



Anglo-Israelism

A Refutation of

(1) "The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy"

of Herbert W. Armstrong

Editor of the Magazines

"Plain Truth" and "The Good News" and also

(2) of the Anglo-Israel Views of Various Other Writers

"God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thes. 2: 11).

Chapter 1

Many sincere Christian people have labored and do labor under various delusions. We should therefore be slow to censure, but swift to help, building up one another in the most holy faith "that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ" (Jude 20; Eph. 4: 14, 15).

It is not our purpose or desire to disparage anyone, but rather to warn against the errors and pitfalls of those who partially or wholly "abide not in the doctrine of Christ" (2 John 9; Jude 3). Our aim is to defend the Bible truth and to attack and destroy the errors, rather than to attack the errorists.

Anglo-Israelism (also called British-Israelism) is one of the most "cunningly devised fables" of our day (2 Pet. 1: 16; 2 Tim. 4: 3, 4). A refutation of it is found in *Thy Kingdom Come*, pages 250-253, 290-300 (we supply this book). But in response to many requests that we provide a more extensive refutation, including in it answers to a number of pertinent arguments not treated in that book, we now set forth this further refutation of a "strong delusion" which has confused and deceived many in Christendom, especially in the U.S., Canada and Britain, and is threatening to deceive and more or less divert and estrange many more Christians from their proper attitude toward and relationship to God and to Jesus Christ as our true Shepherd (John 10: 1-16), Teacher (Matt. 11: 29) and Head (1 Cor. 11: 3).

Some U.S. publications and organizations that prominently advocate Anglo-Israelism are:

(1) The widely circulated book *The United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy* (we will refer to it as US&BCP) by Herbert W. Armstrong of Pasadena, California, whose magazines, *The Plain Truth* and *Tomorrow's World*, have a circulation of over 3,000,000 each issue. The Ambassador Colleges, here and abroad, were founded by him; his son Garner Ted Armstrong is his main assistant, especially in widespread radio and television broadcasting (using the program name "The World Tomorrow"). They teach some Truth, but claim the Church has no eternal home in heaven, that Christians *must* keep the seventh-day sabbath, pay tithes, *etc.*

(2) Destiny Publishers, Haverhill, Massachusetts, headed by Howard B. Rand as the main author and editor (he was one of the main organizers of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, founded in 1930).

(3) *The Kingdom Digest* of Dallas, Texas, with John A. Lovell, founder of the United Israel World Fellowship, as editor.

Some other magazines that advocate Anglo-Israelism are: *Identity*, published by The Association of Covenant People, in Vancouver, Canada; *The National Message* and *The New Jerusalem Fellowship* in England; and *The Covenant Message* in S. Africa.

Anglo-Israelism's claims are very appealing and seem plausible, at least on the surface, to many who do not study carefully and thoroughly the underlying principles in the light of all the pertinent Scriptures and their contexts, sanctified reason and facts. These claims usually appeal strongly to those of Anglo-Saxon lineage, many of whom are unduly influenced by and yield to Anglo-Israelism's attractive appeals to nationalism and materialism and its accompanying appeal to vanity. Accordingly, to a considerable extent, they are led to claim special favor from God on the basis of their physical birth into what they have been deceived to believe is one or another of what are called "the ten lost tribes of Israel," especially into Britain or into the United States—supposedly the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. Thus they are led away, often almost imperceptibly, from a proper humbling of themselves under the mighty hand of God (1 Pet. 5: 5, 6), from diligence in working out their own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. 2: 12) and from walking not after the flesh, but only after the Spirit (Rom. 8: 1; Gal. 5: 16-18).

Man looks on the outward appearance, but God looks on the heart (1 Sam. 16: 7). "No flesh should glory in his presence" (1 Cor. 1: 29). "Many glory after the flesh"; but we as consecrated Christians should "worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh"; "it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing" (2 Cor. 11: 18; Phil. 3: 3; John 4: 24; 6: 63).

If our examination of some of the prominent and fantastic claims of Anglo-Israelism, in the light of God's Word, reason and the facts of history, will serve to deliver from its clutches any of its estimated three million or more adherents, or help to preserve others from its subtle ensnarements, we will consider our efforts very worthwhile and for this will render to God additional thanks and praise.

The views of the proponents of the Anglo-Israel theory differ from one another on some points, but the following, stated years ago by the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, seems to cover the main tenets of Anglo-Israelism (the bracketed comments are ours)

THE ANGLO-ISRAEL CREED

(1) "The Bible does not state or infer that the Jews are God's chosen people. Judah and Israel are entirely distinct and separate entities. 2 Chron. 11.

(2) "The Bible made these prophecies and recorded these facts concerning Israel and the Jews. Israel was to find an island home and be moved no more. The Jews were to be strangers in all lands. Israel was to constitute a kingdom but the Jews were never to be a nation until reunited with Israel [obviously erroneous, as facts since 1948 abundantly prove!]. Jews were to remain under the Law and Old Covenant, whereas Israel was to be a Christian people.

(3) "Israel had nothing to do with the crucifixion of our Lord, not being in the land, except Benjamin, who accepted Him.

(4) "'Ephraim' is England and 'Manasseh' represents the United States. Manasseh was the thirteenth tribe [counting the Levites as a separate tribe], and that accounts for the discovery of America on Oct. 13, 1492, and the following 'thirteens' in American history: Thirteen colonies; 13 bars and 13 stars (flag); 13 letters in 'E Pluribus Unum' and 13 feathers, 13 olives, and 13 arrows on American coins. First American navy, 13 ships; Cornerstone of White House laid Oct. 13, 1792. The 13th amendment abolished slavery. The first letter in Manasseh is the 13th both in the English and Hebrew languages.

(5) "The Celtic-Anglo-Saxons are Israel, the chosen people of God. The British Isle inhabitants are descendants, among others, from the tribes of Saxons (Isaac's sons), the Danes of Dan, the Jutes of Judah, the Friesians, the Picts, and the Scots, and Normans of Benjamin.

(6) "'Brith' in Hebrew means 'covenant'; therefore, we have Britain, 'covenant law,' British, the 'covenant man,' Britannia, 'covenant ships.' 'Brittania rules the waves [obviously no longer true!], controlling the English Channel, Gibraltar, Singapore, Shanghai, Hong Kong, the Suez Canal, Malta, Aden, and other gates and stations. America controls practically all of the remaining gates. This, all in fulfillment of Gen. 22: 17, 'thy (Abraham's) seed shall possess the gate of his enemies' (read Isa. 14: 1-8).

(7) "The Anglo-Saxons are 'Christianized Israel' and are fulfilling Isa. 49: 6: 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.' The Church is the priesthood of the nation.

(8) "In 1776 A.D. the Lord divided Israel into two nations, so that God's promises to both Ephraim and Manasseh might be realized.

(9) "The throne of David has come down to Great Britain through a clear line of descent and therefore the fulfillment of God's promise that David's throne would endure forever. Great Britain and America, Ephraim and Manasseh (who are to render willing obedience), are preparing the way for the coming of the King. The house of David, removed from Jerusalem in the days of

Nebuchadnezzar, was brought to Ireland by Jeremiah the prophet in the person of Tamar Tephi, thus establishing the present line of descent. The Ten Tribes came from Assyria to Europe, thence to the British Isles to be joined to the house of David; God's Jehovah throne was established in the midst of His kingdom, Modern Israel, or Britain. An ancient king of Ireland was married to a Jewish princess from the East and their coronation was on Jacob's stone, and the royal house of Britain descended from that union.

(10) "According to Dan. 2: 44, 45, a Stone is to come from heaven, smite all other kingdoms, become a mountain and fill the whole earth. This Stone kingdom is to stand forever, Israel is to stand forever, Jer. 31: 35, 36. Therefore, Great Britain is the Stone Kingdom, the forever Israel.

(11) "The little stone [of Scone] now occupies the chief seat in the kingdom, the coronation chair at Westminster Abbey. The Kings of the House of David have been crowned upon this Stone."

The above statement of the main tenets of Anglo-Israelism gives some idea of how it misapplies Scripture and merits a censure similar to that given to the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 15: 6): "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition."

Unable to find real Scriptural or historical foundation for their claims, many of the Anglo-Israelites, like the Roman Catholics, appeal strongly to the unreliable and uninspired Apocryphal books, which never belonged in nor were accepted as parts of the Old Testament canon by the Jews, its custodians (Rom. 3: 2), and from which Jesus never quoted. They appeal also to legends, traditions (see Matt. 15: 6), derivations from word meanings, archeological finds, *etc.*, to which they attach many unfounded suppositions, unwarranted conclusions and wild imaginations.

ETYMOLOGICAL BLUNDERS

Anglo-Israelites manifest their poverty for real proofs of their theories when they must resort to such arguments as the claim (1) that the name *England* is derived from the Hebrew word *engle*, meaning *bull* (this is one of their many etymological blunders, for in Hebrew there is no word *engle*, though there is *egel*, which denotes a *calf* or *steer*; the usual Hebrew word for a *bull* or *bullock* is *par*), and (2) that since Joseph's glory is pictured in a bullock (Deut. 33: 17—but the Hebrew word for bullock here is not even *egel*, but *showr*), and since Joseph was Ephraim and since Ephraim is (supposedly) British-Israel, therefore Ephraim is John Bull! And they point to another proof (?)—the ancient Britons worshiped the bull! Such a silly argument might be used to prove that the Hindus, who also worship the bull, are a part of Israel! And why not include ancient Egypt, with their sacred bull Apis?

Another outstanding etymological blunder is found in the claim that the word *British* is derived from the Hebrew words *brith* (covenant) and *ish* (man). Thus, according to Anglo-Israelism, every Britisher is a *Brith-ish*, a *covenant man*. Factually, the British Isles were originally called

Barantanic, which means *tin islands*, because large quantities of tin came from England's Cornwall mines. The word *British* is derived from this word.

Still more *foolish* is the claim that the word *Saxon* is of Hebrew origin, that it means *Isaac's son*, and that each Britisher is an Isaac-son. The Anglo-Israelites explain (*e.g.*, in US&BCP, p. 116) that "the House of Israel not only was to lose its identity, but its name. It was to be called by a new name, since they no longer were to know their identity as Israel, as God said plainly in Isaiah 62: 2, referring to these latter days, and to the millennium."

Thus they misapply another Scripture, by ascribing to themselves the promise of the "new name, which the LORD shall name" (Isa. 62: 2) and which refers to the new (Divine) nature (2 Pet. 1: 4) and office that Jehovah Himself gives to the Church in the First Resurrection (Rev. 20: 4, 6), the "new name written, which *no man knoweth* saving he that receiveth it" (Rev. 2: 17). Instead of this new name, they work out a deceptive counterfeit and derive the name "Saxons," a name "which *every man knoweth*." They lay hold of Rom. 9: 7; Heb. 11: 18 and Amos 7: 16, the last of which speaks of "the house of Isaac," and from these texts they construct their "new name"—[I]SAAC'S sons, in which they find SAXONS as a contracted form. Of this claim a prominent Hebrew authority states: "Anyone claiming correspondence between the Hebrew term *Isaac's son* and *Saxon* is woefully ignorant of the Hebrew. Isaac in Hebrew is *Yitshak*, and *son* is *ben*. *Isaac's son* is *Ben Yitshak*. A religious system that seeks to justify its claims by an appeal to resemblances in words of different languages succeeds only in displaying the poverty of its proofs."

Incidentally, *Samurai*, the name of the ancient Japanese military caste, sounds much like *Samaria*, which was the capital of the ten tribes. Should the Japanese therefore be traced to Israel? No less far-fetched and fantastic is the Anglo-Israel claim that the "Jerrys" of Ireland are named for Jeremiah and the "Davies" of Wales and Scotland for David, that "the harp that hung in Tara's hall" was the harp of David, that "Union Jack" is derived from the "*union of Jacob*" and that the Scottish plaids and kilts hark back to Joseph's coat of many colors!

According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, "Modern ethnography does not confirm in any way the identification of the Irish with a Semitic people; while the English can be traced back to the Scandinavians, of whom there is no trace in Mesopotamia at any period of history. English is a branch of the Aryan stock of languages, and has no connection with Hebrew." And according to Dr. U.H. Parker, professor of Hebrew at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, "There are hardly more than two dozen words, exclusive of Bible names, in the English vocabulary, which can be traced to Hebrew roots. Nearly every one of the handful of Hebrew words we do have, came to us via the Greeks, and might more reasonably be credited to the Phoenicians than to the Hebrews."

As shown in Item (9) of their creed, the Anglo-Israelites claim that the ten tribes came from Assyria to Europe, and thence to the British Isles. They claim also (US&BCP, p. 117) that some traveled there in ships, because "it is recorded that 'Dan abode in ships' (Judges 5: 17)." As "proof" of the tribe of Dan's alleged journeying, they lay hold on any name that has in it *Dan*, *Den*, *Don* or *Dun*, such as *Dardanelles*, *Danube*, *Denmark*, *Donegal*, *Londonderry*, *Dundee* and

Dunsmore. Such "proof" is indeed flimsy and far-fetched! Since the Anglo-Israelites emphasize so greatly the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, it is indeed strange that their alleged journeyings and the journeyings of other tribes among the ten tribes are not similarly marked. And if reference to ships has any significance, why single out the tribe of Dan, when of Zebulun so much more is said in this respect? Note Gen. 49: 13: "Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea; and he shall be for an haven of ships." And why should not Zebulun therefore represent Britain, once the greatest sea-going nation in the world?

APPEAL TO LEGENDS, TRADITIONS, ETC.

It is claimed also—Item (9) of their creed—that Jeremiah saved a daughter of king Zedekiah, Tamar (Tea) Tephi, from captivity and sailed with her to Ireland, that the king of Ireland's son, later called Herremon, supposedly of the tribe of Judah, married her, whence the claim that the present reigning house of England is sitting on the "throne of David among God's people Israel." Surely believers in God's Word would not question that "the king's daughters" were spared (Jer. 41: 10; 43: 6); but the Bible is silent as to what became of Jeremiah, Baruch and these daughters. There is no real proof—nothing at all in the Bible or from any other reliable source—to show that they ever left Egypt, or ever came to Ireland. Therefore the Anglo-Israelites, in order to maintain their theories, must obey (?) God's Word in reverse and establish their faith, not in the "power of God," but in the "wisdom of men"—which is "foolishness with God" (1 Cor. 2: 5; 3: 19).

Herbert W. Armstrong, in *US&BCP*, p. 118, appeals to "the ancient annals, legends, and history of Ireland," though he admits that "the real ancient history of Ireland is very extensive, though colored with some legend." He then proceeds to "throw out that which is obviously legendary" but retains that which to him is not so *obviously* legendary, and from this mass of legendary uncertainty he lays hold of what he can use to support the Anglo-Israel fabrication—the idol set up for worship. Thus he refers to the legendary name Tea-Tephi—a name not found in the Bible—as the supposed name of one of Zedekiah's daughters, who supposedly came to Ireland, supposedly with Jeremiah, an "elderly white-haired patriarch," who in Irish tradition came to Ireland in ancient times. Mr. Armstrong states (p. 121): "Beside the royal family, Jeremiah brought with them some remarkable things, including a harp, an ark, and a wonderful stone called 'lia-fail,' or 'stone of destiny.'" On the basis of such uncertainties and speculations much of the Anglo-Israel "faith" is supported.

Regarding "lia-fail," Mr. Armstrong remarks that "a peculiar coincidence (?) is that Hebrew reads from right to left, while English reads from left to right. Read this name either way—and it is still 'lia-fail.'" Many English words, such as *level*, *refer*, *rotor* and *madam*, read the same either right to left or left to right, but this has nothing to do with Hebrew origin. Is Mr. Armstrong claiming a Hebrew origin for "lia-fail"? One might well ask the Anglo-Israelites the question—very embarrassing to them: What caused Israel to lose the Hebrew language, written from right to left, and invent an entirely new language and write it from left to right, the opposite direction, within 700 years, between the time of the captivity of the northern kingdom of Israel and Julius Caesar's day?

THE CORONATION STONE

And what a fanciful absurdity is found in the Anglo-Israel fable concerning the coronation stone of England! It is supposed to have been the stone that Jacob used as a pillow when he had his vision at Luz, which he renamed Bethel (*house of God*; Gen. 28: 10-19). Without the least scrap of Biblical or historical evidence, it is claimed that Jacob carried this heavy stone with him in all his wanderings and eventually gave it to one of his sons, that it was carried from place to place in Israel's wanderings, that it was preserved from generation to generation, and that at the time of Zedekiah's overthrow it passed into the hands of Jeremiah, who carried it with him to Ireland! Allegedly, it was taken later to Scotland and placed beneath the coronation chair in Scone Abbey—whence its name, the Stone of Scone—and finally was transported to England, where it was placed beneath the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey. Mr. Armstrong in *US&BCP*, p. 121, says, "A sign beside it labels it 'Jacob's pillar-stone' (Genesis 28: 18)."

Much has been made over this stone. The Destiny Publishers have published a tenth edition of *The Lost Tribes of Israel*, by the late Reader Harris, an ardent Anglo-Israelite. On p. 42 he struggles with the Scriptures to try to make it appear that in Gen. 49: 24 "the stone of Israel" does not refer to the Shepherd of Israel, but "perhaps the meaning of the passage is that Joseph's sons were to take charge of the stone, which would be to them a symbol of the Shepherd of Israel. ... Evidently a stone or piece of rock was brought out of Egypt by the Israelites at the time of the Exodus when Joseph's bones were carried by them out of Egypt; and this may have been what Paul referred to in 1 Cor. 10: 4: 'The Rock that followed them.'" Nor is he hindered in this contradiction of the teachings of God's Word by the Apostle's specification of that Rock as "spiritual," and his explanation that "that Rock was Christ." Reader Harris even adds: "Perhaps this very stone was the one which Moses struck, for 'the rock that followed them' must have been a moving rock." Thus he seeks to exalt the material "Stone of Scone" against "that spiritual Rock"—"Christ"! With this he joins other Anglo-Israelites in "making the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition" (Matt. 15: 6).

Another Anglo-Israelite, a "Professor" Odlum, referring to Bethel as the House of God and to Jacob's Pillar as the "Stone of Scone," makes this ridiculous claim: "The spiritual rock that followed Israel was Christ. ... It was God, and not Christ, who went ahead. ... The only official house of God, accepted by God and His chosen people, followed Israel. Hence Christ followed, because He was in His house, 'the house of God.' And it was the proper place for Christ to be. He, the spiritual rock, was in His rock house of God, viz., with Jacob's pillar. ... So in after-ages He could say He was the rock. He had been the spiritual rock inhabiting the material rock (God's house for forty years in the wilderness). Just as He inhabited the material rock for a long period of time, so He at the end came to inhabit the larger and more important Material Rock, the Rock Nation of Israel, Britain; and He is in this Kingdom, David's stone kingdom."

On this absurd statement, W. Lamb in his book *Anglo-Israelism, True or False?* comments: "I can only say that never have I come across error so absurd and yet so dangerous in its possible

implications. ... The meaning of all this kind of expression is that the grim, grey-looking piece of Scottish sandstone which lies under the Coronation Chair over there in Westminster Abbey, is really God's house even now"; and he goes on to show clearly that the "spiritual Rock" had nothing to do with Jacob's stone but according to 1 Cor. 10: 4 refers to Christ, and that the only house of God that exists during the Gospel Age is "a spiritual house," made up of "spiritual stones" (1 Pet. 2: 4, 5).

The Anglo-Israelites claim that the "Stone of Scone" could not possibly have come originally from the British Isles, that no similar rock has ever been discovered in Ireland, but that rocks of a similar type are to be found in Palestine. But C. F. Davidson, a well-known authority, gives the geological evidence (1) that there is "no authority for the view" that this stone originated in Palestine, and (2) that the "whole balance of evidence thereupon is in favor of the Stone having been quarried somewhere in the east of Perthshire, or in southern Scotland, probably not far from the ancient seat of the Pictish monarchy of Scone; ... from this study, the Coronation Stone is seen to agree most closely in lithology with sandstones of Lower Old Red Sandstone from Scotland." In other words, it is only an ordinary Scottish rock!

"ELIZABETH: NAME OF DESTINY" (?)

Of course, much was made over Queen Elizabeth II's coronation in 1953, and many ridiculous claims were made in this connection by some Anglo-Israelites. *E.g.*, in the May 1953 *Destiny* magazine appeared the following by Rev. James Haggart, in his article "Elizabeth: Name of Destiny":

"Many will know that she is the rightful heir to the throne of King David and that she will be seated upon the Stone of Destiny, as King David was, when she receives the crown upon her head. For the symbol most significant in the coronation ceremony will be the famed 'Stone of Scone,' which is fitted into the seat of the throne chair. This stone will be the same stone upon which Jacob laid his head when he had the dream of the angels of God descending on a ladder out of heaven."

Mr. Haggart then proceeds to trace the usual Anglo-Israel fictitious account of Jacob's pillar stone, its supposed conveyance to Ireland and the later legendary and historical story of its experiences, and then, after emphasizing its supposed significance, refers to the prophecy in Luke 1: 30-33 and emphasizes the statement that God will give unto Jesus "the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of *Jacob* (Beth-el) for ever." But now note his wild conclusion: "At the time that Jesus was born, the stone of Beth-el had been removed from Jerusalem. It was hidden away in northern Ireland, according to God's plan. It was not yet the hour for Jesus to claim the throne of His father David or else the stone would have been in Palestine"!

It would seem that Jesus in His Second Advent should not, according to this Reverend (?) gentleman, come "having on his head a golden crown" (Rev. 14: 14), but should of necessity first

proceed to Westminster Abbey in London and there sit on the coronation chair over the Stone of Scone, which apparently was quarried somewhere in southern Scotland, and then call upon the Archbishop of Canterbury to place the golden crown upon His head and proclaim Him "the rightful heir to the throne of King David"! Or perhaps the Anglo-Israelites should demonstrate their faith and their readiness to receive their Messiah King by taking this marvelous stone to Jerusalem, so that Jesus can reign there and there sit on that stone and thus "claim the throne of His father David" in Jerusalem (Isa. 2: 3; 46: 13; 59: 20; Jer. 3: 17; Joel 2: 32; Obad. 1: 17; Micah 4: 2, 7; Zech. 8: 3, 8), seeing that it is allegedly so necessary for this stone to be in the land of Israel for Him to reign there!

Mr. Haggart next presents a politico-religious, if not almost superstitious, discussion of Elizabeth's name, claiming that it "contains within it the words *Beth-el* and *Elijah*." He then explains: "Realizing that Elizabeth does sit upon the throne of the House of David reigning over the House of Jacob, and that Jesus, when He comes again, will take that throne, we should pay special attention to Elizabeth and to the times in which we live. Can it be assumed that Elizabeth will be the last of the sovereigns to sit upon the throne of David before He who is to be King of kings and Lord of lords returns? We may derive a clue from the meaning of her name. In English the letter *j* may easily be substituted for the letters *z* or *s*. Doing this in the first part of the name Elizabeth, we obtain 'Elija,' which is, in fact, 'Elijah.'"

With this *presto-chango* verbal acrobatic stunt he then draws some strange conclusions. He refers to Elijah's whirlwind ascent into the sky (2 Kgs. 2: 11), to the rapture of the saints (1 Thes. 4: 16, 17), to the prophecy of Malachi (Mal. 4: 5, 6) that Elijah would come before "the great and dreadful day of the LORD" and Jesus' reference to it in Matt. 11: 9-15 and His statement concerning John the Baptist, that "if ye will receive [believe] it, this is Elias [Elijah], which was for to come."

Of course, Mr. Haggart does not realize that just as John the Baptist prepared the way for Jesus' First Advent, so the Church in the flesh during the Gospel Age, as antitypical Elijah, has been preparing the way for Jesus' Second Advent; hence he tries to exalt the Anglo-Israelites in the person of Queen Elizabeth II to that position, as follows: "In a search for the meaning of the symbology hidden in the name 'Elizabeth,' then, we find in the Queen's name the name of Elijah the Prophet, who was referred to at the time of the first coming of Jesus and who, according to Malachi, is to be sent again before the second coming of the Lord. Elizabeth, having the scepter of the House of Jacob handed to her, is the chosen leader for God's people and her name has a meaning for us that cannot be ignored. From the inference we may deduce that God is telling us that the reign of Elizabeth heralds the coming of our Lord as King of kings and Lord of lords." (It is amazing how far Anglo-Israelites will go to support their theory!)

He then continues: "From the word 'Beth-el,' also contained in her name, we may surmise that her reign will mark the cleansing of Israel, for it was when he returned to Beth-el that Jacob cleansed his household of all evil. Jacob's return to God at Beth-el becomes a pattern, then, for the rededication of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to their God under the reign of their new Queen, Elizabeth II. ... The enthronement of 'Elija-beth' is a portent of many wondrous things to come."

The National Message (June 1958) stated the matter thus: "We may truthfully say that our Monarchy is sacramental. Her Majesty the Queen is the Lord's anointed as have been our monarchs (even bad monarchs!) down all the centuries. The anointing of the Queen with holy oil by the Archbishop of Canterbury (symbolizing the Holy Spirit's anointing), and the reception of Her Majesty by the people, establishes a covenant between God and nation. The anointing takes precedence over the coronation, which latter is the seal of God's acceptance of His anointed monarch; whereupon the people join in singing with heart and voice the refrain which caused the hills of Palestine to ring at the anointing of Israel's first king—*God save the king!*

"Her Majesty is thus a person set apart for a particular and exclusive purpose which no lay president could fulfill. In a true sense she is not 'one of us,' however much our egalitarian age may like to think of her as such. *She is the Lord's anointed*, and nothing can reduce her to the level of the commoner, or raise the commoner to the level of royalty. In addition to her high calling as the Empire's Queen, she has the royal blood of centuries running through her veins, and to say, as is sometimes said, that she is 'just an ordinary person' is completely untrue."

Thus on the basis of the fable of David's throne now established in England, the present queen is hailed as "The Lord's Anointed"! While we may properly honor England's Elizabeth II as one of the best monarchs that England has ever had, we should not blind ourselves to the fact that she has made some very serious mistakes (such as her visit to the Vatican and her paying homage to the pope, and thus to the great Antichrist system—see *The Time is at Hand*, Chapter 9), and that she, like all the rest of Adam's fallen race, is a sinner and in need of salvation. Noble as she is, she is not a goddess, nor the Lord's Anointed seated on the Throne of David, nor the Elijah which was to come before Christ's Second Advent, to herald His reign of peace and righteousness.

JEREMIAH'S "COMMISSION"

The Anglo-Israelites make much over Jeremiah's "commission" in Jer. 1: 4-10, where God appointed him "a prophet unto the nations" (v. 5), *to speak as God commanded* (v. 7), "to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant" (v. 10). It is claimed that Jeremiah's building and planting was fulfilled when, according to an Irish legend, with the consent of an aged prophet who brought her to Ireland, "King Herremon married an Eastern princess whose name was Tea-Tephi and who was, according to Irish legend, the daughter of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah" (*The Lost Tribes of Israel*, by Reader Harris, p. 38). Thus they claim the throne of David was continued in Britain.

But we do not need to look to the uncertainties of legend, tradition or folklore for a basis of our faith or for a fulfillment of Jeremiah's "commission." Frequently Bible verbs mean, not *to accomplish* a thing, but *to declare* it. For example, to justify or condemn often means to declare one as being just or guilty (Prov. 17: 15; Isa. 5: 23), and to remit or to retain sins means to declare them remitted or retained (John 20: 23). Thus God's prophets are set forth as actually *doing* what is enjoined upon them *to declare should be done*. In this sense they *rooted up, pulled down and*

destroyed, by declaring God's judgments, and they builded up and planted, by declaring the promises of His mercy and future blessings. For example, God said to Isaiah (6: 10): "Make the heart of this people fat ... and shut their eyes." In other words, Show them that they are stupid and blind, and that, because they have shut their eyes and hardened their hearts, God will in His judgments leave them to their hardness and darkness. Ezekiel mentions "the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city" (Ezek. 43: 3); but the marginal reading clarifies the matter: "when I came to prophesy that the city should be destroyed."

Thus God appointed Jeremiah to declare His purposes concerning the overthrow or restoration of kingdoms and nations according as they should persist in or repent of their sins (see Jer. 18: 6-10). In pursuance of these directions, Jeremiah's activities in rooting out, pulling down, destroying and throwing down nations and kingdoms were done by him, *not by doing these destructive works himself, but by declaring God's judgments, telling what God would do.* Note, for example, Jer. 25: 15-38. Surely Jeremiah did not go in person to all the nations named and make them drink from a literal cup; rather, he did as God told him to do (v. 30): "Prophecy thou against them all these words"—thus causing them to drink of the cup of God's wrath.

Similarly, when Jeremiah was told "to build, and to plant," he was not told to do so by his own hands literally; God told him to "gird up thy loins, and arise, and *speak* unto them all that I command thee" (Jer. 1: 17). Accordingly, Jeremiah prophesied messages, not only of destruction, but also of restoration. Note how wonderfully he thus built and planted in chapters 3, 30, 31, especially in 31: 27, 28, where he directly refers to his "commission" and speaks for Jehovah: "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will sow the *house of Israel* and the *house of Judah* with the seed of man, and with the seed of beast. And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I watch over them, to *build*, and to *plant*, saith the LORD." Note also Jer. 48: 47; 49: 6, 39; and 50: 4: "In those days, and in that time, saith the LORD, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the LORD their God." Jeremiah's prophecies of building and planting, like that of Ezekiel regarding the joining of the "two sticks" (Ezek. 37: 16-28), had a small, limited fulfillment when in response to Cyrus' decree the more faithful of all God's people returned to their promised land and built the temple, though their main and complete fulfillment's are still future. In uttering these prophecies for Jehovah, Jeremiah fulfilled that which he was told to do and in the manner specified (Jer. 1: 5, 7); and we do not need to consult, accept or rely on Irish legend—much of which is admittedly unreliable—in order to find the fulfillment of Jeremiah's building and planting.

ISA. 37: 31, 32 MISAPPLIED

Another Scripture misapplied to try to prove that the throne of David continues in Britain, is Isa. 37: 31, 32 (repeated in 2 Kgs. 19: 30, 31). In US&BCP, pp. 103, 108, Mr. Armstrong quotes it in reverse order: "For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of mount Zion: the zeal of the LORD of hosts shall do this. And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall *again take root downward, and bear fruit upward.*" He claims that this

prophecy was not fulfilled until years later, when after Jerusalem's fall, Jeremiah's remnant, including at least one of Zedekiah's daughters, (allegedly) took root downward in Ireland (was *replanted*) and bore fruit upward (was builded).

A text without its context often makes a pretext. Mr. Armstrong omits a discussion of the context in Isa. 37, which assures Hezekiah of God's answer to his prayer and God's rebuke of the enemy (vs. 21-29), and gives comfort and assurance in a remarkable sign (v. 30) and in God's promise that He would turn back the Assyrian enemy and save Jerusalem (vs. 33-35). According to Isa. 36: 1, 2, Sennacherib the king of Assyria "came up against all the defenced cities of Judah, and took them," and now sent his general Rabshakeh "with a great army" to threaten Jerusalem. This last and strongest fortification was doubtless crowded with refugees—the "remnant" of the house of Judah that had escaped when their "defenced cities" were taken. They now were threatened with starvation (36: 12), from which Sennacherib promised them relief if they would surrender (vs. 16, 17).

Hezekiah was strengthened in his refusal to surrender by the sign God gave him through Isaac (37: 30), by the assurance of vs. 31, 32, and by God's promise to spare the city and to disperse the enemy (vs. 33-35), which promise was fulfilled that very night (v. 36; 2 Kgs. 19: 35). The sign that the king of Assyria would be completely bridled and trouble Judea no more was: "Ye [Hezekiah and his people, whose land had been devastated by the enemy's invasion] shall eat this year such as groweth of itself; and the second [probably sabbatical] year that which springeth of the same: and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruit thereof." Thus God assured them of continued freedom of the land from interference by the Assyrian army; the Judeans could again sow and reap in peace.

So God promised (Isa. 37: 31, 32) "the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judea [see margin; *i.e.*, the remaining Judeans that had escaped and fled to Jerusalem for protection] shall again take root downward [replant], and bear fruit upward [reap bountifully and also prosper otherwise in their restored land]: for out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and [even] they that escape [will go forth] out of mount Zion [not because they defeated the enemy, but because]: the zeal of the LORD of hosts shall do this."

There is nothing in this text or its context that warrants the wild, imaginary conclusion of Mr. Armstrong and other Anglo-Israelites that this prophecy was not fulfilled until many years later, after the fall of Jerusalem, when supposedly Jeremiah through one of Zedekiah's daughters planted the throne of David in Ireland! Rather, the Scripture itself, together with Isaiah's sign and prophecy and their remarkable fulfillment, completely refutes the contrary application of this Scripture by Mr. Armstrong and his fellow Anglo-Israelites.

A "RIDDLE" AND A "PARABLE"

The Anglo-Israelites misapply also the "riddle" and "parable" of Ezek. 17, in their efforts to find something in the Scriptures to uphold their claim that Jeremiah took one of Zedekiah's daughters

(supposedly the legendary Tea-Tephi) to Ireland and thus transplanted David's throne (through the Solomonic line) into Britain. In US&BCP, pp. 107, 108, Mr. Armstrong misapplies this riddle and parable to the ten tribes only. He states: "The riddle is found in verses 3 to 10. Then, beginning verse 11, the Eternal explains its meaning." Mr. Armstrong claims that this covers "the FIRST half of Jeremiah's commission" and that "the PLANTING of David's throne ... comes in the parable, verses 22-24."

Mr. Armstrong quotes from v. 22: "I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a *tender one*, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent," and then comments: "Ah! 'A tender young twig'! The twigs of this highest branch represent the children of King Zedekiah! Certainly a tender young twig, then, represents a DAUGHTER!" He then misapplies the high mountain and the fruitfulness of the goodly cedar to Britain (as Israel), and of the legendary Tea-Tephi he says: "After this Hebrew Princess is 'planted' on the throne, now in ISRAEL—lost from view—that throne is to BEAR FRUIT. She is to marry, have children, and her sons are to continue David's dynasty!"

Thus again Mr. Armstrong erects a counterfeit image and misapplies to Britain and his counterfeit line of David to sit on David's throne, that which Scripturally applies to Christ's Kingdom soon to be established on earth and to Jesus Himself as the fruitful Branch who will bring blessings to all the families of the earth.

Let us now see how wonderfully this riddle and its parabolic explanation harmonizes with all the other teachings of God's Word and illustrates most beautifully the coming Kingdom blessings promised in the foundational Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 12: 1-3; 22: 15-18; 26: 4; 28: 14; Gal. 3: 8, 16, 29)—the Gospel message as set forth from Genesis to Revelation.

We note first, however, that Mr. Armstrong's premise, that Ezekiel's message was to the ten tribes only, is not true. He quotes Ezek. 17: 12 as follows: "Say now to the rebellious house [God says—the 'rebellious house' being Ten-Tribed ISRAEL (Ezek. 12: 9), to whom Ezekiel is sent a prophet (Ezek. 2: 3; 3: 1, etc.)] ..." Furthermore, he says that the prophetic message of Ezek. 17 "is addressed, NOT to Judah, the Jews, but to the House of Israel," that "it is a message to give light to the lost Ten-Tribed House of ISRAEL in these last days!"

As to "the rebellious house," Ezekiel had just declared in chapter 16 a message to the two-tribed kingdom (Jerusalem, vs. 2, 3), stating that they were even more corrupt and abominable than ten-tribed Israel (Samaria, vs. 46, 47, 51, 52). The whole twelve tribes were a rebellious house (2: 3; 12: 9, 10; 20: 8, 13, 21).

Ezekiel, a priest (Ezek. 1: 3), was one of those who went into exile with thousands from the higher classes of the two tribes, including their king Jehoiachin (2 Kgs. 24: 14-16). God told Ezekiel, "I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel" (Ezek. 3: 17; 33: 7)—all twelve tribes, for many of his messages were especially for Zedekiah and the Jews still in Judea (see, e.g., Ezek. 4; 5; 8; 9; 21; 33: 21-29). Sometimes the elders of *Israel* in general (representing the twelve tribes) consulted with Ezekiel (14: 1; 20: 1), and the messages then pertained to all twelve tribes; but

when the elders of *Judah* came (8: 1), the message was distinctly for Judah—that portion of the people whose exile Ezekiel shared and those still in Judea.

This message to "the elders of Judah" covered several chapters. It contained a review of the conditions of the people of Judah—both of those still in Judea and of the thousands of Jews who had come with Ezekiel into Chaldea as exiles. The prophet is transported in vision to the temple in Jerusalem, and sees the abominations practiced there (Ezek. 8) and the punishment of all except those who had received God's mark (9). He sees the glory of Jehovah depart from the temple (10), punishment fall upon the princes, and the glory of Jehovah leave the city (11; note that in vs. 5 and 13 the people in Judea are called "house of *Israel*" and "the remnant of *Israel*"; compare 9: 8, 9). After this vision ended, Ezekiel by a symbolical act expresses to his fellow exiles the coming removal of their countrymen from Jerusalem and the land of Israel, and the doom of Zedekiah, the profane wicked prince of Israel (12; note vs. 12, 13; compare Jer. 52: 7-11); and he warns against false prophets and prophetesses, whether in Jerusalem or in Chaldea, who were holding out false hopes that the city would be spared (13).

Josephus tells us (Antiq. X, Chap. VII) that Ezekiel sent this prophecy to Jerusalem, and that Zedekiah was confused, because Ezekiel said "that Zedekiah should not see Babylon, while Jeremiah said to him [Jer. 32: 4, 5; 34: 3] that the king of Babylon should carry him away thither in bonds." Zedekiah therefore rejected them both as not speaking the truth. Both prophecies, however, were true and were fulfilled exactly (2 Kgs. 25: 4-7; Jer. 52: 7-11).

THE SCRIPTURAL APPLICATION

Let us be rid of the Anglo-Israel nonsense that Ezekiel was sent as a prophet only to ten-tribed Israel, and that Judah, the Jews, were not included. Now let us consider Ezek. 17 and its wonderful message. Vs. 1-10 contain the riddle; vs. 11-21, the interpretation and application of it to Zedekiah; and vs. 22-24, the promise of the Messianic Kingdom.

Ezekiel put forth this riddle, and spoke this parable, to the whole house of Israel (v. 2), including exiled representatives of Judah, of which people he had just been speaking (16: 2, 3). The great eagle with great wings and long pinions (v. 3) represents the great king Nebuchadnezzar (v. 12), who swept victoriously over widely distant lands (compare Isa. 46: 11; Jer. 48: 40; 49: 22); the *diverse colors* suggest that his subjects were of various races and tongues. He came to Jerusalem, here called *Lebanon* because it is the proper home of the cedar. The *highest branch* (*topshoot*) is Jehoiachin, and the *young twigs*, carried into a land of traffic, a city of merchants (v. 4), are Jehoiachin's children and the princes led with him to Babylon, the great center of commerce (v. 12).

Nebuchadnezzar took also of the seed of the land (v. 5), Zedekiah the king's uncle, a native prince, in contrast to a foreign Babylonian governor, and took an oath of him (v. 13). He did not plant this shoot like a cedar on top of a mountain, but in low ground, by great waters, like a willow tree, that the kingdom might be base and subject to him (v. 14). This planting became a spreading

vine of low stature, spreading out its branches in all directions, though Nebuchadnezzar's object in planting it was that its branches would turn unto him and that its roots would be under him (v. 6).

Another great eagle (v. 7), the king of Egypt (v. 15), also had large wings and many feathers, *i.e.*, a widespread and powerful kingdom, though less so than Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. The vine representing Zedekiah bent its roots and shot forth its branches toward the king of Egypt, that he might water it where it was planted; Zedekiah was rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar, to whom he owed his very position, in sending to Egypt for horses and much people (v. 15). If Zedekiah had remained quiet under Nebuchadnezzar, as a hanging vine well watered, his government might have continued and prospered (vs. 8, 14), but now, Shall it prosper? Shall not Nebuchadnezzar uproot and cut off this planting he made? (v. 9); for how can he escape who thus breaks his vow of allegiance? (v. 15); the king of Babylon, who had made him king, would surely uproot him and take him to Babylon, where he would die (v. 16).

Thus the low vine "shall wither in all the leaves of her spring [springing, growth]" (v. 9); and (ASV) "not by a strong arm or much people can it be raised from the roots thereof." "Neither shall Pharaoh with his mighty army" help him in the war (v. 17), "seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant," to which he had given his hand in a pledge of fidelity (v. 18). Zedekiah had made a solemn oath with Nebuchadnezzar in the name of Jehovah his God, upon whose throne he sat as king over Israel (1 Chron. 28: 5; 29: 23) and as God's representative. By despising what was thus representatively "the oath of God" (Eccles. 8: 2) and by breaking the covenant he had made with Nebuchadnezzar, he had brought reproach on the name of the God of Israel. Therefore God solemnly averred, "Surely mine oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head" (v. 19); "I will bring him to Babylon, and will plead with [Hebrew, *shaphat, judge, punish*] him there for his trespass that he hath trespassed against me" (v. 20). Those fleeing with him would not escape death, and those remaining would be scattered in all directions (v. 21; compare 12: 12-16).

THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM PROMISED

Vs. 22-24 describe the planting of the true twig of the stem of David. God says (v. 22), "I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it" (KJV), or, more literally, "I myself will take a sprig from the lofty top of the cedar, and will set it out" (RSV; compare Keil and The Jewish Publication Society translations). The next clause is a parallelism, giving the same thought in different words: "I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent [or, a high and lofty mountain]."

Who is this sprig, this tender twig or shoot? Surely it could not be of Zedekiah, including one of his daughters, as the Anglo-Israelites claim. In US&BCP, p. 108, Mr. Armstrong with his customary wresting and twisting of the Scriptures and his brilliant jugglery sets Zedekiah on top of the cedar tree as its highest branch, whereas the Bible describes him merely as "of the seed of the land" and "a spreading vine of low stature" that "shot forth sprigs" (vs. 5, 6).

It was not one of these sprigs that God took for planting, but a sprig from the lofty top of the cedar. Furthermore, God said (vs. 9, 10) that "when the east wind toucheth it [the vine of low stature; Nebuchadnezzar came from Assyria, the East, to wreak vengeance]" it shall wither in all its leaves; for he shall "pull up the roots thereof, and cut off the fruit thereof, that it wither" beyond recovery—for "not by a strong arm or much people can it be raised from the roots thereof" (ASV)—"shall it not UTTERLY wither?" How positively God puts the matter! The Solomonic *regal* government shall be no more restored (in Ireland or any place else). Zedekiah shall be its *last monarch*, and the Solomonic dynasty shall finally terminate with him—utterly withered, pulled up by the roots, beyond recovery.

But God promises to raise up another monarchy, for which He takes a sprig, a young twig or scion, from the lofty top of the cedar, the rightful representative of the royal house of David (compare Gen. 49: 10; Ezek. 21: 25-27). Jesus came as "a tender plant" (Isa. 53: 2; 11: 1), not only tender as a young shoot from David's line, but tender also in the same sense in which David and Solomon were tender in their want of strength for the proper administration of such a government (2 Sam. 3: 39; 1 Kgs. 3: 7; 1 Chron. 22: 5; 29: 1; Prov. 4: 3). God planted this scion upon "a high and lofty mountain" (v. 22): "in the mountain of the height of Israel" (v. 23), "in mine holy mountain" (20: 40); "I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion—the seat and center of the Kingdom of God (Psa. 2: 6). How sacrilegious are the Anglo-Israelites in applying this Messianic promise to the legendary Tea-Tephi, supposedly a daughter of Zedekiah, the last monarch of the rejected Solomonic line! They are thus guilty of substituting her for the Messiah Himself!

The branch that God planted in His holy mountain, His Kingdom, was to "bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar: and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing [of every race, color and tongue]" (v. 23; Isa. 2: 2-4; 4: 2; Jer. 23: 5, 6; 33: 15; Zech. 3: 8; 6: 12).

During Christ's Millennial Reign (Acts 3: 19-23; Rev. 20: 1-4, 6) all of earth's great ones (trees of the field, v. 24) shall know that Jehovah has brought down the high tree and dried up the green tree (the Solomonic line) and has exalted the low tree and made the dry tree (the Nathan line of David and its Branch Jesus, to whom God gives "the throne of his father David"; Luke 1: 32, 46-55; Isa. 53: 1-12; 54: 1-17; 62: 1-7), from which He and His precious Bride, the Church, "the Lamb's wife," as the Spiritual Seed of Abraham will bless all the families of the earth (Rev. 3: 21; 19: 7; 21: 1-5, 9, 10; 22: 17).

Anglo-Israelism

Chapter 2

SOLOMONIC DYNASTY ENDED WITH ZEDEKIAH

Zedekiah's overthrow marked the full end of the Solomonic dynasty; it was not to continue in Jerusalem, Ireland or anywhere else. The overthrow is graphically described in Ezek. 21: 25-27, where God addresses Zedekiah thus: "Thou, profane wicked prince of Israel [the ten tribes as distinct from the two are not referred to here] ... Remove the diadem, and take off the crown [the active power to rule, along with the dominion] this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. [After the crown of Israel, or Judah, was thus transferred to Babylonia, there were still three more transfers to be made:] I will overturn [to Medo-Persia], overturn [to Greece], overturn [to Rome—see Dan. 2: 31-45] it: and it [the crown] shall be no more [or, *shall not belong (to anyone)*—Leeser's translation; it would not belong to any daughter of Zedekiah, nor would it be given to any descendant of King Coniah (Jehoiachin) the son of Jehoiakim (Jer. 22: 24, 25; 2 Chron. 36: 9, 10; Matt. 1: 11, 12), for he was written childless so far as any of his seed 'sitting upon the throne of David' was concerned (Jer. 22: 30); the crown was not to be given to anyone], until he come whose right it is; and I will give it [the crown that fell from Judah's head as represented in Zedekiah (Lam. 1: 3; 5: 16)] him."

The crown (the active power to rule, with the dominion) was turned over to the Gentiles at Zedekiah's uncrowning in 607 B.C., when their "seven times" (7 x 360 = 2520; "the times of the Gentiles"—Luke 21: 24) lease of power began, which ended in 1914 with the beginning of the World War. After Christ at His First Advent as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah" had proved Himself worthy, He obtained, under God, full authority in heaven and on earth (Rev. 5: 5; Matt. 28: 18). As the rightful crowned King of earth, Jesus in 1914 began the dispossession of the nations and their breaking into shivers (Rev. 2: 26, 27; 19: 15; Dan. 2: 35, 44).

ROYAL LINE NOT FROM JUDAH'S SON ZARAH

In further clutching at any straw that they can to float their theory, the Anglo-Israelites claim that (the legendary) King Herremon of Ireland, like the (legendary) Princess Tea-Tephi, was a descendant of Jacob's son Judah—though not through Judah's son Pharez, but through his son Zarah—and that by Herremon's (supposedly) marrying Tea-Tephi, (allegedly) a descendant of Judah through Pharez, the breach between Zarah and Pharez was healed (Gen. 38: 29). Judah had three sons by his wife Shuah and two sons by his daughter-in-law Tamar. It was necessary that the account in Gen. 38 be recorded because Judah and Tamar were progenitors of Jesus through Pharez (Luke 3: 33). Pharez was born first, thus supplanting Zarah, upon whose hand a scarlet thread had previously been bound. As the supposed progenitor of Herremon, Anglo-Israelites call Zarah "the *prince* of the scarlet thread" (as though Judah was a king!). But even if

they could prove that Herremon was descended from Zarah, this would not give him any share in God's promise to David, *for David was not of Zarah's lineage.*

Anglo-Israelites claim also that the prophecy in Ezek. 21: 26, that God would exalt the low and abase the high, was fulfilled in the casting down of Judah's line in Zedekiah (a descendant of Judah through Pharez and David) and the (supposed) exalting of Zarah's line through the marriage uniting the (legendary) Irish king (allegedly a descendant of Judah through Zarah) with a daughter of Zedekiah (another assumption). But this unscriptural application of the prophecy (a counterfeit of the true application) would accomplish nothing even if all the assumptions pertinent to the legend could be proven true, for the unconditional covenant promise that "David shall never want [lack] a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel" (Jer. 33: 17-22) was made to David, *and David was not descended from Zarah!*

How foolish therefore is the Anglo-Israel claim that the British monarch sits on David's throne! Neither of the two pertinent propositions is valid, as our examination shows: The claim that the royal line of Judah descended through a (legendary) King Herremon of Ireland (supposedly through Zarah) will not hold, *for David was not of Zarah's line.* Nor can the claim of the royal line of Judah's descent be Scripturally, reasonably and factually supported with the legend of Tea-Tephi, supposedly a daughter of Zedekiah, for even if all that is claimed for her could be shown to be true (which cannot be done), it would prove only *that she and her descendants have inherited a lost dominion; for the diadem was removed and the crown (the power to rule, along with the dominion) was taken from Zedekiah, the "profane wicked prince of Israel" and was given to the Gentiles.*

GOD'S PROMISE TO DAVID

But the Anglo-Israelites claim that Jer. 33: 17-22; 2 Sam. 7: 12-16 and other similar passages prove that the royal family of David must have continued even to our day—that there must always be an active throne (rulership) of David somewhere with one of his descendants through Solomon occupying it. They claim of course that this royal rulership is found in British royalty and that it will remain there until Jesus' Second Advent. (Mr. Armstrong, in the April 1969 issue of *The Plain Truth*, in discussing his group's archeological work in the Jerusalem area, asserted that the literal "throne of David" is "buried at the very site of our present project." Evidently he thinks it should be found so that our Lord can sit on it after His return!)

We should remember that while God's promise to David himself was unconditional (see, e.g., 2 Sam. 7: 12-16; 1 Chron. 17: 11-14; 22: 9, 10; Psa. 89: 3, 4, 19-37; 132: 11; Jer. 33: 20, 21), His promises to David's children of the Solomonic royal line were conditioned on their obedience and loyalty to Him, even as David himself testified, "That the Lord may continue his word which he spake concerning me, saying, *If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee (said he) a man on the throne of Israel*" (1 Kgs. 2: 4; compare 1 Kgs. 8: 25; 9: 4-9; 1 Chron. 22: 13; 28: 7, 9; 2 Chron. 6: 16; 7: 17-20; Psa. 132: 12). *Not having fulfilled this condition, the Solomonic line was finally deposed in the*

days of Zedekiah. But God nevertheless kept His promise to David, "that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2: 30); "of this man's seed hath God *according to his promise* raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus" (Acts 13: 23).

As to the prophecy of Jer. 33: 17-22, the advocates of Anglo-Israelism actually reverse the promise as though it meant, "David shall never want for a *throne* for a son to sit upon," whereas it simply meant that as long as God had His typical throne in Israel, a son of David (beginning with Solomon—1 Chron. 29: 23—and ending with Zedekiah) would sit on it; and when God again has a kingdom on earth (the one for which we pray, "Thy kingdom come"—Matt. 6: 10), the son of David, Jesus Christ, will sit on its throne. During the Gospel Age, God selects the Bride, the Church, to be united with Christ and to reign with Him; after this selection He rebuilds the tabernacle (the house, royalty, or dominion) of David, *which is fallen down*, and sets it up, that the remainder of mankind, the non-elect, might seek after the Lord (Acts 15: 14-17; see also Psa. 2: 8; 22: 27, 28; 45: 1-17; 72: 1-20; 110: 1; Matt. 22: 41-46; Isa. 2: 2-4; 11: 9; Luke 2: 10; John 1: 9; 12: 32; 1 Tim. 2: 3-6; 4: 10; 2 Pet. 3: 13; Rev. 21: 1-5).

The context of Jer. 33: 17-22 itself shows that the true application is *within* the house of David and that it points to Jesus Christ, "the Branch of righteousness," who "shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land" (vs. 14-16). And in vs. 25, 26, God gives outstanding assurance that He will not cast off fleshly Israel forever, nor reject His Beloved Son Jesus Christ, and the Church, His Body, from being the Davidic Seed, to be rulers over the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, when at Christ's Second Advent He causes them to return from their captivity and has mercy on them (Isa. 4: 2-4). God promised to give to Jesus "the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever" (Luke 1: 32, 33; Isa. 9: 6, 7).

"OLAM" DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN ETERNALLY

But referring to God's promise to David in 2 Sam. 7: 12-16, Mr. Armstrong (US&BCP, p. 67) states: "David's throne (v. 16) was established FOREVER in Solomon (v. 13). Observe that this nowhere says that when Christ comes, God will establish it in HIM forever. It says it was to be established FOREVER *in Solomon*."

Let us see if this conclusion is correct. The Hebrew word here translated "for ever" is *olam*, which means *concealed, i.e., the vanishing point; generally, time out of mind; hence, unto a completion, for the age, or forever, perpetual, everlasting*. Thus the word *olam* is not always used in the sense of eternal, or everlasting. For instance, in Ex. 12: 14, 17, 24, *olam* is applied to the period of time for the keeping of the feasts of the typical Passover and unleavened bread prior to the setting in of their antitypes (1 Cor. 5: 7, 8). The typical feasts were not to be kept throughout eternity, but *unto a completion, for as long as the Mosaic arrangement would last*. And in Ex. 40: 15, *olam* is applied to the Levitical priesthood: "an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations"—surely not for eternity (Heb. 7: 11-28), but *unto a completion*, at the end of the Age. The Hebrew scholar, Dr. R. Milligan, explains that *olam* and its Greek equivalent, *aion*, "are always perfectly exhaustive of the entire period or cycle to which they are

applied. If they refer simply to the period of a man's life, they exhaust it; if to an age, they exhaust it; and if to eternity, they, in like manner, exhaust it."

In harmony with this, we see that when Hannah would give her son Samuel to God for His service under the care of Eli the priest, in Shiloh, it was "that he may appear before the LORD, and there abide *for ever*" (*olam*; 1 Sam. 1: 22)—surely not everlastingly, throughout eternity, but "all the days of his life," "as long as he liveth" (vs. 11, 28). Thus the Bible explains its own use of the word *olam* here. And likewise in 1 Sam. 2: 30, God said to Eli: "I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father [see Ex. 27: 21], should walk before me *for ever* [*olam*—surely not for eternity, but all the days of their functioning as Israel's priests, *unto a finality*] but now the LORD saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed" (comp. Jer. 18: 9, 10). And of Samuel, God said: "I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind: and I will build him a sure house; and he shall walk before mine anointed *for ever* [*olam*; all his days]" (v. 35).

In 2 Sam. 7: 12-16, God promised David that He would establish the kingdom of David's son (Solomon, v. 12), that Solomon would build the temple and that the throne of his kingdom would be established *for ever* (*olam*; *unto a completion*, v. 13). While the promise to David was unconditional, it was conditioned on obedience to Solomon and his line—"If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him" (v. 14). "But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul" (v. 15). Saul's son (Jonathan) did not succeed him as king, but Solomon's son (Rehoboam) did succeed him, and God allowed Solomon's line to reign in Judea until the crown was finally taken away from it. But David's kingdom is to be unconditionally established forever (Psa. 89: 3, 4, 19-37; Luke 1: 32, 33). God through David warned Solomon that if he would forsake God, "He will cast thee off for ever" (here the connection shows that *olam* does mean *eternally*, so far as reigning is concerned; 1 Chron. 28: 7, 9; compare 1 Kgs. 2: 4; 8: 25, margin; 2 Chron. 6: 16; Psa. 132: 12). God fulfilled this promise at the time of Zedekiah's uncrowning (Ezek. 21: 25-27). Therefore even if the Anglo-Israelites could prove that the line of British monarchs now occupying the throne is descended from Zedekiah, it would but prove that their royalty is of a line that has been cast off eternally.

DAVID'S HOUSE IN "FALLEN DOWN" CONDITION UNTIL CHRIST'S SECOND ADVENT

The Bible makes it very plain that there was no royal house of David standing at the time of Jesus' First Advent, either in Israel, Britain or anywhere else. Acts 15: 14-17 (compare Amos 9: 11, 12) shows that long before the Apostles' day the royalty and dominion of David had "fallen down." This occurred in the days of Zedekiah. During the Gospel Age, God "visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name," to be engrafted into the Body of Christ in place of rejected Jews (Rom. 11). Only "*after this*" does He return His favor to fleshly Israel. THEN (v. 16), *and not before*, does He "build again the tabernacle [the house, royalty, or dominion] of David [lodged in the Christ], which is fallen down [the Anglo-Israelites' claims to the contrary notwithstanding], and build again the ruins thereof [the ruins of fleshly Israel], and set it up

[permanently]: that the residue [remainder] of men [the non-elect world of mankind] might [during the world's Thousand-year Judgment Day, the Millennial Age] seek after the Lord, and [even] all the Gentiles, upon whom [by right of purchase through Jesus' ransom-sacrifice—1 Tim. 2: 4-6] my name is called, saith the Lord."

Therefore the British throne cannot possibly be David's throne; for David's "tabernacle" (his house, royalty, dominion, throne) "is fallen down" until after the Times of the Gentiles the Lord in His Second Advent builds again its ruins (see *The Time is at Hand*, pp. 85-87).

Furthermore, another devastating blow against Anglo-Israelism is the fact that, as prophesied, there has been a long period of time when Israel (the twelve tribes) has not been "reckoned among the nations" (Num. 23: 9), in which they have remained "many days without a king, and without a prince" prior to returning to Jehovah their God and David their King, and thereafter reverencing Jehovah and His goodness "in the latter [last] days" (Hosea 3: 4, 5 ; Micah. 4: 1).

PSA. 89: 25 MISAPPLIED

Another Scripture that is misapplied to try to prove that God is perpetuating David's throne in Britain is Psa. 89: 25. In US&BCP, p. 113, Mr. Armstrong says: "When the Eternal swore to David to perpetuate his throne, He said: 'I will set his hand [sceptre] *in the sea*' (Psa. 89: 25). The throne is to be 'set,' planted, 'in the sea.'" Because Britain is surrounded by water (though near the coast of Europe), Mr. Armstrong assumes that Britain is referred to here. Thus he grievously misapplies this verse, together with other Scriptures in this connection; and he says nothing about the rest of the verse: "and his right hand in the rivers," for this does not adapt itself to his misapplication of this Scripture.

If Mr. Armstrong would read more carefully and apply the context properly he would see that v. 20 points especially to God's great Servant to come, the Messiah, God's Anointed and Beloved, the antitypical David (*David* means *Beloved*), and that in v. 27 God promises "I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth." Jesus is God's firstborn (Col. 1: 15; Rev. 3: 14), and His Kingdom will extend to "the uttermost parts of the earth" (Psa. 2: 7, 8); His power (hand—compare Ex. 3: 20; 7: 5; nothing in Psa. 89: 25 indicates a throne or scepter, as Mr. Armstrong assumes) will be established (set) Millennially among the unstable, restless masses of mankind (the sea), and His special favor (right hand—compare Psa. 16: 11) will be established in its various tributary parts.

Then regathered Israel will come to God, and He promises them (Ezek. 16: 60): "I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant [the New Covenant—Rom. 11: 27; Heb. 8: 8-13; Jer. 31: 31-34; 32: 40; Ezek. 36: 21-38]." This will be accomplished through the all-embracing Abrahamic Covenant, which in its Divine, Christ-producing features, "the sure mercies of David" (Isa. 55: 3), applies to God's Beloved, His Anointed (Matt. 3: 17; Luke 9: 35; 2 Pet. 1: 17; compare Jer. 30: 9; Ezek. 34: 23-31;

37: 24-28). That David in speaking of himself often spoke prophetically of the great antitypical David, Jesus Christ, is proved, for example, by Acts 2: 25-36; 13: 33-37.

2 SAM. 7: 10; 1 CHRON. 17: 9 MISAPPLIED

Here God promises David: "I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime." The Anglo-Israelites insist that this planting was done by Jeremiah, through Tea-Tephi, in Britain, and that "once this 'place of their own' was reached, and the throne of David planted there, *they were to move no more*. Therefore, the location of this people TODAY *is the place where Jeremiah planted David's throne* more than 2500 years ago!" (US&BCP, p. 112). Mr. Armstrong claims that the context supports this viewpoint. In quoting this Scripture, however, he (like other Anglo-Israelites) stops after the words "and move no more." Why does he avoid quoting the rest of the verse: "neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime"? Is it because this immediate context to what he quotes completely overthrows his fabrication? Indeed, it would be impossible for him to show that his "Israel people," his Ephraim and Manasseh (allegedly Britain and the U.S.), suffered no affliction from wicked people since Jeremiah's day, and especially in their recent wars!

Furthermore, God shows that this promised planting of the twelve tribes of Israel (they were all one nation when God made this promise to David) in the land that He would appoint, or ordain, for them (*i.e.*, the land that He had promised to them and their fathers—Acts 7: 2-5), would not come until centuries after Jeremiah's death. It is spoken of in Amos 9: 11-15: "*In that day* [after He has sifted the house of Israel among the nations—v. 9] will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen ... and I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel [will regather the scattered nation] ... and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the LORD thy God." Powerful enemies have repeatedly tried to destroy this new nation of Israel planted in their midst, but God has repeatedly and miraculously delivered them, for He has planted them there *to be pulled up no more*.

In Jer. 16: 14-16, God promises that for this permanent planting He would bring "the children of Israel [the twelve tribes] from the land of the north [Germany, Poland and Russia especially], and from all the lands whither he had driven them: and I will bring them again into their land [not Britain!] that I gave unto their fathers." God has been sending "fishers" with the attractive bait of Zionism to "fish" them, and has been permitting "hunters" with intent to destroy to "hunt" and fiercely persecute them; and thus He has aroused them and caused them to return to their promised land and has planted them there to stay.

REGATHERED ISRAEL INCLUDES ALL 12 TRIBES

In promising to regather the children of *Israel*, God did not refer merely to the ten tribes (sometimes called *Israel*, *Ephraim*, etc.) as distinct from the two (usually designated *Judah*), but rather to *all twelve tribes*, for all twelve tribes were represented in "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10: 6), which house was cast off in 33 A.D. That all twelve tribes are meant is clearly indicated in Isa. 11: 11, 12, where both the ten tribes as *Israel* and the two tribes as *Judah* are specified: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time [even as He did the first time, at the end of the Babylonian captivity] to recover the remnant of his people. ... 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* [all of which has been going on in recent years, but was never done before, for before their Gospel-Age dispersion the twelve tribes had never been scattered so widely]."

Also in Ezek. 36: 22, 24, God refers to *all twelve tribes* under the name of *Israel*, when He says: "Therefore say unto the house of Israel ... I will take you from among the heathen [nations], and gather you *out of all countries*, and will bring you into your own land [not Britain, but their promised land]." This regathering was to precede the full end of the Gentile nations into which God had scattered them (Jer. 30: 10, 11; 46: 27, 28), and was to be from every quarter, to make of them "one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel ... and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all ... and they shall dwell in the land ... for ever" (Ezek. 37: 21, 22, 25).

JESUS—DAVID'S SON THROUGH NATHAN

Since the Solomonic line was in Zedekiah dispossessed of the crown (the power to rule, with the dominion), and since Judah's Zarah line was not eligible to sit on the throne of David, how could Jesus inherit the throne of David and be given the crown? The answer is that when Jesus, the Son of God, was "made flesh" it was through a virgin who was descended from David, but not through the deposed line of Solomon. Joseph, through his father Jacob (Matt. 1: 16), was descended from David through Solomon (Matt. 1: 6-16), but he was not Jesus' real father. However, Mary was descended from David through Solomon's elder brother Nathan (Luke 3: 23-31; 2 Sam. 5: 14; 1 Chron. 3: 5; 14: 4). Note that in Luke 3: 23, Joseph is said to be the "son of Heli," the words "the son" being supplied by the translators (indicated in many Bibles by italics). Since Joseph was the son of Jacob we must conclude logically that he was the *son-in-law* of Heli (see margin), for which relationship there is no separate word in the original Greek.

God's selection of the virgin Mary, of the line of Nathan, to be the mother of the promised Messiah, is another proof that Solomon's line had been cast off. Solomon's elder brother Nathan would naturally have had a prior right to succeed David as Israel's king, but apparently Nathan and all his regal heirs up to the time of Christ constituted God's reserved royal line, not one of whom ever sat upon a throne, but who were nonetheless a royal line in God's program.

God gives us still another indication that He had cast off Solomon's line from the right to the throne of David and from reigning over Israel. It is found in Mary's Divinely inspired "Magnificat" of praise to God (Luke 1: 46-55) and refers directly to the prophecy in Ezek. 21: 26 of exalting the low and abasing the high: "He hath scattered the proud [the exalted Solomonic dynasty] in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty [the Solomonic line] from their seats, and exalted them of low degree [the line of lowly Nathan]" (vs. 51, 52). Thus God "helped his servant Israel [the whole 12 tribes], in remembrance of his mercy" (v. 54) and leaves no room for a daughter of Zedekiah to retain the crown for Solomon's line. How wonderfully God Himself overthrows the foolish claims of Anglo-Israelism!

From what is stated in the forepart of this treatise, it is evident that Anglo-Israelism is built largely on the unstable foundation of etymological blunders, legends, traditions, suppositions, guesswork, assumptions, twistings of and misapplications of Scriptures, *etc.* This should be ample to show any humble, sober-minded, Bible-believing person that it is grossly erroneous, and to cause him to turn away from it. But since its advocates are very emphatic in their claims that it is founded on the Bible (and some readers may need more evidence to be convinced of this theory's erroneousness), we will now refute some additional misapplications of Scriptures that they make, starting with some in Genesis.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

Gen. 12: 2: "I will make of thee a great nation." This prophecy does not refer to Britain, as Anglo-Israelism claims; for it was fulfilled literally in the great nation of the twelve tribes of fleshly Israel, especially during the reign of Solomon. In a higher sense it applies to all who "are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (*Gal. 3: 7-9*)—but especially to the Christ, Head and Body, the fruitful and holy nation of *Matt. 21: 43* and *1 Pet. 2: 9* (which obviously is not Britain).

The "great nation" in this higher sense is elaborated in *Gen. 22: 16-18*, in the Oath-bound Covenant (compare *Heb. 6: 13-20*). In a wider sense it has two aspects—the heavenly and the earthly: the seed like *the stars of heaven* (the Little Flock and the Great Multitude—*Luke 12: 32*; *2 Tim. 2: 12*; *Heb. 12: 23*; *Rev. 7: 1-17*) and the seed like *the sands of the seashore* (the Millennial Kingdom's earthly representatives: chiefly the Old Testament Worthies, from Abel to John the Baptist, of the time prior to the opening of the heavenly calling—*Psa. 45: 16*; *Isa. 32: 1*; *Matt. 11: 11*; *Heb. 11: 1-40*—but including subordinately other faith-justified, consecrated servants of God who are selected in the end of the Gospel Age after the heavenly calling is closed).

In a still wider sense the earthly seed includes also "Israel after the flesh" (partly blinded during the Gospel Age but converted at its extreme end—*Rom. 11: 25-29*; *Zech. 12: 6-14*) and the loyal Gospel-Age unconsecrated Gentile believers. These two classes will be used subordinately in blessing all the families of the earth (*Isa. 2: 2-4*; *Zech. 8: 23*; *Matt. 25: 34-40*). As "sons" in the Kingdom they and the "daughters"—the non-elect who will become believers—shall "prophesy"—declare the Divine Truth and works with rejoicing (*Joel 2: 28*; *Zeph. 3: 8, 9*; *Psa. 107:*

21, 22). God's "holy nation" (not Britain!) is truly "great," and its dominion will be throughout the earth (Psa. 72: 7, 8, 19; Dan. 2: 35, 44).

"And I [God] will make thy [Abraham's] name great." It is claimed that Britain is the only country in the world to add "Great" to its name, and that in so doing this prophecy was fulfilled. Surely such a puerile explanation would not suit any careful Bible student! It was Abraham's name, not Britain's, that God promised to make great. God gave him a great reputation, a great office and a great position among God's people. God honorably mentioned him in the New Testament, where he is called "the Friend of God" (James 2: 23), "the father of all them that believe," *etc.* This prophecy will have further fulfillment in the resurrection, when Abraham, "the heir of the world," and his seed who "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham," will take their places in God's Kingdom established on earth. His name in its wider senses will then be great and honored by mankind in general (Rom. 4: 11-13).

Gen. 15: 18: "Unto thy [Abraham's] seed have I [God] given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." It is claimed that since Britain was given suzerainty over this land, she must be Israel, the seed of Abraham. Her suzerainty, however, was short-lived. Today she is out of Palestine and out of the Suez Canal and Egypt and the rest of the Middle East, considerably discredited. She has no foothold between the River of Egypt and the River Euphrates. Furthermore, her suzerainty (which was only temporary) did not give her *possession* of the land, which *Gen. 13: 15* and *17: 8* say will be given to the seed of Abraham for an everlasting possession.

THE GATE OF THE SEED'S ENEMIES

Gen. 22: 17: "Thy [Abraham's] seed shall possess the gate of his [the seed's] enemies." Note how in Item (6) in Anglo-Israelism's creed set forth in the beginning of this treatise, this passage is applied only to the nations of Britain and the U.S. as being (allegedly) Abraham's seed and controlling certain key geographical positions on earth (their "gates"). Thus they teach contrary to God's Word, which declares (*e.g.*, in *Gal. 3: 8, 16, 26-29; 4: 26-29*) that the Seed is the Christ, Head and Body (*Eph. 1: 22, 23*), brought forth "after the Spirit," the "children of God by faith in Christ Jesus"—New Creatures (*2 Cor. 5: 17*). *Isa. 14: 1-8* also is misapplied in Item (6); for *v. 7* indicates that its fulfillment will be in Christ's coming Millennial reign of peace, when "the whole earth is at rest, and is quiet; they break forth into singing."

As to Abraham's fleshly seed, one might well inquire why the Anglo-Israelites apply the *Gen. 22: 17* statement only to Ephraim and Manasseh (allegedly representing Britain and the U.S.), and not to all of Abraham's fleshly seed—all twelve tribes, and whether the key positions were held by Britain and the U.S. for the blessing of others, or mostly for their exploitation. And why has the possession of some of their "gates" passed away, and of others become very uncertain? Are God's promises due to fail, and are they only temporary or uncertain of fulfillment? Surely not!

What is the true meaning of the "gate" in Gen. 22: 17 (comp. Psa. 127: 5, margin)? In ancient times the cities were walled for protection and strength, so walls in Bible symbols represent safety, power and protection. Thus the gate, or entrance, to a city was very important, for whoever held it controlled the city. The true seed of Abraham, "they which are of faith" (Gal. 3: 8, 16, 29), have as their enemies Satan, sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, and by nature these are entrenched in their hearts and minds. By using the strength that God supplies through Christ (Eph. 6: 10-18; Phil. 4: 13, 19) they have been able to take possession and hold the gate, or entrance, into their hearts and minds, and thus maintain control. Consequently they are fitted and prepared to assist mankind in overcoming their enemies in the coming Kingdom of God on earth.

ABRAHAM "A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS"

Gen. 17: 4-6: "Thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceedingly fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee." Referring to this, Mr. Armstrong (US&BCP, p. 24) states: "The JEWS have never been more than *one nation*. They are not, and never have been, MANY nations. ... We must look for a number of NATIONS apart from either the Church or the Jews. Amazing as it is, we must do it or deny God's promise." Thus by a perversion he tries to make it appear that we must look to the British Commonwealth of Nations for the fulfillment.

But note carefully that the promise was made *to Abraham*, and not *to "the Jews,"* as Mr. Armstrong applies it. And, considering it even from the standpoint of his fleshly seed only, and not from the standpoint of his being the father of all the seed also that are such by faith (Rom. 4: 11, 16, 17), Abraham obviously was "a father of many nations," for from him stemmed not only his descendants through Jacob—the Israelites—but also the Ishmaelites "according to their nations" (Gen. 17: 20; 25: 12-16), the Edomites (Esau's descendants), including many kings and dukes (Gen. 36), and Abraham's many children through Keturah and their families, notably the Midianites with their kings and princes (Gen. 25: 1-4; Num. 31: 8; Judges 6: 5; 7: 25; 8: 21; Isa. 60: 6).

"A NATION AND A COMPANY OF NATIONS"

Gen. 35: 11: "I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee [Jacob], and kings shall come out of thy loins." Considering this also even from the standpoint of fleshly seed only, this promise had its fulfillment in the twelve tribes stemming from his twelve sons, especially in Solomon's reign. In Gen. 48: 4, Jacob refers to this promise as meaning "a multitude of people," and surely a multitude has stemmed from him. In blessing Jacob, Isaac said: "God Almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people" (Gen. 28: 3). The Hebrew word translated *multitude* here is the same one translated *company* in Gen. 35: 11. And the Hebrew word for *nations* in Gen. 35: 11 is

translated *nations* also in Gen. 10: 5, 20, 31, 32, as respects the sons of Japheth, Ham, Shem and Noah—"after their families, in their *nations*." Eleven times the KJV translates this same word as *people*. Obviously, then, companies or assemblies of nations or peoples were quite commonplace, instead of being "completely foreign to ancient statecraft," as a prominent Anglo-Israelite claims.

The application of the prophecy of Gen. 35: 11 to the British nation and the British Commonwealth of Nations by the Anglo-Israelites is built upon the unproven premise that the Anglo-Saxons are in fact Abraham's seed. It is in reality a counterfeit of the true, future application, to the Christ, Head and Body, the true "Holy Nation," and the company of nations as they will exist after Christ's Second Advent, "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations" (Matt. 19: 28; 25: 31, 32).

When, in the earthly phase of God's Kingdom, restitution (restoration to Adamic perfection) takes place for the world of mankind (Acts 3: 19-21), and when Christ and those who are His Body members as the true primary seed, antitypical Isaac (Gal. 3: 29; 4: 28), bring blessings to all the families of the earth and offer them everlasting life (Rev. 22: 17), then *all* nations will be joined to the nation of Israel, the twelve tribes of Jacob's natural seed (Matt. 19: 28), who by that time will have accepted Christ as their Messiah and will be leading the world in righteous government. "And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain [kingdom] of the LORD, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem"; "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations [living and dead] shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest" (Micah 4: 2; Rev. 15: 4).

Thus, and thus only, will everlasting peace and righteousness be brought to mankind (Psa. 72: 3). Nothing less than this would meet the requirements of the Oath-bound Covenant. As shown also by the remainder of Psa. 72, Solomon's reign of peace is a type, or pattern, of Christ's future reign of peace on earth, when Abraham, "the father of all them that believe" (Rom. 4: 11) in that day, will in the fullest sense be "a father of many nations," even as his name signifies (Gen. 17: 4-6).

JACOB'S NAME ON EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH

Gen. 48: 16: "Let my [Jacob's] name be named on them [Ephraim and Manasseh], and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac." In US&BCP, pp. 52, 53, 77, Mr. Armstrong makes no application of the names Abraham and Isaac, but confines himself to the name of Jacob only. He says: "His name was ISRAEL. Hence, it was the descendants of THESE lads [Ephraim and Manasseh], not the descendants of Judah, or the Jews, who were named ISRAEL." "It is *they*—not the Jews—who are called ISRAEL!"

We agree that when the ten tribes were separated from the two, "the ten-tribed kingdom was the one to which the national title 'Israel' was given." But Jacob's prophecy did not exclude Judah or any of the other tribes from the use of the name Israel, nor from the use of the names Abraham and Isaac. All twelve tribes were called "the children of Israel" (Ex. 6: 13). Stephen in addressing the Jews spoke of Abraham as "*our* father Abraham" (Acts 7: 2); Paul called himself "an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin" (Rom. 11: 1; Phil. 3: 5) and did not refer only to the children of Ephraim and Manasseh when he spoke of "Abraham *our* father, as pertaining to the flesh" and "the father of *us all*" (Rom. 4: 1, 12, 16); and James, in writing to "the twelve tribes," spoke of "Abraham *our* father" (James 1: 1; 2: 21).

According to Mr. Armstrong and other Anglo-Israelites, Jesus and the Apostles did not speak correctly when they referred to the *Jews* as "Israel" and as "the house of Israel." Jesus, the son of David (Luke 1: 32, 33, 69), of the tribe of Judah (Heb. 7: 14), a Jew (John 4: 9, 22), the self-confessed "King of the Jews" (Matt. 27: 11), said "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*" (Matt. 10: 6; 15: 24). Surely Jesus considered that the Jews, as well as others of the twelve tribes of Israel, rightfully owned and were called by the name "house of Israel"; otherwise the Jews would have been excluded from His ministry. And since the Jews, as children of Israel, are rightly called "the house of Israel," the "King of the Jews" is in the same connection rightly called "the King of Israel" (Matt. 27: 37, 42; Mark 15: 26, 32; John 1: 49; 12: 12, 13). Also, in addressing Nicodemus, "a ruler of the *Jews*," Jesus called him "a master of *Israel*" (John 3: 1, 10); and in commending the faith of the Gentile centurion He said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in *Israel*" (Matt. 8: 10).

Surely Jesus, in using the term *Israel* in these and other instances, was not referring merely to Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph, who were adopted by Jacob (Israel) as his own, his name being called on them as well as upon his other sons (Gen. 48: 5, 6), but specified particularly of them (whose mother was an Egyptian) to indicate their full adoption as among his sons. Nor was Jesus by using the name *Israel* referring merely to the ten tribes as distinct from the two tribes—Mr. Armstrong and other Anglo-Israelites to the contrary notwithstanding.

EPHRAIM GREATER THAN MANASSEH

Gen. 48: 19: "He [Manasseh] also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother [Ephraim] shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude [*fulness, margin*] of nations." In the Anglo-Israel creed, Item (4) applies Ephraim to England and Manasseh to the United States, for which some far-fetched alleged proofs were given in connection with the number 13. But while these two nations did become great (the one growing into an empire by its conquest of other nations), the Anglo-Israelites apparently overlook the fact that this prophecy was already fulfilled in the increase and importance of the literal peoples of Ephraim and Manasseh. Especially after they entered and were in the land of Canaan, Ephraim became the fullness of nations (peoples) to Israel. The same Hebrew word here rendered "nations" is translated "people" in referring to the twelve tribes in Josh. 3: 17; 4: 1; 5: 6, 8; 10: 13; Judg. 2: 20, *etc.* Any map showing Canaan as divided among the tribes reveals that goodly

portions were given to the children of Joseph—Ephraim and Manasseh—on the west and also on the east of the Jordan. In all, they had about one half of Canaan, and they were multitudinous among the nations (peoples) of Israel. As Jacob prophesied, Ephraim became the greater; when the kingdom was split, this tribe became the leading tribe of the northern section, which was often called by the name Ephraim.

Note, also, how untenable the Anglo-Israel misapplication of Gen. 48: 19 really is. In his pamphlet, *The "British Israel" Cyclone*, W.J. McNaughton asks many challenging questions, among which are the following:

"If Ephraim the younger is Great Britain the older, and Manasseh the older is U.S. the younger, how is it that the U.S. younger has outstripped the British Isles in size and population [and in economic and military strength and world influence] contrary to the prophecy that Ephraim should be comparatively greater than Manasseh?

"In tracing a genealogy it is ridiculous to jump to geography. For instance, if some British explorer would clamp down the Union Jack on a group of Eskimos, would they thereby be sons of Ephraim? Would Swedish parents have Irish children in Ireland? Then, only then, can you say that sons of Ephraim who migrated to America became sons of Manasseh by crossing the Atlantic."

THE SCEPTER OF JUDAH

Gen. 49: 10: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." The Anglo-Israelites appeal also to this text in their efforts to support their theory that the royal crown and house of David in its direct line of succession did not cease with Zedekiah's uncrowning, as Ezek. 21: 25-27 plainly teaches, but that it can be traced down to the British royal crown and house, where they allege it will remain until Jesus' Second Advent. They claim that there was a "transfer of the Sceptre from the Pharez to the Zarah line," "*after Zedekiah was dethroned,*" (allegedly) at the overturning of the throne by the (legendary) marriage of Herremon and Tea-Tephi centuries before Christ (US&BCP, p. 105), and they claim (p. 34) that the Bible calls "the *spiritual* promises" the scepter.

Their definition of the scepter is misleading. We should be careful to define clearly and to distinguish properly between the "sceptre" of Gen. 49: 10 and the "crown" of Ezek. 21: 26, 27, and not confuse them with each other. As we have seen, the *crown*, as distinct from the *scepter*, signifies the *power*, or *active ability*, to rule, along with the dominion. The *scepter* symbolizes the *right*, the *authority*, or *legitimate claim*, to rule *earth's dominion*. That the definition of the scepter is correct is shown, *e.g.*, by Psa. 45: 6 (compare Heb. 1: 8), where Jesus' scepter is prophetically called "the sceptre of thy kingdom." That this includes earth's dominion is abundantly proved by such passages as Matt. 6: 10; Psa. 72: 8; Dan. 2: 35, 44; 7: 13, 14, 18, 27; Zech. 9: 9, 10; Rev. 5: 9, 10).

The scepter did not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet (loins), *until* Shiloh (the *One sent*, the Peacemaker, the Reconciler, the Lawgiver, the Deliverer) came, at His First Advent. Then the scepter departed from Judah; it was finally given to Christ, the Lion (the Strong One) of the tribe of Judah (Rev. 5: 5; Isa. 11: 1; Micah 5: 2; Rom. 1: 3; Heb. 7: 14), who kept the Law perfectly and made peace and reconciliation for iniquity by the blood of His cross. "All *authority* [see Diaglott, ASV, RSV, Young, Rotherham, etc.] in heaven and in earth," was given to Him at His resurrection (Matt. 28: 18; Eph. 1: 10, 20-23; Phil. 2: 9-11), but He, as God's Agent in His Kingdom, does not take His great *power* and begin His glorious reign until His Second Advent, His Second Presence (Rev. 11: 17, 18), at the beginning of which He comes as the crowned Reaper (Rev. 14: 14, 15), to gather His elect (Matt. 24: 31).

Thus antitypical David (Jehovah's *Beloved*), the Lion of the tribe of Judah, at His Second Advent sits on the throne of David, to which He gained the *right* at His First Advent (Luke 1: 32, 33, 69, 70; Isa. 9: 6, 7; Jer. 23: 5; 30: 9; Ezek. 34: 23, 24; Zech. 6: 12, 13). "Thy throne, O God [*O mighty One*], is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre" (Psa. 45: 6; Heb. 1: 8).

We see therefore that the Anglo-Israelites cannot through the British royal line properly claim any right to the SCEPTER, which remained in Judah *until*—and only *until*—Shiloh came at His First Advent; the tribe as such had to continue until then, though with the rest of Israel it was cast off from God's favor in the Jewish Harvest (Matt. 23: 37, 38). We see also that the Anglo-Israelites likewise have through the British royal line no right to the THRONE of David, which was lost to the Solomonic line because of disobedience and came to Jesus through the lowly line of David's son Nathan (Luke 3: 31; 1: 52). Also, they cannot legitimately lay claim to the CROWN (the power to rule and the dominion); for it was *removed* from Israel in Zedekiah's day and *turned over* to the Gentiles, "until he come [at His Second Advent] whose right [gained at His First Advent] it is; and I will give it him" (Ezek. 21: 27; see *The Time is at Hand*, pp. 81-87).

JOSEPH A FRUITFUL BOUGH

Gen. 49: 22: "Joseph is a fruitful bough ... whose branches run over the wall." In v. 1, Jacob had called his sons together, saying, "that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days"; or, as Dr. Berry correctly translates it in his interlinear text, "in after days" (compare NEB, "in days to come")—thus expressing simple futurity. This is the case also in Deut. 4: 30 and 31: 29 (translated "in the latter days") where the same Hebrew words are used in referring to days after Moses' death when Israel would experience evil. Similarly, Jacob was telling his sons future events and conditions pertaining to their posterity, some propitious and others not.

But ignoring the historic fulfillments of Jacob's prophecies which took place in the "after days" of the Jewish Age, leading up to Christ's First Advent, the Anglo-Israelites emphasize the translation "in the *last* days" in v. 1 as applying only in modern times, and that Joseph's branches ran over the wall "when they 'ran over' the geographical limits of their homeland" (*The New Jerusalem Fellowship*, No. 289, p. 21). Thus we have an inconsistent absurdity; for it was not *two* "branches" (allegedly Britain and the U.S.—which did not then yet exist) but only some of *one*

alleged "branch" (Britain) that crossed the ocean; and how absurd is the claim that some Ephraimites became sons of Manasseh merely by going over that geographical watery "wall"!

The true fulfillment is to be found in *both* (not just one) of Joseph's branches, Ephraim and Manasseh, running over the wall (barrier or boundary), by being numbered among the tribes of Israel. They were the only ones of all Jacob's grandchildren to have this honor; though their mother was an Egyptian, they were adopted by Jacob as his own sons ("let my name be named on them"—Gen. 48: 16), and they became two of the largest and most important tribes in Israel—Ephraim being the most influential of the ten tribes during their separation, and Manasseh having extensive influence and much territory on both sides of the Jordan river. Thus Joseph became very fruitful, his two branches running over the wall and growing into two tribes, whereas none of his brethren formed more than one tribe.

Anglo-Israelism

Chapter 3

THE BIRTHRIGHT

1 Chron. 5: 1, 2; "Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, (for he was the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel: and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright. For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birthright was Joseph's:)."

The Anglo-Israelites make much of this text, misapplying it to Britain and the U.S. as supposedly the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. They ignore the historic fulfillment of Reuben's birthright inheritance transferred by Jacob to Joseph (Rachel's eldest son) and through him to his two sons, and they try to make it apply, not to Joseph personally, but only to Britain and the U.S. as supposedly Joseph's sons in "the last days" of the Gospel Age (US&BCP, p. 57). They claim that the birthright inherited from Abraham is solely of "RACE, not grace," "the *material* and *national* promises"; and by contrast they set forth—as we have already noted—a very misleading definition of the scepter, namely, "the *spiritual* promises" (US&BCP, p. 34), thus excluding the right, or authority, to rule *earth's* dominion. But Christ's Kingdom is both heavenly and *earthly*.

Note carefully, however, that in the birthright the Bible includes *spiritual* as well as earthly promises, which shows the falsity of Mr. Armstrong's definition. Jacob longed for the Abrahamic Covenant birthright and its gracious promises, especially the promise that through Abraham's seed all the families of the earth would be blessed. And as we have already seen, that seed was to be *spiritual*—"as the stars of heaven," as well as earthly—"as the sand which is upon the sea shore" (Gen. 22: 17). After Esau "despised the birthright" and sold it for a "morsel of meat" (Gen. 25: 31-34; Heb. 12: 16), Jacob, thereafter its rightful owner, claimed by faith that which was rightfully his and fled after receiving Isaac's blessing, leaving all the temporal possessions for Esau. God then confirmed the Abrahamic Covenant of *Grace* to Jacob—it was all of God's *grace* (see Gen. 28: 10-15, especially v. 14), and included Covenant promises for those of the spiritual seed who would not be of his race. Of course, it was also of *race*, for God's gracious promises to Abraham involved his *race* through Isaac and Jacob and the twelve tribes of Israel as a nation, including those of the spiritual seed who would be of his natural progeny. God made the Covenant with Abraham and confirmed it "unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant"—to the "seed of Abraham," the "children of Jacob his chosen" (Psa. 105: 6-10; Gal. 3: 8, 9, 14, 16, 29).

Reuben's birthright that passed to Joseph and through him to his sons was his personal birthright as Jacob's eldest son—not that the gracious promises of the Abrahamic Covenant were exclusively his; for Jacob in bestowing blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant did not single out any one of his twelve sons but gave blessings to them all, who at his death were for the first time

called "the twelve tribes of Israel" (Gen. 49: 28). God blessed all Israel (including Reuben) as Abraham's seed, gave them His Law and made a covenant with them as a nation, typically His "holy people"—"a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth" (Deut. 14: 2; Amos 3: 2).

Reuben forfeited his birthright as Jacob's firstborn by his sin (Gen. 35: 22; 49: 4). As seen from what Esau lost by selling his birthright to Jacob, the firstborn naturally became the head or chief of his house or tribe ("be lord over thy brethren ..."; Gen. 27: 29, 37, 40). The dominion passed to Judah (Gen. 49: 10). His "prevailing" among his brethren is shown, *e.g.*, when in Moses' day the tribe of Judah considerably outnumbered all the other tribes (Num. 1); when it was given the first mention (Num. 2: 3; 7: 12; 1 Chron. 2: 3, *etc.*); and when God made Judah the vanguard of the army in the war against the Canaanites (Judg. 1: 1, 2). Also, of Judah came the chief ruler, David first (1 Chron. 28: 4), and finally, Messiah the Prince (Micah 5: 2). This honor was secured to Judah; and the reason for Judah's pre-eminence was seen when our Savior was born of the house of David (Matt. 2: 6; Luke 2: 11).

However, the birthright was Joseph's. In particular, the right of Jacob's firstborn to "a double portion" (Deut. 21: 17) was conferred on Joseph, both by the expressed will of Jacob (Gen. 48: 22) and in the actual partition of Canaan (Joshua 16 and 17). The wording in the parenthesis in 1 Chron. 5: 1, 2 explains why the sons of Joseph, to whom was transferred Reuben's birthright, *i.e.*, its privileges, were not entered into the family register of the house of Israel according to the birthright, *i.e.*, as firstborn sons. The genealogy was not reckoned after the birthright, but started with Reuben, Jacob's firstborn. Joseph's two sons—Ephraim and Manasseh—by obtaining the birthright of Jacob, became "as Reuben [Jacob's firstborn] and Simeon [his second-born]" (Gen. 48: 5), thus supplanting them, but not in the genealogy.

Joseph had also a "double portion" (two parts) of inheritance among his brethren in that two tribes descended from him, each of which—Ephraim and Manasseh—became as considerable and prominent as any one of the other tribes, except Judah. Thus the proper distinctions and the literal fulfillments leave no room for the legendary and suppositional conclusions and guesswork of Anglo-Israelism in this connection.

UNCIRCUMCISED ISRAELITES CUT OFF

According to historical records (which are much more reliable than legends and guesswork), the Angles and the Saxons were Germanic tribes. Consequently, they have none of the ethnological evidences that Israel certainly would have if they had stayed together as a separate people, as the Jews did. Therefore one of the greatest weaknesses in all the Anglo-Israel claims is the fact that the Anglo-Saxons, which they allege are the "true Israel," have not practiced fleshly circumcision. So even if it could be shown that the Anglo-Saxons now living in Britain and the U.S. were actually descended from Jacob, this would not make them heirs of the Abrahamic promises through any "birthright" legacy, unless it could also be proven that they have practiced fleshly circumcision.

Note the following terms of the Abrahamic Covenant, set forth in Gen. 17: 1-14: Vs. 10, 11 state: "This is [represents] my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: *Every man child among you shall be circumcised*. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and *it shall be a token [or, sign]* of the covenant betwixt me and you." And vs. 13, 14 state: "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, *that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.*"

Circumcision had been neglected in Israel's wilderness journey, so Joshua saw to it that every male was circumcised before they entered into the promised land and its blessings, and thus the reproach of Egypt was rolled away from them (Joshua 5: 2-9). But we do not find any record of circumcision being a practice of the Celto-Anglo-Saxon people. Even if they were of Israelitish origin (as is alleged) they could not rightfully claim any favor from God on this basis, because from the time they would have failed to perform fleshly circumcision they would have been cut off from God's people, *having broken their covenant with Him*. If the Anglo-Israelites are sincere in their professions and wish to claim the blessings of Abraham's seed according to the flesh, they should follow God's pertinent arrangements for the children of Israel and be circumcised.

But the British and kindred nations have been uncircumcised as far back as their history extends, so the Anglo-Israelites' boasting in the flesh is in vain. There is still, however, an opportunity to become of Abraham's seed in a much higher sense; for "they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. 3: 7-9, 29). "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 10: 4). "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision: but faith which worketh by love" (Gal. 5: 2-6).

In Phil. 3: 1-16 the Apostle Paul explains that though he was "circumcised the eighth day," "of the stock of Israel," *etc.*, yet he had "no confidence in the flesh"; he counted these things but loss and dross that he might win Christ. The Anglo-Israelites would do well to glory not in the flesh, but only "in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. 6: 14); for "it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing" (John 6: 63).

SABBATH-KEEPING—A PERPETUAL SIGN

Another token or sign whereby we can identify "true Israel" according to the flesh is the keeping of the Sabbath—the *seventh* day of the week. This identifying sign was given by Jehovah to mark Israel forever: "The seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God"; "The children of Israel shall *keep the Sabbath*, to observe the sabbath *throughout their generations*, for a *perpetual* covenant. *It is a sign* [the same Hebrew word that is translated *token* in Gen. 17: 11] between me and the children of Israel for ever" (Ex. 20: 10; 31: 16, 17).

The keeping of the seventh day—the weekly Sabbath—was not made obligatory on anyone until after 2,500 years of human history had passed. Then God appointed Moses as His agent to deliver Israel from Egyptian bondage and dealt with him as the typical father or representative of the Israelites. The Passover was a prominent feature of the Law, and it was instituted before the Exodus began (Ex. 12: 21-43). By accepting and obeying Moses, the Israelites in effect made a covenant to obey the laws God would give them through him. The demonstration later at Sinai was a *formal ratification* and acknowledgment of their covenant.

The observance of the Sabbath Day, *which was new to the Israelites*, was not instituted until shortly before the formal giving of the Law on tablets of stone at Sinai (Ex. 16: 1; 19: 1). The providing of manna for the Israelites afforded a most favorable opportunity for giving them an object lesson in the double supply on the *sixth* day, and none on the *seventh* day (Ex. 16: 5, 22-30). Moses' uncertainty in the case of the first transgression of the Sabbath law (Num. 15: 32-36) proves that the keeping of the Sabbath was *new*, that it had not been previously enjoined upon nor kept by them or their fathers. It was inaugurated as a *memorial* of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, in which they had no rest from their taskmasters. This is clearly stated in Deut. 5: 15: "Remember that thou wast a *servant* in the land of Egypt, and that the LORD thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* the LORD thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." The Law Covenant is continually referred to as dating from the time of the Exodus (Heb. 8: 9; Jer. 31: 32; Ezek. 20: 5, 6); and it, together with its seventh day observance, was made, not with the Gentile nations, but with Moses and with Israel only (Ex. 34: 27; Deut. 5: 2, 3; Amos 3: 2).

The Law Covenant is just as binding on non-Christian fleshly Israelites today as it ever was; for "the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth" (Rom. 7: 1). It was typed by the bondwoman Hagar, who gendered to bondage, and was cast out, with her son Ishmael. Fleshly Israel as a nation, antitypical Ishmael, will not be given everlasting life until they accept their Messiah, are forgiven their sins and are regenerated and proven faithful (Matt. 19: 28; 25: 31-40) under the New Law Covenant, which God through the Christ, Head and Body, as their Mediator, will make with all the tribes of Israel as a whole (Gal. 4: 21-31; Gen. 21: 12-19; Jer. 31: 31-34; Rom. 11: 25-32; Heb. 8: 6-13). Meanwhile "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one *that believeth*" (Rom. 10: 4). Therefore, only by actual death, or by becoming "dead to the law by the body of Christ" (Rom. 7: 1-4), by accepting Jesus as his Savior and becoming His disciple, can a fleshly Israelite now be set free from that Law Covenant.

The Apostle Paul (Heb. 4: 3-11) explains that fleshly Israel did not enter into the real *rest* or Sabbath, although many zealously observed the seventh day. He says that the reason for their failure was *unbelief* (Heb. 3: 12, 18, 19; 4: 6, 11)—that they did not exercise the *faith* by which alone the rest can be enjoyed. "We which have believed do enter into rest [and thus have a *perpetual* Sabbath]." "There remaineth therefore a rest [Greek, *sabbatismos*; margin, *keeping of a Sabbath*] to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest [the rest of heart and mind in faith, given by Christ], he also hath ceased from his *own works* [from attempts to justify himself by works], as God did from his [works—*i.e.*, as God left the work of *redemption* and recovery for

Christ to do, so we also accept Christ's finished redemptive work, and rest by faith therein, with all the obedience possible]." Those who trust in the Law Covenant or who blend its requirements with those of the Grace Covenant, the Covenant of Sacrifice (Psa. 50: 5), cannot fully enjoy this rest, which is for the consecrated Christian believers only.

The Apostle (Rom. 14: 5, 6) shows also that it is a morally indifferent thing whether we esteem one day above another or every day alike unto the Lord. For allowing themselves to be Judaized into keeping as obligatory, *days* (weekly Sabbaths), *months* (the new moons), *times* (Jewish festal seasons) and *years* (sabbatical and Jubilee years), the Apostle feared that the Galatian Christians had lost their standing before the Lord in the High Calling, and thus had made his work on them fruitless (Gal. 4: 9-11). And in Col. 2: 16, 17 he forbids Christians to allow anyone to teach them as obligatory, dietary matters (meat or drink), or Jewish days of observance—*annual* (holy days, such as the Jewish feasts of Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles), *monthly* (Num. 10: 10; 28: 11) and *weekly* (seventh-day Sabbaths), declaring them to be types, shadows of future good things (Heb. 10: 1), their substance being of Christ. We see then that these typical obligations are binding on no others than Jews—fleshly Israelites—under the Law. As to Christians, the Apostle says: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5: 4).

ANGLO-SAXONS HAVE NO SABBATH SIGN

It is rather amusing to see how the Anglo-Israelites try to get around the Sabbath-keeping obstacle and still maintain that they are of the ten tribes of Israel. The Destiny Publishers in their booklet "The Lost Tribes of Israel," by the late Reader Harris, cite Ex. 31: 16, 17 (quoted above), and explain: "The observance of a Sabbath has been given by God as a sign which shall mark Israel for ever." But in Ex. 31: 16, 17, God does not specify the keeping of "a sabbath," but specifies twice the keeping of "*the sabbath*." And, as seen above, the manna was withheld on the *seventh* day, not the *first* day. God thus shows that His Sabbath is the *seventh*, not the *first* day of the week.

It is in vain that Reader Harris claims for the Anglo-Saxons the identifying sign, saying (p. 27) that "of all the nations, Great Britain and her [former] sixty colonies and the United States of America alone observe the Christian Sabbath," and that they "alone of the nations on earth possess this sign." It is good that Christian people set apart a special day each week for general rest, fellowship and worship, be it the seventh, or the first [our Lord's resurrection day], or any other day of the week; but, as seen above, the true, antitypical "Christian Sabbath" is the rest of faith, and should be enjoyed, not just one day in seven, but every day throughout the Christian life—a *continued* rest, a *perpetual* Sabbath, like that which God Himself enjoys. (For proofs that Jesus rose on the first day, and not the seventh day, as Mr. Armstrong and other seventh-day keepers claim, please see BS 265—a copy free on request.)

On the other hand, Mr. Armstrong—advocating the Seventh Day Adventist viewpoint—also refers to Ex. 31: 17, and states (US&BCP, p. 157): "It was on *the seventh* day of that Creative week

that He [God] rested from the work of Creation. Not Sunday, the first day of the week. Only *the seventh* day of the week points back to *Creation*." And on p. 158 he says: "The Sabbath also was given as a *sign* which identifies *who* are the *people* of God and who are *not!*" Then on p. 164 we have what is to the Anglo-Israelites an embarrassing question: "But *if* the Sabbath is God's *sign* to identify His people Israel, *then WHY don't our nations keep it today?*"

To circumvent this obstacle, Mr. Armstrong bases his argument on a number of false premises and derives a number of false conclusions. He starts by saying: "The answer to that question is the answer to another: *WHY* are the Ten Tribes of the *House of Israel* called 'The *lost Ten Tribes*'?" The *true* answer to this question is that they are not so called nor allowed for anywhere in God's Word. As already seen, the ten tribes, as well as the two, were represented in the return to the promised land after the Babylonian captivity. In the New Testament the twelve tribes are referred to interchangeably by the terms Israel, Israelite and Judah, Judean (Jew). But after indulging in various falsities in this and other respects, Mr. Armstrong comes up with the following astounding conclusion (p. 166, bottom): "The *Ten Tribes*, known as the house of *Israel*, lost their identifying tag—God's Sabbath. *That is why they lost their national identity!*"

In Ex. 31: 16, 17, God makes it very plain that "the children of Israel [all twelve tribes] shall keep *the* Sabbath [the seventh, not the first day of the week], to observe *the* sabbath THROUGHOUT *their generations* [no room here for them to lose their tag for most of their generations!], for a *perpetual* covenant. *It is a sign* between me and the children of Israel *for ever*."

"Let God be true," even though others with substitutions of the first day for the seventh and with claims of lost tags of circumcision and the loss of God's Sabbath do more or less "make lies their refuge, and under falsehoods hide themselves" (Rom. 3: 4; Isa. 28: 15, 17; 59: 3, 4). The only "Israel after the flesh" on earth today, who have "observed [though imperfectly] *the Sabbath throughout their generations*," are the children of the more faithful of the twelve tribes of Israel, mostly of the tribe of Judah, who in response to Cyrus' and Artaxerxes' proclamations (Ezra 1: 1-5; 7: 11, 13, 28) went up to Jerusalem to build "the house of the LORD." For many centuries they have been known as "Jews"; and they still have the "for ever" sign of their "perpetual covenant"—namely, the keeping of God's Sabbath—the seventh day of the week. (For those desiring a more thorough and detailed study on the Bible's teaching respecting the Sabbath, we recommend our booklet "The Sabbath Day"—a copy free on request.)

THOU SHALT LEND, AND NOT BORROW

Among the many Scriptures that the Anglo-Israelites wrest out of their context and misapply to Britain and the U.S. are Deut. 8: 18; 15: 6 and 28: 12; thus they claim for themselves the promise: "Thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow." But note that in each case the promise is made to the twelve tribes of Israel *under their Law Covenant, and that only on condition of obedience*; and in each case the context warns of what punishments they would

suffer "if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day" (Deut. 28: 15).

The Anglo-Israelites are finding it more difficult to claim this promise for Britain and the U.S. in the face of their inability to pay off their tremendous war debts, their begging for mercy from their creditors, the repeated devaluations of the pound and the dollar and the threatening collapse of their monetary systems.

Identity magazine (Nov.-Dec., 1972), quotes a publication as predicting the end of the world leadership for the American dollar, as follows: "The U.S. dollar is dying as a world currency. Gold will resume its position, and then watch the [Russian] ruble. Many Western economists also believe that the gold-backed ruble will shortly replace the dollar in world trade."

ISA. 49: 6 SADLY MISAPPLIED

Another Scripture that the Anglo-Israelites wrest in the interests of furthering their fanciful theory is set forth in Item (7) of their creed, given in the forepart of this treatise. They misapply Isa. 49: 6 to "the Anglo-Saxons," most of whom surely are not truly "Christianized," nor are they God's "salvation unto the end of the earth," as they claim. Jesus Christ is God's salvation for the world; "neither is there salvation in any other" (Acts 4: 10-12). God gives Him, together with His Body members, the Church, "for a covenant of the people, to establish [*raise up*, in the Millennial restitution] the earth, to cause [the restored race of mankind] to inherit the desolate heritages [the perfect physical, mental, moral and religious endowments originally conferred on Father Adam but desolated under the curse of death resulting from his sin—Rom. 5: 12, 18, 19], that thou [the Christ, Head and Body] mayest say to the prisoners [to all the world, locked up in the prison house of Adamic death], Go forth ['all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth'—John 5: 28, 29]. ... I will also give *thee* [not the Anglo-Saxons as such] for a light [Jesus is 'the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world'—John 1: 9] to the Gentiles [nations, peoples—Gen. 22: 18], that *thou* mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth ['all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God'; 'all nations shall come and worship before thee'—Isa. 52: 10; Rev. 15: 4]" (Isa. 49: 8, 9, 6; compare Isa. 42: 1-7). It was not to the Anglo-Saxons as such, but to His disciples that Jesus said, "Ye are the light of the world" (Matt. 5: 1, 2, 14-16).

RESPONSIBILITY FOR JESUS' CRUCIFIXION

The fictitious claim of the Anglo-Israelites that they are the "ten lost tribes of Israel" naturally would include them in the responsibility for the crucifixion of our Lord; and they labor hard to exclude themselves from this responsibility and its consequences. Items (1) and (3) in their creed state that "Judah and Israel are entirely distinct and separate entities" and that "Israel had nothing to do with the crucifixion of our Lord, not being in the land, except Benjamin, who

accepted Him." If Israel was not in the land, then where did John the Baptist go in "the day of his showing unto Israel" (Luke 1: 80)?

In *The Lost Tribes of Israel*, by Reader Harris, it is stated (p. 6): "Let us understand the difference between the Jews and the lost tribes of Israel. ... The Bible is perfectly plain. When it speaks of Israel, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the ten tribes are meant. There are some few passages where the word 'Israel' undoubtedly refers, as it did originally, to the twelve tribes of Israel.

NO "TEN LOST TRIBES" IN THE BIBLE

The terms "ten lost tribes," "lost tribes" and "lost Israel" *cannot be found in the Bible, and such a thought is contrary to its teachings*. Our Lord twice used the expression "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10: 6; 15: 24); but in sending His disciples to preach to them He was not telling them to go to any lost *tribes*, for they would not have known where to find them. The "lost sheep of the house of Israel" were not lost *tribes*, but *individuals* of the twelve tribes who had wandered from the faith (1 Pet. 2: 25). It was to these that Jesus and His disciples were sent; they did not travel to distant eastern, western, or northern countries, including England, in search of any "lost tribes." The Apostle James knew nothing of ten lost tribes, so he addressed his epistle to "the *twelve* tribes which are scattered abroad" (Jas. 1: 1). And the Apostles Peter and Paul spoke of "all the house of Israel" (Acts 2: 36) and of "our twelve tribes" (Acts 26: 7), thus indicating that their whereabouts were well known. *It was common knowledge where they were!*

Mr. Harris' reservation of one case out of a hundred when the term *Israel* does not refer to the ten tribes but to the twelve tribes, is essential to the Anglo-Israel hypothesis, in order to provide a way whereby they can try to turn away from themselves as the alleged ten tribes the responsibility for Jesus' crucifixion. Note what he writes: "When the Messiah came, the Jews, or rather, the tribes of Judah and Levi, as was predicted, put Him to death, saying, 'His blood be on us, and on our children' (Matt. 27: 25), which saying has been fulfilled in terrible measure. The tribe of Benjamin seems to have taken no part in putting our Lord to death."

But if the Anglo-Israelites are really the ten tribes of Israel then they are surely a part of "all the people of Israel," responsible for the crucifixion of the only begotten Son of God and the resultant punishment that followed. In Acts 2: 22-23 the Apostle Peter says plainly that it was the "men of Israel" who took Jesus and by wicked hands crucified Him; in v. 36 he addresses "*all* the house of Israel [leaving not the slightest doubt that *all twelve tribes* are included]," and he tells them, "God hath made that same Jesus, *whom ye have crucified*, both Lord and Christ"; in Acts 3: 12-15, 17 (compare vs. 25, 26) he states unequivocally that it was the "men of Israel" who "delivered up and denied ... and killed the Prince of life"; and in Acts 4: 10 he reaffirms that it was "by *all* the people of Israel" that Jesus was crucified.

But in spite of these many plain statements of the Scriptures, the Anglo-Israelites boldly claim that "Israel had nothing to do with the crucifixion of our Lord, not being in the land"—Item (3) of

their creed. They try to put the full responsibility for Jesus' crucifixion on the tribes of Judah and Levi only. And as respects Rom. 11: 25, which plainly states that "blindness in part is happened to Israel," they claim that this does not refer to the ten tribes at all!

ALL 12 TRIBES REPRESENTED IN JUDEA

The other above-mentioned Anglo-Israelite dictum—that when the Bible "speaks of Israel, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the ten tribes are meant"—is likewise entirely untrue. Also, it is a sad mistake to think that only the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi were represented in the inhabitants of Judea at Jesus' First Advent—for *all twelve tribes were represented there*. Even in the period of the kings, after the division between the ten tribes and the two tribes, the name *Israel* did not refer exclusively to the ten tribes; for example, both Jehoshaphat and Ahaz, kings of Judah, are spoken of also as *kings of Israel* (2 Chron. 21: 2; 28: 19).

Very shortly after this division, many of the more faithful people of the ten tribes (these tribes turned away from the true worship of God into idolatry) migrated into Judea in order to hold to the true worship. In the very beginning, in the days of Rehoboam, a message came to "all Israel in Judah and Benjamin" (2 Chron. 11: 3; see also vs. 13-17). It is seen also in 2 Chron. 15, which tells of the revival that occurred in the southern kingdom (Judah) during the reign of Asa, king of Judah. People came "to him out of Israel [the ten tribes] *in abundance*, when they saw that the LORD his God was with him," and the tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh and Simeon are mentioned particularly (v. 9). They brought many animals for sacrifice and renewed their covenant with "the LORD God of Israel [in this expression, which occurs many times in the Bible, the name *Israel* always—not just one time out of a hundred—refers to all twelve tribes]" (vs. 11-14).

Also, when Hezekiah, king of Judah, held his great passover—about the time of the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel—he sent "to *all Israel* [the ten tribes] and Judah, and wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh, that they should come to the house of the LORD at Jerusalem, to keep the passover unto the LORD God of Israel [the twelve tribes]" (2 Chron. 30: 1). The messengers went "throughout *all Israel* [the ten tribes], from Beersheba even to Dan" (vs. 5, 6) and "passed from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulun: but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them. Nevertheless divers [various ones] of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulun humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem" (vs. 10, 11).

About one hundred years after the fall of the northern kingdom, Josiah, king of Judah, did a great reform work in Judah and "throughout all the land of Israel," including Manasseh, Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali; and for repairing the temple, the Levites "gathered of the hand of Manasseh and Ephraim, and of all the remnant of Israel, and of all Judah and Benjamin" (2 Chron. 34: 6, 7, 9). This does not sound much like "ten lost tribes of Israel." There was, according to this Scripture, a "remnant of Israel" still in the land, *i.e.*, those that were "left in Israel" (v. 21). And in 2 Chron. 35: 17, 18 we read that "the children of Israel that were present kept the passover at that time ... the Levites, and all Judah *and Israel* that were present."

After the 70 years' desolation of the land and the Babylonian captivity, portions of the ten tribes, as well as the two, went back to the land of Israel, though the tribe of Judah was the most largely represented. Cyrus' edict stated: "Who is there among you of all his [Jehovah's] people ... let him go up to Jerusalem ... and build the house of the LORD God of Israel" (2 Chron. 36: 23; Ezra 1: 3). Less than 55,000 cared enough to return.

"ALL WHOSE SPIRIT GOD HAD RAISED"

We read: "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, *with all them whose spirit God had raised*, to go up to build the house of the LORD which is in Jerusalem" (Ezra 1: 5). Mr. Armstrong (US&BCP, pp. 89, 90) quotes from this verse, but stops after the words "the Levites" and states: "Only those of the tribe of Judah, together with remnants of Benjamin and Levi, who constituted the house of JUDAH, returned at that time." But why did he not quote what follows—the italicized portion? Was it because the error of his statement would thus be exposed? For this last group, "all them whose spirit God had raised," *included the more faithful ones of the ten tribes*.

But Mr. Armstrong falsely claims that "the House of Israel did NOT return to Palestine with the Jews in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah" (US&BCP, p. 89), and he adds: "Jews are, truly, *men of Israel—or people of Israel*—but they are *not* of the NATION called HOUSE OF ISRAEL. ... Consequently those in Jerusalem in the time of Christ were of these three tribes [Judah, Benjamin and Levi], NOT of the House of ISRAEL." This is in direct contradiction of God's Word; for it is recorded of Anna that she was of the tribe of Asher, one of the ten tribes of *the house of Israel* (Luke 2: 36); and in Acts 2: 36 the Apostle Peter says that it was "*all the house of Israel*" that crucified the Lord. By claiming that the three tribes—Judah, Benjamin and Levi—are "NOT of the House of ISRAEL," Mr. Armstrong thus really exonerates the Jews from responsibility for Jesus' crucifixion and confines it to the ten tribes only—contrary to his own belief! How inconsistent, self-contradictory and confused some errorists really become!

Those who returned from the Babylonian captivity included "all them whose spirit God had raised." Cyrus' proclamation was addressed to the ten tribes as well as to the two—to "all his [Jehovah's] people"; for both Judah and Israel were captives in the land of Assyria (Ezek. 8: 1; 14: 1; 20: 1). The two tribes were further joined to the ten tribes in the Assyrian captivity when Nebuchadnezzar, "the king of the Chaldees," took the remnant of the two tribes to the same area, "where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia" (2 Chron. 36: 17-20). And now "all Israel" in their representatives "whose spirit God had raised" returned to their land of Israel and dwelt "in their cities" (Ezra 2: 70); "and when the seventh month was come and the children of Israel were in the cities, the people [of the twelve tribes] gathered themselves together *as one man* to Jerusalem" (3: 1). After building a house "unto the LORD God of Israel" (4: 1), "the children of Israel" made "a sin offering *for all Israel, twelve* he goats, *according to the number of the tribes of Israel*" (6: 16, 17).

Later on, Artaxerxes, king of Persia, likewise made a proclamation that "all they of the people of Israel" who wanted to go back to Jerusalem might go; and they did so (Ezra 7: 11, 13, 28). They selected *twelve* priests to carry the offering of gold and silver, made in part and received by "all Israel there present" (Ezra 8: 24, 25, 29). In their burnt offerings "unto the God of Israel" they offered "twelve bullocks for all Israel," and they offered "twelve he goats for a sin offering" (v. 35). That the ten tribes were joined to the two in their return and all together called Israel is manifest also from Ezra 9: 1; 10: 2, 5, 10; Neh. 1: 6; 2: 10; 7: 7, 61, 73; 9: 1, 2; 10: 33, 39; 11: 20; 12: 47 and 13: 3, 18.

However, in spite of all this and other Scriptural and historical evidence, J. Mountain, the Anglo-Israelite author of *The Ten Tribes—Lost and Found*, states: "Over and over again, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah limit the returned tribes to Judah, Benjamin and Levi." Arthur Pritchard, author of *The Bible and the British Race*, is somewhat more liberal and admits "there might have been a few Israelites of the other tribes mingling with them." P.W. Thompson, author of *British-Israel: The Plain Argument*, concedes even more in his admission: "When Matthew Henry said that Jerusalem was repopulated after the Babylonian captivity by 30,000 Jews and 12,000 Israelites he was probably right." The truth is that *all twelve tribes* were represented in the land from that time on and the ten tribes and two tribes were no longer considered as two kingdoms.

JEW AND ISRAELITE SYNONYMOUS TERMS

After the division of the twelve tribes of Israel, the kings of the ten tribes were called kings of Israel, and the descendants of David who ruled over Judah and Benjamin were usually (though not always, for example, 2 Chron. 21: 2; 28: 19) called kings of Judah. The name *Jew* was formed from *Judah* and indicated a subject of the kingdom of Judah. Thus for a time Jacob's descendants were called either Israelites or Jews, according to their tribal relation to one or the other kingdom. However, even then, as seen above, the application of the name *Israel* to the entire nation was never completely lost. This is seen, *e.g.*, in Jer. 31: 27-33, which points to the Millennial Age and the New Covenant, which God will make with all the twelve tribes of Israel, when all shall know Him and He will forgive their iniquity and remember their sin no more. This prophecy was made when the ten tribes, called Israel, were separate from the two, called Judah; therefore to make it clear that all twelve tribes are included in the promise of a New Covenant, both kingdoms are mentioned by name (v. 31); and after thus joining them as one, the prophecy refers to all twelve tribes by the one name *Israel* (vs. 33, 36). That the Jews are included in Israel here is confirmed by vs. 38-40, which describes places in the portion of the two tribes, in and about Jerusalem.

The term "Jews" (translated from *Yehudim*, of the tribe of Judah, *i.e.*, Judaites) appears for the first time in 2 Kings 16: 6, which describes how they were driven from Elath during the reign of Ahaz. The people of the southern kingdom are again called Jews during the reign of Hezekiah, the successor of Ahaz (2 Kgs. 18: 26). It seems from Esther 3: 6, 10; 9: 1-3 and Dan. 3: 8 that the term *Jew* was applied to all Hebrews during the captivity. That it was so applied after the captivity is clear from Ezra 4: 12; 5: 1, 5 and Neh. 1: 2; 2: 16. Young's Concordance defines a Jew as "A

descendant of Judah; in later times also an Israelite," and states: "In 2 Ki. 16: 6 this appellation is applied to the *two* tribes; in later days the *twelve* tribes."

The same general usage is found also in the New Testament, where the term Israel occurs 78 times and the term *Jew* (*Jews, Jewish, Jewry, Jewess*) 207 times. Nathaniel, "an Israelite indeed," spoke of Jesus as "the King of Israel"; and Jesus confessed that He Himself was "the King of the Jews" (John 1: 47-49; Matt. 27: 11; Mark 15: 2; Luke 23: 3). The people of Israel were called Jews, even though all twelve tribes were represented (Matt. 2: 2, 6; John 4: 22; 6: 4; 19: 14). One outstanding example proving that in Jesus' day members of the ten tribes were included among the Jews at Jerusalem is Anna the prophetess, "of the tribe of *Aser* [*Asher*]" (Luke 2: 36, 38). Above Jesus' head on the cross were the words, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews"; yet His revilers referred to Him as "the King of Israel" (Matt. 27: 37, 42; Mark 15: 26, 32).

Jesus was recognized as being a Jew (John 4: 9; Matt. 1: 1; 22: 42; Heb. 7: 14; Rev. 5: 5), yet the people hailed Him as "the King of Israel" (John 12: 13). Surely Jesus as "the King of Israel" was King, not merely of the ten tribes, nor of the two tribes, but of all twelve tribes—Israel as a whole, often called Jews. Similarly, Israel as a whole was referred to when the disciples asked Jesus, "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1: 6); they looked for all Israel (not just the ten tribes) to be redeemed (Luke 24: 21). They recognized no lost tribes, but only one Israel composed of members of the two tribes and the ten tribes, in two parts—a part dispersed among the Gentiles and a part at home in the land of Israel, which also was trodden under foot by the Gentiles, under Gentile dominion (Luke 21: 24).

Representatives of the twelve tribes were referred to as Jews and as men of Israel—the terms being used interchangeably. In commending the faith of the Gentile centurion, Jesus said: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel" (Matt. 8: 10); and in addressing Nicodemus, a "ruler of the Jews," Jesus called him "as master of Israel" (John 3: 1, 10). Surely in these two cases Jesus was referring, not to ten lost tribes in Britain or elsewhere, but to Israelites then living in the land of Israel, often called Jews. It was the "men of Israel," the "house of Israel," living in the land of Israel, that crucified our Lord (Acts 2: 22, 23, 36; 3: 12; 4: 8, 10). But these "men of Israel" are in Acts 2: 5 spoken of as "Jews" from "every nation under heaven"; they are described as "Parthians [from east of Media], and Medes, and Elamites [Susiana, a part of Persia], and the dwellers in Mesopotamia [the western part of Assyria], and in Judea, and Cappadocia [north of Syria], in Pontus [northeastern Asia Minor], and Asia [western Asia Minor], Phrygia [central Asia Minor], and Pamphylia [south central Asia Minor], in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene [in north Africa, west of Egypt], and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes [of the island southeast of Greece] and Arabians [from southeast of the Holy Land]" (Acts 2: 9-11). In view of this description, the early church obviously did not recognize any "ten lost tribes"!

The "council" and "all the senate of the children of Israel" were not in Britain but in the land of Israel (Acts 5: 21, 34, 35). In the Apostle Paul's missionary tours he ministered to "the twelve tribes scattered abroad." The synagogues of these "men of *Israel*" are sometimes referred to as "the synagogues of the *Jews*" (Acts 13: 5, 14-17, 23, 24, 42, 43, 45, 50; 14: 1, 2; 17: 1, 10, 17). Obviously the terms "men of Israel" and "Jews" were used synonymously and interchangeably.

Note that in Acts 21: 27, 28 the *Jews* from Asia called the Jews at Jerusalem "men of Israel"; and in Acts 26, Paul spoke of the *Jews* (vs. 2, 3) as consisting of "our *twelve tribes*, instantly serving God day and night" and hoping for the fulfillment of the promise that God had made to their fathers (vs. 6, 7). Surely Paul was not referring to any lost tribes of Israel in Britain, totally unaware of their identity, as earnestly serving God day and night and maintaining faith in His promises to their fathers, for history shows that the Britons were pagans before Christianity was introduced. Accordingly, when John the Baptist showed himself to Israel (Luke 1: 80), he did not have to go to Britain to do so.

Following the custom of his day of calling all Israelites Jews and using these terms interchangeably, the Apostle Paul asks: "What advantage then hath the Jew?" And he answers: "Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them [the Jews] were committed the oracles of God" (Rom. 3: 1, 2). Would our Anglo-Israelite friends have us believe that the Law and the Prophets were committed only to one of the twelve tribes and not to any of the others? Surely not! The Law was committed to Moses and the tribe of Levi, together with the other twelve tribes. They were all *Israelites*, yet Paul calls them *Jews*.

Paul, of the tribe of Benjamin, calls himself an Israelite (Rom. 11: 1; 2 Cor. 11: 22; Phil. 3: 5), and he speaks of himself also as a Jew (Acts 22: 3; Gal. 2: 15), thus using these terms interchangeably. Even to this day the term "Jew" is used to designate all the descendants of Abraham through Jacob, or Israel, and the Israelis are known as Jews. In Rom. 1: 16, Paul says that the Gospel of Christ "is the power of God unto salvation to *every one* that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek [this name represented all of the Gentiles, just as 'the Jew' represented all members of the twelve tribes—Israel as a whole; compare Rom. 2: 9, 10]." Surely Paul in mentioning only two classes here was not excluding any members of the ten tribes; for they were known as Jews. The words "*every one that believeth*" would include also believers of the ten tribes (called Jews) as well as believers of the Gentiles. So allowance is made here for only two classes: Jews and Gentiles. Thus the Bible here rules out completely any *third* classification which is neither Jew or Gentile, such as Anglo-Israelites claim for themselves.

JESUS WAS A JEW

But in the face of all these Scriptures, the Anglo-Israelites claim that Jesus was not a Jew. Here again they build their theory on tradition, misconstrued history, conjectures, misunderstandings, misapplications, and/or ignorings of ancient usages and customs. For example, Benjamin Freedman in *Common Sense*, May 1, 1959, states that "Jesus was a 'Judean,' not a 'Jew,' just as the term 'Texan' signifies a person living in Texas." What sophistry! Such an illustration is very deceptive and does not fit at all; for the term "Texan," unlike the term "Jew," does not describe either race or religion.

The Greek word translated "Jew" is *Ioudaios* (literally, a Judean, *i.e.*, one belonging to *Jehudah*, or a Judaite). Unlike the claim for a Texan, the Judaite, or Jew, did not have to be "a person living in Judea" in order to be a Jew. In fact, many Judeans, or Jews, probably never were in Judea. For

example, Aquila ("a certain *Ioudaios*"—Judean, or Jew) was born in Pontus, in Asia Minor, and came from Italy to Corinth, in Greece, "because that Claudius had commanded all Jews [Judeans] to depart from Rome" (Acts 18: 2). There is no indication whatever that Aquila, Priscilla, or others of these Jews who had lived in Rome had ever lived in Judea. Note also the Judeans, or Jews, "dwelling in Ephesus" and in Damascus (Acts 19: 17; 22: 11, 12). Did they have to live in Judea in order to be Judeans, or Jews? Surely not!

Jesus was a Judean, a Judaite, a Jew, of the tribe of Judah, regardless of where He was living. As already noted, He was descended from Judah through David, was "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1: 3), and therefore was a Judaite, a Jew. He was of the Jewish race, nationality, nativity and religion.

If we were to accept the definition that Jesus was not a Jew, but merely a Judean in the sense of living in Judea, "just as the term 'Texan' signifies a person living in Texas," then by analogy we would have to say that "the term 'Italian' signifies a person living in Italy." Thus if an African or a Chinese would move to Italy and live there he would thereby become an Italian! And if an Italian would move to China or to Egypt and live there he would thereby cease to be an Italian and would become a Chinese or an Egyptian! Pilate spoke of Jesus as "the King of the Jews," but, though living in Judea, he disclaimed that he himself was a Judean, a Jew (John 18: 33-35, 39). Let us be rid of all this Anglo-Israel nonsense about Jesus not being a Jew!

Thus we have examined in the light of the Scriptures, reason and reliable history the main arguments and many minor ones advanced by the Anglo-Israelites, and we have found that they are fanciful, far-fetched, without real basis in the Bible and history and grossly erroneous, and should therefore be rejected by true Bible believers.

As indicated at the beginning of this treatise, Anglo-Israelism emphasizes the importance of one's lineage; and its tendency is to lead away from a proper humbling of one's self. Note, *e.g.*, Mr. Armstrong's statement as to his genealogy, as given in earlier editions of US&BCP: "The writer has a copy of this chart [allegedly giving the ancestry of the British royal family], and also his own genealogy for each generation back into the line of ancient British kings, and therefore has the complete record of his genealogy through the House of David clear to Adam—believe it or not!"

(We are aware, of course, of the many serious charges that have been made recently against Mr. Herbert Armstrong and his son Garner Ted Armstrong, and that many of the prominent leaders in their movement have left as a consequence. We will not discuss these charges, however, for even if it could be proven that both men are innocent of them, their teachings on Anglo-Israelism and certain other subjects would still be just as erroneous, and they would still be very unsafe teachers to follow.)

Anglo-Israelism leads also to misapplications and misinterpretations of Scriptures that border on blasphemy. Note the following, from a current issue of *The National Message*: "The Stone Kingdom, Israel-Britain, has taken the fruits of the Sacrificed Son to the ends of the earth, in offering the open Bible that 'all families of the earth be blessed.' She will yet become the 'great

mountain and fill the earth' as promised by her Creator, Law-giver and Redeemer, the Rock and Stone in Sacrifice." What a perversion of the promises pertaining to Abraham's true seed and their fulfillment in Christ's Kingdom soon to be set up on earth!

Many earnest and devout Christians, including many who would gladly die for their Lord rather than in any way deny Him, have been and are being deceived, and others are in danger of being deceived, by the Anglo-Israelism delusion. We are now living in "the last days" when "perilous times" have come, when many, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof," as seducers, "wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (2 Tim. 3: 1, 5, 13).

God's consecrated people are to be sanctified by the Truth, the Word of God (John 17: 17). "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine" (1 Tim. 4: 16). Error can be disastrous to character and eternal life. Accordingly, our Lord warns: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ [*anointed*]; and shall deceive many. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24: 4, 5, 24).

This treatise goes forth with the prayer that the Lord will bless it and use it for the blessing of His true and faithful people, whether laboring under the Anglo-Israel deception or not, "that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" (1 Cor. 2: 5).