

# Letter to a Friend,

THE REV. JOHN ROWLANDS, M.A.,

RECTOR OF GRIMSTON, NORFOLK,

ON

THE ANGLO-ISRAEL THEORY,

AND

THE ALLEGED ADVENT OF CHRIST

IN

1882.

BY THE

REV. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A.,

RECTOR OF SHILLINGFORD, EXETER;

AUTHOR OF "THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE," &c.

"It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power."—*Acts* i. 7.

"If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."—*St. Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, iii. 29.

---

LONDON :

LONGMANS AND CO.

1882.

*Price Sixpence.*

2.

Any of the undermentioned Works will be forwarded on application to the Rev. B. W. Savile, Shillingford Rectory, Exeter, *Post free.*

1. THE OXFORD MOVEMENT OF THE LAST FIFTY YEARS.

*Price 3s. Cloth.*

"I thank you very sincerely for your useful volume, which I think will do a great deal of good. I have often thought that an exhibition of the violence, vulgarity, and totally unchristian mode of writing and speaking, adopted by leading Ritualists, would go far to show to reasonable people that the Spirit of God could not be with them, for His fruits are love and peace."—*From the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol to the Author.*

"I have not met with an abler or more concise statement of the history and progress of the Romanizing movement in the Church of England. Your book is admirably suited to the wants of the time, and deserves to be better known."—*From John Walter, Esq., M.P. for Berkshire.*

2. A LETTER TO DR. PUSEY ON THE "CATHOLIC" PRACTICE OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

*Third Edition. Price 2s.*

"This is an earnest, exhaustive, and most crushing reply to the fallacies of Dr. Pusey's system of confession, and should be widely read and known."—*Public Opinion.*

3. PAMPHLET FOR THE YEAR 1882 !!!

*Price 2s. 6d.*

ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE GREAT PYRAMID:  
An Examination of the Alleged Claims of Her Majesty Queen Victoria to the Throne of David, and of the Anglo-Israelite Reasons for fixing the End of the Age in 1882.

"I have read your very interesting pamphlet, and think your arguments are strong enough to convince all who read with an unprejudiced mind. It exposes clearly the strange delusions, and 'the foolish and unlearned questions' with which the subject abounds. The unscriptural theory of Anglo-Israelism appears to me 'a profane' as well as 'an old-wives' fable.' I think their distortion of some texts shocking. Our Lord is robbed of His glory that it may be given to Great Britain."—*From the Rev. Canon Bell, Rector of Cheltenham.*

*Price 1s.*

4. "THE END OF THE WORLD"

**In 1881 or 1882,**

According to the Pseudo-Mother Shipton, and Speculators on the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh.

Also some Ancient Prophecies relating to Russia and Turkey.



## A Letter, &c.

MY DEAR FRIEND AND BROTHER,

In your friendly critique on my pamphlet, *Anglo-Israelism and the Great Pyramid*, you say, respecting the legend of "JACOB'S PILLOW," that we might "As well believe in Samson's stone in Wales—a large flat stone, about 12 feet by 10, lying on or near the road-side, not far from Aberystwith, with a hollow in the centre in the form of a human foot, having once been *Samson's shoe*, which one day he threw off, and gave it such a fling that it passed through the air (from Canaan) to Wales, and fell where it now lies. The people call it *Samson's shoe*. May we not compare Jacob's Pillow with such things?"

I quite agree with you that there is as much truth in the one as the other, save that the latter is a myth of our own day, invented by those who say they are Israelites but are not, while it is contradicted by the older, and equally fanciful legend of the real Israelites, that it was originally embedded in the wall of Solomon's Temple, where it was found 16 centuries later, when the Saracens captured Jerusalem, A.D. 637, and 12 centuries *after* the time when our Anglo-Israelite friends assert it was brought by the prophet Jeremiah to Ireland, after the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 589.

You will have seen by my pamphlet that I once thought there was sufficient evidence to support the theory of our Israelitish origin; but I had not then studied the subject under either its prophetic or ethnographical aspect, and it was not long before I discovered the delusion under which I had been labouring.

I had overlooked the fact that the "Identity" theory contradicts a most important Scripture prophecy, *viz.*, that in which Noah foretold the supremacy of the descendants of Japhet, which is universally recognised in the dominion which Europe has so long exercised over the rest of the world.

Before I had given any attention to the science of ethnology, such as is revealed in the 10th chapter of Genesis, I supposed that the *Beth Khumri* of the Cuneiform monuments, who, as all oriental scholars know, represent the ten tribes of Israel, were the same people as the *Cimmerians*, who are first met with on the same monuments during the reign of Esarhaddon; and whom Niebuhr, Arnold, and Rawlinson have shewn to be ancestors of the ancient Britons, who swarmed into Europe from Asia some centuries before the Christian era. Although these two races, Semitic and Japhetic, the *Beth Khumri* and the *Cimmerians*, are found on the Assyrian monuments as neighbours, the one "in the cities of the Medes," and the other in the mountains of Media, there is no further identification between them, as I once thought, than there is between the English and the Basutoes, with whom we have recently been at war, and are consequently neighbours at this present time in the province of South Africa.

However, I was rash enough to accept the theory, and to adopt it in my first pamphlet, *Are We Israelites?* And it seems to have approved itself so much to the "Anglo-Israelites," that I received most undeserved praise for my unlearned suggestion. I was told by the enthusiasts of the party that I had written "the best pamphlet which recommended the theory of Anglo-Israelism"—that it was "able and exhaustive, and the best and most cogent of all Mr. Savile's efforts,"—that it contained "unanswerable arguments," and that "the pamphlet is quite perfection," &c., &c.

As soon, however, as I discovered the delusion under which I had been labouring, I thought it right publicly to say so. And this has been confirmed by the fact that I have received letters from more than one brother clergyman, informing me that they had been staggered by the assertion that I was a believer in the theory, and congratulating me on my escape from the snare. No sooner, however, was the acknowledgment of my error published, than the wind blew from another quarter. I was accused of "apostasy"—"tergiversation"—"almost treachery"—"professed scepticism"—claiming "infallibility"—writing in an unchristian and ungentlemanlike "way"—manifesting

"audacity" in changing my mind, for which I must have some "secret reasons" which I have not "dared to tell"—that I deserved credit for nothing but "profound ignorance"—that my arguments were "so weak, that they can do the cause of Anglo-Israelism no harm, but an immense deal of good"—that my reasons must tend to my own "utter confusion"—that I have proved myself to be "a shifty and confused pervert," and a "bitter opponent" of the cause, and have displayed a great "want of charity towards Mr. Bird, editor of the *Banner of Israel*, in particular, and to all who hold his views in general."

To these charges I can only say that I am not conscious of having shown "bitterness towards Mr. Bird," or to any other supporter of the Anglo-Israel theory. In announcing my change of opinion, I determined to avoid all "hard speeches" towards those from whom I was constrained to differ; and I appeal to any unprejudiced person to say if I have not succeeded.

The theory which assumes the British nation to be descended from ten of the twelve tribes of Israel, and which, I believe, is not yet twenty years old, has produced three parties, each holding somewhat different views on the identity question.—1. The late Mr. John Wilson, who adopted the theory of *Continental Nations* of Western Europe as representing the ten tribes. 2. Mr. Edward Hine, author of the *Forty-seven Identifications*, editor of *Life from the Dead*, &c., in a periodical entitled *British Israel and Judah's Prophetic Messenger*, advocates the theory of the ancient *Britons* being identified with the tribes of Israel. 3. While Mr. E.W. Bird, of Clifton, editor of the *Banner of Israel*, argues that one of the three Teutonic tribes which invaded England in the fifth century, called the *Angles*, have the best claim to that honour; hence the name of "Anglo-Israelites."

Of the late Mr. John Wilson I desire to speak with sincere respect, and gladly take this opportunity of apologising to his friends for having spoken of him as "the founder of the present Anglo-Israel School." I have received a letter from a member of his family, protesting against my having named him as the originator of the theory, "for which he was not responsible,

and making him apparently endorse views to which he was distinctly opposed. In no sense can he be honestly termed the founder of 'the present *Anglo-Israel School*.' Of that Messrs. Hine and Bird may justly claim the parentage and education."

Mr. Edward Hine, who boasts of having done so much to make Mr. Wilson's name known, does not appear to agree with him respecting the European nations, for he confines the descendants of the ten tribes to the British Isles and their offshoots. Hence he says of himself in *Life from the Dead*, "When called by God before the nation, John Wilson's one work, *Our Israelitish Origin*, may be said to have been, as it really was, the only identity work that had been written; and, alas! this at that time was next door to being forgotten. When first called into public notice, the whole matter was, as a power, latent. Since our first pamphlet was issued in 1870, we have done 177,000 of our *Forty-seven Identifications*. We firmly believe that the Lord will continue to sustain us, and dispose the British people to help us. We have never had the least doubt from the very first of our identity; and we challenge any one to state a single fatal objection to our own nation being identical with Israel" (*Life from the Dead*, vol. v., pp. 1-4).

In the same volume Mr. Hine states:—"From his own knowledge there were 300 marks that were to surround the people of Israel in the time of their exile, and the British nation responded to all those 300 marks. . . . Buying of the shares in the Suez Canal by Lord Beaconsfield was an act of God, and it was one of the proofs of the return of Israel to Palestine. England must possess Constantinople, otherwise God's word would not be fulfilled, and the question would issue in England occupying Constantinople by virtue of the promise that God gave to Abraham and his seed" (pp. 117, 119).

Mr. Hine is, however, so sanguine that his theory will be accepted, that in the periodical, *British Israel and Judah's Prophetic Messenger*, which represents his views, and which claims to be "the first Constitutional paper of the day," according to "one politician of great political knowledge and experience" (No. 62, p. 98), he states, "The British Israel Identity Corporation sell all works published upon the identity,

and they are now prepared to supply photographs of E. Hine, Esq.; Philo-Israel (E. W. Bird, Esq.); W. Cookson, the first Identity Martyr; E. Tudor, the persecuted, &c., &c.; the whole forming the most interesting portrait gallery yet conceived; giving to the nation *the picture brainwork of the pioneer leaders in the most marvellous Reformation of the world's history*" (p. 55).

Mr. Hine advertises one of his own works in the following terms:—"The world-wide renowned *Forty-seven Identifications*. This vastly popular work gave the inspiration to all identity writers of the present day. There is *scarcely a trustworthy identity-thought* put forth by others, but what has been *borrowed from this book*. In it, there are not only *conclusive proofs that the British are really lost Israel*, but it is proved that *America is identical with Manasseh*. Philo-Israel says, 'I desire to acknowledge in the most unreserved manner my obligations to Mr. Hine, for the light he has been the means of throwing upon the pages of the word of God in the various publications he has put forth.' Mr. Hine has a thousand and one other testimonials given by titled people, eminent men, &c.; and no less than 230,000 copies of the work have been sold" (p. 60).

*British-Israel's Prophetic Messenger* adduces the authority of Mother Shipton as having predicted, "in A.D. 1448," that the world would come to an end in the year 1881; apparently ignorant that the following lines, which are quoted in support of the Identity theory, are in reality the invention of Mr. Charles Hindley of Brighton, A.D. 1862 (*Notes and Queries*, vol. xi., p. 353, 4th series)—

"Carriages without horses shall go,  
 "And accidents fill the world with woe—  
 "Around the world thoughts shall fly  
 "In the twinkling of an eye—  
 "The world to an end shall come  
 "In 18 hundred and 81."

Mr. Bird seems to have so far approved of this alleged prediction of Mother Shipton, that he once wrote in *Life from the*

*Dead* that "the grand gallery of the Great Pyramid measures 1881 Pyramid inches in superficial floor length. This measurement points to 1881—only six years hence—as the year of a wondrous event. The point now for Christians to ponder is, whether 1881 may not be the year in which will take place *the public manifestation of the sons of God*; the identification and discovery to the whole world of God's long-lost people, the ten tribes of Israel, in the *Anglo-Saxon race*" (vol. ii., p. 242). Mr. Bird has, however, altered his opinion respecting the year; for in his work on the *Great Pyramid* he writes, "The dispensation of grace in which we are now living will come to an abrupt and sudden close in May, 1882" (p. 17).

I conclude, however, from the way in which Mr. Bird gives up some of the theories propounded by Mr. Hine and others, that he considers them indefensible. Thus in the *Banner of Israel*, December 1880, p. 518, when reviewing my pamphlet on *Anglo-Israelism*, he writes—"On these points (viz., Jacob's Pillow, Tara's hill, the Queen's descent from David, the Stone kingdom, the Manassite origin of the Americans, the Great Pyramid theory, the crucial date of 1882), we intend to leave the field to Mr. Savile, and to let the case go by default."

This usually means that there is nothing to say in defence of the above-named points; but I regret that Mr. Bird should have termed me "a bitter opponent of the views held by the *Banner*, and of myself, its editor" (*Banner* of Jan. 26, 1881, p. 42), as I am not conscious of having displayed any "bitterness" towards him, and he does not mention any words of mine to justify so serious a charge.

Mr. Bird having stated that all the points mentioned above were "a matter of perfect indifference to the *main question* of 'British identity with Israel,'" adds, that "the evidence on record and at hand *amply suffices to prove* that we British are *identical* in race with the Semitic Israelites of the lost tribes.\*

---

\* Mr. Bird, in making this assertion, can scarcely have studied any of our ancient chroniclers respecting the origin of the English people. *E.g.*, Nennius, the earliest writer on ethnology, whom Dr. Giles places in the middle of the eighth century, says, in his *History of the Britons*, "After the deluge,

Mr. Savile has not told us exactly *why he has changed his mind*, nor explained the error underlying the arguments which satisfied him then. We think it is *due to us* to explain the reason of the change—to his own reputation, to his late fellow-believers, to the public—nay, to Mr. Gladstone, that he should let us all into the secret, and tell us what it was which upset in 1880 the opinions arrived at after such *laborious study* in 1877. In conclusion, we do not think the Rev. Mr. Savile's pamphlet will do our cause any, the least harm. And failing that, we can see no reason why this pamphlet should not do our cause *immense good*, since it serves to draw attention to Mr. Savile's own unanswerable arguments to prove our Israelitish origin "(p. 518).

I think Mr. Bird is mistaken on one point, in giving me the credit for "*laborious study*." It was *the absence of such study* which led me too hastily to accept the theory; while my first real study of the question proved that I had been long labouring under what Mr. Gladstone has gently termed "*almost a delusion*." It resembled the celebrated aphorism of Bacon: "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth man's mind about to religion."

When I first wrote, at Mr. Bird's request, on the ethnographical branch of the subject, I had scarcely studied it at all. I had dipped into Rawlinson's Herodotus, came hastily to a wrong conclusion; and Mr. Bird, in a pamphlet entitled *Arguments in Proof of British Identity*, has copied my mistakes, as well as my references to Rawlinson's work. Dr. Grant, of Cheltenham, appears to have adopted the same error, and then they unite

---

Noah's three sons occupied the earth; Shem, Asia; Ham, Africa; Japheth, Europe. The first who dwelt in Europe was Alanus (whose genealogy is traced through eighteen generations to Japheth). From his eldest son sprang the FRANKS, the LATINS, the GERMANS and the BRITAINS; and from his youngest the VANDALS, SAXONS and OTHERS, &c. We have obtained this information respecting the original inhabitants of Britannia from ancient tradition" (iii., § 17). It is true that the Saxon Chronicle traces the pedigree of our Saxon kings from Alfred the Great through WODEN, the heathen ideal god of the Teutonic tribes, up to Bedwig, whom it affirms to have been the son of Shem, and to have been *born in the ark*! But this is so evidently mythical and legendary, that it does not require any serious refutation.

to pronounce my arguments "*unanswerable.*" The answer is simply this. It is true enough, as Dr. Grant says, that Rawlinson considered "the *Cimbri* of the Romans and the *Khymry* of Wales to be the same people; but it is a sad mistake to conclude that Rawlinson deems this a proof of identity between the *Khymry* of Wales or the *Gimiri* of the Assyrian monuments and the *Beth Khumri*, i.e., the house of Israel, on the same monuments. Having obtained a transcript from the British Museum of the two names, as they were written nearly 3000 years ago on the Cuneiform tablets, I find the letters of the names are as follows:—

1. The name *Khymry*, or *Gimiri*, is written thus—*mât—Gimir-ra-a-a*.

2. *Beth Khumri*, or the house of Israel, is written—*mât-bit-Hu-um-ri-a*.

Now it will be plain to the English reader there is no more resemblance between the names *Gimirraa* and *Huumria*, who were dwelling contiguous to each other in Media 26 centuries ago, and consequently no identity between the two peoples, than there is between the English and Basutoes, who are near each other in South Africa at the present time. In reference to Dr. Grant's idea that Rawlinson gives any support to the Identity theory, this is contradicted by what he has said in reply to Mr. Hine's alleged "Identifications," that they are "not calculated to produce the slightest effect on the opinion of those competent to form one. Such effect as they may have can only be on the ignorant and unlearned, or those who are unaware of the absolute and entire diversity in language, physical type, religious opinions, and manners and customs, between the Israelites and the various races from whom the English nation can be shown historically to be descended."

I proceed now to meet Mr. Bird's request of "letting him into the secret," and telling him *why I have changed my opinion* respecting the theory of the English nation being the same as, or descended from, ten of the twelve tribes of Israel.

1. Because of the overwhelming evidence from Scripture, history, and ethnology, which has convinced me of the force of Professor Rawlinson's arguments as stated above, and that



I was under a grievous delusion, when I gave in my adhesion for a time to the more reasonable portion of the Identity theory ; though I need scarcely tell you I was never for a moment misled by the wild speculations which Mr. Hine, the founder of the school, and the Rev. F. R. A. Glover, author of the legend respecting Jacob's stone, the prophet Jeremiah, and the Princess Tephî, together with their followers, have put forth as historic truth !

2. Because I have been unable to find a single text in Scripture, which, when fully investigated, will bear the interpretation placed upon it by the Anglo-Israelites. I will give two examples of their manner of interpreting the sacred oracles of God. My valued friend General Aylmer having been invited to hear an address from a leader among the Anglo-Israelites, received from him the following answer to a question on Ezekiel xxxvi. 16—38, which shows that "Israel" was to be scattered among the heathen, and gathered from amongst them "into your own land," previous to their acknowledgment of Christ as the promised Messiah. The lecturer sought, as General Aylmer expressed it, "to put a scabbard on the edge of the sword of the spirit, by asserting that 'Ezekiel in that chapter used a *different nomenclature* from the one usually observed ;' in other words, altered the meaning of the name *Israel*"!!! Such is the way in which some persons will, as Hooker says, "turn Scripture into a nose of wax, making anything of it as they list."

So Dr. Grant of Cheltenham, in his *Summary of Anglo-Israelites Teaching*, tells his readers that, "It is very important to trace out instances where the word *Gentile* is applied to the ten tribes. In John vii. 35, the Jews ask, 'Whither will He go ? Will He go to the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles ?' Here we have 'the dispersed among the Gentiles, evidently the ten tribes, and the Gentiles used as *interchangeable terms*'!!! Thus Dr. Grant appears to teach that "Gentiles" spoken of in this passage become the ten tribes of Israel, or, in other words, the Israelites were dispersed among the Israelites, *i.e., amongst themselves* !

3. Because of the many strange reasons put forth by the

Anglo-Israelites for believing in the Identity theory. Their name is *Legion*; but I have only space to mention a *single specimen* of their reasons offered as a proof that we must be Israel. One writer in *Israel's Hope and Destiny* is convinced of the truth of the theory, because *Brit* in Hebrew signifies "covenant," and *ish* signifies "man." Hence *British* is said to be equivalent to "covenant man." But, says Mr. Hope Wallace, "the covenant man is and *must be a Hebrew*, a son of Isaac! Now our whole contention is that the Anglo-Saxons are the Hebrews, or covenant people. Hence, in telling a man that he is *British*, you are telling him what in Hebrew signifies a 'covenant man,' i.e., *you are a Hebrew!*" I think we may improve upon this curious specimen of Anglo-Israelite hermeneutics, by remembering that *Brit* is derived from a Hebrew word signifying "to eat," by which act the *covenant* was ratified between the two parties. Now it is a well-known proverb amongst the "Britishers," as the Americans term us, that if you want to do business with them, you must unite in *eating a good dinner*. Hence the argument, *We must be Israel!*

The *Banner of Israel* frequently adduces what is termed "Blind Evidence" in support of the Identity theory. In its issue of May 14th, 1881, it gives a specimen of such reasoning. "The *Sunday at Home* gives *blind evidence* to our identity," on this wise. An Orphanage at the city of Nazareth having two flags, one the *English* "Union Jack," and the other marked with "the red *Jerusalem* cross on white ground;" therefore, says the *Banner*, "the strange coincidence of the blending of the two flags, those of Jerusalem and Great Britain, is *explained by our identity*; and *nothing else does*!" This style of argument has been met by an eminent Evangelical clergyman, who writes to me in the following way:—"The men of Israel had each one a face, nose, eyes, &c., so have the British of the present day—ergo, *we are Israelites.*"!!!

4. Because the Identity theory contradicts one of the earliest and most important prophecies of God's word, viz., Noah's prophecy respecting the supremacy of the descendants of Japheth over the descendants of his two brothers, Shem and Ham, and which we have seen accomplished during the

last 2000 years in the supremacy of Rome and the European nations generally over the rest of the world.

5. Because of the language which some of the advocates of Anglo-Israelism employ against those who differ from them. This is a most painful and delicate topic to enter upon; and I only do so, in reply to the demand which Mr. Bird has made upon me, to give my reasons for having changed my mind on the subject of the Identity theory; as I have been more than astonished at the language which Mr. Hine and his followers have adopted towards those who differ from them; it seems to conflict with such exhortations as abound in the Pauline Epistles—*e.g.*, “The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient in meekness, instructing those that oppose themselves. . . . Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you.” I content myself, therefore, with quoting the words of some of the leaders of the party without comment, as a justification for my declining to accept a theory which requires to be supported by such language as the following:—

Mr. E. Hine, the founder of the present school of Anglo-Israelites, who boasts that nearly every argument on behalf of the theory has originated with himself, thus interprets a passage in the prophecy of Jeremiah i. 10, saying, “In this one verse is concentrated *very much of the pith of the bulk of the Bible*. It may be truly said to be the key to the mysteries of the Bible . . . . The two missions of Jeremiah of *rooting up and replanting*, had a direct national application to the *British people*, because the British being identical with lost Israel, by it we are plainly told that *David’s crown was rooted up from Judah to be planted over the British* . . . . We know from the character of the opposition brought to bear against Jeremiah that his work was accepted by God, who did all things through him that He declared He would do; so now we safely judge, by the *railery, clamour, vulgar abuse, lying, unmanly manœuvring, and the fierce displays of temper*, we meet with from the

hitherto accepted teachers of the people, that *God having called us*, is working by us ; because this array of opposition could never be called forth unless from a consciousness that we were successfully making a material inroad upon their accepted ways of thinking " (*Life from the Dead*, vol. v., p. 95).

I have not the slightest knowledge of Mr. Hine's meaning, or to whom his language refers, but it does not seem to accord with the advice given by St. Paul to believers respecting their conduct towards those who oppose themselves.

Mr. Hine then refers his readers to "the important teachings" of his follower, the Rev. F. R. A. Glover, who "unquestionably shows that the Princess Tephi, in direct line from David, was brought by the prophet Jeremiah to Ireland, from whom we have in direct descent David's sceptre in ruling sway in the very hands of Queen Victoria." I do not propose to discuss the legend of Jeremiah and Tephi bringing Jacob's "pillow," on which his head rested when he had the heavenly vision at Luz, and which is quite equal in point of romantic fiction to the "Golden Legend" of Jacobus de Voragine in the middle of the dark ages ; but I introduce Mr. Glover's name as the *fidus Achates* of Mr. Hine, and as one who comforts his friends against those who are unable to receive the curious teaching of the Great Pyramid in the following severe language—"Never mind, good people, *let the devil's agents howl their curses along with their master !* That little line will laugh them to scorn : that thing is, as it were, *the rod of iron of the great shepherd king*, that will break in pieces all who oppose. Nor is the time distant, for doubtless the day of redemption draweth nigh " (See Glover quoted in *Philitis*, by Charles Casey, p. 42, third edition).

A writer of the same school, the author of a tract entitled *Solomon's Temple*, speaks of himself and his fellow-believers in the Anglo-Israel theory in the following way :—"We have an unction from the Holy One, and *know all things*, and need not that any man should teach us." The writer then contrasts his opponent's "loud and abusive tongue, his persecuting slanders, his want of gentlemanly feeling, and lying accusations," with his own temper.

The *Banner of Israel*, which I believe is the principal exponent of Anglo-Israelism, replies to Dr. Horatius Bonar's article in the *Sunday at Home* of October 1880, in the following way :—"The Rev. H. Bonar, D.D., may denounce our opinions as unscriptural. We can safely afford to let the doctor do his worst, satisfied—this truth being of God—that He will take care what He causes to be published shall prevail, though all the bishops and all the doctors of divinity in the land set their reverend faces dead against it. *We have Scripture warrant for our views, but Dr. Bonar has none for his.* He has no reason either, no Scripture, no logic to uphold him. His opinions impugn God's faithfulness, declare *God has broken His oath, &c.* What can lead Dr. Bonar in *his compound of ignorance and false accusation* published in the *Sunday at Home*? The doctor's charge is not true, nor anything like the truth. *God's truth is confided to our keeping*, and by His grace we mean to uphold it, even though our adversary be the Rev. H. Bonar, D.D."

Again, the *Banner* of April 6th, 1881, replies to the Rev. Charles Lyne, of Cheltenham, for his information, that "Mr. Joseph, a converted Jew, lectured here on Monday, and proved conclusively that we are of *Japhetic* origin," in the following way :—"There is not a single text in the four corners of the Bible to support even one of Mr. Joseph's lugubrious predictions; one wonders that an Englishman like Mr. Lyne can be found to take comfort in the fouling of his own national nest, when for the shameful statement (that England will lose her possessions) there is not a shadow of proof. How dare Mr. Joseph pose as a prophet, and why does Mr. Lyne favour us with his post cards to publish his *venomous statements*? Who are *these two false prophets*, who venture to speak evil of God's people?"

In the same number, the *Banner* describes an opponent, who had interpreted Hosea i. 10 differently from the Anglo-Israelite theory, as "the traducer of his brethren;" "our foolish, self-satisfied adversary;" "our present libeller;" "men like our revilers who make it their mission, in fulfilling their contemptible prophetic destiny, to tell us to our face *that we wrest and forge the word of God to suit our own purposes.*"

Nevertheless, the *Banner* of May 4, 1881, condemned me for having changed my opinion by asking, "Where is Mr. Savile's consistency? How is one to deal with a divine, who for every occasion has a different doctrine, and *who deals with Scripture after a fashion that makes it speak just what he demands to suit his own purpose?*"

6. Leaving these extracts to the calm consideration of my readers, I pass on to the final reason why I have been compelled to give up my hasty credence in the Identity theory.—Because of the many instances in which they appear *to pervert the plain meaning of the word of God*. I will specify a few of them in the following order.

1. Genesis xxii. 17 tells us that Abraham's seed was to be multiplied as "*the stars of heaven, and the sand upon the sea shore;*" or, as subsequently promised to the seed of Jacob, "*as the dust of the earth.*" Now it is a well-known fact that the English nation, sprung from various races of Japhetic origin, numbers about 35 millions, according to the census of the year 1881—probably more than Israel possessed in the time of David and Solomon at the culminating point of her earthly grandeur, and about one-twelfth of the Chinese nation in the present day. So that when the Anglo-Israelites adduce this text in proof of our descent from the ten tribes, we see the incongruity of the argument, inasmuch as there are several other nations at this present time more numerous than ourselves. But the same Spirit who inspired Moses to record the prophecy, equally inspired other writers to record its fulfilment in ages long past. Thus it is written in 1 Kings iv. 1, 20, that in the time of King Solomon, "*Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea in multitude.*" So in 1 Chronicles xxvii. 23, it is said that David abstained from taking a census, "*because the Lord had said He would increase Israel like to the stars of the heavens.*" Hence it is said in 2 Chronicles i. 9, "*And Solomon said to God, Thou hast made me king over a people like the dust of the earth in multitude.*"

2. The same text contains God's promise to Abraham that his "*seed should possess the gate of his enemies,*"—a common Hebrew idiom to denote possession of the land which God had

covenanted to give ; and which is defined in Genesis xv. 13—18 as the land extending “ from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates.” We learn from Scripture how this was literally accomplished when “ the border ” of David’s kingdom extended to “ the river Euphrates ” (2 Sam. viii. 3); and “ Solomon reigned over all kingdoms from the river unto the land of the border of Egypt ” (1 Kings iv. 21).

This interpretation regarding the multiplicity of Abraham’s seed, and possession of the land of promise in the days of David and Solomon, which has been accepted by the Jewish and Christian Churches for the last 3000 years, is now sought to be set aside by the Anglo-Israelites, who say that this universal consent is entirely wrong—that Abraham’s seed means ten only of the twelve tribes of Israel, *i.e.*, the British nation, which will soon have the “ gates ” of the world in its possession, and especially that gate of gates, *La Sublime Porte*, CONSTANTINOPLE. The secretary of the Anglo-Israel Association tells us that “ on this gate almost every thing hinges.” The editor of the *Banner of Israel*, in an address to the electors of England, dated March 12, 1880, says, “ We have almost *all the gates of the world* in our keeping ! *The dominion of the whole earth is promised to us* ” !!! The Rev. Dr. Barrow, of Laura Chapel, Bath, in a lecture on “ Anglo-Israelism and Lord Beaconsfield,” assures us that “ his policy would eventually lead to England possessing the double gates of her enemy Russia.—CONSTANTINOPLE on the East, as she already possessed Gibraltar on the West, and then the prophecy ‘ *She shall reign from sea to sea* ’ would be literally fulfilled.” Passing by this terrible perversion of Psalm lxxii. 8, 11, which Dr. Barrow applies to England in place of to Christ, and which the Papal coins apply to the Pope of Rome (see *Numismata Pontificum*, pp. 50, 58)—the possession of Constantinople appears to be the key note of the Anglo-Israelite theory, of which I imagine there is less likelihood than of the Pope taking possession of the City of London ! There are, I am glad to say, some exceptions to this species of covetousness among the Anglo-Israelites. I have received a letter from my valued friend, the Rev. H. Marriott, an accomplished Hebrew scholar, who has long laboured as a missionary to outcast Israel,

both in Asia and Africa, who dates his letter from Syria—"I cannot refrain from writing to tell you how sincerely I agree with you in your just reproof of Mr. —'s unjust and ungodly proposal that we should take possession of CONSTANTINOPLE. One would think that city were situated in our own land, to see the zeal with which some Anglo-Israelites have advocated the acquisition."

3. Genesis xxviii. contains the accounts of Jacob's heavenly vision beside the walls of Luz, and of his taking the stony pillow on which his head had rested, which he "set up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it" (v. 18). This stone Mr. Hine and his followers declare to be the identical stone now fixed in the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey. The Anglo-Israelites have invented a most romantic legend of the way by which this stone travelled from Bethel to Westminster, but there is no more truth in the story than there is in the tale of Samson having flung his shoe from Canaan to Wales, or the Papal legend concerning the flight of the house wherein the holy family dwelt from Nazareth to Loretto.

4. Numbers xxiii. 9 contains Balaam's prophecy respecting the twelve tribes of Israel "dwelling alone, and not reckoned among the nations;" which all history testifies has been the case with the descendants of those tribes, even to the present day. Nevertheless, an Anglo-Israelite is venturesome enough to adduce this text as a proof that "We must be Israel, *because we are separated from the continent of Europe.*"!!!

5. The "altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt," mentioned by Isaiah xix. 19, 20, is interpreted by the Anglo-Israelites to mean the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh, which was considered by the ancient Egyptians to be the mausoleum of one of the Pharaohs, whom Herodotus terms "King Cheops." The Anglo-Israelites, however, confidently pronounce it to be a Messianic monument, built under the divine direction as much as Noah's Ark, Moses's Tabernacle, or Solomon's Temple. Every inch in the internal passages, with certain exceptions, is understood to symbolize a solar year, so that we are taught to know the duration of the three great dispensations—the Heathen dispensation, from the Flood to the Exode, which lasted,



according to this theory, 985 years; the Mosaic, from the Exode to the Nativity, 1542 years; these two refer to the past: and for the future, inasmuch as there are 1881-6 inches in the length of the grand gallery, this is said to teach us that the duration of the Christian dispensation will last a fraction over 1881 years. So that supposing our common era were true, that Christ was born on Dec. 25, B.C. 1 (though it is well known that the Nativity must have taken place some years before), the age or "world to an end will come," not as the pseudo-Mother Shipton asserts, in 1881, but in 1882.

6. Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6. For nigh 2000 years Christendom has applied the term THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to none beside. Not so some of the Anglo-Israelites. Mr. T. Fletcher, of Smallthorne, in *British Israel's Prophetic Messenger* of Feb. 3, 1881, p. 58, denies the application to our Saviour, saying, "The righteous Branch cannot be Jesus Christ; . . . though called a king, it is necessary *that branch* should be a woman's, in order to fulfil Jeremiah xxxi. 22." And though our Queen Victoria "is *not at present* called by any such name, that is no reason why she should not be, when the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit of righteousness takes place, and so fulfil this prophecy relating to her as well as 'a woman shall compass a man.'"<sup>1</sup>

7. Daniel ii. 44, 45. "The stone cut out of the mountain without hands," has been applied by the universal consent of Christendom to Christ's kingdom. For the first time in the history of the world (with perhaps the exception of the fifth Monarchy men of the Commonwealth) the Anglo-Israelites assert that the honour belongs to the entire BRITISH NATION. The *Banner* of August 7th, 1878, says, "Verily all men see that to Great Britain is allotted the whole earth; and how can it be otherwise when we know that *we are Israel*; and to Israel is granted 'the kingdom and dominion' under the whole heaven." Again, in its issue of August 20th, the *Banner* adds, "The people of the saints of the Most High must be the same people or nation which is represented by the stone. In both cases, the kingdom is to endure for ever. That kingdom, reader, is THE BRITISH EMPIRE." The writer appears to forget what St. Peter was

inspired to teach the faithful, whether of Israelitish or Gentile birth, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy NATION" (1 Pet. ii. 9).

8. In the same way Psalm ii. 8 is misinterpreted by attributing to the British nation, what the Christian Church has always applied exclusively to Christ. But this sad perversion of Holy Scripture has so horrified Bishop Tidcomb, the only dignitary of our Church, I believe, who has accepted the Anglo-Israel theory, that he wrote to the Rev. J. Clifford, June 14th, 1877—"Of all things which must tend from time to time to repel me from the whole controversy, is the very thing you have charged me with. I hate and abominate, loathe, detest, and abhor, such misdirected applications. . . . The application of Psalm ii. 8 always horrifies me. These are the dead flies in our sweet ointment which make it stink. But, believe me, I am never guilty of such uncritical nonsense" (See *Anglo-Israelites*, pp. 5, 6). I see by a correspondence which has recently appeared in the *Cheltenham Telegram*, that Mr. Bird, the editor of the *Banner of Israel*, endeavours to defend this interpretation of Psalm ii. 8, notwithstanding Bishop Tidcomb's faithful protest against such an awful perversion of God's Holy Word. I see also in that correspondence, that what St. John terms "the spirit of error" is making fearful progress among the "Anglo-Israelites." I could not have believed it possible that any one pretending to the name of Christian could have so misinterpreted Titus ii. 13, as to declare that "the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," means "*looking for the discovery and identification of the ten tribes*"!!! And yet this is what Mr. Bird has declared in the *Banner* of Nov. 2, 1881, and attempted to defend in a letter dated Nov. 10, addressed to the editor of the *Cheltenham Telegram*. Can we wonder at the strong language which Bishop Tidcomb and other Evangelical clergymen, who have studied the subject, have used in condemnation of such a "misdirected application" of the Infallible Word of Life. The words of "Clericus," who replied to Mr. Bird, in the correspondence which appeared in the *Cheltenham Telegram* of Nov. 16th, that he "has yet to learn the first principles of Christianity, one of which is that national

birth is of no account whatever in the kingdom of heaven," are plainly true.

9. Psalm cxviii. 22 is also painfully perverted by some of the Anglo-Israelites. The Rev. Dr. Wild, of New York, a most voluminous writer on the theory, tells us that "*the stone which the builders refused*" is proved to be the same as "Jacob's pillow," now in the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey; but he somewhat inconsistently adds, "The stone in Westminster Abbey may not be the very identical one on which Jacob rested his head; but whether it be or not, the very idea of the English having and using such a stone, points them out to be the children of Jacob, the Lost Tribes of Israel! *This is the Lord's doing: it is marvellous in our eyes*" (Dr. Wild's *Future of Judah and Israel*, p. 92).

10. Zechariah (viii. 23) was inspired to teach that the time would come when "ten men would take hold out of all nations of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." Commentators have generally interpreted this "Jew" to refer to Him who once came to "His own, and His own received Him not." The Anglo-Israelites interpret the passage differently. My friend, W. H. Peters, Esq., formerly High Sheriff of Devon, in a letter to the *Daily Western Times* of July 27, 1878, considers that it refers to the late Lord Beaconsfield at the Congress of Berlin. And so another Anglo-Israelite writer interprets Isaiah xlv. 11 of the same deceased statesman, as the "*ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country;*" because the Government of which he was the head "brought a contingent of the British army from India to Malta in 1878." And so Mr. Hine, the founder of the Anglo-Israel theory several years ago, pronounced Lord Beaconsfield to have been "*specially raised by God as a Deliverer for our nation*. I see by the eye of faith *intense glory* ready to flash across our path under his premiership. His whole surroundings are evidently touched *as by the finger of God*" (*Life from the Dead*, vol. i., p. 160). And so an enthusiastic writer in *British Israel's Prophetic Messenger*, adopting the same view respecting the success of Lord Beaconsfield, written the year following the general

election of 1880, says, "We shall return to the land of our forefathers as the righteous nation, for whom God will open the gates—which gates were being opened by *His inspired minister*, Lord Beaconsfield, when he in his wisdom added Cyprus to our possessions; and under *his God-inspired statesmanship*, we should soon have had Constantinople, so being prepared for the glorious march of the Israelites to their own land" (p. 59).

And so the *Banner* of July 24th, 1878, spake of the late Lord Beaconsfield as "*our God-taught Premier*—the man that is a Jew;" thus ascribing to a poor fellow-sinner, whose celebrity is as much that of a novel-writer as anything else, what Christians have hitherto applied to the Incarnate Son of God!

Another passage in Zechariah is grievously perverted in this way. In the *Banner* of Dec. 21, 1881, the editor interprets Zech. xi. 14, thus—that the tie "between Judah and Israel in Benjamin was broken before the crucifixion, since God '*broke the brotherhood*' when Judas flung down the coin which betrayed his Lord in the Temple at Jerusalem" !!! Here Benjamin, a part of the kingdom of Judah, is made to take the place of the Ten Tribes of Israel !!!

11. Jeremiah xliii. 6 speaks of "the king's daughters, Jeremiah and Baruch," having been carried by Johanan, the son of Kareah, into Egypt. It is on this passage that the Rev. F. Glover and other Anglo-Israelites have founded the legend of Jeremiah having fled with one of the king's daughters to Ireland, and there given her in marriage to an Irish chieftain; and that Queen Victoria, as a descendant from that marriage, is heir to the throne, and now holds the sceptre of David !!! It is scarcely necessary to say that there is not a shadow of secular historic evidence for this romantic myth; but I now proceed to show that it is a very serious and terrible perversion of Scripture. If any one will carefully study the descent of our blessed Lord from King David according to prophecy as set forth in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, he will find that the former traces the pedigree through the royal line up to Solomon, the son of David; whereas the latter traces it up to Nathan, the son of David. Both agree in making Zerubbabel, the son of Salathiel, the first prince of Judah after the 70 years' captivity in Babylon; but whereas Matthew appears to make Salathiel, the

son of Jeconiah, the last regular King of Judah previous to his being carried a prisoner to Babylon (Zedekiah, his uncle, being only a makeshift appointed by Nebuchadnezzar), Luke states that Salathiel was the son of Neri, and equally descended from David through Nathan, as the royal kings were through Solomon. How is this to be explained? A simple reference to Jeremiah xxii. 30, solves the difficulty. We there learn that, by God's appointment, King Jeconiah, the son of Jehoiakim, was to die childless, and no man from his seed was to sit on David's throne, or rule any more in Judah. Hence he adopted "Salathiel, the son of Neri," equally descended from David with himself through another line; and thus his adopted son Salathiel, as is frequently done among the princes of India in modern times under similar circumstances, became one of the honoured progenitors of Him who condescended to take our nature, and to be known to the Christian world as "great David's greater Son," our Incarnate Saviour, who will hereafter rule over all the earth.

12. Romans xi. 26. St. Paul, in writing to the Romans, tells them of the twelve tribes of Israel, that blindness in part is happened to them until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, adding, "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion *the Deliverer*." We have already seen that Mr. Hine considered the late Lord Beaconsfield as "specially raised by God as a deliverer." One of Mr. Hine's followers appears to have considered Mr. Hine himself as more deserving of the title of "Deliverer;" but which naturally so horrified another portion of the Anglo-Israelite party, that at a meeting of the Israel's Identification Association held in Clifton, it was unanimously resolved—"That this meeting, having considered the correspondence which has lately taken place in the Bristol papers regarding Mr. Harrison Oxley's article in the last number of *Life from the Dead*, asserting therein that Mr. Edward Hine is identified with the 'Deliverer mentioned in Romans xi. 26,' (APPENDIX A), desires in the strongest manner to repudiate such allegations." We thus learn that some of the Anglo-Israelites have profanely attempted to make the founder of the Identity theory usurp the place of our Incarnate Saviour, the promised "Deliverer out of Zion."

Having thus pointed out some of the interpretations which the Anglo-Israelites place upon certain texts of Scripture in support of their theory, let us notice other texts which make it sufficiently clear that the theory is contrary to the mind of Him who has revealed Himself in that word, which is so plain and simple, as Isaiah says, that "the wayfaring men, though fools (in the estimation of the world), shall not err therein." Let me remind you in passing of the number of times which the word "*Israel*" or its concomitants occurs in Holy Scripture, which I think may help to account for the way in which the Anglo-Israel theory has been received by those who do not sufficiently regard the context in their interpretation of the term. The names of "*Israel*," "*Israelite*," "*Israelitish*," &c., occurs upwards of 800 times, and is *very rarely* used of the ten tribes exclusively, as separate from the two-tribed house of Judah. In 2 Chronicles xi. 3, and xii. 1, and in Ezra ii. 70, the term "*ALL ISRAEL*" is applied to the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin; while in the 15th verse of 2 Chronicles xiii. the same term "*all Israel*" is used to denote the *ten tribes* separate from the other two. Some Anglo-Israelites contend that the term "*all Israel*" is never applied to the two tribes of Benjamin and Judah, but a reference to the above texts will show that they are mistaken.

One of the frequent arguments put forth in proof of their theory by the Anglo-Israelites is that we are a numerous people, either by ourselves, or together with the United States of America, whom they strangely interpret as descended from the tribe of Manasseh, as we are said to belong to the tribe of Ephraim, though the smallest amount of historical knowledge must convince every one in his right senses that the Americans are descended from the English, and that it is turning Holy Scripture into a farce, making it "a nose of wax," as Hooker said, to suppose for a moment of the numerous house of "Smith," whose branches have extended so far and wide, both in England and in the regions of the far West, that any one bearing that name, if living in England, he is of the tribe of *Ephraim*, but if he emigrate to America, he is then of the tribe of *Manasseh*! (APPENDIX B.)

It is true enough that the Anglo-Saxon race scattered through the four quarters of the globe is very numerous, equal perhaps in point of numbers to one-fourth of the Chinese, the most populous nation on the face of the earth. But the very fact of the Anglo-Saxon race being as numerous as they are, is perhaps the strongest and clearest proof that they cannot be descended from any of the twelve tribes of Israel. For it is as plain and evident as any thing recorded in Holy Writ, that when the twelve tribes of Israel were driven out of the land which God gave to Abraham and his seed, and scattered among the Gentiles (as they have been in a greater or less degree for the last 26 centuries, ever since Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria, B.C. 740, took all "the land of Naphtali," and carried its inhabitants—the first tribe so treated—into captivity, far away from the land of their fathers), it was prophetically foretold that they would become "*few in number*,"\* and so remain, until in God's own time they are restored to that land from which they have been so long banished. Let any one carefully, prayerfully, and humbly read such passages as Leviticus xxiv. 21—38; Deuteronomy iv. 1, 25—27; viii. 19, 20; xxviii. 15, 62—66; Romans ix. 25, 26; as these passages are sufficient to show those who are willing to be guided by God's word, the delusion they are suffering under who suppose that because the English are a numerous race of people, therefore they must be ten of the twelve tribes of Israel! Probably we are the most hybrid race on the face of the earth, from our insular position and other causes which account for the same, and consequently may have plenty of Israelitish blood. Certainly there must be a mixture of Jewish blood with the British, Roman, Teutonic (Jutes—Angles and Saxons), Danish, Norman, and Angevin races, which have during the last 2000 years flowed into Britain; inasmuch as when all the Israelites in 1290 were banished from England, 16,000 remained on their making a profession of Christianity, and were of course soon mixed up with the rest of the inhabitants, who are so frequently, but most erroneously,

---

\* It is calculated that the whole house of Israel scattered throughout the earth numbers between seven and ten millions at the present time.

termed "Anglo-Saxons," as if those two Teutonic tribes were the sole ancestors of the British people!

Another common error among the Anglo-Israelite party is to regard ten of the twelve tribes of Israel as "Lost Israel" (APPENDIX C), and now discovered for the first time in the British isles, oblivious of the fact, that all the twelve tribes were to be scattered among the Gentiles in all parts of the world. The ten tribes have never been lost, any more than the other two tribes of Benjamin and Judah; and the evidence of the Karaites in the Crimea is very plain, that after the two tribes were banished from their land by the Romans at the destruction of Jerusalem, the descendants of the twelve tribes were again united as one people, though "few in number," and "scattered," as prophecy declares they would be, and will so remain, until, as Isaiah foretold, that "The Lord will set His hand again the *second* time to recover the remnant of His people (of the twelve tribes), which shall be left from Assyria, &c., and from the islands of the sea" (xi. 11).

A most curious interpretation which the Identity theorists have put forth on the subject of the return of the twelve tribes to Canaan, is contained in the *Banner of Israel* of July 31, 1878, where a writer in that number, Mr. Robert Lamb, of Durham, confidently asserts that "the two witnesses (Revelation xi. 3), Israel and Judah—the British and the Jews—will during three and a half years from this time (1878), lie 'dead' in 'the street of the city of Jerusalem and in Egypt,' *i.e.*, be in possession, but not in recognised ownership of these localities as the rightful inheritors. The end of the three and a half years will bring us to January, 1882, *our date for the public recognition and return of Israel of the thirteen tribes to their own land.* I quite expect in January, 1882, to see our glorious Queen proclaimed *Empress of Turkey*, as she is now Empress of India." The editor of the *Banner* contents himself wisely by remarking that, if spared till January, 1882, we shall not fail to remind our readers that such a suggestion was made and published in July, 1878, by Mr. R. Lamb, of Durham."/

Respecting "my two witnesses," which Mr. Lamb interprets of "the British and the Jews," there is much difference among



the Anglo-Israelites as to whom those "witnesses" refer. One writer interprets them of "Judah and Anglo-Israel;" another, of "Judah and Benjamin;" a third, of the "Jews and the Turks;" while a fourth surpasses them all in originality by suggesting that they mean "the two great stone monuments—viz., the *Great Pyramid of Ghizeh*, and the *hill of Tara*" in Ireland! (See *Modern Hieroglyphics*, by a Watcher, p. 3.) It is such speculations as these, together with the many perversions of Holy Scripture, some of which have been already mentioned, which has done more than anything else to cause the Church of England, as represented by the three chief schools of religious thought in this country, to reject the Identity theory *in toto*. I have not space to prove this at any length; but I think the following extract will be sufficient to show that I am not speaking at random. I learn from the *Banner of Israel*, May 4, 1881, what the *Church Times*, the organ of the Ritualists, thinks on the subject, as it plainly says, "There is no foundation whatever in Scripture or elsewhere for the Anglo-Israel craze. No competent scholar accepts it in any part, and its votaries are chiefly such people as self-educated men—apt to run after mere will-o'-the-wisps." The *Guardian* of August, 1880, the representative of the Semi-Ritualistic school, observes, "It may seem 'a waste of powder and shot' to undertake a serious and critical examination of a theory so ridiculous on the face of it, as that which identifies the ten tribes of Jeroboam's kingdom with the English people. We are truly sorry to observe that Bishop Tidcomb, of Rangoon, figures among the active advocates of this absurdity. It is just one of those notions which a man can hardly take up without at once gravely compromising his own reputation for discernment, and also lessening the weight of every thing else he says and does." And so the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who may be regarded as a true representative of the learned and historic moderate High Church school, writes to a vicar of his diocese—"I never heard of a professed scholar or ethnologist, who entertained the Anglo-Israel theory even for a single moment." (APPENDIX D.)

As regards the Evangelical school, with which it has been my

happiness to have been connected during the last 45 years, it will be sufficient if I give extracts from three of the numerous letters which I have received from various members of the Evangelical party, both lay and clerical, who are unanimous in their condemnation of the whole theory; and I suppose it may be safely asserted, that of the 40,000 ministers of the New Testament existing in England at this present time, and who by their education and position may be supposed capable of forming a just opinion on the subject, not one in a hundred—perhaps not one in a thousand—has accepted the alleged theory that the British empire is identified with ten of the twelve tribes of Israel.

1. My deeply valued friend, Canon Carus of Winchester, writes to me as follows:—"This fancy about 'Anglo-Israelism' is a most *utterly absurd* one. It is marvellous how people have been carried away by it; but there is nothing too absurd to believe."

2. Canon Bell, Rector of Cheltenham, writes to me that he considers—"The unscriptural theory of Anglo-Israelism appears to me '*a profane*,' as well as '*an old wives' fable*.' I think *their distortion of some texts shocking*; our Lord is robbed of His glory that it may be given to Great Britain."

3. I adduce the testimony of my old friend, General Aylmer, because I consider him better qualified by his reading, as well as by his being more deeply taught in Gospel truth, than any other Evangelical layman whom it has been my privilege to know on earth. He writes to me respecting those "who say they are Israelites, but are not," as follows: "I truly and warmly honour your efforts to witness against *Anglo-Israelism*, which I believe to be a *complete hallucination*, and *something much worse still*."

Such is the opinion of three experienced believers on this novel theory, which has been broached by Mr. E. Hine and his enthusiastic followers during the last twelve years; and which I am inclined to think will prove nothing more, as one of the ablest of our religious periodicals has said, "than a merely ephemeral wave of opinion, which will run its course, and subside as rapidly as it has arisen." This conclusion appears to be supported by the fact, that in addition to the allegation that the English people must be the same as the ten tribes, the Anglo-

Israelites assert with surprising confidence that the Great Pyramid is a Messianic monument, built under Divine direction ; that it teaches the duration of the Christian dispensation, and that in consequence " we are thus enabled to calculate the date of our Lord's return," which is " absolutely fixed as *not later than August 6, 1882*" (APPENDIX E), notwithstanding our Master's warning that "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."

And lest we should be doing the Anglo-Israelites an injustice in thus assuming that they so easily set aside the solemn commands of our Divine Master, I give the words of " Philo-Israel," as published by him in a leaflet, dated " Bristol, March 1879," in which he speaks as follows :—

"The length of the grand gallery in the Great Pyramid, symbolizing the duration of the Christian dispensation, is exactly 1881·6 Pyramid inches. Reckoning inches for years, we have the end of this dispensation indicated as destined to occur about July or August, 1882. THE IMPENDING south wall of the grand gallery shows the suddenness of the Lord's coming, 'even as a thief in the night.' . . .

"Other calculations derived from the measurements of the Great Pyramid point also to A.D. 1882 (APPENDIX F), as the close of the 6000 *years* of the world's history, and the beginning of the seventh thousand, or Millennial reign of our Lord upon earth, only three and a half years (now only seven *months*) hence! . . . Let me ask you to dwell on the marvellous favour shown to us British—*being ISRAEL*, in that we are *thus enabled to calculate the date of the Lord's return.*" !!!

Such are the speculations which the Anglo-Israelites are now making respecting the time of the SECOND ADVENT. I need not remind you how directly it conflicts with the infallible word of God. Whereas how different is the case of those who seek to realize, as the early Christians did, the doctrine of the Second Advent in its unspeakable "comfort," by watching, as Clemens Romanus wrote to the Corinthian believers, "hour by hour," for the event, without attempting to speculate on the time, which is known only to God. Let us not forget the words of Justin Martyr in the second century—"I and others, who are orthodox

Christians in all things, know that there will be *an out-resurrection from amongst the dead*, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, as Isaiah and Ezekiel declare" (Dial. cum Trypho., c. 80). For that event we should be ever waiting on the watch-tower of faith, hope and love, in the spirit of that great master in Israel, the saintly Augustine, whose CONFESSIONS open with these memorable words—"O God, Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."

Believe me, my dear Friend,

Yours very faithfully in Christ,

BOURCHIER W. SAVILE.

SHILLINGFORD RECTORY, EXETER,

January 1, 1882.

P.S. As time has now proved the fallacy of Mr. Bird's unlawful speculation respecting "the public manifestation of the sons of God, the identification and discovery to the world of God's long-lost people, the ten tribes of Israel, in the Anglo-Saxon race," during the year which has just closed, we may reasonably hope that many who have hitherto accepted his teaching as almost inspired, will be convinced of the fallacy of his alternative speculation thus expressed—"We have the end of this dispensation as destined to occur *about July or August, 1882.*"! The origin of all these attempts to "calculate the date of our Lord's return" may be traced to an Italian writer of the 14th century, LEONARDO ARETINO, the Pope's secretary, who says in his work—*The World's Destruction*, which he predicted would occur in the last fortnight of November, 1881; that on November 21st, "all human beings would be stricken *dumb*;" and on Sunday, the 27th, "the demise of the whole human race would take place;" and by the 30th, "heaven and earth would be consumed by fire, and the general resurrection" would be an accomplished fact! But inasmuch as none of these speculations have proved true, we may suppose that all the rest of a like nature will share the same fate.

Other speculators are in full force at this present time. Strange to say, the leading articles of the *Times* of November 18th, 1881, condescended to tell the public that the Mohammedans have fixed on the year 1882 for the appearance of the "Mahdi, or *Mussulman Messiah*," but unfortunately the writer betrayed his ignorance by asserting that this is "the *thirteen hundredth* year of the Hegira," whereas any well-educated person knows that the Hegira commenced July 16th, A.D. 622, so that it is now only the 1260th year of the Hegira, which may possibly be the year destined for the overthrow of the Mohammedan power, as possessed by the Sultan of Turkey. The Mohammedans, however, like the "Anglo-Israelites," are not agreed about the year; for another portion, according to a work by a British officer, *Recollections of the Indian Mutiny*, assert that their Messiah will not appear until 1883! Professor Grimmer, an American astrologer, has fixed upon the year 1885! A current tradition among the Germans at Oberemmel declares that the coming woe, or the end of the world, will not take place until Easter falls on April 25th, Whit-Sunday on June 13th, and Corpus Christi day on June 24th, all of which occur, it is said, in 1886! The *Christian Herald*, the chief organ of the Futurist school, postpones the end

of the age until 1890! While Dr. Wild, an enthusiastic supporter of the Anglo-Israel theory, declares it will not take place until 1893!!! Such are the varied and unlawful speculations of those who do not know, or who forget the solemn rebuke which just before the Ascension our Lord delivered to the disciples, who were over curious to know the time when the kingdom would be again restored to Israel, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power."

#### APPENDIX A, p. 23.

Mr. Hine appears to accept this designation of the "Deliverer of Sion;" as in *Life from the Dead* he speaks of himself as being "called by God" — "God having called us, is working by us," &c. He also declares that, previous to his birth, his mother had revealed to her that she was about to have a son, "one who would be produced to teach the people of God." Thus Mr. Hine seems to affirm with the same faith which caused *Joanna Southcott*, a maid-servant of Exeter in 1814, to declare that she was about to have "a son by the power of the Most High, in the sixty-fifth year of her age," that "the identity of the lost ten tribes of Israel is the one grand, great essential of the age—the one thing to be accomplished before ever the sublime conceptions of the mind of the Almighty given forth in His eternal word can be realized by the entire nations of the earth" (*Life from the Dead*, vol. v., pp. 179, 346). On the subject of the Great Pyramid, Mr. Hine agrees more with the speculations of the pseudo-Mother Shipton in reference to the time of the end, as in the same volume he declared that "he was justified in believing that in 1881 some great, grand and sublime fulfilment of prophecy would take place, judging from the indications in the Great Pyramid" (p. 118). Whereas the *Banner of Israel*, which I believe represents the general feeling of the Anglo-Israelites at the present time, declares that the Great Pyramid "absolutely fixes the approaching end of the age as not later than August 6th, 1882, for the terrible events we anticipate" (April 7th, 1880).

#### APPENDIX B, p. 24.

A writer in *British Israel's Prophetic Messenger* endeavours to meet this "stumbling-block," as he terms it, though he declines to admit its force, in the following very original way:—"Mr. Wareham rightly says, 'Going to America cannot change the tribeships,' Is not that a stumbling-block? Certainly not. The stumbling-block consists in not knowing what the theory hitherto has been concerning Manasseh. This is the true theory, that the bulk of the Anglo-Saxon people of the United States are of one particular Saxon tribe, viz., the *Devia*, who came from thence, and colonized America. Why should we stumble over nothing?" (*British Israel's Prophetic Messenger*, February 3, 1881, p. 58). I believe this to be an average specimen of the reasoning powers of the Anglo-Israelite theorists. And with those who are satisfied with such reasons, it would be quite useless and needless to attempt to reason.

#### APPENDIX C, p. 26.

The best historical account of the ten tribes will be found in Basnage's *History of the Jews, from Jesus Christ to the Present Time*. Basnage was an eminent French pastor of the 17th century, who was banished from France at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. His great work was written in French, and a translation was published in London in 1708, a fine folio

edition of 752 pages. It contains the fullest information respecting that portion of the twelve tribes, who by a strange misnomer are frequently, but most erroneously, spoken of as "Lost Israel."

#### APPENDIX D, p. 27.

The reason why all competent scholars, as the Bishop of Gloucester says, refuse to entertain the Anglo-Israel theory "for a single moment," is the same, I believe, which makes the scientific world reject the wild speculation of Mr. John Hampden, who denies the truth of the Copernican system, and asserts in very violent language that the world is not round, but as flat as a plate. Mr. Hampden's knowledge on this point appears to be on a par with that of an Alexandrian monk of the sixth century, the traveller *Cosmas*, who accurately represents the science of his day, by maintaining that the earth was of a long, narrow, rectangular shape, surrounded by a high wall, and that towards the North Pole were high mountains, round which the sun, planets, and stars revolved. Few persons have either the time or the inclination to attempt to refute such fanciful speculations as these; they are left to refute themselves.

#### APPENDIX E, p. 29.

As well as the Great Pyramid being pronounced a Messianic monument giving the date of our Lord's return "not later than August, 1882," some of the Anglo-Israelites have confidently stated that the census taken in April, 1881, would prove our Israelitish origin on this wise. Mr. Charles Horner explains the opening verse in Revelation xi., where the angel commands St. John to measure the temple of God, its altar and worshippers, to mean the Astronomer Royal of Scotland measuring the height of the grand gallery in the interior of the Great Pyramid in 1865; though, says Mr. Horner, "he little knew the significance of the act, for then it was that he *involuntarily measured the worshippers*. For the mean height, viz., 339.5 inches, is none other than *the Index of Britain's Israel's census for A.D. 1881*." Mr. Horner then proceeds to show, that as every inch symbolizes a *living soul*, we are to understand that the population of Great Britain would amount in the census of 1881 to 33,950,000 souls. "This," adds Mr. Horner, "is the number of the British nation, even the house of Israel, recorded in that monument 4000 years since, to be openly manifested to His people in *the present year of grace A.D. 1878*, as another incontestable proof that the monument (the Great Pyramid) is indeed *HIS WITNESS*" (*Philo-Israel's Digest of Great Pyramid Teaching*, p. 51). Unfortunately, when the census came to be taken in April, 1881, it was found that the population of Great Britain had then reached the number of 35,246,562 souls, or 1,296,562 more than was required according to the Great Pyramid riddle, notwithstanding that an enthusiastic Anglo-Israelite once wrote to assure me that "the Great Pyramid could not tell lies." Mr. Horner has, I believe, proved himself equal to the occasion, and suggested that the number of cubic inches has been underestimated, and that it agrees with what "British Israel's" *population will be in 1882*, when the Lord returns!

#### APPENDIX F, p. 29.

Having on one occasion asked a leader among the "Anglo-Israelites" what he should do, if August 1882 arrived without any of "*the terrible events*" which he anticipated as about to happen, either on or before that date, "having come to pass," he frankly replied, "Then I shall give the whole affair up." Most Christians will deem this a very wise and discreet reply.