong. For is it not distinctly said of the returned people, ‘*none of them shall be left*’”?

Allow me to reply, however, that if you were familiar with Biblical phraseology you would not press this argument. For it was not the habit of Scripture authors to write with the same exactness as our schools of modern theology. Those writers continually expressed themselves in terms which indicated absolute *universality*; when they only intended to denote something in a *general* or *representative* sense. Thus, it is said, “*All the world went up to be taxed*” (Luke ii. 1); not meaning every one in the world, but representative heads of families. In like manner, when the writer of the Second Book

of Kings spoke of the captivity of the Ten Tribes under Shalmaneser, saying, "The Lord removed them out of His sight; *there was none left* but the Tribe of Judah only" xvii. 18); though the term used is one of absolute universality, we know from 2 Chron xxxiv. 9, that "a remnant" of Ephraim and Manasseh remained behind who were resident in Israel during Josiah's reign. On the same principle of Jewish phraseology, therefore,—when Ezekiel says of the final return from exile, "*none of them shall be left*,"—what is there justly to hinder our understanding this term of absolute universality in the sense of a general or representative fulfilment, which would equally allow a remnant to be left behind? Comparing one part of Scripture with another, it appears to me that this reasoning is unanswerable.

I now conclude this portion of my correspondence with an expression of grateful thanks to you for your kindness and patience in receiving and replying to it. Should you be willing to hear more, I have further remarks to make upon the subject which may prove interesting. But I certainly will not pursue it unless you request me.

So, resting now upon my oars, I shall moor my bark upon the shore, and await your signal for moving forward.

Yours, ever devotedly attached,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.



III.

---

THE BOOK OF CONFIRMATIONS.

**Dedicated**

TO

THOSE STUDENTS OF THIS SUBJECT

WHO,

HAVING AN INCREASING INTEREST IN IT,

DESIRE

TO BE FURTHER CONFIRMED IN

ITS TRUTH.

K



## LETTER XXXI.

THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY ALONE ACCOUNTS FOR THE  
GEOGRAPHICAL MARCH OF CHRISTIANITY.*London, October 20, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I have not had to wait long for my orders; nor can I complain of the manner in which you have expressed them; for the language you have employed is far more complimentary than I deserve. Obedient, however, to your wishes, I proceed.

Having steered with some success, even according to your own confession, through the waters of Difficulties and Probabilities, I now mean to guide you, if I am able, into the more open stream, and shew you certain Confirmations of this Theory of Prophetic Interpretation, resulting from independent considerations which, I think, will make the subject plainer to your mind, and put it on a more satisfactory basis.

The subject on which I shall first address you is notified at the head of this Letter; and is one of no little importance. Did you never hear Infidelity comment upon the incompetency of Christianity to make progress during the apostolic age among the inferior and less civilised races? If you have not, I have. Shall I tell you what it says? It points, in the first place, to the written record of the Acts of the Apostles, and remarks upon the historical fact that the only inspired account of the triumphs of Christianity lies along a line of march through Asia Minor into Europe; and that as the result only of two missionaries—viz., St. Paul and Barnabas. It then asks sneeringly, “What became of the other apostles?

Why have we no record of their missionary travels? Why was not the Gospel successfully planted and sustained in Eastern Asia and Africa? Granting that the Church flourished for a season in Abyssinia, Alexandria, and Carthage, why has it practically died out in those countries, and become extinguished even in Asia Minor itself? Is it not evident that, while Brahminism, Buddhism, and Mahommedanism has had power to take root in Asia and Africa, the soil has proved uncongenial to Christianity? Do we not see, therefore, in the line of its geographical march that it was chiefly suited to the Indo-European family; and that, although its birthright was Semitic, its area of triumphs has been in Western civilisation rather than in any less cultivated regions?" Thus it argues against the Gospel as a successful revelation of God to mankind at large; and it concludes that it has practically failed in its mission, as a message adapted to "all nations."

Now I cannot but acknowledge that, apart from any considerations other than those just noted, this criticism carries with it, to my own mind, a great amount of force. Many and many a time, in years past, have I pondered over it, without ever seeing my way clearly through the mist. I used to endeavour to satisfy myself by saying, "This geographical march of Christianity into Europe, where alone it proved successful, arose from the fact that, in those days, all the energies and moral forces of civilisation naturally gravitated toward Rome." But then I recollected that our Lord's commission to His apostles received no such limitation. It was general. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (St. Mark xvi. 15). Moreover, all the apostles were "endued with power from on high" for the purpose of executing this commission. When St. Thomas, therefore, went to India, as



tradition informs us, and the rest in other directions, how came it that similar well-sustained victories for the cross of Christ did not take place in their case? Where are the results of the work of St. Bartholomew, of St. Andrew, of St. Matthias, and the rest? Assuming that they may have been successful for a time in their own personal ministry, why did not the Churches which they planted perpetuate and extend themselves afterwards throughout Asia and Africa, and produce the same wide-spread demolition of idolatry, as the Churches did which were planted in Europe?"

I then fell back for an answer upon the advantages which Europe possessed, over and above other parts of the world, by reason of its possessing, to a great extent, one homogeneous language. I reasoned upon the greater facility with which the Greek Septuagint Version of the Scriptures, and the New Testament, written in Greek, would circulate throughout the old Roman Empire in Europe, where that language was so generally well understood. Nevertheless, I could not help remembering that, in order to meet this very difficulty, the apostles had received, on the day of Pentecost, an express "gift of tongues;" by means of which "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Egypt, and Libya" were all capable of being freely addressed in their own language. I was, therefore, constrained to say—"With such miraculous aids, why should not those countries have had the same advantages as Europe?" Often as I went over this circle of reasoning, I found myself beaten back with the difficulties. And, although it did not, for one moment, really weaken my convictions as to the divine origin of Christianity, I confess it was painful and unsatisfactory. I felt that I could never give any sufficient reason for the fact that the Gospel

should have thus firmly established itself in a westerly direction, while in a southerly and eastern direction it seemed to have failed.

When I came, however, at last, upon this Anglo-Israel Theory of prophecy, all these clouds above my head began to disperse, and I at once saw why this state of things should have been permitted; for, according to that Theory, the "*fulness of the Gentiles*," which had first to be brought into the covenant, lay within the exiled *house of Israel*; and the main body of that people had migrated in a *north-westerly* direction through Europe. It became, therefore, actually necessary, on this basis, that the geographical march of Christianity should take that course rather than any other. Indeed, without such a fact, the Scripture conditions of prophecy could not possibly have been fulfilled. This consideration, I say, made everything plain; and so I put it down now among the first of my Confirmations of our Anglo-Israel Theory. I know of nothing else that will satisfactorily explain the matter. If you can suggest a better explanation, I shall be glad to hear it. Meanwhile, I remain,

Yours, content with my own reasoning,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XXXII.

THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROTESTANT  
UNITY OF THE TEUTONIC FAMILY, OF WHICH THE  
ANGLO-SAXONS ARE THE CHIEF REPRESENTATIVES.

*London, October 24, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

If my last Letter struck you as putting this subject in a new light, it is more than probable that this present Letter will do the same.

Did it never strike you, as a man of original thought, to be very singular that every Protestant nation should belong to the Teutonic family? This has been often observed. Indeed, some writers have so intensified the circumstance, as to endeavour to argue from it that Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are not so much matters of belief, as of race. They contend that the Latin races of Europe are almost incapable, on ethnological grounds, of ever becoming Protestant; while the Teutonic peoples are, by their psychological condition, everywhere pre-disposed to it.

I believe in nothing of the kind. There are large groups of Protestant Churches in France; and, in the days of the Huguenots, there were more than there are at present. The work of Protestantism has begun both in Spain, Portugal, and Italy under the late effusion of spiritual revival. Switzerland has her Protestant Cantons; and even Austria is not without some representatives of the same faith. If the main mass of the population of those countries, therefore, still remain faithful to the Papacy, these simple facts are quite sufficient to prove that it does not result from any mental or moral want of

receptivity of truth. No, the reason does not lie in any stereotyped form of psychological incapacity to become Protestant. It is not a question of race. It is not a question which has to be settled by any of the laws of ethnology. There are many reasons, historical, social, and national, which might be adduced to account for it, quite independently of these. At the same time the striking fact yet remains,—that the only nations which have bodily yielded to the principles of the great and enlightened Reformation are the Teutonic. Why, then, is this? Even if it were a matter of race, it would not affect my conclusion. On the contrary, it might even strengthen it. But this I decline to believe, on the ground that any such consideration would impugn the power of the Gospel. It would imply that the diffusion of pure Christianity was not adapted to “all nations,” but only to particular countries and peoples;—an opinion which would be utterly subversive of the power of the Holy Spirit to effect the world’s conversion to God. Why, then, is it?

You may possibly find some other reason for yourself; and, if so, I shall be thankful to hear it. But, to my own mind, the Anglo-Israel interpretation of prophecy is enough to make everything clear. For if the Teutonic race be of Israelitish origin, and the Anglo-Saxon a mere especial embodiment of them, then all this unity in Protestant faith and feeling falls into its proper place in Christendom, and remarkably illustrates the truth of this wonderful Theory.

To make this more plain, let me continue the passage in Jeremiah, at the point where I broke off in my twenty-seventh Letter. You had better reperuse that Letter before you proceed any further. It treats, you will observe, of Jeremiah iii.; in which the Israelitish nation, then exiled and uncovenanted, is

prophesied of as being recalled into the covenant and again betrothed unto the Lord. Judah is still "treacherous," but Israel is now "justified." The time is then described when Israel, during her justified or converted state commences a very partial and meagre return of a few of her sons to Palestine ("one of a city, and two of a family"). Agreeably with the Anglo-Israel Theory, I pointed out in that Letter how this may have already been accomplished, by the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric on Mount Zion under the protectorate of England and Germany, together with other English enterprises in Palestine. But these represent the Protestant powers of Europe. Do they not? Very well. Now read the 15th verse of that chapter. "And I will give you *pastors according to mine heart* which shall feed you with *knowledge and understanding*." I ask—could there possibly be a better description of our Protestant rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, than this? Are not "knowledge and understanding," through the possession and circulation of God's Holy Word, the pre-eminent characteristics of Protestantism? Set in contrast with Papal countries, where the Bible is hidden from the people, and all progressive enlightenment is hindered by an ecclesiastical policy which openly favours ignorance, are not Protestant countries possessed of greater religious knowledge and understanding? And, speaking as I do to a member of the reformed faith, may I not expect you to acknowledge that our "pastors" are men more according to the "heart" of God than Roman Catholic priests? Are we not driven, then, to the opinion that whenever or wherever Israel shall be ultimately found Christianised, it will be among Protestant and not Roman Catholic nations? If, therefore, the Teutonic nations are all Protestant, is not the inference plain that Israel is to be found among *them*?

Again, go on a little further in this chapter, and look at one verse of a most remarkable character, in which treacherous Judah is at last predicted as *joining himself to converted Israel*. This prediction is very clear; especially if it be read according to the marginal rendering of our English version. "In those days *the house of Judah shall walk to the house of Israel*; and they shall *come together out of the land of the North*, to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers" (verse 18). The picture here presented, is that of the old unbelieving Jewish people joining themselves in a body to their converted brethren of the Ten Tribes; and then both resettling together in their land of inheritance. Now to shew that the marginal reading of "to" is correct, I may observe that, "In the Vatican Edition of the LXX., and in that published by Bagster," we read a passage in the Greek which may be translated, "The house of Judah shall come together to the house of Israel"—come in a body to Israel. The Vulgate gives "Ibit domus Juda ad domum Israel." The Italian translation by Diodati gives "La casa di Giuda andrà alla casa d'Israel." The translation by Martini gives, in a more pointed manner, "La famiglia di Giuda si riunirà alla" (will reunite itself to the) "famiglia di Israel." It is in all "shall go unto." Our English translators give in a marginal reading, "to" for "with." It would seem that they knew not what to make of "go unto," as the subject of our inquiry was quite out of view (From a paper by the Rev. H. Newton, Vicar of St. Michael's, Southwark). Hence you may take it as having been fairly prophesied, that, "in the days" of which we have been just speaking, there will be a voluntary alliance of Judah with his converted brethren of the Ten Tribes; this being a part of the resurrection of the "dry bones" spoken of by

Ezekiel. They will "*walk unto the house of Israel.*" Here let me ask but one question. Is it in the remotest degree probable, that, whensoever or wheresoever this prediction may be fulfilled, the house of Judah should go over as a body into alliance with the Roman Catholic power of Europe?

Would any English statesman, or any Protestant student of history, or any so-called Jew of the present day, whether orthodox or rationalistic, hazard such an opinion? Has not the Papacy, with its images and idolatrous relics, been the great stumbling-block of the unbelieving Jews to their reception of Christianity? Has not Rome been, for ages, the great persecutor of that race? On the other hand, have not the Protestant nations been their greatest friends? Above all, has not England been their best liberator and patron; removing their civil disabilities, granting them full religious toleration, and even admitting them to sit in their Imperial House of Legislature? Everything goes, therefore, to shew that whenever this prophecy shall become accomplished,—in other words,—whenever the present house of Judah shall awaken to a recognition of their brethren of the house of Israel in their promised condition of recovenanted union with the Lord, the alliance will be with Protestant Christianity, and not with Roman Catholic. Under such circumstances, then, are we not justified in saying that the fact of all the Protestant nations being of one race, makes the Anglo-Israel Theory fall in exactly with the whole bearings of prophecy? And may I not fairly set it down as one of its greatest Confirmations?

Yours, believingly expectant,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

## LETTER XXXIII.

THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE FACT THAT THE ANGLO-SAXON NATIONS NOW OCCUPY THE SAME POSITION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT COVENANT WHICH THE HEBREW PEOPLE HELD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT COVENANT.

London, October 30, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

Hoping for the same success that I have met with in my two last Letters, I now sit down to pen another. The subject is given above; and is one on which it is impossible to lay too much stress.

The usual light in which Christian interpreters have regarded the New Testament Covenant is that of a long parenthesis in the history of God's dealings with His ancient people; during which period He has been gathering together a *spiritual Israel*; reserving all dealings with the *literal Israel* (using the word in its largest sense) until the "times of the Gentiles" shall be fulfilled. But while it is perfectly true that all are *spiritually* Abraham's seed who are justified by the faith of Abraham, Jews and Gentiles, without any difference (Gal. iii. 7—9), and while it is perfectly admitted that, apart from the *literal Israel*, there is full salvation for the whole world in the covenant of Gospel-grace by Jesus Christ; it does not by any means necessarily follow that this introduction of grace, to those who are by fleshly descent separated from the ancient seed, was intended to suspend God's covenant-dealings with the house of Jacob, and to introduce a new covenant which should be parenthetical between His former and latter favours toward them.



It is correct to say that it suspended divine relationship with those who crucified their Messiah, and were cut off from their land as outcasts; and who, so long as they abide in unbelief, must remain under an anathema. But (as I have shewn you in my 19th Letter), at the time when that branch of Jacob's house was being rejected, the other branch, the house of Israel, was beginning to be converted and re-nationalized. This, indeed, was absolutely necessary to the integrity of prophecy; because it had been said that the Hebrews "*should never cease from being a nation*" (Jer. xxxi. 36). And again, "*My glory will I not give to another*" (Isa. xlviii. 11). Thus the glory of God's Name, in the Old Testament covenant, is bound up with the national existence of His ancient people without any limitation to time or place.

You may spiritualize the words "Jacob," "Israel," "Jerusalem" and "Zion," in the Old Testament prophecies, as much as you please; but if Israel was "*never to cease from being a nation,*" then—whether in Palestine, or in the Isles of the Sea—the work of world-wide glorification of the Lord which that nation had from the very first to achieve, must be carried on by a *literal descent of the people in perpetuated generations*; otherwise, the prediction utterly fails. What, then, if the new covenant was opened to the world by the house of *Judah*? Now that Judah is under the anathema, it must be carried on by the revived house of *Israel*. Gentiles, not of that stock, may do the same in a subordinate and contemporaneous manner; but "Israel" (as lineally of the nation that was "*never to cease*") must, upon the very faithfulness of God's own word, be still the people of His choice, occupying their predestined function of sending forth light and salvation to the ends of the earth.

This being so, look around Christendom, and ask where such an Israel is to be found, if it be not among the Anglo-Saxon nations. *First*, try it negatively. Does the Greek Church fulfil this function? What! A Church which has sunk into the idolatry of picture worship? and which makes no organised efforts to evangelize the nations of the earth? Does the Papacy fulfil it? What! A Church which, notwithstanding its great missionary efforts, and its wide-spread possessions through the earth, has propagated error instead of truth in every direction; which worships saints and angels, bows down before images; and which lords itself over God's heritage in the spirit of an Anti-christian usurpation? Do the Syrian or Abyssinian Churches fulfil it? What! Churches that have little or no influence beyond a few degrees of latitude and longitude? Well, then, by the mere process of exhaustion, you must come to the Churches of the Teutonic race. Try the question, therefore, *secondly*, by a more positive method of inquiry.

What of the Anglo-Saxon Churches? It was said, "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit" (Isa. xxvii. 6). Again, "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the nations" (Isa. xlii. 6). Again, "This people have I formed for Myself; thou shalt shew forth My praise" (Isa. xliii. 21). These passages refer to the Hebrew people as a whole; but, as I have said before, Judah being excommunicated, and "backsliding Israel justified," the "nation" that can "*never cease*" must now be represented by this latter portion, notwithstanding that she has hitherto been lost to view, and has not even herself recognised her identity. Where, then, shall this portrait of Israel be verified, if not among the Anglo-Saxons? The

description might fill a volume rather than a paragraph. It would need a review of all those moral and religious influences which we are carrying on in active exercise over the whole world. Whither do not principles of justice, liberty, philanthropy, and knowledge go forth through this highly-favoured race, scattering seeds of light, and extending the general interests of humanity? What race but this ever paid down millions of gold and silver to liberate slaves and wage a crusade in favour of the essential freedom of man's universal birth-right? What country but ours is the world-wide refuge for outcasts, the palladium of liberty for every human being oppressed by tyrants and despots? To whom do the nations look for sympathy and aid in times of distress, when famines, floods, and earthquakes desolate their populations, if it be not to Britain? Is not Anglo-Saxon generosity as great as Anglo-Saxon love of liberty? Again, to whom do the nations look in times of financial embarrassments? Is it not to British gold, and Anglo-Saxon enterprise? In this respect do we not accurately fulfil the destiny of faithful Israel, according to God's covenant promise in Deut. xxviii. 12:—"Thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow?" Above all, what would be the condition of the world in regard to written revelation, if it were not for this great land of Bibles? Have not our missionaries translated the Scriptures (either in whole or part) into 200 languages? Are we not occupying in this respect exactly the same position toward the Word of God which Israel did of old? Most assuredly, if we are not Israel "after the flesh," God is using us, notwithstanding, for the fulfilment of His covenant purposes. Read carefully the first thirteen verses of the 28th of Deuteronomy; also the first thirteen verses of the 26th of

Leviticus. Have you done it? Tell me, now, in the first place, if the fidelity of Great Britain to her Sabbaths, and her faithful witness against idolatry, and her love for the Law of the Lord (which is here read more fully, more regularly, and more publicly, throughout her Churches than in any country of Christendom), does not correspond to the conditions of blessing laid down for Israel in these chapters (see also, as regards the Sabbath, Isa. lviii. 13, 14). And then tell me, in the next place, whether the fulfilment of those blessings in relation to our national prosperity and temporal greatness is not as exactly corresponding. Are not all these things Confirmations of the Anglo-Israel Theory? I admit they are not actual demonstrations. As I have said all along, the nature of the case allows of nothing approaching to any positive and palpable proof. But is there not throughout these Letters a constantly accumulating testimony upon the subject which renders its credibility more easy, and its belief more natural?

Yours, growing more and more a disciple,

To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

## LETTER XXXIV.

THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR SOME STRIKING CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN THE HEATHEN MYTHOLOGY OF THE TEUTONIC NATIONS AND THE STATE OF ANCIENT ISRAEL.

*London, November 1, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I dare say you have noticed that I sometimes speak of the Israelites as being one with the Teutonic race in general,

and sometimes as being more particularly identified with Britain and the Anglo-Saxons. There is no contradiction in this; for the greater must always include the less. At the same time, I am free to confess that as far as my study of this subject has advanced, I have scarcely made up my mind whether the Israelitish stock may be regarded as actually co-extensive with the whole Teutonic race, or whether it may be traversing only certain leading sections of it with which it has become incorporated,—large enough, perhaps, to give a moral and religious tone to the whole, yet not necessarily individually coincident with the entire mass. While, this, however, represents a suspended point of belief; the facts now about to be considered are worthy of review on perfectly independent grounds.

1. It seems to be an undoubted fact, that, among the Keltic Druids of Britain, the heathen religion of our ancestors, more or less, took the form of Baal worship; being exactly that form of idolatry which must have been inherited among the Ten Tribes from their progenitors in the land of Israel during the times of their kings. Indeed, the first name which Britain had, after it was inhabited by any races known to history, was—"Y Vel Ynys," or, "The Island of Bel"—V being pronounced B (see *Davis' Celtic Researches*, p. 190). You will remember, there were many cities in Israel into whose composition the word Baal entered; as (*e.g.*), Baalah (1 Chron. xiii. 6); Baalath, a city built by Solomon (2 Chron. viii. 6); Baal-shalisha (2 Kings iv. 42); and others I need not mention. In like manner there is a town in Scotland, in Perthshire, named Tillie-Beltane (meaning the *hill of the fire of Baal*); near to which there is still a Druidical stone circle. As for the names of places, both in Scotland and Ireland, beginning, with *Bal*, they are

L

so numerous that, after having reached above a hundred, I gave up the task of counting them. It is well known also that, on the lofty eminences of the cairns, which were extended in a line over the whole coast where the Druids resided, it was the custom on the eve of May-day to light up large fires in honour of "*Beal*," the Keltic word used for the "sun." Hence "*Bealteine*" is a word still used for May-day among the Scotch Highlanders. "Two of these fires," says Toland, "were kindled on May-day in every village; between which the men and beasts to be sacrificed had to be passed" (*Hist. of Druids*, Vol. I. p. 71). Pennant, in his *Tour in Scotland*, 1769 (p. 110) says:—"On the first of May the herdsmen of every village hold their *Beltein*." And Dr. Macpherson, in his *Critic. Dissert.* XVII. p. 286, says:—"In Ireland *Beltein* is celebrated on the 21st of June, at the time of the solstice. Then, as they make fires on the tops of the hills, every member of the family is made to pass through it; reckoning this ceremony necessary to insure good fortune through the succeeding year" (Quoted from Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*). Who cannot see that this is a remnant of the older customs of Baal worship in Israel, when they made "their sons and daughters to pass through the fire" (2 Kings xvi. 3)? Such customs are now gradually expiring; but the evidence is quite sufficient to shew the historical connection which existed between the Baal worship of the ancient British Kelts, and the Baal worship of the perverted Israelites which they brought with them in their early migration to this country. You may tell me all these facts might be accounted for by Phœnician colonisation in Britain quite independently of any Israelitish race. But that is no proof of the impropriety of my shewing how such facts are confirmatory of there having been an old Israelitish emigration as well.

2. Let us now come to the Teutonic nations (viz.), Scandinavia and Germany. If there be any truth in our supposition that this stock is Israelitish, we must find evidences of a similarity between their earliest religious faith, and the religion which existed in Media, from whence the Tribes originally emigrated, and where they learned the religion of the country. Now is this so? Much depends upon the answer. I begin with remarking that there is evident ground in our accounting for the difference between the Baal worship of those Israelites whom we suppose to have first reached Britain, and those Tribes who afterwards reached it in the Saxon invasions. For the former we believe to have come hither along the Mediterranean, through Spain, by an exodus preceding the captivity of the Ten Tribes (see Letter XI.); so that there is a manifest reason why *they* should have brought their Baal worship with them from Palestine. But, on the other hand, the rest of the Tribes, who left Media, and joined the Getæ, and afterwards formed themselves into the Gothic nations, must have come hither along a different line of march. We shall, therefore, naturally look for a different form of religious faith in their case; especially as we find from the deciphering of one of the lately discovered inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser, that it was the habit of the Assyrian monarchs to place their captives under the Magian religion. The words are so important that I shall give them to you in full:—"There fell into my hands altogether, between the commencement of my reign and my fifth year, forty two countries, with their kings. I brought them under one government. *I placed them under the Magian religion.*" I quote this from Sir Henry Rawlinson's translation, as a proof merely of the Assyrian policy pursued toward their captives. In this respect I hold it to be extremely important;

inasmuch as we have thus a fair right to believe that when the Assyrian king Shalmaneser carried away the remnant of the Ten Tribes, who had not escaped with the rest of their brethren, he pursued the same policy. The question we have, therefore, to investigate is this, did the Tribes, on their exodus from Media, whom we profess to identify with the Gothic people, carry with them any evidences of a Magian form of worship? In other words, is this form of religion at all discernible among the Teutonic race? If it be not, then, so far, *cadit questio*. If it be, then we have undoubtedly added to our list another valuable Confirmation of the Anglo-Israel Theory. Let us see.

You must know that, before the time of Zoroaster, who did not appear until after the Babylonian captivity, the Magian religion was, what is called, elemental. It consisted in a worship of the powers of Nature, and chiefly of the sun and light. The Magians had no temples, no altars; but worshipped in groves, and on hills, in the open air. "In the element worship there were no temples, images, or emblems; but only fire-altars on the high mountains for sacrifice" (Rawlinson's Herodotus. Note, Vol. I., p. 348). Now, it was just the same in the primitive worship of the Scandinavian nation. Mallet says, in his celebrated work on Northern Antiquities, "The use of temples was proscribed by the primitive religion, which taught that it was offensive to the gods to pretend to enclose them within the circuit of walls. There was, doubtless, a time when the Scandinavians worshipped their divinities only in the open air, and either knew not, or approved not of the use of temples" (chap. vi.). The same is true of the ancient Germans. I find in Kohlrausch's History of Germany (Introduction), "They considered it at



variance with the dignity of the divinity to enclose him within walls, or to represent him in human shape. They built no temples; but they consecrated to holy purposes groves and woods, of which Nature had found the pillars, and whose canopy was heaven itself. . . . And they still more strongly distinguished themselves by their firm and cheerful belief in the immortality of the soul. This sublime natural feeling, and this purity of their religious ideas made them, in after times, better adapted for the reception of Christianity. They were the vessel which God had selected for the pure preservation of His doctrines. Like the Persians, they revered the sun and fire; but worshipped, as their superior god, *Woden* (Guodan, Godan, Gutar, Gott); calling him also by the beautiful name of the Universal Father (*Alfadir*)."

If you do not see in these facts a most singular line of evidence, confirmatory of a religious connection between the primitive religion of the Goths and of the Magians, I shall be much surprised. Whether they inherited this from an original Aryan ancestry, otherwise unknown to us, I cannot and will not attempt to say. But undoubtedly, if the Tribes of Israel imbibed this Magian faith in Media, when they cast off finally their own sacred books, and had become merged among the heathen; and if, after having thus learned it, they appeared among the Getæ on the Danube in the dawn of European history, and finally multiplied themselves into the so-called Gothic nations, then the whole chain of events is both continuous and natural.

3. If we now come to Teutonic literature, and its mythology—which, though dating from a later time than the first period of the Gothic exodus from the Danube, must be, nevertheless, primevally connected with it—we shall meet with

similarly striking results. I will not lay much stress upon the Prose Edda of the Scandinavians; for it was written after Christianity had made a certain amount of way among them;\* and, therefore, it is open to objectors to say that its author may have borrowed some of his ideas from the fundamental doctrines of Revelation. At the same time I shall make a few extracts from it; because I see no reason myself for taking that view.

The work begins with an account of a visit of *Gangler* (the assumed name of a wise king) to Asgard, where he beheld three thrones raised one above another, with a man sitting on each of them; one of these being called *Har*, or, "The High and Lofty One;" the second, *Jafuhar*, or, "Equal to the High;" and the third, *Thridi*. Gangler then enters into conversation with these and asks questions. First he asks, "Who is the eldest of the gods?" To which *Har* replies, "He is called All-Father, or, the Father of All." "Where is this god?" continues Gangler. "What is his power, and what hath he done to display his glory?" "He liveth," replied *Har*, "from all ages; he preserveth all realms, and swayeth all things great and small." "He hath formed," added *Jafuhar*, "heaven and earth, and the air, and all things thereunto belonging." "And what is more," continued *Thridi*, "he hath made man and given him a soul which shall live and never perish. And all that are righteous shall dwell with him in the place called *Gimli*; but the wicked shall go to *Hel*, and thence to *Nifhel*, which is below in the ninth world."

Further on Gangler says:—"Thou tellest me many wonderful things of heaven, but what other homesteads are to be seen

---

\* Supposed to belong to the eleventh century.

there?" "There are many others," replied Har. "One of them is named Elfhome (*Alfheim*), wherein dwell the beings called the Elves of Light; but the Elves of Darkness live under the earth, and differ from the others still more in their actions than in their appearance. The Elves of Light are fairer than the sun; but the Elves of Darkness are blacker than pitch."

Still further on Har describes a future conflagration of the world, introducing Midgar the Serpent who will then be killed, and a number of other mythological beings. In the course of this address he says—"The stars shall be hurled from heaven, and the earth so violently shaken that trees will be torn up by the roots, the tottering mountains tumble headlong from their foundations, and all bonds and fetters be shivered in pieces."

"Will any of the gods survive, and will there be any longer a heaven and earth?" demanded Gangler. "Then will arise out of the sea," replied Har, "another earth most lovely and verdant, with pleasant fields, where the grain shall grow unsown. Vidar and Vali shall survive. They shall dwell on the plain of Ida, where Asgard formerly stood. Thither shall come the sons of Thor, Modi, and Magui. Baldur and Hödur shall also repair thither from the abode of Hel (death). There they shall sit and converse together, and call to mind their former knowledge, and the perils they underwent, and the fight with the wolf Fenrir, and the Midgard Serpent."

"Soon after this Gangler heard a terrible noise. He looked everywhere, but could see neither palace nor city, nor anything save a vast plain. He, therefore, set out on his return to his kingdom, where he related all that he had seen and heard; and ever since these tidings have been handed down by oral tradition."

These few extracts shew, I think, one of two things: either that the eleventh century author, who put these oral traditions into written language, incorporated some ideas into them, derived from early missionaries of Christianity; or else that they are genuine recollections of the pre-historic and pre-Christian period, handed down through generations from the earliest Teutonic forms of mythological and religious beliefs. The former opinion is, of course, open to any objector. But I am now going to give you my reasons for thinking otherwise. These are two-fold. (1) If, when thus written, they had been new and late additions to the beliefs which had been popularly received by the Scandinavians, it is hard to see how this author could have had the face to recite them as "*tidings which had been handed down by oral tradition*;" for the people to whom they were first delivered must have known better, and would have repudiated them. (2) They cannot be regarded as new at the time of their delivery, inasmuch as they agree, in the main, with a much more ancient composition called the *Voluspá*: "a poem," says Mallet, "of undoubted antiquity, composed long before the name of Christianity was known in the north." As this argument is so important to the bearings of the present subject, I shall take the liberty of adding a few quotations from that work also. You may then judge for yourself.

"The *Voluspá* begins with a description of Chaos," says Mallet. "In the day-spring of the ages there was neither sea nor shore, nor refreshing breezes. There was neither earth below nor heaven above to be distinguished. The whole was only one vast abyss, without herbs, and without seeds. The sun had then no palace; the stars knew not their dwelling-places; the moon was ignorant of her power." The account

then goes on to relate how the abyss became gradually filled up with icy vapours, and continues thus:—"Then a warm breath, coming from the south, melted these vapours, and formed of them living drops, whence was born the giant Ymir. It is reported that, while he slept, an extraordinary sweat under his armpits produced a male and female, whence is sprung the race of giants—a race evil and corrupt as well as Ymir their author. Another race was brought forth which formed alliances with that of the giant Ymir. This was called the family of Bor, so named from the second of that family who was the father of Odin. The sons of Bor slew the giant Ymir, and the blood ran from his wounds in such abundance that it caused a general inundation, wherein perished all the giants, except only one, who, saving himself in a bark, escaped with all his family. Then a new world was formed."

I might go on with very much more, in a similar strain to this, confirmatory of what I have already quoted from the Edda.\* But why? Have I not said enough to convince you that, before its contact with Christianity, the old Teutonic mythology carried with it certain grotesque recollections of the Hebrew traditions, which are all in keeping with the idea that they were originally brought out of the Israelitish captivity?

Like all the rest of my argument, it is not a proof; but it is an additional Confirmation: and so I place it on my list, as an aid to the cumulative evidence which I am adducing. Nothing, perhaps, is sufficient to produce conviction by itself;

---

\* For an able analysis of the *Voluspá* worked out as an historical and prophetic poem, based upon the Israelitish wanderings and hopes, see *Wilson On Our Origin*. Lecture VII.

but put it all together, dear Anthony, and it comes out clear and strong.

Yours, even more of a disciple,  
To Anthony —, Esq.

ARTHUR.

---

### LETTER XXXV.

THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR CERTAIN REMARKABLE CUSTOMS  
FOUND IN ANCIENT BRITAIN AND AMONG THE TEUTONIC  
PEOPLES, WHICH ARE IN AGREEMENT WITH A HEBREW  
ORIGIN.

*London, November 2, 1875.*

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I am gradually coming to a termination of this correspondence, so please to be patient with me.

To-day I shall pass from the haze of old mythological thought into the more solid region of historical fact. I am going to refer to certain manners and customs of our forefathers which will very likely interest you a great deal more than those contained in my last Letter.

1. On THE PRACTICE OF DIVINING BY RODS, which existed among the Germans and Druids of Britain, and which evidently was an Israelitish custom. Of Moses (*e.g.*) it was said, "Thou shalt take this rod in thine hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs" (Exod. iv. 17). Davies, in his *Celtic Researches*, says, "So generally was the emblematical use of a rod or staff admitted, that the words themselves became synonymous with *power*, *commission*, and the like. Thus in Psalm cx.—'The Lord shall send the *rod of thy power* out of Zion.' Again,

‘Moab is spoiled. How is the *strong staff* broken, and the *beautiful rod*’ (Jer. xlviii. 15, 17)! These forms of expression must have alluded, necessarily, to some established custom; they must be referred indispensably to some primitive system, which regarded rods and staves as the symbols of certain ideas. So far the customs of the old Asiatics corresponded to those of the Druids. To this extent the device was innocent; but the heathens of Asia, as well as those of Europe, abused it for the purpose of *divination*, as we may collect from the following passages:—‘My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their *staff* declareth unto them’ (Hosea iv. 12). Again, in Isaiah xix. 11—15, the prophet speaks of the wise men of Egypt being deceived in their divination, and declares, ‘Neither shall there be any work for Egypt, which the head or tail, *branch* or *rush*, may do.’ Here is a manifest allusion to a superstitious practice in which the rush and branch were employed. And Ezekiel terminates his climax of abominations by these words:—‘Lo, they put the branch to their nose’” (Ezekiel viii. 17) (p. 291—293).

I may add that the use of *rods*, as means of deciding trials *by lot*, appears even under the sanction of Divine command; for, in the days of Moses, it was said:—“Speak unto the children of Israel, and take of every one of them a rod according to the house of their fathers, of all their princes according to the house of their fathers twelve *rods*: write thou every man’s name upon his *rod*” (Numb. xviii. 2). Hence *rod* and *lot* are used in Scripture for synonymous names. In Deut. xxxii. 9 we have, “The Lord’s portion is His people; Jacob is the *lot* of His inheritance.” And in Jer. li. 19, “Israel is the *rod* of His inheritance.” Compare also Psalm lxxiv. 2 and cxxv. 3; and, no less, refer to the “two sticks” of Ezekiel in chapter xxxvii.

Having now shewn that the Israelites used rods, both lawfully and unlawfully, for the purpose of *lots*, and also for superstitiously *divining hidden secrets*, let me quote you a passage from Tacitus, in which he describes all this as a custom of the ancient Germans. "They cut a rod or twig from a fruit-bearing tree into little short sticks, and, having distinguished them one from the other by certain marks, lay them without any order, as they chance to fall, on a white garment. Then comes the priest of the State, if the consultation be at the request of the public; but if it be a matter of private curiosity, the master of the family may serve well enough; and, having prayed to the gods, looking up to heaven, he takes up each stick three times, and draws his interpretation from the marks before impressed on them. If these marks intimate a prohibition to proceed, there is no further inquiry made that day concerning that particular affair; but if they have full authority to go on they then proceed to the auspicia or divining from birds" (*De moribus Germ.*).

If we pass from Germany to Britain we find the practice of divination by rods also—Dr. Borlase, in his *Antiquities of Cornwall*, saying, "By sticks the Druids divined" (Quoted from Davies' *Celtic Researches*, p. 231). In a Bardic poem by Taliesin (of the sixth century) we find an allusion to this practice:—

"I am Taliesin,  
Chief of the Bards of the West;  
I am acquainted with every *sprig*  
In the cave of the Arab diviner."

In another poem he makes a further boast of his knowledge:

"I know which was decreed—  
Praise or disgrace—by the intention  
Of the memorial of the *trees* of the Sages;  
I understand my institute."



Many other passages of a like kind might be quoted; but these are surely enough. I mean to say they are enough to illustrate the direct ethnic affinity which we suppose to exist between the Teutonic nations and the Israelites.

2. THE DIVISION OF TIME. No one need to shew from Scripture that, among the Hebrews, the months were divided into *weeks*. This method of dividing time was not known to the Greeks, who divided their civil month into three periods of ten days each. Nor was it known to the Romans until the reign of Theodosius (see Brand and Cox's Article "*Weeks*" in their *Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art*). Whereas it was so thoroughly established long before this among the Teutonic nations, that the days of the week, even now named among ourselves, inherit titles which are derived from their primitive heathen deities, of which Tuesco, Woden, Thor, Friga, Seater are quite sufficient representatives. These heathen names, as applied to the days of the week, amply prove that they had their origin quite independently of Roman influence, and still more so of Christianity. You, therefore, see that, while Greece and Rome thus stand apart from the Israelites in their computation of time, the Teutonic people are intimately and ethnically associated with them. Is not this another touch of the brush to the picture which I am endeavouring to paint? May I not fairly number it among my Confirmations?

Again, no one needs to prove that, among the Hebrews, the day was reckoned from evening to evening, instead of from morning to morning. Our Anglo-Saxon ancestry employed the same reckoning, of which we still retain traces in such words as "se'nnight," and "fortnight." Does not this add another touch to our picture; and indicate the Israelitish ancestry of the Anglo-Saxons? I cannot say that this is quite

so strong a Confirmation as the last; because, if I remember rightly, the old Egyptians did the same. But I think, notwithstanding, it has much force; and so I submit it to your consideration.

3. RELIGIOUS FESTIVALS. Among the Hebrews every one is aware that there were *three* festivals of the greatest importance, to which the people resorted by Divine appointment from all quarters. It was the same among our Scandinavian and Saxon forefathers. Mallet gives an account of these (p. 110, 111, Bohn's Edition). The first was *Jul*, from which our word *Yule* is derived, and which exactly corresponds with Christmas. The second was held at the first quarter of the second moon in the year; the only point of similarity with Israelitish custom being, that it was regulated by the moon. The third was held in the beginning of spring; exactly corresponding with the time of the Feast of the Passover. Indeed we derive our own title of "Easter" (Saxon, "*Eastra*," Teutonic of "*Aster*") from this very festival. Nor is it at all unlikely that the word may have come from "*Astarte*," or "*Ashtoreth*," a Phœnician goddess; with the worship of whom the ancient Israelites may be identified (see 1 Kings xi. 33). Is not all this another incidental Confirmation of our Anglo-Israel Theory?

4. SUBDIVISION OF THE PEOPLE INTO HUNDREDS AND TENS; AND THE PRINCIPLE OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

If you look to Deut. i. 9—18, you will see that the Hebrews were privileged to select from among themselves such as they thought qualified for the duty of representative government. "Take you wise men and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you." When this was done, they became "captains over thousands, cap-

tains over hundreds, captains over fifties, and captains over tens."

Now this subdivision of the people into hundreds and tens, was precisely followed among the Saxons, of which we still have vestiges in our "Chiltern Hundreds," and the word "tything." Each of the Saxon towns was divided into ten wards, and were called "tythings;" and their leader was called a "tything man." Is not this, again, another singular coincidence, bearing on our present subject? Was not this of the essence of that *representative* form of government, for which England, both in her municipal and parliamentary institutions has been so long conspicuous among the nations? "So striking, indeed, is the resemblance between the ancient Saxon constitution and that of Israel, that, more than a hundred years ago, a book was produced with the following title: "*An Historical and Political Essay, discovering the Affinity or Resemblance of the Ancient and Modern Governments both in our Neighbouring Nations, as also in the Jewish Commonwealth, in respect to Our English Parliament*" (Quoted from Wilson, on *Our Origin*, Lect. X.). Now you may call this accidental if you like; you may say it is simply a curious coincidence. But, taken in conjunction with all that has gone before, I cannot help putting it down among one of the strongest of my adduced Confirmations.

5. THE NATIONAL ARMS OF ENGLAND. Here I come to a matter which you may playfully call funny; and, tossing up your head at it, laugh to your heart's content. Yet, why should the Anglo-Saxon people, who, springing from Great Britain, now cover "the coasts of the earth," and fulfil the promise to Ephraim of being "a multitude of nations," have, in every latitude and longitude, upon their National Standard,

the emblems of the *Lion and the Unicorn*”? These signs belong to no other race. Why should they be ours? I am aware that these signs were not introduced as supporters of the Royal Arms till the accession of James I., when the Lion of England and Unicorn of Scotland were united; and that the “unicorn” of Scripture (*reem*) is not the fabulous animal of our own Standard. But these considerations are not to the point; for, in a rough and rude age, the original portraiture of the unicorn, as we now have it, may well have been traditionally received as an old Israelitish emblem; notwithstanding it may have been originally the rhinoceros, or the wild bull, or antelope. It is, at any rate, a significant fact that these are very similar emblems to those which were given to Israel (see Numb. xxiv. 8, 9). I can well imagine your turning away with a sneer, and saying, “Well, really, that is babyish!” But why? Use your reason. Is it babyish to say that the French and Austrian *Eagles* represent the old emblems of Cæsar’s empire? Everything must have had *some* origin. What was the origin of the English *Lion and Unicorn*? Can you give it me? If not, on what principle is it to be accounted for? The union of these two signs is unique in the history of all emblems, except in the source from whence I derive it. Find me a better source, and I will give in. Till you do, let me press it on you as a curious Confirmation, if nothing higher, of the Anglo-Israel Theory.

6. ENGLISH WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. For brevity’s sake I will give you only one illustration. There is good reason for believing that our Long Measure *barleycorn* is historically identical with the Hebrew scale. For, according to the ordinance survey of Jerusalem, the setting out of the rock scarps, width of piers, and other original work of the Sanctuary has

been found *exactly commensurate with English inches*. On June 1, 1875, a Paper was read before the Society of Biblical Archæology, by F. R. Carden, Esq., C.E., in which the following passage occurs: "We may refer to the span of each of the two great bridges from the Temple to the city; to the piers and recesses at the triple gate, and to the piers of the gallery under the Chel to the north of the existing platform of the dome of the rock, as good examples of that accordance. And the entire plan of the noble Sanctuary, as drawn by the Royal Engineers, on a scale  $\frac{1}{8000}$ , is so exactly spaced out by a *modulus* based on this commensurate length, that it would seem to have been actually plotted on the paper on that scale."

This part of the subject might be much amplified; but I fear that I am wearying you. Indeed, dear Anthony, I might give you several other Confirmations of a similar kind to these. But in mercy I desist. Some, I confess, to be weak; and, therefore, on the principle that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, I forbear to insist upon them. Others would fairly pass muster; but, on the principle that "enough is as good as a feast," what can you want more? If these considerations will not convince you, I know not what will.

Yours, increasingly confirmed in my opinions,

To Anthony, — Esq.

ARTHUR

## LETTER XXXVI.

THIS THEORY ACCOUNTS FOR THE CONTINUALLY ENCROACHING  
CHARACTER OF GREAT BRITAIN'S COLONIZATION.

London, November 3, 1875.

MY DEAR ANTHONY,—

I have already noticed a passage in which it was promised to Joseph that *he should "push the people together to the ends of the earth,* and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and the thousands of Manasseh" (Deut. xxxiii. 17). Moreover it is added that "his glory" should be, for strength, "*like the firstlings of his bullock*" and his "*horns of unicorns.*" Now, without entering into any zoological disquisition respecting the nature of the "unicorn"—whether it represented the "antelope" or the "rhinoceros"—it is, at any rate, here presented to us as using its horn for the purpose of pushing away its enemies and causing them to recede to the ends of the earth. You may possibly say that this was fulfilled in Bible history by the manner in which Ephraim and Manasseh pushed away the Canaanites to the "ends of the land of Palestine." So far good. But it stands connected, you know, with another prophecy of a parallel breadth, viz., that "Ephraim should become a multitude of nations" (Gen. xlviii. 19). The two are part and parcel of the same career. Yet when was *this* fulfilled in Palestine? Indeed, how could it be, seeing that the word "nations" (*gōim*) fundamentally implied people who were *foreign to the Hebrew nation*?

Either one of these two consequences must, therefore, follow.

The prophecy has not yet been fulfilled, or it has been fulfilled without our recognition of the circumstance.

If you take the first supposition, then you must look forward to a time when Ephraim, in full Jewish aspect, will appear upon the stage of future history; rising up from the Afghans, or from China, or from some place where they are now the most insignificant people in the world, and suddenly becoming a world-wide power of immense colonial possessions and territorial empire. Is this likely? Would any one, with a knowledge of ethnology, believe your prediction if you said it? Would you not be among the first to laugh at such a thought so visionary?

If you take the latter supposition, then you must look for its fulfilment among the present nations. And, if so, to whom will you look, if not to England? I will not lay stress upon our "Unicorn Standard," nor yet upon our "Bull" like tenacity, which is everywhere recognised throughout the earth, and which was so strongly illustrated in the Indian Mutiny. But I must lay stress upon our career as a nation during the last 300 years; since the time when our colonization commenced in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, down to these last days of Queen Victoria; when we have just annexed the Fiji Islands to our empire, and have other annexations still looming in the distance. Have we not become "a multitude of nations?" Have we not been uniformly "pushing the people together to the ends of the earth? Has not our dominion been everywhere *encroaching* and *expanding*? Is it not referred to by the French in their literature and newspapers? Does it not make us, on all sides, the wonder and the envy of the world? These facts have not hitherto been noticed in connection with the long deferred realization of Ephraim's covenant promises.

But now they are beginning to be brought into view, and large numbers of intelligent minds are struck by them. I think I may safely say that these considerations have had as much to do with my own change of views as anything; and I, therefore, press them upon your own honest convictions.

Yours, as confirmed in the truth of the Anglo-Israel Theory, as any man can well be in a matter which admits of no absolute demonstration,

To Anthony, — Esq.

ARTHUR.

P.S.—It is needless to say that Jones is now in the highest spirits; and that he may be seen walking along Pall Mall looking an inch or two taller than he did at the beginning of the present year.

THE END



Works by the same Author.

---

REVELATION IN PROGRESS.

*Religious Tract Society, Paternoster Row.*

---

CAUTIONS FOR DOUBTERS.

*Religious Tract Society, Paternoster Row.*

---

GLADIUS ECCLESIAE;

OR,

CHURCH LESSONS FOR YOUNG CHURCHMEN.

*Church of England Sunday School Institute, 34, New Bridge st., Blackfriars.*

---

BAPTISM:

ITS PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

*Hunt and Co., Holles Street, Oxford Street.*

**WORKS ON THE  
IDENTIFICATION OF THE TEN LOST TRIBES,  
PUBLISHED BY  
W. H. GUEST, 29, PATERNOSTER ROW.**

---

**THE ANGLO-ISRAEL POST BAG; or, How Arthur came to see it.** By the Rev. CANON TITCOMB. Price 2s. 6d. 3s. in cloth, gilt edges, by post 2d. extra.

---

**WORKS BY EDWARD HINE.**

**THE 47 IDENTIFICATIONS.** Price 6d., post free 7d.

**FLASHES OF LIGHT.** Price 6d., post free 7d.

**OXFORD WRONG, &c.** Price 4d., post free 5d.

**ENGLAND'S COMING GLORIES.** Price 6d., post free 7d.

**ANGLO-SAXON RIDDLE.** Price 2d., post free 2½d.

Or bound in one volume, gilt edges, 3s. 6d.

**BY SAME AUTHOR,**

**LIFE FROM THE DEAD.** Price 4d. Monthly. Vol. I., gilt edges, 6s. Vol. II. nearly ready, same price.

**LEADING THE NATION TO GLORY.** Price 1d. Weekly, or in Quarterly parts 1s. 4d. each. Vol. I. 6s.

---

**THE STANDARD OF ISRAEL.** Edited by the Rev. A. B. GRIMALDI, M.A. Price 6d. Monthly.

**BY JOHN WILSON.**

**OUR ORIGIN.** Price 3s. 6d.

**TITLE DEEDS OF THE HOLY LAND.** Price 3s. 6d.

**THE MISSION OF ELIJAH.** Price 3s. 6d.

---

**ISRAEL DISCOVERED** in the Anglo-Saxon and other kindred Protestant Nations. By Rev. H. NEWTON, B.A. Price 6d., or cloth 1s.

**ISRAEL OR THE TEN TRIBES** Identified with the Anglo-Saxon and other Branches of the Teutonic Race, Being a Report of the Anglo-Ephraim Association, 1874. Price 1s.  
The Report for 1873, price 6d.

WORKS PUBLISHED BY W. H. GUEST.

**THE ISRAELITES FOUND IN THE ANGLO-SAXONS.**

The Ten Tribes, supposed to have been lost, traced from the lands of their captivity to their occupation of the Isles of the Sea. By WILLIAM CARPENTER. Price 2s. 6d.

**THE ENGLISH THE DESCENDANTS OF THE TEN Tribes.** By the Rev. J. R. POLWHELE. Price 1s. 6d.

**IDENTITY OF ISRAEL WITH THE ENGLISH AND Kindred Races.** By PROTHEROE SMITH, M.D. Price 6d.

**BIBLICAL TESTIMONY OF THE PRESENT AND Future of Israel.** By the Rev. J. G. TIPPER, M.A. Price 1d., or 6s. per 100.

**OUR SCYTHIAN ANCESTORS.** By COLONEL GAWLER, Keeper of the Crown Jewels, Tower of London. Price 2d.

**ARE THE ENGLISH PEOPLE THE LOST TEN TRIBES of Israel?** By PHILO-ISRAEL. Price 4d.

**LOST ISRAEL.** By H. L. Price 6d.

**SHEARJASHUB; or, England's Coming Ordeal.** By WATCHMAN. Price 1s. 6d.

**BEULAH; or, Eden Restored in Immanuel's Land.** Five parts, 6d. each, post free 7d. Set of Eight Maps to Illustrate Beulah, 2s.

*New Work on the Great Pyramid.*

BY COMMANDER B. W. TRACEY, R.N.

**THE PILLAR OF WITNESS: a Scriptural View of the Great Pyramid.** Price 1s. 6d., 2s., and 3s., post free 2d. extra.

**PROPHETIC THOUGHTS.** Humbly submitted for Christian consideration. By B. W. TRACEY, R.N. Price 4d.

**PHILITIS; or, Solution of the Mystery which for Four Thousand Years has Shrouded the Great Pyramid in Egypt.** By CHARLES CASEY. New and Enlarged Edition, price 2s.

BY PIAZZI SMYTH, Astronomer Royal, Scotland.

**OUR INHERITANCE IN THE GREAT PYRAMID.** Price 18s.

**LIFE AND WORK AT THE GREAT PYRAMID IN 1865.** Thirty-six plates, price 56s.

**ON EQUAL SURFACE PROJECTION.** With Folding Maps. Price 3s.

**THE PYRAMID AND THE BIBLE.** By a CLERGYMAN. Price 3s.

**PAPERS ON THE GREAT PYRAMID.** By St. JOHN VINCENT DAY, C.E. Price 4s.

**FACTS AND DATES.** By Rev. ALEXANDER MACKAY, LL.D. Second Edition, price 4s.

LONDON: W. H. GUEST, 29, PATERNOSTER ROW.

**MISCELLANEOUS WORKS**  
**PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY W. H. GUEST.**

---

**On the High Antiquity of Iron and Steel.** By St. JOHN V. DAY, C.E., F.R.S.E. Price 2s. 6d.

**Revelation of Science in Scripture, in Three Lectures.** By INVESTIGATOR. Price 3s. 6d.

BY REV. H. NEWTON, B.A.

**The Resurrection of Israel.** A Poem. Price 1s.

**The Fall of Babylon.** An Epic Poem. Price 5s.

**The Three Liberals.** A Poem, and a Tale for Church, Dissent, and Neither. Price 1s.

---

**A Synopsis of English History from the Earliest Times to 1870.** By STACEY GRIMALDI, F.S.A., &c. Price 2s. 6d.

**666 the Number; and the Name of Anti-Christ.** An Argument, &c. Price 2s. 6d. Post free 2s. 10d.

**Spencer's Exercises in Arithmetic.**

I.—Spencer's Complete Working Series. Price 1s. each set.

II.—Spencer's Standard Test Exercises. Price 8d. a set.

BY HENRY BUTTER.

**The Etymological Spelling Book and Expositor.** Price 1s. 6d.

**Maiden prepare to become a Happy Wife and Mother.** Price 2d.

**Is the Pleasure worth the Penalty?** Price 1d.

**Marriage for the Million.** Price 1d.

---

**SCOTTISH STORY.**

**The Book of Scottish Story: Historical, Traditionary, Legendary, Imaginary, and Humorous.** Publishing in Twelve Monthly Parts, 64 pp., price 6d. each (uniform with "The Book of Scottish Anecdote").

"Selected with skill and discrimination."—*Edinburgh Courier.*

"The contents of the First Part are capital, really amusing, picturesque, and pure."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"Deserves to succeed. It is a capital idea."—*Northern Ensign.*

Ready at Christmas. New and cheaper Edition of

**Hislop's Book of Scottish Anecdote: Humorous, Social, Legendary, and Historical.** Carefully Revised, with many new additional Anecdotes. In Two Volumes, Crown 8vo., price 2s. each. Each Volume is complete in itself, and may be had separately.