

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY:

Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

**A Booklet Draft Prepared for
United Church of God, An
International Association**

By

Rick Sherrod

Submitted February 1997

Author: Rick Sherrod at United-Remote
Date: 2/19/97 10:58 PM
Priority: Normal
TO: Jim B. Franks at United-Remote
TO: Scott Ashley at United-Remote
TO: Steven Andrews at United-Remote
Subject: Israel in Prophecy Booklet

----- Message Contents -----

Hello from Michigan.

Attached to this message and the two which will follow, I am sending you the booklet draft of "ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?" (my working title). This message will come with chapters 1-3; message two with chapters 4-6; and message three with chapters 7-8.

I send it with a mixture of satisfaction and disappointment. I am pleased to be done with a working document. . . but as with most projects I have done of this scope and size, I am painfully aware of the limitations of one individual to present material which is so expansive and important.

With these thoughts in mind, I want to draw your attention to some of the warts so you will be expecting them before you begin to read. Some of the feedback I received before completing the draft indicated that the information you will find in chapters 2 (about the history of the B-I movement) and 3 (regarding hermeneutics) is not of value to our undertaking. This may well be true. However, if the information (or part of it) can be used, it is there for the taking. If not, there will be a need to create some new transitions between chapters.

Another concern I have is the extensive use of quotations from authoritative outside sources. Believing it better to put in such information (which might otherwise be time consuming for our editors to find themselves), I decided to incorporate these quotes as part of the initial draft. As you encounter each quotation, please ask whether it would be more beneficial to say these things in our own words or invoke the authority of a reputable scholar. In that connection, I have tried to label the denominational affiliation of those whom I quote--a practice which might cause offense in some quarters. . . but which might also present an openness and honesty which will be appreciated by others.

On a somewhat different note, one reviewer suggested that we omit direct references to Raymond F. McNair's "American and Britain in Prophecy." This is probably the best thing to do. I chose, however, to leave these references in the draft on the assumption that if they are of value, they will be there. . . and if not, they can be easily excised.

In terms of general approach, there may be a need to recast the presentation in places to provide the reader with a stronger and more directive tour through the ideas and issues. I have framed many of the arguments in a less assertive way--yet hoping to lead the reader to the obvious conclusions with all their implications about "what I should be doing". I decided on the more subtle type of delivery in hopes that it would better suit a 21st century audience that is more well-educated and more likely to be critical of the kind of style which was appropriately used during the years which Mr. Herbert Armstrong presented the same information. If (as some messages on the Elders Forum would like) we need to blow back the hair of the reader,

then some sections (particularly the conclusions in chapter 8) will have to be vigorously strengthened.

Speaking of Mr. Armstrong, I have included some quotations from his work in my booklet draft. One individual who read through my review of December 1996 advised against such direct quotations. There is a good deal of merit to his argument: if an idea is true, we need invoke no one. My decision to include Mr. Armstrong's quotations was in large part to show where he (and we as a Church) fit into the broad stream of thought and discussion about Israel's identity in modern times. If the editors decide that the former approach better serves our interest, Mr. Armstrong's words can easily be recast on our own words.

You will also find that the document abounds with text boxes. For example, Chapter 7 contains more text box material than text content. I have no illusions that all of the material included in the text boxes is usable. Indeed, I reserved much of the highly subjective information for just this purpose, hoping that those ideas which are of lesser value can be easily dispensed with.

If there is an interest in including a short selected bibliography as part of a UCG publication, I will be happy to put something together. My B-I bibliography is over 100 pages long, and I can quickly isolate those titles which are most appropriate. If we make use of this, I recommend that we preface the bibliography with a carefully worded disclaimer distancing ourselves from wholesale support of any of the works we cite.

As an aside, I should mention that the attached files are less than error-free than I would like. This is the result of two factors. My MicroSoft Works system no longer has a functioning spell checker. Moreover, for the past seven weeks, I have been thoroughly immersed in producing the booklet draft. I fear that I am so close to the forest I may have missed seeing a few obvious trees. Hopefully, I found most of them.

At the risk of being presumptuous, I would like to make a request concerning the by-line for any forthcoming booklet. If the material in this draft is usable for a UCG publication, it is my preference that my by-line be used only if I am in the full-time employment of UCG. My request is for professional reasons and relates to my marketability in academe (which is my principal fall back position should a job in UCG fail to materialize).

Finally, as you will quickly see, a significant danger in my style is that my work tends to read in many places like a history book (sorry. . . it's a professional hazard). If the editors decide that this will work against us, we may have considerable work left before UCG can produce and publish an acceptable booklet.

As for any parting thoughts, I have tried consciously to err on the side of providing far more material that we can (or, for that matter, should) use. I've based this approach on the premise that it is easier to edit/cut out than it is to create. My apologies in advance to those editors who must now clean up what is best left unpublished. I remain willing and eager to help with the continuing development of the booklet, and need only be contacted if you would like me to do so.

Thanks for allowing me to contribute to this particular project. Best regards,

Rick Sherrod

I

“I Am Your Brother Joseph” or Who and Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

“I am Joseph!” (Gen. 45:3) (Slide #2134, 3322--“Joseph Recognized by His Brethren” by Baron Francois-Pascal Gerard (1770-1837).

Few statements could have made a more startling impact. The eleven middle-aged men already stood uncomfortably as mere merchant-traders--tenders of flocks and herds--before the most powerful prime minister in the world. Now they *truly* were astonished and speechless. Could it be? What must have passed through the minds of these shocked and frightened listeners who, incidentally, were the very ones responsible for selling this Joseph into captivity in the first place (Gen. 37:12-28)?

The last time they knowingly had seen their brother, Joseph, was impetuous and outspoken 17 year old. They had watched as he disappeared over the horizon, no doubt vigorously protesting his sale into the hands of Midianite slave-traders (Gen. 37:12-28). How could those brothers have known the incredible adventures--the remarkable ups and downs through which their younger sibling had passed during the intervening two decades?

Certainly, Joseph's experiences had been incredible: transported against his will to Egypt, the dominant “world” power of the 18th century B. C. Levant (Gen. 37:36); sold as a slave to a high-ranking Egyptian official and officer in the very court of Pharaoh (Gen. 39:1-6); gaining respectability and position in his newfound place in life, only to find himself falsely accused and whisked away to become an inmate in an Egyptian prison (Gen. 39:7-20); experiencing yet another unlikely rise in station in the midst of his incarceration to become the chief assistant of the prison warden (Gen. 39:21-23); moving literally from the prison to the palace, assuming the office of prime minister under the

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Pharaoh (Gen. 40-41); and now finally, dramatically revealing his true identity before the very brothers who had sold him into captivity over twenty years before.

A more unbelievable tale hardly could have been contrived. More significantly, Joseph's remarkable story was to become a forerunner of the precise experiences that his many descendants would undergo on a national scale over the millennia which were to follow. It is a tale which remains *in process*. One purpose of this very booklet is to make that story clear.

Meanwhile, back in the 18th century B.C. court of Pharaoh, until Joseph identified himself before his brothers, they knew nothing of the reality of his life after his enforced departure from home as the slave of a foreign people. For all they knew, he had long since died (cf. Gen. 44:28). Even if he was still alive, what chance would there have been that he had escaped the dehumanizing experience of his enslavement--of removal from the comfort of his homeland, denied the role of his father's favorite son (slides #2138 "Joseph Telling His Dream" by Rembrandt; #2133 "Joseph's Coat of Many Colors" by Ford Madox Brown) to be treated instead as chattel. Certainly, few things so remarkable have ever happened as Joseph's ascent from slavery to the prime ministership of the most powerful kingdom of the Fertile Crescent.

Why does the Bible record the story of Joseph's trials and tribulations followed by his ultimate rise to unbelievable heights? The answer is multifaceted. In Israel's traditions and history, the Joseph stories provide an interesting and captivating account of an ancient people's pedigree and lineage. At a different level, far more important to us today, the life of Joseph was an acting out, millennia in advance, of one of the most distinctive and prominent threads of Western history.

Joseph's story holds a key to locating the so-called "Lost Ten Tribes" of Israel. These Israelites disappeared from the historical record around the close of the 8th century B. C. when the Assyrian hosts largely swept them from their homeland in Palestine. More importantly, knowing the identity of Israel today equips us not only with critical

understanding of end time prophecies but also knowledge about the changes which God would require of the people of the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth nations of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United States of America.

The Abrahamic Covenant

The story begins in ancient Mesopotamia with the biblical patriarch Abraham (slide #1847), probably some time in the mid-19th century B.C. It hinges upon the most important promises and prophecies ever delivered by God to man. People even casually acquainted with the Bible are generally familiar with the monumental spiritual dimensions of God's promise to Abraham. God told the patriarch that He would make of him "a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall *all the families of the earth* be blessed" (Gen. 12:1-2--cf. Acts 2:25-26, Gal. 3:8, 16, 29).

Thus from the virtual onset of the biblical record we understand God's intention to offer *spiritual* salvation to the whole of humanity. The fulfillment of this great promise was reached at one level on Passover A. D. 31 with the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and the consequent breaking down of the wall of partition separating humankind from God (Mt. 27:51). The Christ-sacrifice made it possible for people of all the nations of the earth to enjoy a relationship with Yahweh, the God of Israel, who until that time had dealt almost exclusively with the descendants of the patriarch Jacob or Israel.

Is the spiritual dimension of the Abrahamic promise the entire story? What exactly did God mean by his promise to make of Abraham a "great nation" (v. 2)? A closer examination of God's relationship and dealings with Abraham reveals one of the most important and least understood aspects of the biblical record. From Genesis chapters 12 through 22, we find seven different passages which describe the Abrahamic Promise. In the initial account (Gen. 12:1-3), God admonishes Abraham to leave his homeland and family--a *condition* preceding the promise--for which God promised to make of Abraham a *great* nation, would bless him and would make his name great. A few verses later, we

read how God soon thereafter miraculously appeared to Abraham, promising his descendants the Land of Canaan (v. 7).

In chapter 13, the biblical narrator provides us even more details--information which implies a physical dimension tied to the Abrahamic promise. Following the dramatic account of Abraham's willingness to concede the fertile Jordan plain to his nephew Lot (v. 5-13), we see that God in turn promised *all of Canaan* to Abraham *forever* (v. 14-17). Moreover, He promised to make the still childless Abraham a father with descendants "as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered" (v. 16).

TEXT BOX:

Abraham -- Friend of God

What would it be like to be the very "friend of God"? That is what God considered the ancient patriarch Abraham (Js. 2:23). What was it about this remarkable man that so endeared him to his Creator?

Abraham was a man very much like you and me--given to human flaws and foibles (cf. Js. 5:17). Not long after God began to work directly with him, Abraham allowed *fear* and *faithlessness* to compell him to lie to preserve his own life (Gen. 12:11-13). Not once but twice, the Bible bears witness of Abraham giving in to this same temptation (20:1-2). Moreover, he grew impatient waiting on the promises of God to provide him with a child and heir (12:2, 15:5). Abraham even caved in to the pressures to solve his problem through his own culture's ancient world version of surrogate parenthood--producing a son through the handmaiden of his lawful wife (16:1-4).

As we mus to today, Abraham had to grow and overcome. He had to address his shortcomings and failings and literally become like God (Gen. 17:1, Mt. 5:48). Through

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

very personal life experiences, Abraham saw that God was good to His Word--that His Creator could be trusted to fulfill His promises.

Today, Abraham is known as a man of great faith. Among Christians everywhere he is "father of the faithful" (Rom. 4:12-21, especially v. 16). Many qualities made Abraham special to God. He was a man of instant obedience. He was willing to obey the voice of the Eternal--to *do* without question what he understood as the will of the mighty Yahweh (Gen. 12:1-4, 22:3, 26:3, 5--note also 17:23, 26 and Acts 7:8). Abraham was also a loving, compassionate, and humane man ever ready and willing to consider the interests and plight of others as well as himself (Gen. 18:23-32, 21:11, 24:32).

If Abraham exhibited a lack of faith in certain actions, he ultimately rose to meet and defeat faithlessness. He went on to a perfection in character which reflects the very image of God. Across the span of his 175 year lifetime, Abraham experienced and passed four main tests of faith, each requiring him to relinquish something which he dearly loved. His very calling (Gen. 12:1) involved the forsaking of both his homeland in the Tigris-Euphrates river valley and almost all of his extended family (many of whom tradition tells us were fully involved in the syncretistic Mesopotamian religious practices of the day). Abraham very likely left a quite comfortable lifestyle in Ur of the Chaldees (11:28, 31, 15:7, Neh. 9:7) at a time when that city was enjoying a heyday of commercial and political prestige.

Abraham's response to God's calling--his voluntary removal to a place essentially unknown to him and his family in the Land of Canaan--is a physical action which representing something important for Christians of the New Testament era. Abraham's forsaking of his homeland portrays the spiritual commitment which one makes upon acceptance of Jesus Christ as personal savior and embracing a way of life literally defined by the laws, statutes, principles, and judgments of God (cf. Rev. 18:4 and its reference to spiritual Babylon, a principle city of the Mesopotamian River valley). In both Abraham's case and our own, accepting God's calling (Jn. 6:44) requires *faith* to give up those

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft — Rick Sherrod — February 1997

things close and familiar. We exchange the comfortable present for an oftentimes precarious and uncertain sojourn into a land of promise, all the while waiting to inherit blessings which are yet to be received (Heb. 11:8-9).

Some time after Abraham's arrival in Canaan, he again demonstrated his belief in God's own faithfulness to provide. In his new and foreign setting so far from his Mesopotamian homeland, Abraham's sole fellowship with extended family was that which he enjoyed with Lot, a nephew who had accompanied him on his travels. When conflict between Abraham's herdsman and those of his nephew made dwelling together in peace an impossibility, Abraham willingly deferred to Lot, allowing him to take the preferred grasslands of the well-watered Jordan plain (Gen. 13:1-13). On a third occasion, God directed Abraham to cast out his very own offspring, Ishmael, the "child of the bondwoman" and the heir of the flesh (Gal. 4:22-31). The patriarch obediently and faithfully responded in spite of the personal pain which it caused him as a father to experience (Gen. 17:18). Abraham let go of his son, believing that God would provide for Ishmael as He had promised (v. 19-20).

Finally, in Abraham's greatest test of faith, the aged patriarch willingly took the son of promise, Isaac, to the top of Mt. Moriah. There he would have sacrificed him as a burnt offering if not for the direct intervention of God (Gen. 22:1-13). Proving his faith through his actions (Js. 2:21-24), Abraham demonstrated his willingness to give up that which was most dear to him. All the while, he believed that God would remain true to His promises (Heb. 11:17)--that if need be Jehovah-jireh (Gen. 22:14) would resurrect his fallen son to insure the fidelity of His word.

If we exhibit the faithfulness which God expects of us, we are considered nothing less than the children of Abraham (Rom. 4:16, Gal. 3:29--contrast to Jn. 8:39). And like the faithfilled patriarch, Christ will consider us as friends as well (Jn. 15:14). With that status comes a remarkable and invaluable benefit. The Savior promised His disciples:

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Ye are my friends, if you do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you (Jn. 15:14-15).

That promise can include us today. Indeed, this booklet you hold in your hands imparts an understanding unique among the followers of Jesus Christ. As a "friend of God," the Creator gives us as Christians insight into the events of the future--into the prophecies of both the Hebrew Scriptures and New Testament.

The understanding of those physical, national, and material dimensions of the Abrahamic Promise are central to opening our minds to see what lies ahead--both good and bad--for the people of Israel. God grant us all the inspiration and strength to follow in the steps of Abraham and receive the enlarged understanding which being a friend of God can bring.

In chapter 15, we read how about a decade later God again appeared to Abraham in a vision. Notwithstanding the fact that Abraham remained without a naturally born offspring, God reiterated His promise that an heir would "come forth from out of thine own bowels;" that his descendants would be as large in number as the stars of the heavens (v. 4-5). A few verses later, we see that God promised Abraham not only numberless descendants but specific territory stretching "from the river of Egypt [the Nile] unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (v. 18-21)--a swath of territory including considerably *more* than the original commitment to turn the Land of Canaan (12:6-7--cf. 17:8,24:7) into the hands of Abraham's progeny.

The longest and most elaborate articulation of the Abrahamic Promise appears in Genesis 17:1-22. As is the case from the earliest record of the promise itself, receipt of God's blessings remains *conditional* upon Abraham's obedience and living of a perfect life. God admonished him, "I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect" (cf. Mt. 5:48). It is no coincidence that this restatement of the promise fell upon

the first day of unleavened bread (Gen. 17:23, 26, Ex. 12:40-41, Gal.3:16-17)--a special period of time for Christians representing the removal of all sin from their lives (I Cor. 5:6-8). Nor is it surprising that the promise repeated here is directly connected to the covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17:10-14)--a physical act symbolic of the change in heart a Christian experiences upon conversion (Rom. 2:25-29, 8:7-9, 14).

Again, we read that God promised to multiply Abraham's descendants. This was a yet-to-be reality God emphasized by renaming this patriarch heretofore known as Abram--a name denoting "father of Aram," the location of Abraham's original Mesopotamian homeland. "Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham," an appellation literally meaning "father of many nations" or "father of a multitude" (Gen. 17:5).

As we find in the earliest record of the promise (Gen. 12:1) the biblical narrator introduces the theme of *nationhood*--a matter of physical, material, and national concern. Indeed, verse 6 elaborates upon this dimension of the promise, indicating that God intended to make Abraham "exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee" (cf. v. 15-16). The material nature of this aspect of the promise is further demonstrated in verses 8-9 which makes use of the plural pronoun "their." God said, "and I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be *their* God. . . . Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in *their* generations [emphasis ours]."

The Genesis 17 account establishes God's agreement with Abraham as an "everlasting covenant" (v. 7, 13, 19), binding obligation requiring God to give the patriarch's descendants the Land of Canaan in perpetuity (v. 8). It reinforces the notion that God's commitment to Abraham included not only the Messianic promise of grace--unmerited pardon for sins committed--and spiritual salvation. . . but a national inheritance complete with material possessions, power, and position.

The sixth account of the Abrahamic Promise appears in Genesis 18 in a setting immediately prior to the story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Abraham's angelic guests--messengers with news about the hail of fire and brimstone to come upon the cities of the plain--confirmed the soon-coming birth of a son to the 99 year old Abraham and Sarah, ten years her husband's junior (v. 10-14). Promising that God would not "hide from Abraham that thing which" He would do (cf. Amos 3:7), the angels visiting the aged patriarch reconfirmed that Abraham would "surely become a great and mighty nation"--a *physical, material, national* promise in scope and dimension. They also affirmed the spiritual promise that "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him" (Gen. 18:18). True to the promises of God, about a year after this encounter, Sarah gave birth to Isaac (21:1-3). There remained only one great test awaiting Abraham.

The grand climax of the covenantal accounts comes in Genesis 22, one of the most interesting and significant stories in all the Bible. In this account we find the seventh and final elaboration of the promise to Abraham. As the story of Joseph is an acting out in advance of the human history of the Israelitish people, so the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac forecasts the opening phase of salvation history: the 1st century A. D. sacrifice of God the Father's only begotten Son Jesus Christ (Jn. 3:16).

Previous descriptions of the promises to Abraham show that the blessings of the covenant were dependent upon Abraham's actions and behavior (e.g., Gen. 12:1, 17:9). The events described in Genesis 22 transformed the Abrahamic Covenant, elevating it to an entirely new and different level. This was with very good cause. Much to Abraham's discomfort, God commanded him to take the son of promise and sacrifice him as a burnt offering atop of Mount Moriah (v. 2). Trusting in God's wisdom, truth, and faithfulness, Abraham did as he was told, only to be miraculously stopped at the very moment he was about to slay his son (v. 9-11).

God's words spoken shortly thereafter are powerful and revealing: "*Now I know* [emphasis ours] that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

son from me" (v. 12). In obedience to his God, the patriarch was willing to relinquish that which was most precious to him (v. 16--cf. Jn. 3:16). His behavior demonstrated to the Creator that Abraham was truly a man fit for the role of "father of the faithful" (Rom. 4:11-22, Gal. 3:9, Heb. 11:17-19)--that he was suitable as the progenitor of numberless descendants who would become the people of God (cf. Gen. 18:19). It is only at this point in the story of Abraham that the promises--both physical and spiritual--become *unconditional*. God's assertion, "By myself have I sworn" (v. 16) implies that Abraham is no longer obligated to act in order to receive the benefits of the promise. The language used in Genesis 22 implies that there are now no other parties to the contract other than God Himself.

The account concludes with a rehearsal of the central elements of those things promised:

that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore [cf. Deut. 29:13, Josh. 24:3-4, Acts 7:17, Rom. 4:18, Heb. 6:13-14]; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies [*all* promises of a physical, material, national nature--cf. 24:60]; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed [the spiritual blessing of making salvation available to the whole of humanity rather than any single people or nation] (v. 17-18).

God repeatedly renewed the promises to Abraham by passing the covenant in succession from the patriarch's son Isaac (Gen. 26:1-5) to grandson Jacob (27:26-29, 28:1-4, 10-14, 35:9-12--in this last-named account, God changed Jacob's name to "Israel" meaning one who prevails with God). . . and ultimately to the great-great-grandchildren Ephraim and Manasseh (48:1-22), the sons of Joseph through his wife taken from the ranks of Egyptian nobility (41:45). As is the case with those promises described prior to Genesis 23, accounts of the passing of the blessing provides additional evidence that the Abrahamic Covenant included physical-material-national aspects as well as the more important spiritual ones.

The Genesis 26 account of Abraham's passing of the promise to Isaac reveals includes reference to the title and deed for large amounts of land. The double reference to "all these countries" (v. 3-4) implies an inheritance involving colossal material benefits. As in previous repetitions of the promise from God to Abraham, we see Isaac guaranteed a progeny of almost limitless proportions, likened again to "the stars of heaven" (v. 4).

By right of birth, the physical blessings passed down to Isaac should have gone to Esau, the firstborn son (Gen. 25:21-26). However, Jacob, the younger of Isaac's two children induced his older brother to sell his Birthright for a meager bowl of lentil soup (v. 29-34). To insure the acquisition of the blessings that the Birthright entailed, Jacob (with the help of mother Rebekah--27:1-17) later even tricked his blind and aged father into passing the preponderance of the family inheritance to him in place of his elder brother (v. 18-27).

Isaac blessed Jacob (slides #1282, 2130, 3318), saying:

Therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be everyone that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee (v. 28-29).

In spite of the dubious means used by Jacob to trick his father into pronouncing the Birthright blessing upon his own head, God Himself eventually confirmed the passing of the promises to Jacob in a dream at Padanaram (Gen. 28). In the account describing this event, we learn that Jacob's descendants would spread throughout the entire earth, going "to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south" (v.14--cf. Rom. 4:13 which identifies Abraham as "heir of the world").

It is in Genesis 35, however, that we first find introduced an interesting and critically important new dimension to the physical-material-national aspect of the promise. This passage adds the novel element of a "nation and a company of nations" (v. 11), a concept essential to the understanding of where Israel's descendants are to be found in

modern times. From the Genesis 35 account we learn that Jacob's descendants will one day comprise two separate and distinct national entities.

POSSIBLE ILLUSTRATION: Slide #6443-4, 6502 of the River in Jordan where Jacob's dream occurred

Finally, we see the promise passed by Jacob to Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 48). The aged patriarch used this occasion to place his very name upon his two grandsons (v. 16), implying that many references to "Jacob" or "Israel" in the prophetic writings of the Bible point primarily to the offspring of Joseph. Once again, the language of the biblical narrator reveals a clearly physical-material-national dimension to the promises transmitted to this fourth generation. Jacob's blessing upon the two boys involved the giving of land "for an everlasting possession" and the expansion of their own descendants into a "multitude of people" (v. 4--cf. v. 16). Moreover, for a second time, we see articulated the idea of a great nation *and* a "multitude of nations" (v. 19).

A passage found in I Chronicles 5 contributes as well to our understanding of the Abrahamic promise, particularly concerning the difference between its spiritual and physical dimensions. Verse 2 of this chapter reminds us that the "chief ruler" would arise out of the house or tribe of Judah. It confirms Jacob's prediction that "the scepter shall not depart from Judah" (Gen. 49:10), a prophecy which points to both the House of David ruling over the Kingdom of Judah and Israel, and the role of Jesus Christ as Messiah and the One who would make salvation available to all of humankind (Heb. 7:14, Rev. 5:5).

In contrast, the promise of physical, material, and national greatness went not to Judah but rather to Joseph, Jacob's firstborn son by his wife Rachel. In a rich description of how this promise devolved into Joseph's hands, the chronicler writes:

Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, (for he was the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he defiled his fathers bed [Gen. 35:22, 49:4], 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

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; *but the birthright was Joseph's* [emphasis ours] (I Chron. 5:1-2).

Perhaps the most revealing of all biblical passages is found, however, in Genesis 49 which describes Jacob's blessings upon and prophecies about all of his sons' descendants "in the last days" (v.1). The description of those things to befall the people of Joseph are monumental (v. 22-26). Similar to the blessing pronounced by Isaac upon Jacob (25:28-29), they included favorable climate and weather conditions (the "blessings of heaven above") (slides #239, 240, 1771, 2563 [weather]); fertile tracts of land and agricultural abundance; abundant natural resources essential to insure national economic strength and world dominance (those "blessings of the deep that lieth under") (slides #253-6, 315, 5056 [iron];); generally peaceful conditions in which they were to live and grow; and power over the peoples of the world. Jacob predicted that Joseph would become "a fruitful bough"--a people greatly benefitted by the "blessings of the breasts, and of the womb," indicating the sizeable population of Joseph's seed at the end of the age. (slides #231, 241-2, 244, 311-2, 1770, 2237, 2533, 2564-5, 3065 [agriculture]; 257-61, 707, 1606-7, 1626[gold]; 262, 1619, 2124, 2581 [diamonds]; 263-7, 499, 500 1281, 2566 [oil])

The patriarch also forecast a time when Joseph's "branches [would] run over the wall," implying a people broadcast by colonization and imperial expansion literally to all four corners of the earth (cf. 28:14). Jacob represents Joseph's descendants as a people imbued with military might, their "bow" abiding in "strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob."

TEXT BOX: "Blessings of the Deep That Lieth Under"

That the Anglo-Saxon peoples have inherited the richness of the earth is plain for all to see. Jacob prophesied of such nearly four millennia before these material blessings literally overtook the British and American people. A part of that prediction foretold that

the children of Joseph would fall heir to the "blessings of the deep that lieth under" (Gen. 49:25).

Many examples could be cited to illustrate how time and again during the modern period, Jacob's words have been fulfilled. One of the most dramatic testimonies to the faithfulness of God's word comes out of the British imperial sphere in South Africa. Not only did the southern region of the African continent provide the British with a treasure trove of diamond mines; it yielded the *largest* diamond ever found (slides #1238, 3080, 1707). In 1905, the superintendent of the Premier Diamond Mine made an unbelievable find.

This 2,601 carat diamond, named after Sir Thomas Cullinan who opened the Premier Mine, is the largest diamond ever found. The Transvaal government gave the "Cullinan Diamond" as a gift to King Edward VIII who had it cut into several pieces. The largest--319 carats--is known today as Cullinan One or the "Star of Africa." It is found in the scepter of the King of England. "Cullinan Two" is a part of the Imperial State Crown (slide #963).

If the Cullinan Diamond is one of the most dramatic illustrations of Joseph's inheritance of the natural resources of the earth, it is no less remarkable than the gold mines, oil fields, coal and iron deposits all found in great abundance from the British Isles to North America or from Australia to South Africa. These treasures lying deep beneath the earth bear witness to Joseph's modern-day identity.

End of Text Box

Bringing his prophecies to a rousing crescendo, Jacob concludes, "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren" (v. 26). In this final and emphatic pronouncement, we find yet another clue

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

to locate the people of Israel in the latter days. While this final phrase is clearly an allusion to the story of young Joseph's separation from his human family at age 17, like so many other aspects of the Joseph stories, it is also highly prophetic. We should look for the modern-day people of Joseph in a setting where they are separated. . . insulated from descendants of the other Israelite tribes by some kind of physical or geographic barrier. And indeed, this has been the case with the people of Joseph during modern history.

Where are Joseph's descendants today? As unbelievable as it may sound to 20th century ears, they are to be found in those areas of the world which have been populated by the English-speaking or Anglo-Saxon peoples of modern times. They are in fact the peoples of the British Commonwealth nations and the United States of America. In one respect, the story of the meteoric rise of the Anglo-American nations is the ascent of Joseph writ large on the pages of 19th and 20th century A. D. history.

Much like Joseph sold into slavery, the tribes of Israel found themselves cast from their land of inheritance in the 8th century B. C. Thereafter, the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom disappeared from view (cf. II Kings 17:18). The trail they left is an uncertain one. Consistent, hard, and irrefutable evidence of their long and northwesterly journey is impossible to find. However, the tell-tale signs that do exist, combined with Bible prophecy about both past and future, confirm that a physical national people of Israel will exist at the close of this age when Jesus Christ returns to establish the Millennial rule of the Kingdom of God on earth.

It is the purpose of this booklet to examine the historical and biblical evidence which helps us to locate Israel today. As we shall see, the idea that Israel is found among the British and American peoples of the world is an old one--an idea which God's Church and His people have embraced throughout much of the 20th century.

II

British-Israelism:

The History of An Idea

Where did the idea that the British and American people are the "Lost Ten Tribes of Israel" originate? How did it become an understanding so readily embraced by the membership of God's Church? Since the 1930s, the idea has been a commonly accepted teaching among members of the Church of God. We can enlarge our appreciation of how the belief fits in the context of recent Church history by an examination of the historical setting in which the idea known as British- or Anglo-Israelism developed.

The Historical Context

Although the first truly sophisticated published articulation of the idea appeared in 1840 and pre-dates Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859) (slide #1718) by almost two decades, Anglo-Israelism was born and grew to maturity in an intellectual climate heavily tainted by ideas of evolution and racial superiority. Twentieth century critics of British-Israelism often cite this intellectual milieu as evidence that the idea is simply one more expression of the "racialism" around mid-century--one piece of the larger fabric of a flawed and prejudicial 19th century world view. Indeed, the insensitive language of early exponents of British-Israelism can leave even convinced believers feeling a bit uncomfortable. Today, where the idea is known, it is likely to be associated (especially in the United States) with skin-head extremists, or unsavory racist groups like the American Nazi Party, the Freed Men, or the Aryan League.

POTENTIAL ILLUSTRATIONS: Portrait of Charles Darwin; cover of *Origin of the Species*; other possible pictures would be shots of American Nazi Party, Freed Men, Aryan League

Nevertheless, we must evaluate the literature of any era in its historical context, remembering that most British-Israel material was written before Nazi race theories led to the "Final Solution" of the Holocaust. In the last century, while Britain and America were on the

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

ascendancy, the concept that the British and Americans were descendants of the "chosen people" was an attractive and quite plausible idea. In fact, the concept itself is not inherently racist or prejudicial, any more than Jesus Christ was racist in his comments to the Samaritan woman beseeching Him to cast the demon out of her daughter (Mt.15:24). It is interesting that Jesus' response to this woman's request for aid was: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." As such, neither Jesus' ministry nor the premise of British-Israelism demand that we accept wrongheaded notions about inequality among the races of humankind.

In fact, the idea of Anglo-Israelism is not inherently racist any more than Christianity is inherently violent. It depends who is endorsing and practicing it. Neither are its implications, when properly understood, incompatible with New Testament teachings. God was not racist in the selection of Abraham to initiate His plan for the salvation of all humankind (Gen. 12:3, Gal. 3:8, 14). God's choice did not mean He preferred Abraham's race above all others. God simply had to begin somewhere and selected Abraham as his instrument to do so.

At the national level, Abraham's descendants--the Israelites--received a similar opportunity. The earth "and the fullness thereof" are God's. It is His prerogative to give that earth to whomsoever He pleases (Ps. 50:12). Deuteronomy 32:8-9 suggests that God intended from the beginning of human history that various peoples should inhabit specific territories of the earth. Moreover, "he set the bounds of the people *according to* [emphasis ours] the number of the children of Israel" (see also Acts 17:26). Israel's selection was for the purpose of providing *all* the other peoples of the world with a national model of Godly behavior (Deut. 4:6-8). God intended that people of *every* nation might imitate Israel's positive example and also receive the benefits given first to Israel (see Isa. 20:23-24, Zech. 8:23).

If popular ideas about race affected 19th and 20th century British-Israel literature, so did the expansion of British power throughout the world during the 19th century. By the beginning of World War I, British military power and economic influence had created the largest empire in recorded world history. Predictably, the success of British imperialism (slide #1475) fueled the popularity of British-Israelism.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft – Rick Sherrod – February 1997

In America, British-Israelism became a kind of a narrowly-focused or modified version of Manifest Destiny (slides #1934, 643, 1718)--the idea that God favored the territorial expansion of the U. S., to facilitate the free development of democracy across the continent and the acquisition of new territory as an outlet for America's remarkable population growth. Those Americans who embraced British-Israelism carried the notion of Manifest Destiny one step farther, forging a *literal* link between the mid-19th century expansion of the U. S. to fill the North American continent and God's unconditional Birthright conferred on the seed of Joseph.

Consequently, British-Israelism in both Britain and America has become an idea often associated with the negative connotations of "imperialism." Some 20th century critics allege that those who embraced British-Israelism were seeking a salve for the conscience. This idea is anachronistic, projecting today's political sensitivities on an audience that viewed the world far differently than most people do today.

To understand those who accepted British-Israelism, it is essential to consider the historical context in which they lived. In fact, imperialism in mid-19th century Britain was not perceived negatively by the general public. As for justification of Empire, many British citizens--albeit in a self-congratulatory spirit--saw themselves as extending the blessings that had made Britain great to less fortunate peoples around the globe. Indeed, "missionary imperialism"--the *duty* to deliver a superior culture, system, and way of life to the backward peoples of the world--imbued many British subjects with a sense of both right and responsibility to help the barbaric societies of the world to develop, to become elevated (whether the people of those societies liked it or not).

At the turn of the 20th century, the British were a people splendidly confident in their ability to make the world over for the better and in their own image (slide #72). The spirit of Rudyard Kipling's *White Man's Burden* (slide #1057) composed "in 1898 at the height of the imperial endeavor," prevailed over any pangs of conscience about interfering in the affairs of less technologically and (as was the popular 19th century perception) culturally advanced peoples (Christopher Bayly, *Atlas of the British Empire*, (p.125). The general public considered the "New

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Imperialism” which blossomed during the last quarter of the 19th century more a *cause celebre*--giving the masses at home “something to shout about”--than a stain to be expunged from the moral integrity of the British people.

As is well known today, the British Empire ultimately began to fracture and come apart. But this did not begin to happen until the *end* of the 19th century. A general awareness of this process of disintegration did not develop until the early- to mid-20th century, well *after* the British-Israel movement had reached high pitch. Concerning the American context and the mid-century spirit of Manifest Destiny (slide #45--map), American attitudes were similar to British ones across the Atlantic. Most Americans enthusiastically supported the overspreading of the United States across the American continent. The popular American mood was one of belligerent self-confidence.

Just as British-Israelism existed and flourished in an environment which approved of imperial expansion, it also developed within the religious context of the times. By 1840, the year in which the first major British-Israel publication appeared, Britain was almost a decade into the Oxford Movement, a religious revival aspiring to revitalize the Anglican Church by reintroducing traditional Roman Catholic ritual, practice, and doctrine. The chief spokesmen of the movement, the “Tractarians,” enthusiastically promoted their ideas through the printed word and had a significant influence on the Church of England. Many British-Israelites adopted an argumentative style similar to that typical of mid- to late-19th century British religious literature.

In America, the 1840s witnessed the final decade of the “Second Great Awakening,” a time of revivalism distinguished (especially in the South) by considerable religious enthusiasm and the birth of several new Christian denominations. Capitalizing on a growing interest in the Second Coming, a Baptist minister named William Miller (slides #632-3, 635-6b, 663) rode the wave of this burgeoning interest in religion. He and others effectively established the Adventist Movement. Based on his understanding of prophecies in the books of Daniel and Revelation, Miller predicted the imminent Second Coming in the early-1840s. The “Great Disappointment” of 1843 and again in 1844 came only a few years after the introduction of British-Israel teachings in the British

Isles. Miller's focus on end time prophecy and the return of Jesus Christ not only created a mentality receptive to ideas like British-Israelism; many of his teachings and doctrines became an important part of the theology of those Churches of God to which United Church of God, *an International Association* traces its origins.

It is undeniable that British-Israelism was a product of the times. Many who wrote about the idea were influenced to one extent or another by the theological interests or the racist-imperialist intellectual climate of the day. Some writers presented their information more responsibly than others. The fact that many 19th century Anglo-Israelites writers incorporated racism into their arguments brings discredit upon them personally rather than upon the essentially sound core of the idea which they sought to disseminate. The central issue is *not* whether British-Israelism is racist, imperialist, or elitist; rather, it is whether the fundamental concept--that Israel still exists today and is found among the Anglo-American nations--is true or false. The present-day critique of British-Israel ideas touches on more, however, than concerns of theological debate, racism, associations with evolutionary theory, or jingoist imperial expansion. It involves an important dispute over who introduced the idea and when.

Contributors to the Discussion

The origins of the idea itself are somewhat obscure. There is reputed to be a volume entitled *Ten Lost Tribes* in French by Counsellor Le Loyer, published about 1590. Some evidence exists of 18th century British-Israel thought in a volume entitled *Triomphe de la Religion* by Dr. Abade of Amsterdam (a.k.a., Dean Abbadie of Kilaloe). In 1723, he allegedly wrote, "Unless the ten tribes have flown into the air. . . they must be sought for in the north and west, and in the British Isles" (cited in the *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, p. 447). But clear documentation of pre- and early-19th century Anglo-Israel concepts is hard to find.

Where then did the notion that the Anglo-Saxon people were descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel originate? Many critics trace it to the writings of Canadian-born Richard Brothers (slides #2253-4, 3771, 3925, 3944, 4006-10, 4167-9) (1757-1824), an eccentric self-styled prophet who became obsessed with the belief that he was a messenger of God sent to deliver

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

England from impending divine judgment. He made a nuisance of himself writing letters to dignitaries, spent time in debtors prison, and was accused of treason for his aspirations to the British Throne.

Eventually the English government arrested Brothers and incarcerated him in a lunatic asylum at Islington. Although generally regarded as a fanatic, he gained a considerable following, including at least one Member of Parliament, the distinguished scholar Nathaniel Brassey Halhed from Lymington. Brothers' prophecies, some of which actually came to pass, were made against the backdrop of the French Revolution (1789-1799) and Napoleonic Wars (1804-1815) when ancient thrones tottered and new European and world orders were about to emerge. It was the very time when, as we will see in Chapter VI below, the Birthright promise to Joseph hung in the balance.

Although Brothers was a prolific writer, there are only miscellaneous references in his works directly connecting the British to the ancient Israelites. It is hardly surprising that Brothers was attracted to this idea considering his penchant for those things unconventional and outside the norm. But he certainly did not invent the notion. Neither did he ever develop it thoroughly, in spite of the fact that a bibliographic search through monographs written by Brothers reveals the provocative title *A Correct Account of the Invasion of England by the Saxons, Showing the English Nation to be Descendants of the Lost Tribes* (1822). This book is frequently but erroneously cited by opponents of Anglo-Israelism as the foundational treatise on the subject.

Those who make such assertions have never taken the time to read the book. In fact, the actual title of the volume is *A Correct Account of the Invasion and Conquest of the Roman Colony Ailbane, or Britain, by the Saxons*. The work includes only two references to British-Israel concepts, both of which are essentially parenthetical. Nowhere in any of his numerous publications does Brothers make a concerted academic or theological case for such ideas. Instead, his references to the ethnic ties of the English to Israel are casually presented as matters of fact revealed to him by God.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

These inconsistencies lead one to ask: was Brothers used by Satan as a diversion at a critical time in history? Was his impact comparable to that of disreputable televangelists who in the 1980s brought discredit on television as a respectable medium for preaching the Gospel today? It is characteristic of our adversary Satan the devil to use such tactics.

Shortly before Jesus began His public ministry, there were "Red Herrings" dragged before the people of Judæa (Acts 5:34-36). Did this not muddy the waters at the precise time the true Messiah was due to arrive? Christ was also suspect because he came from Nazareth (John 1:46). From the time of the first Jewish Hasmonean king, Judas Aristobulus, and the forcible conversion of the non-Jewish inhabitants of Galilee (104 B. C.), that district became notorious as a seedbed for rebellion. All these circumstances combined to make the charge of treason against Jesus, the Galilean, seem very plausible to Roman authorities (e.g., Mt. 27:11-13, Jn. 18:29-37, 19:12).

Whether or not Satan was involved in 1st or 18th century A. D. developments is beyond our capacity to prove. However, it is not preposterous to assume he was influential in obstructing the plan of God. In the latter case, the disreputable career of Brothers certainly made it convenient for later generations to attack British-Israelism as a crackpot idea which sprang from a deranged and distorted mind.

Considering Brothers' position on the lunatic fringe of British religious life, it should not surprise us that later supporters of Anglo-Israelism were eager to disclaim him. Indeed, he should *not* be credited with creating a full-blown argument connecting the Anglo-Saxon to ancient Israel. That distinction properly goes to a remarkable man from Cheltenham named John Wilson (slides #2135, 2144-6, 7095-6). This Anglican layman published *Our Israelitish Origin* in 1840 only three years after the coronation of Queen Victoria (1837-1901).

Wilson drew on the best of contemporary scholarship and methodology. He made particular use of the work of Sharon Turner (1768-1847), a monumental figure in British historiography whose multi-volume work, *A History of the Anglo-Saxon Peoples* (1799-1805), (slides #3151-2, 3765, 7094) traces the Anglo-Saxons back through Europe to the Balkan countries and ultimately to the Crimea and Caucasus mountain range. This is just where we

would expect based on the testimony of II Kings 17:6 and I Chronicles 5:26. "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

Wilson also rigorously connected his arguments for British-Israelism to Scripture. His knowledge of the Bible was expansive. His impressive list of publications includes not only the foundational works on the identity of modern Israel, but a wide range of theological topics, particularly ones of interest to pre-millennialists--those who believe in a future Millennial rule of Jesus Christ on the earth. Wilson became a popular speaker and drew large audiences principally from the respectable Victorian British middle class.

One of the earliest British-Israel works to capture the popular imagination was *Forty-Seven Identifications of the British Nation with Lost Israel* (1871) by banker and life insurance office manager, Edward Hine (slides #983, 1093, 5986-7, 7087). This man was probably the most significant of Wilson's immediate successors. He lectured on British-Israelism before sizable audiences throughout the British Isles and in the United States during the late-19th century. Hine claimed to have addressed some 5 million people during his lecture circuit career, speaking at venues as prestigious as Exeter Hall. His work represents a certain coming of age in British-Israel thinking. The fact that Hine's work drew criticism from no less than the *Saturday Review*, as well as Canon George Rawlinson, a professor of history at Oxford University, illustrates the degree to which British-Israel ideas commanded the attention of the late-19th century British public.

In both the U. S. and Britain, the idea of British-Israelism cut across denominational lines, although a preponderance of Anglo-Israelites in the British Isles were very likely Anglican. Some of the major contributors to the literature illustrates the denominational diversity of the idea's believers: John Wilson was an Anglican from England; Joseph Wild was a Congregationalist minister from Toronto, Canada; John Harden Allen was a Methodist from the Pacific Northwest; and T. Rosling Howlett was a Baptist minister who had pastorates in New York City, Washington, D. C., and Philadelphia.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Believers typically were non-proselytizing. They usually tried to work within the framework of their own established churches. The "movement" such as it was took organized form only to the extent that a handful of essentially sectarian British-Israelite organizations made a concerted and organized attempt to propagate the British-Israel idea through the published word (including monographs, serial publications [7083, 3994], and pamphlets), public lectures, and debates between British-Israel writers or clergymen and well-known theologians or academicians. The British-Israel World Federation (slides #1340, 3888-90, 3915, 5080,5364) was formed in the late-19th century to bring together many of the various believers into an organized body. Headquartered in Putney, England, it continues to exist today although its vigor and influence are only a shadow of what they once were.

Unfortunately, during the 19th and 20th centuries, a long list of authors have used British-Israelism as a vehicle to trumpet or attempt to justify various political and social agendas, including but not limited to imperial expansion, socialism, anti-communism, and anti-Zionism. However, as the movement grew in strength during the last quarter of the 19th century, it also gathered some distinguished and respectable followers. These included the Charles Piazzi Smyth (1819-1900), Royal Astronomer of Scotland and Emeritus Professor of Astronomy at Edinburgh University; Colonel John Cox Gawler (1830-1882) (slide #1301-2), the Keeper of the Crown Jewels; First Sea Lord and Admiral Jacky Fisher (1841-1920), as well as several members of the British Royal family. Queen Victoria was apparently intrigued, and one of her direct descendants was a patron of the movement until her death a few years ago.

For at least a while British-Israelism made a significant impact in the British Isles. At one stage, up to 20 million British subjects were reputed to be active believers. In 1845 one of the leading Tractarians of the Oxford Movement, John Henry Newman (slide #5006), cited his "fear that the Church of England stood in danger of being taken over by the Christian Israel Identity movement" as one of his reasons for leaving the Anglican Church to embrace Roman Catholicism (Patience Strong, *Someone Had to Say*, pp. 85-86).

TEXT BOX: "We Are the Lost Ten Tribes!"

If many of those who have believed in British-Israelism have been criticized as simple-minded or uneducated, the idea has attracted its share of prominent people as well. In 1914, one of Britain's greatest admirals, Jacky Fisher (slides #855, 1167, 1549, 1696, 1742, 3005) wrote First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, offering advice on naval affairs. William Manchester recounts how "the old salt had been bombarding Churchill with advice, sometimes on profound matters, sometimes on trivia: 'Why is standard of recruits raised 3 inches to 5 feet 6? . . . What d--d folly to discard supreme enthusiasm because it's under 5 feet 6. *We are a wonderful nation!* astounding how we muddle through! There is only one explanation--We are the lost 10 tribes!' He was now seventy-four" (*The Last Lion*, vol. 2, p. 440) (slide #824). An article in the June 1980 *National Message* attributes to Fisher these words when his nation was "at the peak of British sea-power. . . . 'The only hypothesis to explain why we win in spite of incredible blunders is that we are the lost ten tribes of Israel'" (cited in O. Michael Friedman, *Origins of the British Israelites*, pp. 37, 45 [note 44]). Of such remarks, journalist-historian James Morris observes, "Admiral Fisher thought only half in jest that they [the British] were the Lost Tribes" (*Pax Britannica*, p. 502).

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX:

Modern Archaeology & British-Israelism: Flinders Petrie & the Great Pyramid

Picture of Flinders Petrie (slides #5225, 5292-4, 6673, 8053-4)

In 1865, Scottish Royal Astronomer Charles Piazzi Smyth (slide #4004) wrote his classic work, *Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid* (slide #3439, 3984). It was this very book which launched the "father of modern scientific archaeology in Palestine," Sir Flinders Petrie, on a prestigious

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

career involving the excavation of over 50 sites and the publication of 98 books on Middle Eastern archaeology.

Petrie grew up in a strict Presbyterian home which embraced literalist religious beliefs. Smyth was a friend of the Petrie family. At age 13, Petrie read his book. At age 27 in 1880, he went to Egypt with the intention of mathematically confirming Smyth's theories that the dimensions of the pyramids held the secrets of prophecy for the descendants of Israel. In fact, after two years of work, Petrie's triangulation system *disproved* Smyth's prophetic speculations. As the work of Petrie and many others who followed him have convincingly shown, the pyramids were principally tombs for Egyptian royalty.

The results of Petrie's work appeared in his first book, *The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh*. His experience at the pyramids induced Petrie to continue with his work in Egypt, laying the foundation for modern archaeological studies (*Biblical Archaeology Review*, November/December 1980, p. 46).

End of Text Box

On the opposite side of the Atlantic, the idea commanded similar if perhaps lesser interest. It included among its prominent exponents Howard B. Rand (b. 1889), a Chicago lawyer and the founder of Destiny Publishing Company; and Charles Adiel Lewis Totten (1851-1908), a graduate of West Point and War Department Professor of Military Science and Tactics (1889-1892) at Yale University.

The list of Americans who published British-Israel books and articles is a lengthy one. Two of the more balanced presentations include *Israel Redivivus* by Canadian clergyman Frederick C. Danvers, a recognized authority on the Indian Office, the East India Company, and the rise and decline of the Portuguese empire in India; and *Judah's Scepter and Joseph's Birthright* by Methodist clergyman, J. H. Allen.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

POTENTIAL ILLUSTRATIONS: Portraits of Allen (slides #699, 1107, 3408-10, 7080), Rand (slide #1092, 3975), Danvers (slide #1102), Totten (slides #804-5, 4029-30); picture of Totten's masthead and/or Allen's title page of *Judah's Scepter and Joseph's Birthright*

Among this group of balanced and carefully-reasoned works is Herbert W. Armstrong's *The United States and Britain in Prophecy* (all quotations herein are from the 9th edition, revised, November 1986), first published in 1942 and reappearing in ten editions over the next four and a half decades (slide #700). This original volume drew heavily from Allen's research and publications. Whatever the source of inspiration, it was Mr. Armstrong's work which made the association of ancient Israel with the modern day British and Americans a popular and widely accepted idea in the Church of God.

No human work is perfect in every detail. Some editions of Mr. Armstrong's book include inaccurate or failed predictions. Like the apostle Paul, Mr. Armstrong anticipated the end of the age and an imminent Second Coming based on the national and world conditions which prevailed during his own lifetime (I Thes. 4:17). Inaccuracies and errant cosmetic details notwithstanding, in general terms Mr. Armstrong's overall assessment, like the broad strokes of Christian doctrine canonized in the writings of Paul, remains valid and sound.

Some critics assail not so much Mr. Armstrong's predictions or style, but the whole notion of British-Israelism. They consider it theologically and historically unsound. This has been especially true among the critics of British-Israelism at the close of the 20th century. Much that in an earlier century might have been accepted as historical proof would today either be disregarded or at best considered circumstantial evidence. And rightly so--to date, the historical-critical method has failed to *prove* the Anglo-Saxon people are Israelitish. We must be careful, however, not to extend inordinate respect to that methodology.

Some subjects which are accurate, valid, and true--*including* the idea of a resurrection from the dead, one of the fundamental convictions of Christianity itself--cannot be *proven* beyond a shadow of a scientific doubt. Conventional academic methodology leaves us wanting. If a matter may be controversial but nevertheless true, how should a Christian understand Scripture? What are the rules which should govern our interpretive perspective, particularly on an issue

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

relevant to biblical prophecy or the identity of Israel in modern times? These are the concerns we will address in the following chapter.

III

UNDERSTANDING SCRIPTURE

Critics of the Anglo-Israelism are victims of the limitations imposed by the historical-critical method and the criteria by which post-Enlightenment Western society mandates that we scientifically validate all that we consider fact or truth. Such a methodology effectively eliminates faith as a factor in the equation. By these standards--and reminiscent of the unconverted Pilate's musing, "What is truth?" (Jn. 18:38)--absolutely certain truth is a rare commodity in the human sphere.

Anglican clergyman Lesslie Newbigin's discussion of "reigning plausibility structures" is helpful in revealing how the criteria for defining truth in *any* age is actually an evolving set of standards (*The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* pp. 1-11, 16-39, 68-69, 112-113, 199). Newbigin effectively shows how any received opinion--that which is accepted in society as truth without having to bear the burden of proof--is eternally subject to its own peculiar flaws and weaknesses. Every set of standards used to measure and evaluate truth is based on certain *a priori* assumptions which are themselves vulnerable to scientific probe and challenge. As standards, values, and attitudes evolve over the course of time, received opinion will always be something of a moving target.

This kind of subjectivity presents anyone seeking to locate the origins of the Anglo-Saxons with a virtually impossible task. Any honest searcher quickly discovers that it is vain to search for clear, incontrovertible historical evidence to support many aspects of the Anglo-Israel position. Ancient Israel disappears as a national-political entity from the historical record in the 8th century B. C. The Anglo-Saxons appear from out of nowhere on the northwestern European coastlands around the 5th century A. D. Nearly 1,200 years separate these two historical facts. The Anglo-Saxons were part of the Germanic tribes--a group of vigorous, ethnically similar, and

largely illiterate people along the northeastern borders of the 4th-6th century A. D. Roman Empire. The Romans generally considered them as barbarians or savages. The Anglo-Saxons were among these peoples who migrated toward and eventually into Europe during the obscure period between the disappearance of Israel and the settlement of the northwest European coastal regions. . . but very little evidence has survived to document their movements.

TEXT BOX: What the Historians Say

Scholars are hampered in answering questions about "who the Germans were because the Germans could not write and thus kept no written records before their conversion to Christianity [generally dating from the conversion of Frankish king Clovis, c. 498]. . . . Our knowledge of the Germans depends largely on information in records written in the sixth and seventh centuries and projected backward" (McKay, *et. al.*, *History of Western Society*, 3rd ed., pp. 210, 212-214).

Significantly, authority on early-British history James Campbell entitles his chapter on the period A. D. 400-600 "The Lost Centuries." Concerning the archaeological record of this era, he writes:

if in some ways we know very much less of the fifth and sixth centuries than we do of later periods, in others we know more. . . . [However,] those who wish for certainty in history and who like to feel the ground firmly under their feet are best advised to study some other period. For those who care to venture into a quagmire, the archaeological evidence, and the truly remarkable intellectual effort of archaeologists to make sense of it, are of basic importance (*The Anglo-Saxons*, pp. 27, 29).

Thus it is that the period of Anglo-Saxon settlement truly constitutes the lost centuries of British history. Renowned historian, Lord Macaulay (slide #1175) writes:

from this communion [with comparatively cultured Western Continental kingdoms still in contact with the old Eastern or Byzantine Empire] Britain was cut off. Her shores were, to the polished race which dwelt by the Bosphorus, objects of mysterious horrors. . . . Concerning all the other provinces of the Western Empire

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

we have continuous information. It is only in Britain that an age of fable completely separates two ages of truth. Odoacer and Totila, Euric and Thrasimund, Clovis, Fredegunda and Brunchild, are historical men and women. But Hengist and Horsa, Vertigern and Rowena, Arthur and Mordred are mythical persons, whose very existence may be questioned, and whose adventures must be classed with those of Hercules and Romulus. At length the darkness begins to break; and the country which had been lost to view as Britain reappears as England (*The History of England: From the Accession of James the Second*, vol. 1, pp. 6, 10-11).

Sir Frank Stenton, in *Anglo-Saxon England*, opens his volume observing:

between the end of the Roman government in Britain [traditionally marked by Emperor Honorius' letter to his British subjects, who had apparently appealed to Rome for assistance repelling barbarian invasions, instructing them to see to their own defense, A. D. 410] and the emergence of the earliest English Kingdoms [7th-10th centuries A. D.] there stretches a long period of which the history cannot be written. The men who played their parts in this obscurity are forgotten, or are little more than names with which the imagination of later centuries has dealt at will. The course of events may be indicative, but is certainly not revealed, by the isolated coincidental references to Britain made by writers of this or the following age. For the first time in five centuries Britain was out of touch with the Continent. . . . Archaeological discoveries have shown that permanent English settlements were founded in Britain during, if not before, the last quarter of the fifth century [tradition places the Saxon arrival in Britain between A. D. 446-454]. But archaeological evidence is an unsatisfactory basis for absolute chronology, and even if the British traditions may be trusted, they do not indicate the rate at which events moved between the coming of the Saxons and the establishment of permanent Kingdoms. . . . The early history of these nations [Saxons and Angles] is enveloped in the obscurity which overhangs all Germany in the age of national migration. . . . For the next two hundred years the nations of Germany were involved in a movement which carried them to distant seats, created new confederacies which caused the adoption of new racial names. . . . It is only an imperfect story which can be recovered from these [fragmentary comments of Roman writers or poems], and there are irrecoverable passages of crucial importance in the early history of the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. Of these nations the Saxons are the least obscure. . . . [Ptolemy] places them on the neck of the Cimbric peninsula, in the modern Holstein" (pp. 1-2, 11).

Little wonder that Winston Churchill, in *Island Race*, concisely notes that in the 5th century A. D., a curtain is drawn again across English history. "Thereafter the darkness closes in" (p. 8). And so, the trail connecting the Israelites to the Anglo-Saxons (slide #1541, 3180,

3898-3900--Venerable Bede, father of English history) is unreliable, and the information about migration of peoples from the Middle East into Europe quite sketchy.

End of Text Box

To assertively argue the British-Israel case as some have done based on archaeological evidence is to enter an academic black hole. Moreover, such evidence provides us with a sword that cuts both ways. To present that evidence as though it provides an "open-and-shut" case for a particular point of view creates an illusion of certainty which is lacking in substance. The average layman may be easily bedazzled by unqualified assertions which insist that history unfolded in a certain way and archaeology "proves" it. In fact, archaeology speaks with many voices--indeed, it is one of the most subjective disciplines of all the social sciences. As an academic discipline it is, in its interpretive dimensions, far more artistic than scientific. A single find can overturn paradigms--interpretive perspectives--which have held the field for decades. As with all history of antiquity, the paucity of records make interpretation of evidence particularly susceptible to revision.

Furious debates rage around what many of the most significant finds of biblical archaeology really mean. This is little wonder given the incompleteness of the archaeological record. The mainstream evangelical Christian would do well to realize that many of the scholars and archaeologists who would ridicule the idea of British-Israelism on archaeological grounds are the same individuals who use their craft to insist that there were no patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob--that these were merely eponymous ancestors or literary *creations* of an ancient world people in need of pedigree; that there were no twelve sons of Jacob, let alone an Israel in modern times.

Moreover, many of today's most celebrated theologians and teachers of biblical studies believe that there was no Exodus out of Egypt (Ex. 12-15) or Conquest of the Promised Land (the Book of Joshua). Some on the extreme edge of the critical school even argue that there was

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

not even any historical Israel before the time of king David in the 11th century B. C. (For an excellent and highly accessible summary of the main lines of critical interpretation of scripture in this regard, see J. Maxwell Miller's *The Old Testament and the Historian* [pp. 1-19, 49-69]. A conservative perspective on the same material is nicely captured in *Faith, Tradition, and History* edited by A. R. Millard, J. K. Hoffmeier, and D. W. Baker [pp. 1-64, 313-340].)

Nevertheless, archaeology does yield evidence that can be employed (on either side of the argument, of course). It is found in the Middle East, the British Isles, and somewhat tentatively at various points in-between. Some recent work presents a case that the Anglo-Saxons were not the wild-eyed savages they are traditionally portrayed to be. They seem to have had strong cultural links with the people who had inhabited Britain in Roman days.

Writing in *Blood of the British: From Ice Age to Norman Conquest* (1986) Catherine Hills shows continuity in the settlement of the British Isles, from Megalithic to Norman times. She concludes:

Archaeology does provide a great deal of information about the past, and we do know more than we used to. But the answers aren't always obvious, and we sometimes have to rid ourselves of preconceptions in order to arrive at them. One of those preconceptions is that all change equals invasion, or, conversely, that all invasions equal change. . . . Could some of the "Saxons" really have been Britons? Or were there a lot of Britons still living in England who have left little or no traces? Neither of these ideas is unreasonable, but neither is easy to demonstrate.

Such a proposition conforms markedly to the traditional Anglo-Israel hypothesis that more than a single wave of Israelitish people settled the British Isles over a lengthy span of time.

Nonetheless, identification of the Anglo-Saxons as Israelites is impossible to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt. Were these difficulties not so formidable, some enterprising scholar, through use of the historical method, would have *proven* the identity of Israel and consequently made his career and reputation long ago. Indeed, even Scripture itself implies that God intended Israel to be lost from the view of man (cf. II Kings 17:18, 20).

If we are to present the argument by 20th century scholarly standards, we must maintain a distinction between proof and evidence. In other words, we *can* make use of evidence--simply at various different levels:

Beyond reasonable doubt: no other conclusion can be considered likely.

Preponderance of Evidence: such evidence as, when weighed against that opposed to it, has more convincing force and thus a greater probability of truth.

Clear and convincing evidence: More than a preponderance but not proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Tangible evidence: material remains which are comparatively easy to interpret, e.g., the Rosetta Stone, the Behistun Inscription, or Shalmaneser's Black Obelisk.

Circumstantial evidence: proven facts that provide a basis of inference that other facts are true.

Given the limitations of the tangible historical evidence, the *best* we can hope for is a measure of credibility and acceptance in the world of scholarship.

However, if the identity of post-captivity Israel cannot be *proven*. . . neither can it be disproven by history, archaeology, or any other academic discipline. There is evidence in support of those who wish to believe and evidence to the contrary for those who do not. The fact of the matter is, apart from inspiration and faith, there is no way to know for sure. Where does that leave us if we wish to pursue the matter further?

How Are We to Read the Word of God?

While there are primary resources which buttress our case, the most significant primary resource is the Bible itself. Do the Scriptures support the idea that the Anglo-Saxon people are descended from Israel? How strongly? What are the consequences? In fact, without the Bible, there would be little basis or even need for this idea. If the identification of ancient Israel with today's Anglo-American nations rest upon a firm biblical framework, the historical evidence seen

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

in proper perspective can be presented accordingly. Ultimately, our judgment on the matter will stand or fall according to the way we interpret Scripture.

We stand at the end of a millennia-long succession of generations, each striving to understand Bible prophecy in the context of the existing times. The British-Israel view is one way in which the indisputable *facts* of recent world history--a story about the extraordinary ascendancy and dominance of the Anglo-American people--can be arranged to make sense of our contemporary circumstance. Such an arrangement adds a powerful dimension of relevance of the story of 19th and 20th century history. How do we justify this extraordinary interpretation?

Depending on one's rules for interpreting Scripture, British-Israel notions become either plausible or ridiculous. The crux of this issue is whether or not God inspires present-day Christians to have an enlarged understanding of Scripture (e.g., Dan. 10-11, Lk. 24:25-27) and His will (II Sam. 7:1-17, Acts 8:29, 11:12); whether He continues, as He did in Old *and* New Testament accounts, to be involved in human affairs (cf. Ps. 75:6-7, Dan. 4:25, 32, II Cor. 2:12, Rev. 3:8); whether the prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures were all fulfilled by either ancient Israel or Jesus Christ.

Our point of departure must rest on a single, fundamental concept well-articulated in a booklet entitled *Introduction to Prophecy*:

The fact remains the historical record is at best sketchy and inconclusive. But the tribes can be located--if we use the clues and signposts of the Bible itself. What happened to the people of ancient Israel is one of the little understood aspects of history. It is vital to know who they are, if you want to make sense of the prophecies of the "latter days." There is some fragmentary evidence in history, but the *proof* [emphasis theirs] is in prophecy (sidebar titled "Mystery of the Lost Tribes of Israel," p. 12).

We will find the answers we seek in prophetic retrospect and prophetic prospect.

Retrospectively, we must ask, "What do the prophecies given by Jacob and recorded in Genesis 48 and 49 mean?" Who among today's comity of nations best fulfills the incredible predictions relevant to the physical, national blessings and inheritance promised to Abraham's seed? In prospect, we may question, "If Israel still exists (cf. Amos 9:9), what are we to make of

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

the prophecies yet unfulfilled about a coming punishment upon Israelitish people for their sins, and on a far more encouraging note, a regathering and reunion of the tribes in the land of promise?" (e.g., Isa. 11:11, 48:20-21, Jer. 16:14-15, 23:7-8, 31:7, 33:7).

Certainly these questions are important ones. The way we and others have answered them in the past has raised serious challenges. Not the least of these comes from National Endowment for the Humanities award-winning historian, Barbara Tuchman. She describes the methodology of the Anglo-Israel movement as "a tortured interpretation of stray passages from the Bible [by which believers] have convinced themselves that the English are the true descendants of the ten lost tribes of Israel" (*Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, p. 82). Ironically, Tuchman's own unique way of presenting Anglo-American and European history provides us with some of the most compelling evidence to suggest that God's Hand has been active in delivering the Abrahamic promises to the British and American people.

At issue, of course, are two matters far larger than Israel's modern identity: (1) the nature of God's calling (Jn. 6:44, 65) and (2) divine revelation (Amos 3:7). Does God's holy spirit open the human mind to prophetic insight? If we answer "yes," then we have moved into a whole new arena of inquiry. It is spiritual in nature, and as a consequence, impervious to scientific analysis. Understanding prophecy subsequently becomes more a matter of faith than mental capacity or intelligent quotient. Understanding and belief become products of something orchestrated by God in the individual human mind--a matter of the revelation of information which, by ordinary physical human means, could not otherwise be grasped or comprehended.

Are there times when God *reveals* future events to his earthly servants today? If we take the Bible at face value, this seems to be the case. Certainly God is able to foretell the future. Isaiah writes:

Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure (46:9-10).

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

The prophet Daniel forecast a time when knowledge and the truth of God--including the meaning of many heretofore obscure or sealed prophecies--would increase (Dan. 12:1-2, 4, 10). As the end of the age approaches, this passage suggests that God will reveal aspects of prophecy to His people. The communications revolution created by the opening of Internet and the Worldwide Web, not to mention the accompanying proliferation of home computers, gives us some inkling of how Daniel's predictions might be fulfilled, perhaps in our very own time.

The prophet Amos indicates that those called by God will have a special insight into how the future will unfold--"surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets" (3:7). Jesus Christ Himself declared "I call you [specifically His 1st century A. D. apostles, but by extension Christians through all times] not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known to you" (Jn. 15:15). Mr. Armstrong elaborated on this general concept, writing:

He [God] foretold what would, through the years, happen to these cities and nations [of Middle Eastern antiquity]! In every instance the prophecies that were then to be fulfilled came to pass on Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Ekron, Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Persia, Greece and Rome. There has not been a miss! Those prophecies were accurate. And now, in other prophecies, the same supreme God has foretold precisely what is going to happen to the United States, the British nations, Western Europe, the Middle East, the Soviet Union [*sic*]. . . . Great world powers of our time have been, and are, the United States, the Soviet Union [*sic*], Great Britain, Germany, France, and other Western European nations (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. ix, 2).

If the prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures do not specifically mention modern nations in their writings, details about modern events and today's nation-states nevertheless may well be described in many Old and New Testament prophecies. This can clearly be the case when one applies the interpretive principles of duality and forerunners.

Mr. Armstrong observes, "few have realized it but a duality runs all the way through the *plan of God* [emphasis ours] in working out His purpose here below" (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 17). Paul writes of a first and second Adam--the physical human created in the

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Garden of Eden by God (Gen. 1:26, 2:7, 19) and Jesus Christ, the quickening spirit (I Cor. 15:22, 45). As there was a Babylon in ancient times--the capital of the Nebuchadnezzar's world ruling empire (Dan. 2:1, 31, 37)--so there is a spiritual Babylon written of by John in the Book of Revelation (17:1-6, 18:1-4). In similar fashion, the congregation of ancient Israel in the wilderness was a physical type of spiritual Israel or the New Testament Church of God (Rom. 2:29).

One facet of the insight brought by the principle of duality relates to the Church of God's unique understanding of the meaning of the God's holy days described in Leviticus 23. Those special days provide us with a blueprint of the "master plan" of God. We understand better Christ's role as the sacrificial Lamb of God (Jn. 1:29, 36, Rev. 5:8) by examining the ceremonies tied to the sacrifice of Passover lambs among the ancient Israelites (Ex. 12:1-14). The painstaking removal of physical leavening from our homes each spring (Ex. 12:8-39) dramatically underscores for us the need to rid our lives of sin (I Cor. 5:7-8). The wave sheaf offering and harvest at Pentecost enlarges our understanding about the founding of the New Testament Church (Acts 2) and the concept of spiritual firstfruits (e.g., Rom. 8:23, 11:16, I Cor. 15:20, 23).

The Feast of Trumpets illuminates prophecies about end time war, tribulation, and the ultimate return of Jesus Christ (I Cor. 15:52-54, I Thes. 4:16-17). The two goats of Atonement (Lev. 16:1-28) reveal aspects of the story of the Christ-sacrifice *and* the binding of Satan for a thousand years (Rev. 20:2-3, 7). The Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. 23:34-43) gives us a glimpse into the Millennial reign of Christ on earth (Rev. 20:4, 6), and the Last Great Day (Lev. 23:36, 39) resolves the delimita of how God will eventually extend salvation to the billions never called in the age between Adam's sin and the Second Coming (e.g., Mt. 12:41-42, Rev. 20:11-12).

Each respective festival season and holy day portrayed something special in the master plan of God. The holy days, of course, are significant both in terms of physical Israel's national history and spiritual Israel's blueprint for salvation (see the United Church of God publication "God's Holy Day Plan"). Significantly, in the stories about the patriarchs and the ancient

Israelites, numerous key events of national import literally fell on specific holy days--a thread which we will see developed in some of the text boxes in the chapters which will follow.

If the principle of duality magnifies our appreciation of God's holy days, it also shows how predictions, written by prophets of antiquity for people of old, can have a double and quite modern application. It gives us the confidence that God will act today as He has acted in the past. Indeed, many prophecies, as well as biblical stories like those of Abraham or Joseph, appear to foreshadow the future or have multiple fulfillments. Thus, the principle of duality makes possible a variety of complimentary interpretive frameworks.

This principle also can diffuse some of the concerns often raised about the physical, national promises inherited by the descendants of Abraham. Some critics of British-Israelism challenge the idea that these promises were not fulfilled *until* modern times. They often explain that Scripture abounds with references in the Abrahamic promises that the patriarch's seed would become as the dust of the earth (Gen. 13:16), the sand on the seashore (Gen. 22:17, 28:14), and the stars of the heavens (Gen. 15:5, 22:17--cf. Deut. 10:22, 28:62, Neh. 9:23). Many modern commentators vigorously contend that these very promises *were* fulfilled in Old Testament times. Numerous verses appear to buttress their argument.

In Moses' departing message to Israel about to cross the Jordan River and enter the Promised Land (Deut. 1), the leader of the Exodus declared: "The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold ye are this day as the stars of the heaven for multitude" (Deut. 1:10). Commenting on the conditions prevailing in Solomon's Israel, the narrator of I Kings wrote: "Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea in multitude, eating and drinking, and making merry" (4:20). King Solomon himself added to these assertions: "Now, O Lord God, let thy promise unto David my father be established: for thou hast made me king over a people like the dust of the earth in multitude" (II Chron. 1:9).

All these passages appear to undermine the idea that the Abrahamic promise of a multitude of descendants remained unfulfilled throughout ancient times. There are ways, however, to resolve these apparent difficulties through the use of Scripture itself. One need only

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

to continue reading the passage in Deuteronomy 1. Moses continued his thought with the prophetic charge, "the Lord God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many more as you are, and bless, as He hath promised you" (v. 11). There is double and even triple entendre in the bequeathing of blessings from God and the fulfillment of *many* prophecies found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Bible abounds with forerunners which cast a revealing shadow of events yet to come. At one level, the Birthright blessing *was* inherited by those Israelites who crossed over the Jordan River and occupied the Promised Land. Hebrews 4:3-11 is rich in illustrating that both the Sabbath day *and* ancient Israel's occupation of Canaan under Joshua are forerunners of a future establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. Passages like Deuteronomy 1:10-11 demonstrate how this kind of duality--the successive unfolding of one antitype after another--operates as well. It would be nearly four centuries after Joshua's initial late-15th century B. C. occupation of the Promised Land (Josh. 10:40. 11:23) that Israel would finally fill and dominate Canaan (note 13:1).

It took no less than David's personal and political *savoir faire* to bring unity to these Israelites (II Sam. 2:4, 5:1-5) who had battled the centrifugal forces of tribalism off and on since Moses had led Israel to Canaan's borders. The unity that David brought was a picture of something far greater yet to come. The rule of David and Solomon in the 11th-10th centuries B.C. was a forerunner of Christ's thousand year reign over all the earth (Rev. 20:4, 6). Prophecy reveals that the Millennium will be the time of the quintessential reunion of the twelve tribes of Israel (Ez. 37:19, 22)--a prophetic event forecast during the Davidic-Solomonic era (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 59, 93, 122, 184). At that future point in history, all the Israelite tribes will flourish as never before under the rule of a Davidic monarch (e.g., Jer. 30:9, Ez. 37:24-25). The epoch of the 11th-10th century B C. United Monarchy was but an *imperfect* forerunner.

Biblical scholar Eugene Merrill describes the fragility of the twelve-tribed union even under David's adroit political leadership:

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Once a modicum of unity had been achieved, David was able to centralize government in Jerusalem without sacrificing local tribal distinctions and interests. At best, however, this was a loose federation, for up till the last years of his life David had to struggle with the tendency toward fragmentation, especially between Judah and the north. . . . The success of his early wars. . . attests to his ability to organize the nation, at least on a temporary basis. . . . By the time of David's death. . . the old tribal distinctions still existed, but with David there had come at least a sense of national unity in both secular and spiritual affairs.

The United Monarchy disintegrated within one generation following David's death. That breakup testifies to the tentative character of this union (*Kingdom of Priests: A History of Old Testament Israel*, 1987, pp. 281-284--see also the *Soncino* commentary on "Samuel," pp. x-xi).

The success achieved during Israel's Golden Age under David and Solomon is itself a forerunner of the fulfillment of the Abrahamic Promise to Israel. It is not, however, the *greatest* fulfillment. One of the most convincing testimonies to this fact is found in II Samuel 7:10 and I Chronicles 17:9--"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." Concerning this prediction, Mr. Armstrong wrote, "the prophecy was for [1] David's own time, for [2] the *ultimate* fulfillment in the time of the Millennium to come, and *also* [3] for a *different* time in a *different land* where these scattered Israelites were to gather, after being removed from the Holy Land, and while that land was lying idle and in possession of the Gentiles." The Millennial fulfillment to which he refers will see "an era that will far surpass (in grandeur and magnificence) even the reign of King Solomon" (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 59, 93, 122, 184).

To expand somewhat on this quotation, a version of the Abrahamic inheritance came around 2,520 years after the inhabitants of Israel's Northern Kingdom went into Assyrian captivity (see Chapter VI below). The ultimate fulfillment will, of course, be realized during the Millennial reign of Jesus Christ. All fulfillments of the Abrahamic promise which have preceded the Second Coming are antitypes or forerunners which show us the pattern we can expect to see under the rule of Christ (Isa. 11:9) instituted after His return.

A similar kind of duality is exemplified with the founding of the Church age in A. D. 31 (Acts 2). The Church of God's existence illustrates the "not yet, but even now" aspect of the

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

coming of the Kingdom of God on earth (cf. Lk. 17:21). With the establishment of the Church, we see a coming of the kingdom in microcosm, or, as Mr. Armstrong styled it, "in embryo." If the Millennial realization of the promise is the grandest fulfillment, our concerns in this booklet are less grandiose and more mundane. Our focus here is on a lesser yet important fulfillment--probably the pentultimate one--between the days of Solomon and the return of Jesus Christ. To explore that story, we must address the issue of the "Lost Ten Tribes."

IV

Were the Tribes Really Lost?

The identity and whereabouts of the “Lost Ten Tribes of Israel” is one of the great mysteries of ancient world history. Where these Israelites went and who they are today are questions which have stimulated great interest and periodic debate. The hope of finding their whereabouts has inspired many a searcher.

A. S. Geyser reminds us that “even in the course of the Exile itself the prophets started to proclaim the return of the people and the restoration of the destroyed Twelve Tribe Kingdom” (“Some Salient New Testament Passages,” p. 305). Indeed, a belief in the continuing existence of the descendants of these deportees of the Northern Kingdom is evidenced especially in the history of the Jewish people. Simon Wiesenthal convincingly argues that *part* of the impetus of Columbus’ search for the East Indies was an interest in locating the Lost Tribes (*Sails of Hope*). In the mid-17th century A. D., Dutch Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel (inspired by the stories world traveler Antonio Montezinos) (slides #3991-2) even wrote a treatise--*The Hope of Israel* (1650-1652)--on the subject. These are but some of the many examples which could be cited.

If there are Lost Tribes, then where are they today? From the Japanese to the American Indian to the Afghans to the people of Northwestern Europe, almost every group of people outside the Middle East has at one time or another been so identified by some enthusiastic seeker. However, many 20th century historians and theologians have seriously challenged the idea that there even was such a phenomenon. Were the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom ever *really* lost?

Growth of Israel Into a Nation

Before answering that question, it is essential to understand the basic contours of Israelite history. The people of Israel descended from the twelve sons of the biblical patriarch Jacob. At some time probably in the 17th century B. C., severe famine throughout the Fertile Crescent drove Jacob and his family to seek refuge in Egypt where Jacob’s favorite son, Joseph, had been

sold into slavery about two and a half decades before. Thanks to Joseph's remarkable turn of good fortune--his unlikely ascent from slave status to the Egyptian prime ministership--he was in a position to benefit the entire family (Gen. 45:4-7) during this time of trial and famine throughout the entire Levant (41:28-32, 53-42:2, 43:1-2). Jacob and his family took up residence in the fertile alluvial plain of Goshen (45:10-11, 47:1-4) where the children of Israel remained and grew into a people (Ex. 1:7) over the following two centuries.

The establishment of Egypt's XVIIIth dynasty bode ill for the Israelite colony in the northeast corner of the Egyptian kingdom. Founded by Ahmose I (c. 1570-1546), this dynasty very likely introduced the change in Egyptian policy which laid the groundwork that turned Israel into a slave people under harsh Egyptian taskmasters (Ex. 1:8-14). The anti-Israelite character of Ahmose's program was probably part of a larger nationalist reaction against varying degrees of Hyksos domination of Egypt running from Dynasties XIII through XVII (c. 1780-1560). The Hyksos were an Asiatic people ethnically related to the Hebrews. Their dominance in Egypt during the life of Joseph may help to account for his acceptability as a central figure in Egyptian government.

The cryptic biblical reference--"Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph" (Ex. 1:8)--may summarize this very pivotal period of Egyptian history. If the XVIIIth Dynasty (slide #2472) is indeed the period being described, Ahmenhotep I (1551-1524 B.C.) probably followed his predecessor's lead by instituting the repressive policies which reduced the Israelite population to slave labor. Thutmose I (c. 1524-1518 B. C.) was likely the pharaoh who ordered Hebrew babies thrown into the Nile (Ex. 1:15-22). (Slide #8079 of Hatshepsut) And the famous Thutmose III (c. 1504-1450 B. C.) (slide #1149), remembered today as the "Napoleon of Egypt," became pharaoh around the time of Moses flight into the wilderness of Midian (Ex. 2:15).

Whenever these events may have occurred, some 40 years after Moses left Egypt, he returned, only this time to lead Israel on an Exodus out of Egypt (c. 1443 B. C.) (slide #2129) and eventually back to Canaan where father Abraham had spent the final century of his life.

(Slides #6369, 8045, 6371, 6130 of Mt. Nebo) After crossing the Jordan River and entering the land of promise (c. 1403 B. C.), the Israelites spent nearly the next four hundred years attempting to establish themselves as the dominant national presence in the Land of Canaan. This did not occur until the establishment in about 1004 B. C. of a combined Judahite-Israelite monarchy (II Sam. 2:4, 5:1-4) under the remarkably charismatic and talented David ben-Jesse. Only then did Israel finally become the dominant polity of the area known today as Palestine. After Solomon's rule, the Israelite kingdom split with the ten northern tribes existing as an independent polity for the next two centuries.

TEXT BOX: Egypt in American Heraldry

Israel in Egypt slides #12197, 2473

The Israelite experience in Egypt was a formative one. Indeed, Egypt was the location where the twelve sons of Jacob and their families grew into a vast multitude (Ex. 1:7). From these people, God would eventually form His own special nation (19:5). Should we be surprised, then, to find Egyptian symbolism in American heraldry. Perhaps the most conspicuous example is the official Seal of the United States, which appears on the back of the American one dollar bill. Under the motto *Annuit Coeptis*--"He hath prospered our undertakings"--we find the Great Pyramid of Gizeh. This choice of imagery is interesting in several respects.

The name "Joseph" derives from a Hebrew *yosafe*--"let him add"--implying "prosperity" (cf. Gen. 39:2-3, 23). As for the Pyramid of Gizeh, it rests in Egyptian territory almost precisely at the center of the earth along the 30th parallel in longitude and on the 31st meridian east of Greenwich. As it appears on the Seal, the Pyramid consists of 13 layers of stone--an allusion to Manasseh's national number--and is missing the cornerstone at the top (cf. Ps. 118:22, Lk. 20:17). Some British-Israelite exegetes have suggested that the absent capstone is representative of that "Stone Kingdom" described in Daniel 2:34-35. The all-seeing eye above the Pyramid itself connotes God's overseeing presence and attention to the fortunes of the American nation (cf. Ps. 121:4, Jer. 24:6). The Glory Cloud behind the eye is reminiscent of the pillar of cloud which led

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

the ancient Israelites on their journey out of Egypt and through the wilderness (Ex. 13:21, 14:19-20, 16:10, 24:16, 34:5, 40:38, Num. 9:17, 10:34, 16:42, ps. 105:39).

The motto beneath the Pyramid reads *Novus Ordo Seclorum*--"New Order of the Ages." Such a choice is interesting considering that the establishment of the new American nation contributed to the Anglo-American ascendancy--an ascent which is a type of Israel as God's supreme and model nation during the Millennial rule of Jesus Christ.

Egyptian imagery was on the mind of many of those who contributed to the creation of the new United States of America. Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams comprised the original committee for creating an official national seal. Benjamin Franklin's design for the U. S. Seal showed Moses lifting his rod and dividing the Red Sea while in the background Pharaoh's host was overwhelmed (slide #811). Although Franklin's design was not adopted, the rays emanating from the pillar of fire in his design survived to find expression in the Seal which was ultimately selected.

Thomas Jefferson originally proposed that the obverse side of the Seal portray the liberated children of Israel in the wilderness, led through divine guidance by a cloud during the day and a pillar of fire by night (slide #810--an artist's depiction of what this illustration might have looked like). The motto encircling Jefferson's own personal seal (slide #1870) read "Rebellion to Tyrants is Obedience to God"--words taken from Oliver Cromwell and the epitaph of John Bradshaw, both among the regicides of Charles I (1625-1649).

It is apparent that the founding American fathers saw a parallel between the Israelite experience of Egyptian bondage and their own perceived colonial bondage and mistreatment under the "tyranny" of an English king. There was far more to the similarities than they ever imagined in the imagery which they selected for the United States of America.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: Cleopatra's Needles

Slides #976, 1943, 1045, 1296, 3679-80, 5099; Mehemet Ali--2123, 1992, 1962

Two remarkable Egyptian monuments stand today in London and New York City. Both are solid red granite obelisks from the Temple of On in the ancient city of Memphis. Known as "Cleopatra's Needles," one is found on the banks of the Thames River near the Parliament buildings; the other resides in Central Park in front of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Both monuments were gifts to Great Britain and America respectively from the Viceroy of Egypt, Mehemet Ali (1769-1849).

If these obelisks are invaluable treasures from antiquity, they are also interesting silent witnesses to the connection tying Joseph to the land and people of Egypt. Joseph's children were a blend of Semitic and royal Egyptian blood. The mother of Ephraim and Manasseh was in fact Asenath, an Egyptian princess and the daughter of Potipherah the Prince of On (Gen. 41:45). It was probably in part for these very reasons that Jacob formally adopted his two grandsons (Gen. 48:5)--lest any of the other claimants to the Abrahamic Promise and the Birthright challenge Joseph's sons on grounds of their ethnicity.

Indeed there are two scriptural allusions in which the Ephaimite descendants of Israel's family are referred to as Egyptians (Isa. 23:3, Hos. 11:1-3). So it is that today, Cleopatra's obelisks can serve as perpetual reminders of our origins as a people coming out of the land of Egypt and our distinctive Israelitish ethnic heritage.

End of Text Box

Israel's Golden Age

If David laid the foundation for a united Israelite monarchy, it was his successor and son Solomon who brought Israel to new pinnacle of power and glory (cf. I Kings 3:11-13, II Chron. 1:11-12). Although many of today's archaeologists and theologians dispute the accuracy of the biblical account, Scripture represents the Solomonic era as a "Golden Age" when "the king made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones, and cedars made he to be as the sycomore tree that are in the vale, for abundance" (I Kings 10:27).

The language used by the biblical narrator to describe Solomon's splendor and manificence is the same employed later by the prophets to represent the coming millennial age when the Kingdom of God will govern the earth under the rulership of Jesus Christ Himself (e.g., I Kings 4:25 and Micah 4:4). The biblical account of Solomon's reign *abounds* with Millennial types, patterns, and forerunners. As many biblical commentaries will attest, Solomon--whose name derives from the Hebrew root word *shelomoh* meaning "peaceful" or "peaceable"-- is often representative of no less than the quintessential Prince of Peace (Isa. 9:6), Jesus Christ.

Solomon's reign brought a version of the very things which will come in earnest under Christ's beneficent worldwide rule: peace (I Kings 4:24-25, Isa. 2:4, Micah 4:4), happiness and prosperity (I Kings 4:20, 22-23, 10:14-23, 27, Amos 9:13, Micah 4:4), wisdom and the availability of spiritual knowledge and understanding (I Kings 4:29-34, 10:1, 4, 6-9, II Chron. 1:12, the Book of Proverbs, most of which is of Solomonic authorship, and Isa. 11:9), world renown (I Kings 4:21, 10:1, 6, 23-24, Ps. 72:8-11, 19, Isa. 2:3, Zech. 9:10), and a massive program of building and construction (I Kings 6:1, 7:1-2, Isa. 58:12, 61:4, Ez. 36:10, 33-36). Students of the Solomonic period also describe it as an age of intellectual revival and learning (see Lawrence Boadt, *Reading the Old Testament*, p. 477; James Pritchard, *Solomon and Sheba*, p. 30; and Andre Lemaire's essay in *Ancient Israel* edited by Hershel Shanks, p. 106)--something which will also be a major feature of Christ's program to reeducate and elevate the newly subjugated populations of the world (Zech. 8:23, 14:16-19, Rev. 2:27).

Indeed, the Solomonic age of glory is a biblical forerunner of even greater fulfillments of the physical, material, and national promise made to the descendants of Abraham. Like *all* forerunners or imperfect "types," Solomon's Golden Age was a shadow of the reality it forecast. It bore within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

The Divided Kingdom

If Solomon's Israel bore the form of greater things to come, his methodologies for kingdom building were not always Christ-like. Indeed, by the conclusion of his reign, the kingdom's religious life had grossly deteriorated (I Kings 11:4-8). More relevant to our concerns,

dissatisfaction over his high rate of taxation, enforced labor policies otherwise known as the *corvee*, and insensitivity to concerns regarding respect for the territorial integrity of the tribes north of Jerusalem had all reached dangerous proportions.

When Solomon's son and successor, Rehoboam, met with northern leaders at Shechem for the purpose of renewing the Davidic covenant of rulership over the northern tribes (I Kings 12:1), he very likely found himself confronted by a sullen and disillusioned group of men intent on having their grievances promptly and effectively addressed (v. 2-5). The young new king took three days to consider the northern appeal for tax reform and a rescission or modification of the *corvee*, only to mistakenly accept the advice of his younger contemporaries over older, wiser heads (12:6-13). He responded to northern requests with sharp rebuke and a foreboding promise: "My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke: my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (v. 14).

Rehoboam's wrongheaded, youthful presumptuousness had a predictable outcome. Heeding the cry, "To your tents, O Israel" (v. 6), the northern tribes rallied under the leadership of their chief spokesperson, Jeroboam (v. 2-3, 20) declaring "What portion have we in David?" (v. 15-16). From that momentous separation between Israel and Judah, the Bible bears witness to a two century-long progression of 10 different dynasties, presided over by no less than 19 monarchs reigning over what became commonly known as the "Northern Kingdom." This new political entity, completely separate from the Kingdom of Judah, essentially was comprised of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh (descendants of the two sons of Joseph), Dan, Gad, Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali. From the establishment of this independent Israelite monarchy, national leadership invariably took the northern tribes away from God.

Starting with King Jeroboam I (c. 931-910 B. C.), the religious life (slides #6642-50 of Tel-Dan) of the kingdom atrophied. Jeroboam evidently mistrusted God's forthright and awesome assertion which could have launched the Northern Kingdom to remarkable achievement and success. Through the prophet Ahijah, God promised Jeroboam:

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

And I will take thee, and thou shalt reign according to all that thy soul desireth, and shalt be king over Israel. And it shall be, if thou wilt harken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do that is right in my sight, to keep my statutes, and my commandments, as David my servant did; that I will be with thee, and build thee a sure house, as I built for David, and will give Israel unto thee (11:30,37-38).

Unhappily, Jeroboam failed to take advantage of this remarkable opportunity. With a faithlessness that has characterized Israelite behavior throughout almost all of Israel's history (e.g., Num. 13:17-14:45, Lk. 18:8, Heb. 3:8-19) (slide #7066--Golden Calf), Jeroboam succumbed to the pressures of fear that his northern subjects would return to the House of David (I Kings 12:26). In particular, he was anxious that Israelite religious unity eventually would prompt a restoration of political oneness among the twelve tribes.

To subvert any such development, Jeroboam actually polluted the religious life of his people by erecting golden calves as idols in both Dan and Bethel (I Kings 12:28-30). Believing that the common observance of the annual festivals of Yahweh (Lev. 23) would rekindle a desire for national unification, he changed the date of the annual fall festival (Lev. 23:23-44) from the seventh to the eighth month of the Hebrew calendar (I Kings 12:32-33). Finally, he summarily dismissed the Aaronic and Levitical priesthood (v. 31, 14:33), a group of men set apart by God's own decree (e.g., Ex. 40:15) for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the religious life of the nation. The Levitical priesthood represented a threatening independent power base within his kingdom. They inherited their office, owed the king nothing, and were largely outside his control. In place of the Levites, Jeroboam created new ecclesiastical hierarchy "of the lowest people" (12:31, 14:33), a group of men who owed all that they had and were to the king. Such a caste would have to cater to royal favor to retain position. By dismissing the Levitical priests of the north, Jeroboam gained royal control of the priesthood.

Thus the first king of the new Israelite dynasty established a pattern in religious life which ultimately led to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom. So was the impact of the religious changes Jeroboam introduced that his reign became the standard against which future evil in Israel would be measured. While there were occasional religious reformations like the half-baked return

to Yahwism under the administration of general-turned-king Jehu (II Kings 9:6, 16-33, 10:1-7, 18-32), for the most part, Israel's political and ecclesiastical leadership persisted in the sins of Jeroboam (e.g., I Kings 13:34, 15:30, 16:2-3, 19) virtually from the foundation to the collapse of the Israelite state.

In the final analysis, God withdrew His protection and blessing, leaving the Northern Kingdom to fall victim, like most of other small, independent kingdoms across the 8th century B.C. Fertile Crescent to a new and powerful military presence on the ascendancy from about the mid-9th century. The coming of the Assyrians spelled doom for Israel (slides #2414, 2639, 2655--maps).

Into Assyrian Captivity

The landmark 19th century A. D. discoveries of British archaeologist Austen Henry Layard dispelled any doubts that the Assyrian kingdom was a formidable force which ferociously dominated the entire ancient Near East off and on from the 9th through the 7th centuries B.C. It is indisputable that the Assyrians invaded and conquered the Northern Kingdom as part of that domination. What remains beyond our grasp are the precise, complete, and irrefutably accurate facts and figures involved.

Some argue that only a small number of leading people--the Northern intelligentsia--were actually taken captive by the Assyrians. The rest either fled as refugees, or assimilated into the alien populations transplanted in the Northern Kingdom (II Kings 17:24). Others believe that the enslavement and removal of Israelites involved almost the entire northern population. How are we to know who is correct? How many Israelites were actually deported?

TEXT BOX: Egypt, Assyria, and the British Museum

ILLUSTRATIONS: Selected pictures of the main Egyptian & Assyrian pieces in the British Museum

For any enthusiast of ancient world history, a pilgrimage to the British Museum is an antiquarian's delight. Inside its richly filled halls, the visitor discovers many of the most important

archaeological remains of the greatest civilizations and kingdoms in all the ancient world. In particular, one finds an abundance of treasures which document the histories of the Egyptian and Assyrian kingdoms.

From Egypt we find among *many* other things, the Rosetta Stone (slides #5222, 3763)--the key to unlocking one understanding of Egyptian hieroglyphics; the huge granite head of Amenhotep III from Karnak; and an impressive assemblage of mummies and various papyri. The Assyrian collection of the British Museum takes up a full seven rooms. Included in these treasures are Shalmanester's Black Obelisk; the Taylor Prism; the colossal human headed bulls and lions; and the reliefs of the Lachish siege, royal lion hunts, and reliefs from various palace walls. Those who stroll through its corridors leave with a distinct sense of what it might have been like to have lived during the heyday of Nimrud, Nineveh, and other major Assyrian cities.

There is a certain appropriateness that such a large concentration of Egyptian and Assyrian records, monuments, and archaeological artifacts reside in Britain's national museum. For ancient Israel, the two kingdoms of Egypt and Assyria were intimately involved in Israel's beginnings and endings. As the Bible reveals, the tribes migrated to Canaan out of an extended sojourn in Egypt, eventually settling in that area and establishing themselves in the 11th and 10th centuries B. C. as the dominant regional power. After Solomon's rule, the Israelite kingdom split with the ten northern tribes existing as an independent polity for the next two centuries.

The descendants of ten of the Israelite tribes eventually fell victim to the aggressive expansion of the Assyrian Empire. Many of the most interesting pieces in the Museum's collection provide the best extrabiblical documentation of the Bible's account of the extinction of the Northern Kingdom.

End of Text Box

Assyrian court records provide specific numbers. The Emperor Sargon II (slides #2045, 2677) claims to have taken 27,290 captive from Samaria (Sargon's *Annals*, 10-18). This number seems decidedly small against a population which some authorities estimate to have been around

500,000. However, if Sargon's testimony is a primary resource, it is also considered suspect by most modern-day historians of the period. The chroniclers of Sargon's reign did not produce the inscriptional record of Israel's fall until several years after the collapse of Samaria. More importantly, Sargon may have even fabricated a role for himself in the whole matter of Israel's conquest (slide of the Merneptah or "Israel" stele--#4157-8, 5058, 5198, 6664). Many scholars and historians point out other considerations which reduce to Sargon's credibility. "He probably had no right to that claim [of taking Samaria], at least not as king. He may have been Shalmaneser's army commander" (Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 130-131,154).

The immediate chain of events leading to Israel's ultimate fall actually began with Tiglath-pileser (745-727 B. C.), the Assyrian ruler who implemented the Galilean Captivity (734-732 B. C.) taking large segments of the Reubenite, Gaddite, and the trans-Jordan Manassite population into the upper Mesopotamian river valley. In fact, Shalmaneser V (726-722 B. C.) was the Assyrian monarch responsible for the 722/721-718 B. C. campaign into the Northern Kingdom.

Another observer reminds us that Shalmaneser:

was deposed soon afterwards by another king, Sargon II, whose very name, 'True King', betrays the suspect nature of his claim to the throne. Sargon moved the Assyrian capital to his own foundation of Khorsabad, built in imitation of Nimrud. . . . In three campaigns, 734-732 B. C., Tiglath-pileser overwhelmed the area. Damascus and part of Israel became Assyrian provinces, and many of the inhabitants were deported. In 722 B. C. Israel, which had proved a troublesome vassal state, was finally eliminated and Samaria became capital of an Assyrian province. The Assyrian king at this time was Shalmaneser V, but he did not have time to commemorate his achievements in stone, and it was his successor, Sargon II, who claimed credit for his victory (Julian Reade, *Assyrian Sculpture*, pp. 33, 45-46).

Finally, conservative biblical scholar Eugene Merrill observes that Shalmaneser V:

took Samaria in his last year. . . . Sargon, who probably was not the son of Tiglath-pileser, as some claim, but a usurper, reigned over the vast Assyrian Empire from 722 to 705. One of Assyria's most militant rulers, he claims to have undertaken significant campaigns in every one of his seventeen years. In the annals

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft — Rick Sherrod — February 1997

of his first year he takes credit for Samaria's fall. In actual fact the biblical assertion that Shalmaneser V was responsible is correct; as several scholars have shown, Sargon claimed this major conquest for his own reign so that the record of his first year would not be blank (*Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 408-409).

Even if Merrill is incorrect, might it be possible that Sargon's low figures regarding deportees reflect a mopping up operation--that the numbers he lists do not include those already taken by his predecessors Tiglath-pileser III and Shalmaneser V (slide #2618--Shalmaneser's campaign map)? The matter of Sargon's inscriptional record illustrates the difficulty of bias faced by every historian. He regardless of the time period who examines those accounts left behind by the participants in historical events: Can the record be trusted completely?

For those who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture (Jn. 17:17), there is another and far more reliable source: the biblical record. Moses predicted: "I [God] said, I would scatter them [Israel] into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men" (Deut. 32:36). The report of II Kings is probably the most essential biblical testimony:

Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only. . . the Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers, until he had cast them out of his sight. . . For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them; Until the Lord removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day (17:18-23).

Granted, there is biblical proof and indirect archaeological evidence that there were representatives from the northern tribes among the people of Judah well after Israel's fall. Undoubtedly, some northerners moved to the south in protest of the syncretistic practices introduced by Jeroboam I (II Kings 12:25-33, 13:33, II Chron. 11:13-26) (slide #2137) and many of his successors, most notably Ahab and Jezebel (I Kings 16:28-33, 18:3-4, 18). Such men and women did so in an effort to find an unpolluted religious environment in which to worship Yahweh.

It is also quite probable that many northerners headed south permanently to escape the Assyrian onslaught of the 8th century B. C. It is indisputable that the population of Jerusalem

support the idea that every last man, woman, and child of the Northern Kingdom went into captivity "in Halah, and in Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes" (II Kings 17:6, 18:11--cf. Hos. 13:16). Obviously, there were Israelites from the Northern Kingdom who relocated and assimilated into the Jewish Kingdom. The issue is *how many* were taken captive and deported by the Assyrian rulers Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon II.

It is significant that Assyrian ruler Tiglath-pileser instituted a novel policy concerning the treatment of conquered populations. Roman Catholic scholar and theologian Lawrence Boadt tells us that the practice of *mass* deportations "became the standard Assyrian policy from that time on. . . . There is good evidence that conditions were not as bad under the Babylonians as under the earlier Assyrians, who had begun the practice of mass deportations of conquered people back in the eighth century." Boadt amplifies his description of Tiglath-pileser noting that he would hold "entire cities responsible if they did not surrender the rebelling king to him. He would often wipe out a whole population or deport them to far-off lands and replace them with peoples conquered in still other parts of his empire" (Boadt, *Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 43, 383-384). Was this a pattern applied by the successors of Tiglath-pileser? Historians McKay and Buckler note that sometimes the Assyrians deported only a portion of a kingdom or nation. "In other cases they deported whole populations, wrenching them from their homelands and resettling them in strange territories" (*History of Western Society* 3rd ed., p. 50). If these secular historians agree thus, the Bible seems to indicate it all the more.

We must ask whether the biblical assertion that "there was none left but the tribe of Judah only" (II Kings 17:18) should be taken at face value. If one accepts the scriptures as a valid primary resource, the biblical evidence suggests it is wiser to err on the side of literalist interpretation. In predicting the Assyrian overrunning of the Northern Kingdom, the prophet Amos prophetically described the "remnant" that would be left behind: "Thus saith the Lord; as the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear; so shall the children of Israel be taken out that dwell in Samaria in the corner of a bed, and in Damascus in a

couch” (Amos 3:12). In such a fashion, Amos poetically represents the paupery population of the Northern Kingdom after the Assyrian conquest.

Finally, Jewish tradition, which anticipates an eventual reunion of the physical twelve tribes as part of its Messianic eschatology (see the *Soncino Commentary* on Isa. 43:12-21, Jer. 23:6-8, Ez. 37:19; note also Jer. 33:7 and Geyer’s “Some Salient New Testament Passages,” pp. 305-310), also strongly supports the notion of lost tribes. With the exception of the testimony of an Assyrian king, whose *Annals* themselves are suspect, there is no specific number assigned biblically or otherwise to the northerners deported. Neither is there record of the number involved in any resettlement in or return to the region of Judea. And so. . . we are left with the question: Where then did the Israelites go?

expanded greatly during that very time. Israeli archaeologist Magen Broshi estimates that the population of Jerusalem swelled from about 7,500 to 24,000 as the 8th century drew to a close. Not all this increase is attributable to a burgeoning birthrate. Certainly some pious northerners responded to Hezekiah's religious reformation (II Chron. 30:1-18, 31:1) but most probably acted out of fear of the oncoming Assyrian invasion.

Perhaps the greatest archaeological find relevant to the issue of northerners relocating in the south is Hezekiah's "broad wall"--20-23 feet wide and located on the city's western ridge Nahaman Avigad discovered this structure in 1970 (cf. II Chron. 32:5, Isa.22:9-11). Indirectly related is "Hezekiah's Tunnel"--a subterranean channel beneath the city of Jerusalem to guarantee the city's water supply in time of siege. This archaeological feature attests to the anxieties which the Assyrian invasion (II Kings 18:9-19:37, Isa. 36-37) of the late-8th century must have created.

Other frequently cited Biblical passages regarding an Israelite presence in Judea pertain to Asa's reign over Judah (II Chronicles 15:8c-9) and the Josianic reformation period (34:3, 6, 9, 35:17-18, II Kings 23:19-20). Of less certainty are the claims that all Israel was restored in the days of Zerubbabel (slide #2195--Cyrus Cylinder), Ezra, or Nehemiah. Many critics of British-Israelism vigorously maintain that the 6th century B. C. Restoration under Zerubbabel constituted a return of all twelve tribes (cf. mention of "all Israel" in Ezra 2:70, 7:28); not Judah only.

Much is made of the sacrificing of "twelve bulls for all Israel" (Ezra 8:35--see also 6:16-17) or references to "Israelites" (Neh. 11:3-4) or Zechariah's admonitions to both houses (Zech. 8:13). To bring balance to this debate, we must remember that the resettlement process was into areas from which the emigrees' predecessors had formally lived. The names of the returnees accompanying Ezra (e.g., Ezra 1:5, 8:1-15) are Jewish--not names from northern tribesmen.

Moreover, the Bible mentions only a few locations of the area resettled which are not decidedly part of Judah's territorial inheritance (Jericho, Bethel, and possibly Ono, and Neballat--Neh. 7:32, 36-37, 11:31-35). Those sites which were in the north are located in the far

south along the border of the territory of the Kingdom of Judah. We are likely looking at areas which were peopled by the southernmost inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom--ones who escaped the net of the 8th century B. C. Assyrian captivity--or quite possibly Jews who eventually drifted north to occupy the land vacated by Assyrian deportation. Ezra 1:5 implies that the leaders and organizers of the return were Jewish rather than Israelite.

The New Testament includes numerous references to "the twelve tribes." Luke 2:36 mentions Anna the prophetess who was from the tribe of Asher. In Acts 2:2 and 3:12, we see Peter addressing his audience as "ye men of Israel" (cf. 5:21). Some critics employ Acts 9:15 to argue that Paul fulfilled his missionary work to Israel by preaching to the Jews. Others cite Acts 26:2-8 and 22-23 to argue that all 12 tribes worshipped God in the 1st century A. D. Romans 11:1 and Phil. 3:5 identify Paul not as a Jew but a Benjamite. James 1:1 addresses "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." Finally, some commentators argue that the salutation in I Peter 1:1--to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia"--is addressed to non-Jewish Israelites.

Again, Geysler convincingly challenges those who appropriate these New Testament verses in this fashion. He writes:

In parables and debates he [Jesus] taught them [the Twelve] its [the Kingdom's] nature and the signs of its coming, and to pray for it daily. The 'Twelve' (eleven) asked him after the resurrection, 'Are you now going to establish the Kingdom for Israel?' (Acts 1:6). James perceived their presence, the latent twelve tribes, in the Jewish dispersion in and around Antioch around 46 A. D. . . . Paul pronounces a beracha on the Israel of God in the Galatian diaspora, is convinced that all Israel will be saved and pleads before Agrippa his hope that according to the divine promises the Twelve Tribe Kingdom will be restored [Gal. 6:16, Rom. 11:26, Acts 26:6-7]. The twelve to whom Jesus delegated his power and authority to exemplify the ingathering in Galilee, and who for that occasion quite rightly *his*, not the church's, *apostoloi*, are literally fundamental to the Twelve Tribe Kingdom's restoration as apocalyptically symbolised in the "New Jerusalem" ("Some Salient New Testament Passages," p. 310).

In simple terms, there were Israelites as part of a long term diaspora. . . and there were Israelites who had settled within the boundaries of Judah. Neither the biblical nor secular records

V

The Migrations of Israel

If Assyria carried the majority of the Northern Kingdom's population into captivity, where then did those Israelites ultimately go? They were last seen headed northeast--captives of one of the most feared and brutal people in the ancient Near East. From that point forward in time, the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom essentially vanish from recorded history.

Can we find Israel today? If so, where are we to look for the evidence? The Bible itself is the best place to begin. The prophet Amos' prediction expands our understanding of the record in II Kings 17:18-23, a passage which indicates that the Eternal removed Israel "out of His sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only." This prophet from Tekoa in northern Judea tells us that the "remnant of Joseph" (5:15) would be scattered, but ultimately not lost entirely from God's view:

Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom [Israel as a political entity], and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house [or family] of Jacob, saith the Lord. For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth (9:8-9).

Also important is the prediction made even earlier in the days of king David concerning the *long-term* fate of Israel:

Moreover 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 before time (II Sam. 7:10--cf. I Chron. 17:9).

With these passages in mind, we might expect that the migrations of the tribes can be traced by hints in Scripture and prophecies and such is exactly the case.

Where Did the "Lost Tribes" Go?

The Scriptures cited above imply that Israel would be sifted--that they would be participants in a major migratory movement along with scores of other ethnic groups--and then be divinely led to and planted in a permanent home. This being the case, we can deduce from other passages that Israel's new land would be located to the north and west of the Promised Land. The most frequently used verse in this regard is found in the Book of Isaiah:

Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim (49:12--see also v. 20).

Since there was no expression in the Hebrew language corresponding to the English "northwest," it does not do violence to the meaning of Isaiah's predictions to understand this passage to mean that Israel would migrate in a northwesterly direction. (slide #3407--classic map from J. H. Allen book with descriptive caption)

Other sections of Scripture which are often cited include Hosea 12:1.

Ephraim feedeth on wind, and followeth after the east wind [i. e., an expression which implies moving to the west].

Jeremiah provides an interesting clue as well:

Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel (Jer. 3:11-12).

Still different passages suggest that Israel will ultimately be found in an island setting.

I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers (Psalm 89:25).

Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far (Isa. 49:1).

They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn. Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock (Jer. 31:9-10).

Other miscellaneous references to an island location include Jeremiah 31:1-3, 9-10, Isaiah 24:15, 41:1, 5, 51:5, 66:19, and Psalm 89:25. In addition, Isaiah 23:3 implies that Israel will be a maritime people (cf. Ez. 17:4-5). Collectively, all the passages cited above can be used to make the case that the captive Israelites eventually moved from Mesopotamia, ultimately settling in Northwestern Europe. The descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh, upon whom the patriarch Jacob or Israel had *specifically* named his name (Gen. 48:16), finally lighted in the British Isles.

If this use of Scripture seems contrived, there are other no less unusual and surprising applications of God's Word which were made by Jesus and still later the apostles themselves. Even Roman Catholic theologian Paul Knitter who probes the "scandal of particularity"--the claim that Jesus Christ represents something thoroughly surprising, exceptional and unique in human history--concedes the following: "Both critical Christians and skeptical humanists must be open to the *possibility* that *what* they [the Evangelical Christians] are saying may be true" (*No Other Name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions*, pp. 45, 49).

In principle, Knitter's concession applies similarly to the matter of the identity of Israel in modern times. If Israel still exists and is to be found today among the Anglo-Saxon peoples of the world, no amount of eloquent or persuasive theological reasoning to the contrary can confute the plan and purpose of God. If our Biblical reasoning--our hermeneutic--is sound thus far, *historical evidence* begins to bear a greater burden of proof.

How Did the Israelites Get to Europe?

One of the most conspicuously obscure periods of history lies between Israel's 8th century B. C. deportation and the appearance--seemingly from out of nowhere--of Hengist, Horsa, and their Anglo-Saxons compatriots (slide #536). These people arrived on the Thanet (slide #3756--map; 3694-8, 3807-11, 3893-7--Ebbsfleet) off England's southeast coast in around A. D. 449. Finding Israel in the post-8th century B. C. ancient world is, of course, no mean task. It approximates the proverbial looking for a needle in a haystack.

Like all other inquiries of this nature, the results are restricted by the subjectivity of interpreting the very incomplete historical record of antiquity. Since records from the distant past

are so partial--limited by the ravages of time, war, and the elements, not to mention the intractable difficulty of reconstructing the histories of the largely non-literate populations--a single find in archaeology can literally overturn a whole interpretive paradigm in a matter of years. Because of this, the reconstruction of ancient world history is--and until the Marriage Supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19:7-9) will remain--subject to criticism and radically different interpretations of the same basic evidence. Such limitations make the search for Israel's trail particularly challenging.

How then did the Lost Ten Tribes get from Mesopotamia to Northwestern Europe and the British Isles? This scenario seems unlikely--a unique interpretation of both historical facts and the Word of God. The former leaves us very little to go on--only shards of historical evidence. However, if there is a paucity of primary resource material, the broad contours of the story can be reconstructed from the fragments of history we do have.

TEXT BOX: Post-Captivity Israel and the Extrabiblical Record

The two principal extrabiblical references to post-captivity Israel come from 1st century A.D. Jewish historian, Josephus, and the apocryphal work we know as II Esdras (c. A. D. 70-135) (slides #3184-5). In *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus writes:

the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country [to which the Assyrians deported them]; wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers (*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 11, Chapter V, Section 2).

Where Josephus got his information, we do not know

The account of Esdras reads:

Then you saw him collecting a different company, a peaceful one. They are the ten tribes which were taken off into exile in the time of King Hoshea, whom Shalmaneser king of Assyria took prisoner. He deported them beyond the [Euphrates] River, and they were taken away into a strange country. But then they resolved to leave the country populated by the Gentiles and go to a distant land never inhabited by man [cf. II Sam. 7:10], and there at last to be obedient to their laws, which in their own country they had failed to keep [cf. Lev. 26:18-21]. As

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft – Rick Sherrod – February 1997

they passed through the narrow passages of the Euphrates, the Most High performed miracles for them, stopping up the channels of the river until they had crossed over [cf. the Israelite crossing of the Red Sea (cf. Ex. 14:16, 21-22) and later the Jordan River (cf. Josh. 3:13)]. Their journey through that region, which is called Arzareth, was long, and took a year and a half. They have lived there ever since, until this final age. Now they are on their way back, and once more the Most High will stop the channels of the river [cf. Isa. 27:6, 12-13] to let them cross” (II Esdras 13:39-47).

While the records of neither Josephus nor Esdras merit the credibility of inspired and canonized Scripture, there is very likely a core of truth in the accounts which both writers have preserved for us.

With particular reference to Esdras’ record, one of the most creative (if subjective) explanations of how Israel’s trek can be demonstrated is found in an article by John Hulley (a.k.a., Yochanan Hevroni Ben David) “Did Any of the Lost Tribes Go North? Is the ‘Sambatyon’ the Bosphorus?,” published in *B’Or Ha’Torah*, No. 6 (in English), 1987 (pp. 127-133). The author explores the tradition which indicates that the lost tribes are located beyond the “Sambatyon,” a river which is said to have rested--ceased its flow--on the Sabbath day (cf. Babylonian Talmud *Sanhedrin* 65B; Jerusalem Talmud *Sanhedrin* 10:6; *Lamentations Rabba* 2:9; *Genesis Rabba* 11:5, 73:6; *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* to Ex. 34:10; and Nachmanides on Deut. 32:36).

Hulley demonstrates that the narrow strait of the Bosphorus, through which pass the waters of the Black Sea into the Aegean, is the likely the “river” about which tradition speaks. “There the current does slow down drastically, stop or even reverse on average about once a week” (p. 128). He offers an explanation of the physical process which produces this unusual phenomenon. The Bosphorus would have been a likely area through which *some* of the migrating Israelites would have passed on their journey out of Assyrian captivity and on to the European Continent. Hulley concludes his article with a refreshingly balanced approach writing, “these pieces of evidence are circumstantial, and the identification can therefore only be conjectural. On the other hand, they are unique, and their combination is exceptional.” (slides #1378, 4013, 1987, 2118, 3959, 3979-81--various maps highlighting possibilities as described in text immediately above & below)

There are many other interesting and plausible theories about how Israel made the trek from the Middle East to Northwestern Europe. One such treatment is W. E. Filmer's article (slide #1511), "Our Scythian Ancestors," which proposes an Israelite migration well east of the route suggested by Hulley above, and through the Dariel Pass in the Caucasus Mountains. Filmer argues that a network of Scythian tombs dating from the early 6th century B. C. through the mid-4th century B. C. exists to the northwest of the area and documents the course of Israelite migrations. He believes that these travelers filled the expanse between the Sea of Azov and the Carpathian Mountains. Based on evidence derived from some similarities in burial practices, Filmer attempts to connect the Israelites/Scythians with the Germanic population which arrived along the coasts of the southern Baltic Sea several centuries later. His argument, as interesting as it may be, falls somewhat short in making an indisputable connection between Israel and the Scythian tombs (see also Raymond F. McNair, "Hard, Physical Evidence," *America and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 42).

Finally, one of the richest and most detailed description of Israel's departure from Assyrian territory comes from Major Bertram De W. Weldon (*The Origin of the English*, 2nd ed., rev., 1919, pp. 48-52) (slide #3512). Bringing his military experience to bear, he equates the freeing of the Israelites with the defeat of the Assyrians at the hands of Nabopolassar (626-605 B.C.) of Babylon in a sequence of engagements: initially in 612 B. C. with the fall of Nineveh; at the first Battle of Carchemish in 609 B. C.; and the final knock out blow several years later, again at Carchemish (slides #2656, 5331), site of the last remaining Assyrian stronghold (605 B. C.).

Drawing from the apocryphal Book of Tobit (c. 250-175 B. C.), Weldon suggests that Tobit, both a leader in the Israelite community and an Assyrian official, believed a return to Palestine would be impractical. Hostile armies blocked the route back home and Egyptian garrisons occupied Judah. Weldon opines:

Between the country of the Carducci and the armies of the Medes a narrow gap lay open. This was the route through the Caucasus. . . . With some dim traditions of their former Exodus to hearten them, with the encouragement given by the more recent prophetic messages that had reached them [allegedly from Jeremiah--p. 48],

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft – Rick Sherrod – February 1997

the tribes left their starting point (probably in the region of Ecbatana), crossed the upper waters of the Euphrates, where their enemies very nearly cut them off [cf. II Esdras 13:43-44], and swung North through the Caucasus into Scythia. In the Caucasus one of the important passes bears the name of the “gates of Israel” to this day. . . . The flight of Israel, which may be dated 608 B. C., the year of the battle of Carchemish [*sic.*], would bring the tribes across the upper Euphrates, through the passes of the Caucasus, into the vast and barren plains of the Scythian steppes.

As fascinating as the story created by Weldon may be, like much British-Israel literature, his version of events appears rooted in military-strategic intuition more than solid historical evidence.

END OF TEXT BOX

Raymond McNair’s Global Church of God booklet *America and Britain in Prophecy* (1996) does an admirable job in presenting the historical evidence documenting Israel’s location and movements in ancient history (see McNair, “Anglo-American Ethnic Roots,” *America and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 28-44). His work is especially interesting concerning the connections between Israel and the ancient world people known to us as the Celts, Cimmerians, and Scythians. He makes these associations with good cause. Scandinavian scholar Anne Katrine Gade Kristensen includes an argument in favor of identifying the Cimmerians as Israelitish in her volume, *Who Were the Cimmerians, and Where Did They Come From? Sargon II, the Cimmerians, and Rusa I* (see especially chapter 3, pp. 118-122).

It is significant that other historians have argued that the successive waves of “Germanic” migrants--the *Volkeswanderung*--into southeastern and central Europe were essentially comprised of the same ethnic group. The movement itself is a complicated one.

Many twentieth-century historians and sociologists have tried to explain who the Germans were and why they emigrated, but scholars have not had much success at answering these questions. The surviving evidence is primarily archaeological, scanty, and not yet adequately explored. . . . Why did the Germans emigrate? We do not know. . . . ‘The cause and nature of the *Volkeswanderung* challenge the inquirer as much as ever.’ . . . Scholars are hampered in answering these questions [about who the Germans were] because the Germans could not write and thus kept no written records before their conversion to Christianity [generally considered when Frankish King Clovis became Christian in c. A. D. 498]. . . . Our knowledge

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

of the Germans depends largely on information in records written in the sixth and seventh centuries and projected backward (McKay, *et. al.*, *History of Western Society*, 3rd ed., pp. 210, 212-214).

Undoubtedly, the groups of Israelites which departed from Mesopotamia as part of this general movement left the land of their captivity in sizable but distinct and separate groups. Various respective parties probably followed different routes. Moreover, as implied by the prophecy of Amos 9:9--that Israel would be sifted "among all nations, like corn is sifted in a sieve"--intermixed with the many other peoples moving northward to escape from harm's way from the invading armies coming out of the lower Tigris-Euphrates river valley.

With this in mind, we must be careful not to generalize. Not all Scythians, Cimmerians, or Celts were Israelites. Indeed, the term "Scythian" itself appears to be more a *generic* name for tribal peoples rather than for a specific ethnic group. Of course, some Israelites no doubt were included among those so designated after the close of the 7th century B. C. Scripture itself may include a backhanded allusion to this very fact. Note in Colossians 3:11 the interesting biblical use of the term "Scythian" in juxtaposition to "Barbarian." This passage legitimately can be understood to imply Israelite versus non-Israelite, just as the similar phraseology "neither Jew nor Greek" in Galatians 3:28 suggests.

TEXT BOX: The Declaration of Aberbrothock

On April 6, 1320, Scottish noblemen of the Estates in Parliament gathered at the Abbey of Aberbrothock to endorse an official declaration which affirmed their independence from the Kingdom of England. Only three years after English King Edward II experienced a crushing defeat at the Battle of Bannockburn, these aristocrats wished to publicly endorse the rulership of Robert the Bruce and enlist the support of John XXII, the Roman Catholic pontiff.

If the declaration failed to receive the papal endorsement it sought, its contents include an almost unbelievable statement:

We know, Most Holy Father and Lord, and from the chronicles and books of the ancients gather, that among other illustrious nations, ours, to with the nation of the Scots, has been distinguished by many honors; which passing from the greater

Scythia through the Mediterranean Sea and Pillars of Hercules, and sojourning in Spain among the most savage tribes through a long course of time, could nowhere be subjugated by any people however barbarous; and coming thence one thousand two hundred years after the outgoing of the people of Israel, they, by many victories and infinite toil, acquired for themselves the possessions in the West which they now hold. . . . In their kingdom one hundred and thirteen kings of their own royal stock, no stranger intervening, have reigned.

Many British-Israelite writers have found in this remarkable declaration implicit evidence of the Israelite connection to the Scythians whose descendants became the modern-day Scots.

End of Text Box

If all of these various arguments hold a certain appeal, they fall short of being absolutely conclusive. The trail of Israel out of the upper Mesopotamian river valley is less conspicuous than we would like it to be. Nevertheless, it is not that difficult to deduce how groups of Israelites must have moved slowly and inexorably in a northwesterly direction. British-Israelite literature--with varying degrees of support from historical documentation--typically includes some of the following threads in its rendition of how this migration occurred.

Some members of Israelitish clans left Israel well before the 8th century B. C. deportation began. In particular, number of Danites departed Israel shortly after the 15th century B. C. Exodus from Egypt, going first to Greece but eventually settling in Ireland. During the reign of Solomon and other subsequent kings, it is possible that Israelite colonists left Israel for Britain, Ireland, and northwestern European coastlands. The Bible tells us that Solomon had a navy which he operated with the Phoenicians (I Kings 9:26-28, II Chron. 8:18, 9:21). We know the Phoenicians established colonies in North Africa, Spain, and Ireland. At a minimum, some Israelites would have been aware of Phoenician activity in Europe. It is a reasonable possibility that the Israelites also may have been involved in commercial or colonial activity in these same areas.

TEXT BOX: The Red Hand of Ulster

One of the most fascinating legends in Irish history explains the origin of Ulster's heraldic symbol, the Red Hand (slide #735, 1113, 1194, 1206). Although accounts may differ from one source to another, there is general agreement that the symbol is tied to a family named O'Neill. According to legend, there was a boat race between the chieftans of the O'Neill and McDonnell families to determine ownership of the Ulster area. Whoever first reached shore was to receive the land.

As both boats neared the shoreline, the O'Neill chieftain saw he was going to lose the race. To reverse that outcome, he cut off his right hand and flung it to the shore where it touched dry land before McDonnell could arrive. As a result, O'Neill became the Prince of Ulster. Still today, in memory of this episode of Irish history, the Province of Ulster bears as its symbol the renowned Red Hand.

Those who believe that the Throne of David resided in Ireland from the 6th century B. C. through 9th century A. D. often make an interesting and quite different connection between the Red Hand of Ulster and the biblical account, about the birth of Judah's twin sons, Pharez and Zarah (Genesis 38:28-30). The Bible places a special focus on this story and rightly so. As the time of birth drew near, Zarah extended his hand out of his mother's womb. The attending midwife, wanting to insure that the family knew which child was firstborn, tied a scarlet thread around the baby's wrist. To everyone's surprise, the babies repositioned themselves, and Pharez became the first to emerge from Tarah's body. Thus deprived of primogeniture, Zarah's descendants eventually sought a better future by migrating to Europe.

Some suggest that Calcol, Zarah's grandson led the family of Zarah on a migration west temporarily settling in Spain. Calcol finally continued his travels, founding the Kingdom of Ulster near the end of the 17th century B. C. The Zaharite presence in the Emerald Isle, British-Israelites would argue, is the real origin of Ulster's Red Hand. Whatever one may think about the historicity of the migrations of Zarah, it is a curious fact of history that until 1920, the official Arms of Northern Ireland included a scarlet thread encircling the heraldic Red Hand.

For additional information, see W. Howard Bennett's *Symbols of Our Celto-Saxon Heritage*.

End of Text Box

The majority of Israelites, however, remained geographically stationary until the 8th century B. C. At that point, the Assyrians under Tiglath-pileser began taking the Israelites into captivity as early as the 730s, with the final and great deportation from Samaria commencing in 721. The beginning of the end for the Assyrian Empire came in 612 B.C. with the destruction of Nineveh. The final demise came at the Battle of Carchemish (605 B. C.) when the Babylonians, Persians, and their Scythian allies dealt Assyria a knockout blow. After that point and perhaps even shortly before, some of the Israelite tribes in captivity south of the Caspian Sea undoubtedly began to free themselves and migrate towards Europe. This migratory process moved in fits and starts, extending over several centuries.

The *first wave* of Israelite people (very likely the Cimmerian or Celtic people) migrated from Assyria through the Caucasus mountains and then into Western Europe. Those people became known to the Greek writers by the name "Celts" (Kelts) but were called Gauls by the Romans. The *second wave* of Israelites (probably the Scythians) migrated around the eastern side of the Caspian Sea before turning westward. They passed through what is now south Russia into northern Poland and Germany. They were pressed from the rear by the Samarthians, better known today as the Slavs. The Scythians overspread much of Northwest Europe and Scandinavia, eventually taking on names such as Normans, Danes, Swedes, Franks, Lombards, Scots, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and other less familiar appellations of the various Germanic tribes.

Invariably, British-Israelite literature places the tribe of Joseph in the British Isles. From here the story is not only beyond dispute but relatively clear since no one questions whether the British are Celtic and Anglo-Saxon or that the United States was initially settled by people of that same ethnicity. In subsequent sections of this booklet we will explore in greater depth the historical evidence connecting the tribe of Joseph to the Anglo-American peoples. Before we do

so, we should examine a different but related tribespeople. If Joseph's descendants settled finally in the British Isles, what then of his brother tribespeople?

Tribal Identities

How can we know where each respective tribe eventually settled? If this question is less important than the story of modern-day Joseph, its answer is quite significant in magnifying our appreciation of how the bequeathing of the Birthright blessings eventually occurred in the late-18th and early-19th centuries (the timing of which will be explained in Chapter VI). An interesting dimension of the question of modern tribal identities relates to a titanic "struggle for the Birthright" (cf. Gen. 25:22) which continued beyond the biblical record. This story, recorded in modern history, provides convincing if subjective evidence of the identity of both modern-day Joseph and his brothers.

As early as the 17th century, we see periodic bids by the northwestern European and Scandinavian nation-states to dominate the European Continent. Are we witnessing in these struggles for power a picture of sibling rivalry writ large as the expiration of a withholding of the Birthright blessing inexorably drew near? If so, one brother after another--the Swedes, the Dutch, and finally the French--fell short in herculean efforts to usurp the promises made to Joseph and his two sons.

The description of the passing on of the Abrahamic promise as recorded in Gen. 48:22 reveals that the descendants of Joseph would have "one portion above his brethren" (cf. Deut. 21:15-17, Ez. 47.13). We should expect then by implication to find considerable wealth in the hands of the modern-day descendants of the remaining tribes (slides #7947-8--cartoons showing France & England dividing up globe). Such is undeniably the case today among the people of northwestern Europe and Scandinavia.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft — Rick Sherrod — February 1997

Much research has been done by French, Dutch and Scandinavian adherents of the Anglo-Israel movement to link their nations with one or another of the tribes. If such identifications remain somewhat conjectural, there is good circumstantial evidence which gives us confidence in making specific connections, particularly with three of those tribes. Mr. Armstrong also explored the question of tribal identities other than Ephraim and Manasseh but largely in a general way. He writes:

But what about the *other* tribes of the so-called "Lost Ten Tribes"? . . . The other eight tribes of Israel [excluding Judah, Joseph, Levi, and Benjamin] were also God's chosen people. They, too, have been blessed with a good measure of material prosperity--but *not* the dominance of the birthright. . . . The countries of Europe [are] prosperous compared to the teeming illiterate masses [of the world]. . . Suffice it to say here that there is evidence that these other eight tribes, along with elements of the tribe of Benjamin, which were swept up in the Assyrian conquest of most of the biblical land of Israel, have descended into such northwestern European nations as Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, northern France, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Finland. The political boundaries of Europe, as they exist today, do not necessarily show lines of division between descendants of these original tribes of Israel (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 104-105, 152-153).

In the case of one tribe outside of Joseph, Mr. Armstrong made a specific and important connection. He believed it possible to locate the descendants of Reuben. He writes, "The tribe of Reuben settled in the country that is France today. They had lost their national identity. But the French have the very characteristics of their ancestor Reuben [Gen. 49:3-4]" (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 146--see also pp. 40, 42, 104-105, 148-149, 152-153). This identification is an important one which the historical record and logical deduction does much to affirm (slide #510).

Seen from the British-Israel perspective, the long-term Anglo-French rivalry through Western history--an enmity which reached crescendo around the very decades when we would expect Joseph's sons to be positioning themselves to inherit the Birthright blessings--was in fact a struggle between Jacob's two firstborns over the colossal inheritance about to be extended. We

will examine some of the history-shaping implications of the forfeiture of the Birthright by Reuben (I Chron. 5:1-2) both in this chapter and in the one to follow.

Another association connecting the Dutch to the tribe of Zebulun frequently appears in literature about the modern identity of Israelites. One of the best and most convincing arguments for this particular position is *The Netherlands: Strange Parallels* by Helen W. van Woelderren (slides #1133-5). Moreover, just as an awareness of the identity of France as Reuben enlarges our understanding of where Joseph is today, so the story of Zebulun (Gen. 30:20-24) is particularly revealing. It is both interesting and highly significant that the tribe of Zebulun, in its ancient tribal territorial configuration, was a land-locked entity. Yet Jacob's prophecy of Gen. 49:13 predicted that Zebulun's descendants would "dwell at the haven of the sea (slide #2659--map of Holland); and he shall be for a haven of ships." Have the modern Dutch have fulfilled this prophecy? Probably so. (slide #1136--map of 12 Tribes in Palestine showing Zebulun's landlocked position)

In the birth order of Jacob's children, Zebulun and Joseph were the closest (Gen. 30:20-24). They no doubt spent more time together than they did with the other older brothers. The story of the Anglo-Dutch relationship in more recent times is a macrocosmic account of the relationship between these two brothers. The modern history of Britain has been dramatically influenced by circumstances in the "Low Countries." During the late-Middle Ages and early-Modern period, this region of Europe was of critical economic importance as a market for England's principal export of wool. French attempts to gain control of the southern portion of the Low Countries--specifically Flanders--was one of the precipitating causes of the Hundred Years' War (1340-1453--an intermittent and protracted conflict between Reuben and Joseph, descendants of the two firstborn sons of the patriarch Jacob).

In the early-18th century, the Dutch even provided a monarch for England--William of Orange (1688-1701) (slides #3058, 656, 693, 743, 2541, 2739, 2851)--who led both the Dutch and English into a new round of conflicts with France which some historians style as the "Second" Hundred Years' War (1689-1815). It is with good cause that the English often refer to the Low

Countries the "Cockpit of Europe." From Crecy (1346) to Waterloo (1815), a long succession of some of the most pivotal battles determining the fate of the British Isles took place in this very region (slide # --map of battle sites in Low Countries with locations, dates, and names of battles). This reality inspired the English Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger (1804-1806) (slide #688) to describe Belgium as "the chain which unites England to the Continent." Pitt continued the thought asserting that the nation which controls the Low Countries "holds a pistol pointed at the heart of England."

The story of modern Anglo-Dutch relations is complete with examples of sibling rivalry. The three Anglo-Dutch Wars (slides #2625-6, 2654, 2720, 2753, 2757, 2761, 2775, 2802, 2853, 2897) of the 17th century--1652-1654, 1665-1667, and 1672-1674--were part of a bitter struggle over colonial possessions. It is also distinguished by cooperative ventures among blood brothers the collaboration between the 16th century A. D. English Sea Dogs and the Dutch Sea Beggars (slide #2974) who worked together in opposition to the King Philip II's Catholic Spain (1527-1598).

In that connection, Anglo-Dutch relations took an interesting turn during the Revolt of the Netherlands which began in 1566 against Spanish-Hapsburg domination. The Dutch Calvinists violently resisted Roman Catholicism in general and the imperial control of Spanish King Philip II in particular. That resistance precipitated a vengeful and violent Spanish retaliation. Philip dispatched 10,000 Spanish regulars under the notorious Duke of Alva (slides #2811, 2975, 2815, 2828, 2891-2, 2912-3, 2957, 3073) who instituted a brutal reign of terror (1567-1573). During Alva's tenure, he boasted of the execution of up to 18,000 religious and political dissidents. The troubles persisted even beyond Alva's administration.

As Spanish involvement in the Low Countries caused increasing grief, Dutch officials repeatedly appealed to England's Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) (slides #9-10, 740, 766, 837, 980, 1670, 2770, 2786, 3066, 3153, 3157, 3186) for general aid. Initially, any English assistance was covert, but by 1585, the sack of Antwerp by the Spanish Duke of Parma signaled a Catholic sweep through the Netherlands. Elizabeth responded with the Treaty of Nonesuch (August 20,

1585) after which England openly rendered aid to Dutch rebels fighting against Spanish-Catholic imperialism.

The timing of the little known Treaty of Nonesuch may have more significance than first meets the eye. It came 1,260 years after a major event in the history of Christianity--one which affected the nature and character of Establishment Christian practice, doctrine, and teaching for centuries to come. In the past, the Church of God has identified A. D. 325 and the Council of Nicea (slides #3306, 3462) as the landmark event which began the 1,260 days or prophetic years of the Church's exile in the wilderness (A. D. 325-1585).

At the Nicaean conclave sponsored by Roman Emperor Constantine (A. D. 306-337), the Christian ecclesiastical hierarchy settled among other things the Quatrodecimin Controversy by forbidding the observance of the "Jewish" Passover on Nisan 14. This first ecumenical council of the Roman Catholic Church was sandwiched between two other landmark imperial fiats. Both bode ill for all who sought to live by every word of God, particularly those who seriously believed the need to observe the Fourth Commandment-- "remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Ex. 20:8). Even before Nicaea, Constantine had issued an edict in A. D. 321 forbidding work on Sunday. Four decades after the Nicaean Council, at the Council of Laodicea in A. D. 365, the Roman government officially made keeping of the "Jewish" Sabbath illegal for Christians.

Did the Council of Nicaea mark the beginning of the driving of true Christians underground? If so, we should expect the history of Northwestern Europe during the late-16th century A. D. to reveal an increasingly tolerant religious environment--one which enabled Christians to emerge from the "wilderness" (Rev. 12:6) and to practice their religion more openly and without the fear of governmental retribution. Those conditions are precisely what we find.

Considering the ultimate results of England's stiffening policy against Philip's Spain, the year 1585 may very well mark the expiration of the "thousand two hundred and threescore days" of the flight of the Church--prophetically portrayed in the Book of Revelation as a woman--into her place to be nourished in the wilderness. Between 1585 and 1587, Elizabeth sent to Holland some 2,000 British troops and a quarter of a million pounds in financial assistance. Elizabeth's

support of the Dutch, combined with the execution in 1587 of her Scottish cousin and rival for the English throne, Mary Queen of Scots (slides #621, 973, 2508, 2515, 2734), were in no small way the precipitating factors moving Philip to dispatch the ill-fated Spanish Armada in 1588.

POSSIBLE TEXT BOX: The Spanish Armada

The column of smoke began to ascend (slide #1801). The time had come. Englishmen watching the horizon off of England's southwestern coast had sighted the "Invincible Armada" (slides #12-3, 1757, 551, 648, 1669, 1721, 1798, 2734)--130 ships carrying some 31,000 men and 2,431 cannons. This was the largest naval force assembled to date in modern times. The Spaniards enjoyed a two-to-one advantage over the English fleet. It was only a matter of time before the decisive confrontation would occur.

ILLUSTRATIONS: Francis Drake (slides #196, 2825, 2795, 2796, 1793) -- Lacy Baldwin Smith calls him "an incredibly vain man. . . who regarded it as his divine mission to personally punish Philip II for his perfidy to God, to England, and to Sir Francis Drake!" (*This Realm of England*, p. 178-179, 181); Commander Lord Howard of Effingham (slides #1761, 2909); John Hawkins (slide #194)

Could the English Sea Dogs--a group of English mariners disturbingly similar in behavior to ordinary pirates--take on and defeat the foremost military power of the 16th century world? As history has shown, neither New World gold, nor military reputation, nor the blessing of Holy Mother Roman Church would prevail over English daring and barbery. . . of the plain and simple good fortune of the inclimate weather which finished what English guns and sailors could not do.

From the beginning, things bode ill for the Spanish. Spain's greatest admiral, Alvarode Bazan, had died of typhus in 1588. As Bazan's replacement, Philip II (slide #189, 2769, 2976, 3084, 3021) selected the melancholy and reluctant Duke of Medina Sidonia (slide #1844)--a man with little experience as a commander and one who openly admitted his declining health and proneness to becoming sea sick.

On the evening of July 31, 1588, the English launched fire ships (slides #164, 2754) into the Armada thought to be safe at Calais. The panic-stricken Spaniards cut anchor and ran. The smaller and more maneuverable English ships followed in hot pursuit, pounding their Spanish enemies along the way. (Battle scene slides--#1798, 1669, 1760)

Ironically, before the English could finish off the Armada, they ran out of ammunition. Attempting to escape, the surviving Spanish ships sped north (slide #552, 1721) only to be devastated by gale-force winds (cf. Ps. 48:7, 107:23-25, 29) which dashed many vessels along the coastline of Scotland, the Orkney Islands, and northern Ireland. Only 160 heavily battered ships and 10,000 of the original soldiers made it back to Spain. In contrast, England lost only 200 men in battle during the ten days of action. Never again would overseas regions be the exclusive province of Spanish ships and conquistadors.

It is not surprising that many Europeans--English, Spanish, and otherwise--saw in the defeat of the Spanish Armada a judgment from God (cf. Ps. 18:14, 47:8, 114:6). Several of the period medallions which commemorate the outcome reflect just that sentiment.

ILLUSTRATIONS: Slide #1766--Elizabeth in prayer thanking God for victory
Slide #1919--Commemorative English medal (*Flavit etdissipati sunt--*
"God breathed and they were scattered")
Slide #1873--Armada medallion (*Solus Deus Tu Deus Magnus et Magna*
Facistu or "Thou God art greatand doest wondrous things")
Slide #1762--Dutch engraving (*Dextra Excelfi fecit Sahitem--*"I blow
and scatter")

Protestants throughout Europe hailed the Spanish failure as evidence that God had rejected the Roman Church and Catholic Spain. Many contemporary observers, affected by the attitudes regarding gender in that day, believed that an England under female rule was special testimony to God's involvement in the outcome. Whether or not God intervened to produce the final results, the England which emerged over the following centuries was one where religious freedoms progressively grew. England became an environment in which the work of the living God could revive, take root, and grow.

End of Text Box

As a related aside, some British-Israel exegetes have suggested that many of people who settled in Spain are the descendants of Jacob's brother Esau. If this hypothesis is true, it has important implications. Esau was the firstborn son of Isaac, the short-sighted offspring who sold the Birthright for a bowl of red pottage (Gen. 25:29-34--cf. Rom. 9:12-13, Heb. 11:20, 12:16). Jacob later confirmed this transfer of title by his effective but unethical usurpation of his brother's blessing from the blind and aging Isaac (Gen. 27:1-29). By right of primogeniture, Esau was in line to inherit the physical blessings of the Abrahamic promise. Little wonder that he responded with lethal anger (Gen. 27:41), prompting his brothers extended relocation to Mesopotamia (27:42-28:10).

Can we interpret the Golden Age of Spain as a premature attempt by Esau's progeny to recoup the Birthright? If so, it was more than the historical "luck of the draw" that enabled the Spanish kingdom to lead the way in the Age of Discovery or Exploration during the 15th and 16th centuries. Spanish ships largely ruled the world's oceans from the 15th century ascendancy of Spain under Ferdinand II of Aragon (1479-1516) and Isabella I of Castile (1474-1504) to the Spanish heyday under Hapsburg Emperor Charles V (1519-1558) (slides #2543, 2865, 2989, 2990) and his diminutive and idiosyncratic son, Philip II. As a consequence of Spanish colonialism, Central and South America became Spanish provinces; the Conquistadors brought Amerindian empires under heel; American gold and silver routed through Spain determined the fluctuations of the entire European economy; and contemporary Europeans considered the Spanish army the class of the military field, even beyond its prime, until the Battle of Rocroi in 1643 when the French finally shattered the "myth of Spanish invincibility."

It is interesting and probably quite significant that Spain's defeat at Rocroi--its first major loss in a century and a half--came at the hands of the French, a Reubenite people about to take their place in line to vie for the national and physical promises passed on to the descendants of Abraham. By 1715, Spain had fallen to the rank of a second rate power. Eighteenth century

France, notwithstanding Louis XIV's (slides #15, 783, 2730, 3038) long but ultimately unsuccessful bid for European hegemony, became *the* nation-state which set the standard for Europe in most significant areas of human endeavor.

If the identification of Esau with Spain is accurate, we find a quite logical progression of historical events. It is a part of the struggle for the birthright (cf. Gen. 25:22) between Isaac's first and second born sons. The Spanish Golden Age may well be Esau's macrocosmic quest to reverse the effects of his sale of the Birthright to Jacob (v. 29-34) and rescind his father's disappointing pronouncement about his future (Gen. 27:34-40). If so, the Spanish bid for hegemony was fated to fail, coming some two centuries before the expiration of the withholding of the Birthright blessing. The inheritance of that bounty would not be realized by *anyone* until the late-18th and early-19th centuries.

The late-16th century events involving the Spanish, English, and Dutch set the stage for a decisive shift of influence in European affairs. The prevailing east-to-west, Spanish-Austrian Hapsburg dominated axis of power gave place to a north-to-south axis principally controlled by the Israelitish nation-states of England, France, and Holland. Although it would be some time yet before England ascended to the heights of European and ultimately world hegemony, the stage was definitely being set for English ascendancy.

The collective impact of Philip II's failed attempts to master Northwestern Europe freed England from the threat of Spanish domination. It insured that the English kingdom would remain a religiously tolerant Protestant power where the Church of God could enjoy a modicum of freedom to remain faithful to the commandments, judgments, and statutes of God. Hugh A. MacDougall writes that "the early Elizabethan years were decisive in settling the formal religious character of the English nation" (*Racial Myth in English History*, p. 36).

TEXT BOX: Priestly Stones

In ancient Israel, God set apart the tribe of Levi for special service in the priesthood (Num. 2:47-4:49). At the top of Israel's ecclesiastical hierarchy stood the High Priest, a literal

descendant of Aaron, the brother of Moses. Part of his priestly wardrobe included an impressive breastplate (slides #1216, 1235, 1317, 1359, 6842, 7933, 7935) described in Exodus 39:

And he made the breastplate of cunning work, like the work of the ephod; of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen. It was foursquare; they made a breastplate double: a span was the length thereof, and a span the breadth thereof being doubled. And they set in it four rows of stones: the first row was a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle: this was the first row. And the second row, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond. And the third row, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst. And the fourth row, a beryl, and onyx, and a jasper: they were inclosed in ouches of gold in their inclosings (v. 8-13--cf. 28:1-21).

The twelve stones on the breastplate represented each of the Israelite tribes: “And the stones were according to the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, like the engravings of a signet, every one with his name, according to the twelve tribes” (v. 14).

Slides #3114, 2836, 2757, 1462, 835, 2875, 3361

Millennia after the Aaronic priesthood ceased to exist, there appeared a royal house in England known as the Tudor dynasty (A. D. 1485-1603). Those who have sought geneological connections between the Anglo-Saxons and the ancient Israelites sometimes posit a literal link between the tribe of Levi and the House of Tudor (see W. M. H. Milner, *The Royal House of Britain: An Enduring Dynasty*, “The Royal Lines from Zarah and Pharez Judah” chart, p. 4--slides #1312, 577).

Clear proof of this connection is absent from the historical record. However, it may be significant that the Tudor monarchy, starting with King Henry VIII (1491-1547) (slides #784, 835, 985, 1003, 1364, 1462, 2729, 2742, 2875, 502) presided over the greatest transformation in the religious life experienced by the English people before or since. Henry VIII orchestrated England’s breaking free from the Roman Catholic orbit and changed the character of English religious thought and practice as no civil ruler before him ever had. Indeed, the Act of Supremacy (1534) made the English monarch “Protector and Supreme Head on Earth of the Church and Clergy of England”--an act which substituted king for pope.

If the Tudor line sprang out of Levitical origins, one state portrait of King Henry bears an unwitting but telling testimony. Henry is attired with a vestment (slide #3114) which is surprisingly reminiscent of the description we find in the Book of Exodus of the High Priest's breastplate. Who better to wear an item of apparel so intimately tied to the religious life of the country?

End of Text Box

When Elizabeth ascended the throne in 1558, "Englishmen desired above all else strong, vigorous, and secular leadership devoid of fanaticism and passion." They had seen the kingdom rocked through the successive reigns of Henry VIII (1509-1547) whose religious changes were driven primarily by practical, dynastic, and hormonal considerations; Edward VI (1547-1553) whose youth and inexperience enabled various powers behind the throne to introduce policies of extreme Protestantism; and Mary I (1553-1558) (slides #1016, 777, 2059) who drove the English kicking and screaming back into a narrow and intolerant Roman Catholicism. In contrast, Sweet Bess

put out the spreading fires of religious hysteria, she secured the realm in a world filled with women rulers and religious frenzy. . . . The new queen was a *politique*, a firm believer that religion should be an instrument of state and a compartment of life, not the end of government or the whole of human experience.

For all these reasons, historians oftentimes style her reign as the "Elizabethan Compromise" (Lacy Baldwin Smith, *This Realm of England*, pp. 160-162).

Walter Phelps Hall observes that "Elizabeth spared England the terrible excesses which were marking religious disputes in many other lands during her day" (*History of England*, pp. 281, 284-285). Under Elizabeth, there was "no place for either Roman Catholicism or extreme Protestantism." Her policy was one of "theological inclusivism." The Thirty-Nine Articles (1571)--a set of statements defining Anglican doctrine regarding theological and civil matters--"sought to achieve a 'via media' in which all but Roman Catholics and the most doctrinaire Protestants could participate" (Justo Gonzales, *Story of Christianity*, vol. 2, p. 79).

So it was that the 16th century collaboration between the Dutch and the English against the Roman Catholic behemoth of Spain--something that may well represent the combined effort of descendants of Joseph and Zebulun versus Esau--helped to fulfill critical prophecies relevant to the revival of the Church of God.

Another provocative tribal connection is sometimes proposed between Sweden and Naphtali, Jacob's second and last son born to Bilah. In recent years, the Church of God has associated this tribe with the Swedes--a connection which probably has merit. Although it is little remembered today, the Swedish kingdom of the 17th century made a serious impact on European affairs--an intrusion which reflects again a struggle among Israel's children.

During the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), Protestant Swedish King Gustavus II Adolphus (1594-1632) made a very nearly successful bid for regional hegemony. His decisive leadership and spectacular military organization enabled him to piece together an impressive if short-lived Scandinavian empire. Moreover, Gustavus Adolphus (slides #2774, 2928, 3335, 5013) supported Swedish expansion into America. Had he not met an untimely death at the Battle of Lutzen (1632--cf. Dan. 4:25), it would have been interesting to see what kind of additional impact Sweden might have had on European and ultimately world affairs. Gustavus Adolphus' meteoric rise and fall may well represent an unsuccessful 17th century bid by Naphtali to garner the double portion of the Birthright.

Not surprisingly, the most dramatic and significant example of this struggle for the Birthright was between England and France--the descendants of Joseph and Reuben. Concerning the transference of the Birthright, once Reuben slept with Bilah (Gen. 35:22), that Birthright passed directly from Reuben to Joseph. I Chronicles 5:1-2 clearly supports this view. Joseph becomes Jacob's "second firstborn"--indeed the firstborn of the woman he had intended to marry as his first (presumably his only?) wife (Gen. 29:20-30) (slide #3319--Jacob & Rachel).

Viewed from this perspective, the history of the turn of the 19th century takes on added importance and significance. The Louisiana Purchase (1803)--Napoleon's sale of the Louisiana

territory on behalf of France to the U. S. A.--becomes a kind of antitypical handing of the Birthright from Reuben to Joseph. This grand transaction illustrates another interesting feature which is antitypical of the character of Reuben as described in scripture.

The sons of Jacob chafed under the preferential treatment (slide #2133--coat of many colors) given by the father to his favorite son (Gen. 37:2-4). Their anger slowly simmered over Joseph's open sharing of his self-flattering dreams (5-10) (slides #2138, 3320). Although Reuben liked these circumstances no better than his other brothers (v. 4), his sense of responsibility as the firstborn would not allow him to consent to his younger brother's death at the hands of his jealous and resentful siblings (v. 21). Indeed, Reuben's subtle ultimate aim when the hostile brothers expressed their murderous intentions was to "rid him [Joseph] out of their hands" (v. 22). Upon discovering that the other brothers had sold Joseph into slavery, Reuben grieved and tore his clothes (v. 29-30), something which he angrily reminded his brothers about when standing uncomfortably in the presence of the Egyptian prime minister some two decades later (42:22). Reuben's ambivalence toward Joseph is reflected in the story of Anglo-French relationship (slides #3428, 1420, 1464, 713, 1241-2, 2122--Rochambeau, Lafayette, and De Grasse aiding Washington in American Revolution).

The sale of the Louisiana Territory at the ridiculously low price of five cents an acre (the total sale price amounted to about \$15 million for 8.28 million square miles of the world's richest and most fertile land) prompted Napoleon's now famous remark, "this accession of territory affirms forever the power of the United States and I have just given England a maritime rival that sooner or later will lay low her pride." With one hand France extended untold treasures to one branch of Joseph's family, and with the other, she reduced in relative but very real material terms the power of the other branch. Napoleon's intent was to use some of the proceeds of the sale price to prepare for renewed conflict with his adversary across the English Channel (slides #1181 [Nap & Addington cartoon], 49).

A similar if less dramatic example of this Reubenite ambivalence toward Joseph is found the story of privateer Jean Lafite (slides #180, 1985). This French pirate provided American

General Andrew Jackson with the cannons, gun powder, and strategic information about the New Orleans area which insured an American victory over the British in the final battle of the War of 1812.

Was the ambivalent relationship between descendants of Reuben and Joseph inevitable? Certainly Reuben forfeited with great reluctance the premier position to his younger half-brother. Jacob's words as recorded in Genesis 48:5 implies that Ephraim and Manasseh took the place of Reuben and Simeon, the first two sons born by Leah. This understanding helps us appreciate yet another issue, this one concerning the modern-day identity of Joseph. Where today do we find his sons Ephraim and Manasseh.

Ephraim and Manasseh

Historically the Church of God has located modern Ephraim in the British Isles and Commonwealth countries, and Manasseh in the United States of America. There are some studies, however, which identify Ephraim as the U. S. A. and Manasseh as Britain--an attempt *a la* Joseph to reverse the hands of the aged patriarch Jacob (Gen. 48:17-19--cf. Heb. 11:21). This argument inverts of the traditional British-Israel identifications of Ephraim and Manasseh and raises several interesting points. Included in the argument are several basic ideas:

- The United States has become the *greater* of the two powers; no nation--not even Britain at the height of her strength--has ever had in *real* terms the material and economic power as has the U. S.
- The U. S. is far greater blessed than Britain in having the best and most land.

The U. S. is approximately ten times the size of Britain in population; this fact of present-day demographics finds expressions in Deuteronomy 33:17 (Deuteronomy 33 is a parallel passage to Genesis 49 assigning the various blessings of Jacob to the twelve tribes of Israel) which ascribes "ten thousands" to Ephraim and "thousands" to Manasseh. The concept of "company of nations" applies not to Britain's imperial edifice but rather to the legal autonomy accorded the American states and the division between state and federal government.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

- The number 13--a figure recurring regularly in the early history of the U. S. A.--should be associated with Ephraim as the *13th* of Jacob's children.
- As Manasseh preceded Ephraim in birth, so England established a presence in North America before the American colonials established their own independent but "second born" nation--in both cases, there was a time when there was a Manasseh but no Ephraim.
- The appellation "Great" preceding "Britain" is predictable considering Jacob's affirmation that Manasseh "also shall be great" (Gen. 48:21).

If the above ideas have a certain intellectual appeal, they also have certain inherent weaknesses.

In the schema making Ephraim American, the two grandchildren replace Joseph with Manasseh becoming son number 12 and Ephraim son number 13. Is this the way to view the matter?

TEXT BOX: Manasseh, the Thirteenth Tribe

Viewed from one perspective, Manasseh the son of Joseph, became a kind of 13th tribe of Israel after being adopted by the patriarch Jacob (Gen. 48:5-60). This concept has inspired many associations of Manasseh with the United States of America. Every American school child knows the story of the revolt of the 13 American colonies (slides #646, 664-5, 1345, 1769--map) against the Mother Country in 1775 (slide #665, 631). Indeed, that rebellion against English Parliamentary and monarchical rule became the crucible of American independence.

It is no surprise, then, that the number 13 finds frequent expression in the early heraldry (slide #1379) and official symbols adopted by the United States. The first American flag bore 13 stars (slide #1855). Two early revolutionary flags also incorporated 13 in interesting ways. The well-known rattlesnake flag bore the 13 letters "Don't Tread on Me," (slides #1222, 1234, 608, 650, 698, 1222, 1230, 1234) and a flag featuring the liberty tree used the 13 letter motto, "An Appeal to God." (slide #1230, 986)

On the obverse side of the U. S. Seal (slide #1223, 811, 970, 1223B) there are seven features of the heraldry which are composed of 13 parts: the stars, the stripes, the paleways on the shield or esutcheon, the arrows, the olive leaves, the olive berries, and the letters in *E Pluribus*

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft – Rick Sherrod – February 1997

Unum (“One Out of Many,” a motto introduced by Thomas Jefferson [slides #810, 1870]). The reverse side of that same seal has two similar features: 13 letters in the motto *Annuuit Coeptis* (“God hath prospered our undertaking”), and 13 tiers of solid, unfinished granite block.

The eagle clutching 13 arrows in the sinister talon and an olive branch in the other evokes the thought of Jacob’s prophecy in Genesis 49:24--that Joseph’s “bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob (cf. Deut. 33:17). The arrow is, of course, symbolic of the power of war. In spite of America’s overwhelming military might, the U. S. has a history distinguished by relatively peaceful intercourse with its neighbors. The olive branch represents this generally peaceful nature of the American nation-state in international affairs. Coincidentally, the Scriptures sometimes use the olive branch or tree as a symbol of the House of Israel (Isa. 24:13, Hos. 14:5-6, Jn. 15:4-6, Rom. 11:16-18, 24).

It is curious that in Western society today the number 13 bears the connotation of bad luck. Coincidentally, many students of the Bible associate the number with “rebellion, apostasy, defection, corruption, disintegration, revolution, or some kindred idea (E. W. Bullinger, *Number in Scripture*, p. 205). Perhaps it is no accident that the first use of the number 13 in the Bible is in association with the rebellion of the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Bela (Zoar) against Chedorlaomer, the king of Elam (Gen. 14:1-4). Millennia later, that number 13 became intimately associated with another rebellion--one which contributed to the birth of the United States of America.

For further information, see J. H. Allen’s *The National Number and Heraldry of the United States of America* (slide #856) or C. A. L. Totten’s *Our Great Seal* (slide #804-5).

End of Text Box

As a result of Jacob’s placing his name upon Joseph’s two sons (Gen. 48:46), both Ephraim and Manasseh became *sons* of Jacob by adoption. Mr. Armstrong notes “there were twelve original tribes. Joseph was one of these twelve. But when Joseph divided into two tribes and Manasseh separated into an independent nation, it became a *thirteenth* tribe. Could it be mere

coincidence that it *started*, as a nation, with *thirteen* colonies” (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 104).

An equally convincing and far more thoroughly developed case of associating the number 13 with Manasseh has been made by J. H. Allen in his volume, *The National Number and Heraldry of the United States of America* (a book coincidentally written in Pasadena, California in 1919 from 591 El Molino Avenue only a few blocks from the old Ambassador College campus). Allen draws heavily from the heraldry of the United States to make his case.

TEXT BOX: Jacob’s Crossed Arms

The moment was charged with electricity. Joseph guided his two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, before the frail and aged patriarch Jacob. Summoning what little strength he had, he sat upon his bed and rehearsed the story of his relationship with God over the past one hundred years. Reminding his grandsons of God’s promises to make him fruitful--a multitude of people--and to give him the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, Jacob then adopted the boys as his own sons. They became a replacement for his two disinherited firstborns, Reuben (Gen. 35:22) and Levi (34:25-27), borne from his marriage to Leah.

Before pronouncing his blessing upon Ephraim and Manasseh, the aged patriarch laid his hand on each one. Much to Joseph’s distress, Jacob crossed his arms, placing his right hand upon the head of the younger offspring (slide #682). Knowing that the right hand connoted receipt of the greater blessing, Joseph attempted to reverse his father’s hands. “Not so, my father: for this is the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his [Manasseh] head” (Gen. 48:18). But Jacob held steady, replying “I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he [Manasseh] also shall be great: but truly his younger brother [Ephraim] shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations” (v. 19).

Some British-Israel writers find an interesting parallel to the crossed arms of Jacob in the British Union Flag (slide #504, 676, 1013, 1195, 1311, 1313, 485, 682), or as it is more popularly

know, the “Union Jack.” It is interesting that the name “Jack” points us back to the patriarch Jacob. It probably derives from the Latin or French form of “James”--”Jacobus” or “Jacques.”

The flag itself is a combination of three crosses. The first (slide #676) is the St. George cross--a red cross on a white field--an emblem introduced by Richard I Lionheart in 1194. By 1277, Englishmen generally considered this flag as a national emblem. To the St. George cross, the newly ascended English King James I added a second symbol: the cross of St. Andrew. This blue diagonal cross was that of Scotland’s patron saint. The combination of crosses appropriately represented the joining of the English and Scottish kingdoms, a union enacted when James added the English crown to the Scottish one he already possessed. In 1801, with the union of Great Britain and Ireland, the red diagonal cross of St. Patrick became a part of the Union Flag as well (slide #1313, 1311).

Although the unique design and pattern of the Union Flag may be nothing more than a reflection of the unique historical events which created the United Kingdom, for those who see in Genesis 48 a prophecy of the unique blessings passed on to Ephraim’s descendants, it is a perpetual reminder of the heritage promised and received as a part of the Abrahamic Promise.

End of Text Box

Indeed, British and American heraldic symbols--subjective evidence that they may be--make a stronger case for associating Ephraim with the British and Manasseh with the Americans.

The facts of history also argue in favor of the Church’s traditional association. By the late-18th century, English settlement of North America existed in the form of thirteen separate colonies, each with its own governmental apparatus and laws. A certain measure of state independence continues to exist today, with each respective state empowered to make its own laws. However, the tendency toward a dominant federal government was apparent as early as the administration of Andrew Jackson (1829-1836), sometimes derisively called “King Andrew” by his political enemies. Jackson was a staunch supporter of the Union over states rights, an issue

which intermittently troubled American political life from the time of Jackson through the presidency of Abraham Lincoln (1861-1865), whose presidential career was coincident with the American Civil War (1861-1865).

The war between the states ended over 130 years ago. Along with slavery, the issue of states rights was a central consideration igniting this conflict. Perhaps the greatest immediate outcome of that war was that this president named “Abraham” successfully held the Union together, thus preserving a concentration of the resources of North America under the umbrella of a *single, unified* nation-state. From 1865 forward, the political and economic energies of the U. S. were released to produce what Raymond F. McNair has rightly described an “ascent to greatness.”

One popular university textbook opines:

The United States was on its way to becoming a true nation-state with an effective central government. . . . The wartime achievements added up to a decisive shift in the relationship between the federal government and private enterprise. The Republicans took a limited government that did little more than seek to protect the marketplace from the threat of monopoly and changed it into an activist state that promoted and subsidized the efforts of the economically industrious. The most pervasive effect of the war on northern society was to encourage an “organizational revolution.” . . . [The North’s] victory meant that the nation as a whole would now be ready to embrace the conception of progress that the North had affirmed in its war effort--not only advances in science and technology, but also in bringing together and managing large numbers of men and women for economic and social goals. The Civil War was thus a catalyst for the great transformation of American society from an individualistic society of small producers into the more highly organized that “incorporated” America of the late nineteenth century (Robert A. Divine, *et. al.*, *America: Past and Present*, pp. 455-458).

The victory of the Union effectively guaranteed the survival of the United States and the supremacy of the federal government. The centralized structure of the American government is a far more cohesive and structured political framework than the exceptionally diverse imperial edifice of the British Empire.

Britain's imperial framework included a wide ranging array of governmental systems. During the late-19th century, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa existed as virtual nation-states, enjoying "Dominion" status (slide #1908) with autonomy in virtually every arena except the formulation of foreign policy, enactment of constitutional changes, and determining of issues relevant to defense and trade. At the opposite end of the continuum were imperial territories like India. The subcontinent of Asia was the linchpin of Empire and as such the British were scrupulously attentive to retaining absolute control of the region. After the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, the British directly governed India with the kind of ubiquitous control which eventually helped to inspire the creation of the independence-minded Indian Nationalist Congress Party under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. Britain's imperial structure seems a far more suitable candidate for the description "company of nations" (Gen. 35:11, 48:19) than does the American relationship between the states and the federal government.

The Empire itself is an example of the the fallacy in arguing that the United States is far larger in terms of territory and population than the British Isles. Canada alone is larger than the U. S. Australia is almost the same size as the contiguous 48 states. Moreover, Queen Victoria was "Empress of India" (see text box "Maestro of Empire," Chapter VII). There was a time when the United Kingdom ruled over populations which far exceed that of the present-day United States.

The reversal of the prophetic identities of Ephraim and Manasseh can also be challenged on a more intuitive level. The Bible includes some hints that one feature of the Manassite character is resistance to monarchy as a political institution. The 13th century B. C. Manassite deliverer and judge Gideon singularly rejected the offer of his people to found an Israelite dynasty (Judg. 8:22-23). So did others who came later and are of probable Manassite lineage: Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) who directed a monarch-less English government for almost a dozen years following the English Civil War (a.k.a., the "Puritan Rebellion") of 1642-1651, and George Washington (1732-1799), the greatest military leader of the American Revolution (1775-1783). In a spirit similar to that of Gideon, both men rejected offers to assume a crown. In fact, both the

Puritan Rebellion and the American Revolution were a large scale expressions of an aversion to the “tyranny of a king.”

TEXT BOX: The First Inauguration

With over 200 years hindsight, we appreciate what a momentous occasion it was when, under the newly adopted United States Constitution, George Washington became the first American president under a governmental system which has provided for the peaceful transition of power for more than two centuries. There is a fascinating dimension to the inauguration ceremony which brought Washington to the presidency. (slides #3121, 3423, 2027, 2064, 1980, 2001, 2021, 2147)

After becoming the only unanimously elected president in American history, Washington travelled to New York City for the inauguration. A tremendous and joyful crowd greeted him as a special barge transported him to Wall Street. As has become tradition, as the president took his oath of office with his hand placed on an open Bible. Through the years, different presidents have selected various passages on which to place their hands. Washington’s hand rested on a Bible opened to Genesis 49-50. The arrangement of Scripture in that actual Bible (pictured here) makes it very likely that the president’s forefinger would have pointed to Genesis 49:22, a passage reading “Joseph is a fruitful bough.” In light of the incredible evolution of American history from that time until this, Washington could hardly have selected a more appropriate section of God’s Word. How ironic that this passage points us to the abundance which the Manassite branch of Joseph’s family has experienced.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX ON DAVIDIC THRONE

One central theme in British-Israel thought concerns the Throne of David. Many British-Israelite writers believe that throne continued to exist even after the early-6th century B.C.

when the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar apparently terminated permanently the Davidic dynasty. Those who accept this notion base their conviction on Scriptures which describe the special covenant made between Israel's King David and God.

The Biblical Evidence

The Bible certainly seems to say that God made a covenant with David guaranteeing his throne in perpetuity. A host of scriptures support the case:

The word of the Lord came unto Nathan, saying, Go and tell my servant David. . . when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom . . . and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever (II Sam. 7:4).

This promise was not conditional based on the heir's behavior:

If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: *But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul* [emphasis ours], whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever (v. 14).

This surely cannot be interpreted as a reference to Christ who never sinned. Note also:

Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even to him and to his sons by a covenant of salt [a symbol of permanence] (II Chron. 13:5)?

Psalm 89 adds weight to the case:

If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. *My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven* [emphasis ours] (v. 30-37).

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

In this regard, Jeremiah 33 adds:

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. For thus saith the Lord; *David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel* [emphasis ours] (v. 14 - 17).

Shortly before ancient Israel split into two separate kingdoms, God told Jeroboam I, the Northern Kingdom's first monarch:

Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee: (But he shall have one tribe for my servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel:) Howbeit I will not take the whole kingdom out of his hand: but I will make him prince all the days of his life *for David my servant's sake* [emphasis ours], whom I chose, because he kept my commandments and my statutes: But I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee, even ten tribes. And unto his son will I give one tribe, *that David my servant may have a light always before me in Jerusalem* [emphasis ours], the city which I have chosen me to put my name there (II Kings 11:31-37).

Based on these type of passages, it is easy to conclude that someone, somewhere--one who can trace a lineage back to David--will be sitting, or eligible to sit on the Davidic throne until Christ returns to claim it for Himself. It is evident, of course, from the Gospel of Luke that Christ is the ultimate claimant:

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David (1:32).

But Jeremiah suggests that the prophecy cannot be fulfilled with Christ as the *only* claimant:

In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely [hardly true of Jesus' time] . . . for thus saith the Lord; *David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel* [emphasis ours]. . . If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant be broken with David my

servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me. . . . If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers [not "ruler"] over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them (33:16).

If there remains a perpetual Davidic throne, how has God fulfilled His promise?

British-Israelites often insist that the Throne of David is to be found in the British Isles, occupied today by the royal family of the House of Windsor. The claim is made that from this family we find the descendant of David ruling over the modern-day House of Israel. But how could this be? The last reigning king of David's line was Zedekiah (slides #1214, 7920). The Babylonians killed his sons before his eyes, after which he was blinded. The Bible records his own death in Babylon (slide #1483):

Then he [Nebuchadnezzar] put out the eyes of Zedekiah; and the king of Babylon bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death (Jer. 52:11).

The Davidic line could have been continued through Zedekiah's predecessor, Jeconiah, who was restored to favor after years of captivity. However, the Bible makes it quite clear that God did *not* to perpetuate David's dynasty through Jeconiah or his sons. Jeremiah observes:

Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah (22:30).

The account in I Chronicles identifies these descendants of Jeconiah:

And the sons of Jeconiah; Assir, Salathiel his son, Malchiram also, and Pedaiah. . . . And the sons of Pedaiah were, Zerubbabel (I Chron. 3:17-18).

Jeconiah's grandson Zerubbabel led the Jews in a 6th century B. C. Restoration to Judea. He became the Persian-appointed governor over the first wave of returnees who came back to Jerusalem in 536 B. C. But he never held a royal title, and in fact, very likely lost his governorship about 519 B. C. when the seditious sounding prophecies of Zechariah (Zech. 3:8-10, 4:6, 9, 6:12-14) and Haggai (Hag. 1:1-2, 2:6, 20-23) stirred the restored Jewish community with ideas of Messianic Expectation.

The prophecies of both Haggai and Zechariah came in a setting when civil turmoil rocked the Persian Empire (520-518 B. C.). To many contemporary observers, it must have appeared that the mighty but still relatively young empire was tottering and about to fall. Upon the death of Cambyses (522 B. C.), the son of Cyrus the Great, a power struggle for the throne erupted. Pseudo-Smerdis and Darius battled for the royal title, leaving the peoples under Persian rule with an opportunity to take advantage of the disorder and uncertainty prevailing in the highest echelons of government (Eugene Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 495-496).

When Haggai spoke of the overthrow of "the throne of kingdoms" and the destruction of "the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen," the spirits in the restored Jewish community must have soared. The Millennial imagery and Messianic terminology used by both Haggai and Zechariah led many to anticipate the imminent coming of Messiah in the person of Zerubbabel himself.

Popular sentiment to elevate Zerubbabel to monarchical status probably prompted the Persian imperial government to remove him from office altogether. Indeed, no one from the House of Judah restored a throne of *any* kind over those Jews who returned to Judea until the late-2nd century B. C. In 104 B. C., Judah Aristobulus of the Maccabean or Hasmonaen family--*not* of the Davidic line--adopted the title of "king" and reestablished a Jewish monarchy. So how then could the Throne of David continue to exist?

The Jeremiah Tradition

Those who believe that David's throne exists today appeal to long and persistent set of traditions, myths, and legends which form the backbone--albeit a tenuous one--of the story of the prophet Jeremiah's (slides #1207) precarious trek from Jerusalem to Egypt (Jer. 43:1-7) to Europe. Legends indicate he went first to Spain and eventually--around 580 B. C.--to the area of Carrickfergus (slide #5100), Ireland near present-day Belfast. According to legend, Jeremiah's company included one Tea-Tephi, the daughter of Zedekiah (Jer.41:10, 43:5-7) through whom the Davidic lineage was to be preserved. Also in the party was Baruch (Jer. 32:12-13, 36:4-8, etc.), Jeremiah's personal scribe. Eventually arriving in Ireland, the party found a colony of Zarahite Jews descended from people who had immigrated from the Middle East. Some British-Israel theorists date their departure around the 10th century B. C. and attribute their relocation to dissatisfaction with the establishment of a Davidic monarchy springing out of Judah's Pharez line.

Herremon, the ruler of this Jewish colony, married the daughter of Zedekiah--the last "Pharez" ruler over the kingdom of Judah. According to British-Israel theory, this marital union represented far more than a serendipitous turn of fate. Rather it was the fulfillment of an ancient prophecy involving the reunion of descendants of the twin sons of Judah, Pharez and Zarah.

The Breach Between Zarah and Pharez

The Genesis account of the births of these scions of Judah is pregnant with meaning. It reads:

And it came to pass in the time of her [Tamar] travail, that, behold, twins were in her womb. . . when she travailed, that the one put out his hand: and the midwife took and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying, This came out first. And it came to pass, as he drew back his hand, that, behold, his brother came out: and she said, How hast thou broken forth? this breach be upon thee: therefore his name was called Pharez. And afterward came out his brother, that had the scarlet thread upon his hand: and his name was called Zarah (Gen. 38:27 - 30).

Why was this story recorded? Might it be because the "breach" would at some future point be healed. In other words Pharez, who forced himself into the firstborn position, would eventually be reconciled with Zarah. David, Zedekiah, and--through His human descent--Jesus Christ, all were of the Pharez line.

Some suggest that several scriptures found in the Book of Ezekiel (chapter 17 and 21:18-26), foretell of God's healing the breach. In British-Israel theory, part of the commission which God gave to Jeremiah at the very beginning of his prophetic ministry was to insure a marriage between a ruler of the Zarah branch of Judah and the daughters of King Zedekiah was a It is the responsibility alluded to in Jer. 1:9.

Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant.

Some British-Israelites see in Ezekiel 21 a three-fold transference of the Davidic throne. This passage forecasts:

And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will *overturn, overturn, overturn* [emphasis ours], it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him (Ez. 21:25-27).

In Ireland, Jeremiah "planted" the throne through the marriage of one of Zedekiah's daughters to an heir of the other branch of Judah's "scepter" family (Gen. 49:10, I Chron. 5:2). Then, through two more later "overturns," the throne migrated from Ireland to Scotland and eventually to England.

A frequently included element in this story associates the British Coronation Stone, until recently housed in Westminster Abbey, with the pillar stone of Jacob (Gen. 28:11, 18) (slides #575, 1056, 1189, 2222xx, 1752, 2141). According to this legend, Jeremiah traveled to Ireland.

with not only the Pharez princesses but also Jacob's Pillar Stone which had become a physical symbol of the covenants. A still later tradition relates that Fergus I MacErc transported the Stone from Tara (slides #943, 3621-35) in Ireland to the Scottish island of Ionia in around A. D. 530. There the Stone reained for over 300 years.

By A. D. 843, Kenneth MacAlpin had united the Picts and the Scots under his own rule. For his coronation, MacAlpin moved the Stone to Scone (slides #3608-12, 3866-8) in eastern Scotland near Perth where it remained for over four centuries as the site for crowning of newly ascended Scottish kings (slide #). In 1296, Edward I Longshanks (1272-1307) (slides #1004, 2520, 833-4, 2756, 2981, 5025), the king of England removed the Stone from Scone and "took it to Westminster Abbey, London, to form part of Edward the Confessor's chair, used in English coronation ceremonies" (*Treasures of Britain*, p. 426; see also Edward Jenks, *Edward Plantagenet*, pp. 267-268).

If British-Israelites are correct in their assumptions, the actual ascension of a Judahite monarch of the House of David over the English or modern Israelitish people did not take place until 1603. In that year upon the death of Elizabeth I (slides #265, 622, 2705, 2771, 2946, 3158), Scotish King James VI became James I (slides #644, 741, 990, 1021, 1381), King of England. For those who wish to explore further, one of the best reconstructed lineages from king David to Elizabeth II, is found in W. M. H. Milner's *Royal House of Britain An Enduring Dynasty* (slide #3132).

If the Jeremiah tradition is impossible to verify through hard historical evidence, might it like so many other ancient legends have at its center a core of truth? If it does, the story becomes an important signpost in pointing us to the location of the House of Israel in modern times.

End of text box

Is Manasseh to be found in England or America? Support for either position depends largely on *when* we examine the respective histories of the British and American people. People who identify the Americans as Ephraimite often consider the classical identification of Manasseh

with America as a product of early-20th century world conditions. They argue that British-Israel writers came to a logical conclusion given the world dominance of the British and the relative insignificance of the United States in world affairs prior the mid-20th century. They rightly maintain that *if* the U. S. A. has become the greatest and most powerful nation in all world history, this development has reached full maturity *since* World War II.

But the determining factor is not which nation in world history has accumulated the greatest volume of *real* wealth, power, and glory. Rather, it is who in relative terms has been the greatest nation through time. Robert Briffault, viewing British greatness essentially from an economic perspective, captures the essence of the matter writing:

The world control of industrial and wave-ruling England did not become fully evident to the world until the middle of the [19th] century. The year of the Great Exhibition of 1851 may be regarded as marking the proclamation and recognition of that matchless power and influence. . . . That power and influence rested almost exclusively on the fact that England was first in the field of new economic conditions which transformed the world and displaced all other sources of wealth and economic control. . . . The chief cause of their [the English's] 'muddling through' was that they had more money (*The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, pp. 5, 7-8, 12-13).

Another prestigious academic observer, historian A. J. Hobsbawm, amplifies Briffault's commentary, noting that for a brief period the Industrial Revolution:

coincided with the history of a single country, Great Britain. An entire world economy was thus built on, or rather around, Britain, and this country therefore temporarily rose to a position of global influence and power unparalleled by any state of its relative size before or since, and unlikely to be paralleled by any state in the foreseeable future. There was a moment in world history when Britain can be described, if we are not too pedantic, as its only workshop, its only massive importer and exporter, its only carrier, its only imperialist, almost its only foreign investor; and for that reason its only naval power and the only one which had a genuine world policy (*Industry and Empire*, p. 13--on Britain's overwhelming world dominance, see also James Morris, *Pax Britannica*, pp. 126-127; *Farewell the Trumpets*, pp. 338-362; and *Heaven's Command*, pp. 195-196).

Hobsbawm also offers convincing evidence relevant to the importance of the rather unique character of English entrepreneurship to the industrialization process (*The Age of Revolutions*, pp. 30-32).

Regarding the role of the Industrial Revolution as an aspect of Joseph's Birthright blessing, the record of history dramatically illustrates another example of Joseph supplanting Reuben. The academic community marvels over how the British were in many respects more poorly positioned and less endowed than the French in many of the human and material resources necessary for industrial take-off. Nevertheless, it was the English who burst ahead of their rivals across the English Channel as the 18th century drew to a close (on this subject, see R. M. Hartwell, ed., *The Causes of the Industrial Revolution in England* noting in particular the essay by F. Crouzet, "England and France in the Eighteenth Century: A Comparative Analysis of Two Economic Growths," pp. 155-156, 160-161, 167, 169, 173-174.)

William McNeill demonstrates the critical impact of the French Wars (1792-1815) in propelling the economy of Britain to unchallengeable supremacy over France and every other nation-state of the world (*The Ecumene*, pp. 528-529). This rather unexpected outcome is especially ironic considering these conflicts very likely represent Reuben's last frenetic effort to retrieve the Birthright it had forfeited some three and a half millennia before.

In light of all the above considerations, the Church's traditional understanding of the modern-day identity of Ephraim and Manasseh is quite satisfactory. In point of fact, England's greatness *in relative terms* has outstripped anything that the world has ever seen. At the turn of the 19th century, England burst ahead of her fellow nation-states in virtually every category of human economic, military, and political endeavor. By mid-century, the British were so far ahead in economic and industrial development they could scarcely see who was in second place.

If such facts are easily established, historians have been less successful in comprehending why these developments happened *where* and *when* they did. Little wonder since the historian's craft is restricted to what can be determined, perceived, and understood by the critical-historical method, with all its rules, regulations, and attendant limitations. It is only through the inspired understanding brought by a special and revelatory insight into Scripture that our historical understanding can be enlarged. It is to such an examination that we will presently turn.

VI

What Are the "Times" of Leviticus 26?

"God is an Englishman." Or so it was said by many people outside of the British Isles in the 19th century. What accounts for this startling expression of speech from the previous century? If England's status in the world today is a shadow of what it was one hundred years ago, you would have had a difficult time convincing anyone who lived in the 1800s that God was not somehow divinely prospering the politicians, statesmen, diplomats, explorers, generals, admirals, soldiers, architects, engineers, scientists, inventors, bankers, businessmen, shopkeepers, and entrepreneurs of the British Isles.

Perhaps it is significant that the name "Joseph" in the Hebrew--*Yowceph*--literally means "let him add," implying prosperity. Certainly as the descendants of Joseph, the people of Great Britain enjoyed a prosperity that no other people in the record of human history had ever achieved. To many observers both in and out of Britain, it appeared that success came to the British people whether or not they even pursued it--whether or not they made wise or foolish choices. It was as though certain *unconditional* blessings were overtaking them (cf. Deut. 28:2). It was this very kind of "inevitable" success which inspired Cambridge professor of modern history (1834-1895) and author of *The Expansion of England* (1884), John Robert Seeley's well-known observation that England acquired her globe-girdling Empire "in a fit of absence of mind."

The 19th became Britain's century. The British--specialists it seems in "muddling through"--seemed unable to do anything wrong. To their own astonishment, they found themselves ruling about a quarter of the world's population and a fifth of its land mass. British rule extended over not just any locations but the choicest and most fertile territories on earth. Meanwhile, across the Atlantic, the United States' fortunes were about to bloom as well. This was the time that a 2,520 year withholding of the Birthright to the descendants of Israel drew to a

close. It is hardly surprising that educated people of the day saw the hand of God in the process. It was hard to miss.

One example of many comes from Lord Rosebery (slides #1837, 1969), not a British-Israelite but a former British Foreign Secretary (1886, 1892-1894) and Prime Minister (1894-1895). He spoke in November 1900 to the students of Glasgow University about the British Empire :

How marvelous it all is! Built not by saints and angels, but by the work of men's hands; cemented with men's honest blood and with a world of tears, welded by the best brains of centuries past; not without the taint and reproach incidental to all human work, but constructed on the whole with pure and splendid purpose. *Human, and yet not wholly human, for the most heedless and the most cynical must see the finger of the Divine.* Growing as trees grow, while others slept; fed by the faults of others as well as the character of our fathers; reaching with a ripple of a restless tide over tracts, and islands and continents, until our little Britain woke up to find herself the foster-mother of nations and the source of united empires. *Do we not hail in this less the energy and fortune of a race than the supreme direction of the Almighty?* [emphasis ours].

In those more Biblically literate times, people like Rosebery saw some parallel between their own remarkable circumstance and that of the chosen people of ancient Israel. Was not God blessing *them* as he had promised to bless those same ancient people? It did not seem unreasonable to see the British Empire as the Kingdom of God on earth and the British people as the "chosen of God." Some British-Israel enthusiasts even began to regard the British Empire as the fifth or "Stone Kingdom" prophesied by Daniel.

TEXT BOX: The Stone Kingdom

Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon (605-562 B. C.), awoke startled and disturbed (Dan. 2:1). His dream had greatly troubled him. He had seen a magnificent image, tall and fearsome--an image composed of a golden head, arms and chest of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of

powerful iron, and fragile feet comprised of bits of iron and miry clay (v. 31-35). The prophet Daniel gave the king the remarkable interpretation (v. 36).

Each respective section of the image represented a succession of world ruling kingdoms: first, Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon (605-539 B. C.); second, the Persian Empire founded by Cyrus the Great and surviving for another two centuries (539 B.C.-331 B.C.); third, the Alexandrian Empire and its Hellenistic successor kingdoms; and fourth, the mighty Roman Empire (31 B. C.-A. D. 476). Nebuchadnezzar's dream came to a resounding conclusion when a remarkable stone made "without hands" (v. 34) violently fell upon the image's feet of clay. The result was devastating. The stone:

smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.

What did this unique and miraculous stone represent?

Some people in 19th century Britain came to believe that the prophecy in the Book of Daniel portrayed their own British Empire. Had not this empire on which the sun never set "filled the whole earth" even as the stone described in the second chapter of Daniel. This view is not, however, an accurate one. The stone described in the Book of Daniel represents the return of Jesus Christ to earth to establish the millennial rule of the Kingdom of God.

Nevertheless, perhaps it is understandable that there were those who mistook the British Empire for the real thing. Like Solomon's Israel, 19th century British rule and world dominance was a *forerunner* of the Kingdom to come. That rule was imperfect to be sure. . .but generally speaking it was benevolent and produced many positive results.

Many of the builders of empire aspired to construct a peaceful, happy, unified domain with a quarter of the world's population living under British rule. To their great credit, British administrators sent to colonial and imperial territories throughout the globe did an admirable job in

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

establishing and extending law and order (slides #1500, 1780, 2009, 1565). In many regions, the British presence stimulated economic development and brought Western technological advances (slides #1494-5). The *Pax Britannica* enforced peaceful conditions (slide #1688) in many regions of the world formerly troubled by war. Men like William Wilberforce (1759-1833) were instrumental in the abolition of the slave trade (slides #1906, 1953, 2128). And British missionaries became the bearers of Christianity to people from one end of the globe to the other (slides #1567, 1688).

However, for all the good that the empire may have accomplished, it fell far short of the realities which the Kingdom of God will bring. Christ's kingdom will be *worldwide* (Ps. 47:1-9). If the British brought with them their own laws, Christ will bring and enforce the law of God (Isa. 2:3, 11:2-5). British prosperity was transient and accompanied by all the attendant social evils which are so often found in industrial civilizations. The economic stability brought by Jesus Christ to humanity will be pure, equitable, and enduring (Isa. 65:22-23, Amos 9:13, Micah 4:4).

The peace of the British Empire was a human creation--something dependent on control of strategic passageways, overwhelming military might, and technological superiority. Moreover, in places the Empire itself was a perpetual battlefield (slide #1481), troubled by numberless imperial wars. There was even conflict between the British government and the various English, Celtic, and Dutch populations in Ireland and South Africa. The peace of Christ (Isa. 9:6) will be based on a remarkable change in human behavior induced by the writing of the law of God upon the hearts of the men and women of the world (Ez. 36:26-27, Mt. 11:28-30). The hopes of Englishmen to Christianize the world fell far short of expectations. Jesus Christ will succeed where all who have gone before Him have failed (Jer. 31:34). Inevitable tendencies toward ambition and self-interest limited even the best British intentions. In contrast, Christ will rule with fairness and equity (Mt. 20:20-28).

If the British Empire had its various flaws, shortcomings, and weaknesses, it nevertheless provides us with a pattern pointing to the fulfillment of some of the most important and exciting prophecies in all the Bible.

END OF TEXT BOX

But Britain was not always "great." Indeed, the real rise of both Britain and America came *after* 1800. Mr. Armstrong wrote:

It may not be generally realized--but neither Britain nor the United States became great world powers until the nineteenth century. Suddenly, in the very beginning of the nineteenth century, these two--until then small, relatively unimportant countries--suddenly spurted to national power and greatness among nations, as no nations had ever grown and multiplied in wealth, resources and power before. . . . Never did any people or nation spread out and grow so suddenly and rapidly into such magnitude of national power. . . . And nearly all this wealth came to us after A. D. 1800! (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 9, 11, 155, 161).

Only a couple of centuries before becoming the premier power of the world, England stood "in the margin of European economy and culture." On the eve of those 16th century events which would initiate a slow but rarely interrupted ascension in England's power and influence, the Hapsburg Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V aptly characterized the relative place of England in the comity of European nations. He is said to have remarked that he "I speak Latin to God, Italian to musicians, Spanish to ladies, French at court, German to servants, and English to my horses" (Eugen Weber, *Modern History of Europe*, p. 130).

How did such a reversal of fortunes occur over the following two hundred years? More importantly, *why* did it occur *when* it did? Historians have revealed to us much about the process of England's rise to power, but they remain largely as powerless as ever in explaining the timing of it all. That dimension of the story requires an insight accessible only through an understanding of the mind and plan of God.

The industrial and economic growth of the Anglo-American world began to crescendo in the mid- to late-18th century. Economic historians argue furiously about the point at which the industrialization process reached critical mass. Generally speaking, the earliest dates suggested are the 1750s and the latest near the turn of the 19th century. In any case, the proximity of these

dates to the issuing of the Birthright to Joseph's seed helps to make sense of the failure of so many previous kingdoms and empires to develop an industrial economic base, a fact which has long puzzled historians. Why did industrial "take-off" not occur before it did? The answer is simple. It was not according to the masterplan and time table of Almighty God (Isa. 46:9-10).

TEXT BOX: Dud Dudley and Cast Iron

The industrialization process in England came in no small way thanks to the development of the iron industry in the British Isles. Today's visitors to Ironbridge (slides #3794, 3838-49, 5053) can stroll through the reconstructed village and get a sense of what it might have been like to live at the time when the first Englishmen uncovered the secrets which would transform iron ore into one of the most basic, staple resources contributing to the rise of industry. Why did this not take place until the 18th century? History shows that a little known a 17th century Worcestershire innovator came close to discovering the secrets of iron production almost 100 years before.

At least such was the claim of one Dud Dudley, who in 1619 experimented with smelting iron ore through use of coal. He was so encouraged by the outcome of his experiments that he even sent samples of his product to King James I. What appeared to be a promising beginning met with failure due to flooding, the coming of the English Civil War (1642-1651), and Dudley's misbegotten decision to fight in that conflict on the losing Royalist side. The Cromwell government which succeeded Charles I was not receptive to his ideas, and when Charles II was restored in 1660, the new king was too cash poor to help Dudley with the financing he needed to forge ahead (*Warwickshire & Worcestershire Life*, February 1974, p. 45).

Today's experts in metallurgy are disagreed over whether Dudley's processes would have succeeded. As history shows and Providence seems to have directed, successful iron production on a commercial scale had to wait until Abraham Darby's little foundry at Coalbrookdale initiated the process. Between 1709-1717, Darby produced iron from a coke-fired blast furnace (slide #486) and from 1750 forward, the British were able to make machinery and equipment out of cast

iron. So it was that one of the principal elements of the infrastructure of the industrialization process became available at precisely on schedule according to the time table of God.

End of Text Box

One of the best assessments of the timing of industrialization comes from conservative historian, Charles Wilson, who writes in *England's Apprenticeship*:

As yet [c. 1763] "industry" did not mean industrialization as a later age was to understand it. The manufacturing part of the economy was like the components of a watch ready for assembly but not interacting with each other. There were already urban industries (like brewing, soap boiling, sugar refining, etc.) but industry as a whole was far from urbanized. The greater part of the expanding export trade was sustained by rural and semi-rural industries organized on a domestic basis. "Factories" there were, but few of them were mechanized on a [large] scale" (chapter 14 summary, p. 312).

In other words, as the 19th century approached the stage was set for the industrial take-off.

The *dues ex machina* of the industrial process--the steam engine (slides #300; 1011, 2972--James Watt)--was a replacement for the Newcomen engine (slides #299, 8118), an atmospheric pump created in 1712 to lift water from mines. Newcomen's machine was in no small way a product the late-17th century wood shortage in Britain. With little wood available for fuel, the English found an alternate source for heat: coal. And coal mines required removal of water from mines which began to become increasingly deep. During the late-18th and early-20th century French Wars, the need to extract metals for the war effort required deeper mining than ever before. Thus arose another incentive to improve pumping capacity. In 1768, James Watt, the "father of the Industrial Revolution," built his first working model of the steam engine. He patented it in 1769.

The year 1776 was a landmark one (see Marshall B. Davidson, *The Horizon History of The World in 1776*). By that date, the steam engine was in practical use and within another decade--just a few years prior to the French Revolution of 1789 which significantly slowed industrial development in France--it became a commercial success.

Interestingly, the same year the steam engine became a practical tool in England, American colonists declared their independence initiating the separation of Ephraim and Manasseh prophetically forecast in Genesis 48:16, 19. A Scottish University of Glasgow professor of moral philosophy, Adam Smith (slides #275-6, 286, 2549), published *Wealth of Nations* which became the intellectual and philosophical support structure for England's developing capitalist economy. That economic system propelled the Western world in general and the British economy in particular to unprecedented heights. The gospel of *laissez-faire* articulated by Smith gave the rising commercial, industrial, and entrepreneurial classes of the British Isles the moral sanction they needed to implement "the most fundamental transformation of human life in the history of the world recorded in written documents" (Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire*, p. 13).

For England, industrial supremacy (slides #312, 314, 316, 318-23, 1469, 2829, 3079, 5055, 5064-5, 5148-9--trains; 325-6, 949, 1370--boats; 324--canal) was an important factor in the successful neutralization of the threat posed by Napoleon. It placed in the hands of Englishmen a kind of Promethean fire which made possible the eventual broadcasting of British imperial power around the globe--the somewhat haphazard, ill-planned construction of an empire on which the 19th century sun would never set. If British diplomats and statesmen lacked a grand design and blueprint for the construction of that imperial edifice, it nevertheless became the largest and most beneficent empire in all of world history. Little wonder that historians often describe the 19th as the "British Century."

The 2,520 Years

How ever historians or theologians may interpret these astonishing developments, it is undeniable that this flowering of Anglo-Saxon power came some 2,520 years after Israel's demise and disappearance as a result of the invasion of the Assyrians. What happened around that time among the British and American people bears witness to the fulfillment of the prophecies recorded in Genesis 48 and 49. The developments forecast in these prophecies were most dramatically

fulfilled in the Anglo-American setting between about A. D. 1660 and 1820. The former was the year of the restoration of Charles II and the Stuart monarchy by the "Convention" Parliament. By the latter date, the dust from the Napoleonic Wars had settled and England began to lapse into the Splendid Isolation which allowed her to concentrate on the development that made her the foremost nation-state in the 19th century world. It was between these years that the stage was set for the Anglo-American ascendancy of the two most recent centuries of human history. Is this historical happenstance or part of the unfolding of the greater purpose, plan, and design of Almighty God?

To answer this question, we must realize that God often places conditions on the blessings which He promises (e.g., Gen. 17:1). The the promise to the generation of Israelites which left Egypt was *conditional*. The Israelites almost immediately disqualified themselves after receiving the promise (Num. 13:17-14:39, Heb. 3:8-19). Those very Israelites *never* entered the Promised Land. They failed to keep their side of the bargain struck at the foot of Mt. Sinai. God promised Israel: "*If* ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, *then* ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people [emphasis ours]" (Ex. 19:5-8). The assertion "*If* you will obey my voice" (v. 5) is better understood when considered against the "blessings and curses" specified in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28.

God *suspended* the inheritance of the Promised Land for one generation after the Israelites rebelled in faithlessness and unbelief. On a larger scale, He employed the same type of principle in withholding the blessings promised to Joseph, only extending it over several dozen generations after the chosen people were taken into their in the 8th century B. C. captivity. The duration of that withholding was 2,520 years.

Without a doubt 2,520 is an unusual and remarkable figure. *The Companion Bible* observes:

The four *perfect numbers*, 3, 7, 10, and 12, have for their product the remarkable number 2,520. It is the Least Common Multiple of the ten digits governing all

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

numeration; and can, therefore, be divided by each of the nine digits without remainder. It is the number of chronological perfection (7 x 360) (Appendix 10, "The Spiritual Significance of Numbers," p. 14).

The number 2,520 is also important in respect to an understanding of biblical prophecy. This is especially true concerning a passage in Leviticus 26:18-21.

And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you *seven times* more for your sins. And I will break the pride of your power; and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass [a kind of temporary rescinding of the blessings promised to Joseph in Gen. 49:25--"and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of the heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb"]: And your strength shall be spent in vain: for your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits. And if ye walk contrary unto me, and will not hearken unto me; I will bring *seven times* more plagues upon you according to your sins [emphasis ours].

Reference is made in this passage to "seven times" punishment which will fall upon Israel for disobedience to God. In context and based on the Hebrew grammatical structure, the "seven times" spoken of in verse 18 is in fact a measurement of "prophetic times" equaling 2,520 years. Conversely in context the "seven times" of verse 21 is referring to intensity.

In withholding the land of Canaan from ancient Israel, God required that the Israelites remain in the wilderness one year for every day that the faithless Israelites spied out the Promised Land (Num. 14:34). In the language of prophecy, a "time" represents the length of a Hebrew year (360 days). Using this principle of a "day for a year" (cf. Ezekiel 4:4 - 6, and Dan. 4:32), it can be calculated that "seven times" = 7 x 360 days (the ancient Israelites considered 30 days the length of a month) = 2,520 days or prophetic years. Two thousand five hundred and twenty years from Israel's captivity brings us to about A. D. 1800 when God began to restore the Birthright to the modern descendants of Israel. In fact, God was honor bound to extend these blessings.

As we saw in Chapter I above, after the events described in Genesis 22 regarding the sacrifice of Isaac, the Abrahamic Covenant became *unconditional*. The Northern Kingdom was

invaded and became the Lost Ten Tribes, but God remained responsible to fulfill the *unconditional* promises to Abraham's descendants (Gen. 22:12, 16). He restored the Birthright promises to the progeny of those 8th century B. C. Israelites taken into captivity. He undoubtedly was involved as well in the setting of the stage for propelling the Anglo-Saxon people to unparalleled national greatness. This was a process which extended at least back to the mid-17th century.

TEXT BORDER: I suggest that we place in this chapter a table or perhaps a text border, either at the top & bottom, or on the sides of each page, documenting with captions and illustrations the key events in Assyria/Israelite history and Anglo-American history falling between the mid-9th century and 701 B. C., and A. D. 1660-1820 respectively.

NOTE: dates for monarchs of the ancient world are taken from Eugene H. Merrill's *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 320, 336.

Ancient World Events

Ongoing Illustrations: Sequence of maps showing the chronological expansion and contraction of the Assyrian Empire, complete with "X's" for battle sites and capital cities (e.g., slides #2669, 2678--maps)

Assyrian captives: slides #2665, 2699

Assyrian torture: slides #2691, 6006-7

Assyrian winged bull: slide #2859

Assyrian imagery: slides #1521, 2688, 1972, 2173, 2630, 3078, 3131, 3653, 3657, 7151, 7254, 7936, 8058, 6004

Assur-nasirpal II (883-859 B. C.), king of Assyria

Slides #2615, 4071, 5983, 5990-1, 5994-5, 5998

Initiated campaigns to the west

Illustration: Assyrian art work of war chariots (e.g., slides #3078, 2173, 3131, 1972, 2630, 2615)

See pp. 3, 6, 10, 17, 19, 21-22, 27-37, title page, contents page, back cover of Julian Reade's *Assyrian Sculpture*

Ahab (874-853 B. C.), king of Israel

Initiation of Baal worship at the behest of Queen Jezebel
Ahab engages in alliance with Ben-Hadad I of Damascus in anticipation of
Assyrian intrusions into the affairs of the Northern Kingdom

Shalmaneser III (858-824 B. C.), king of Assyria

Initiated campaigns into Syria
Jehu, king of Israel offers tribute to Shalmaneser

Jehu (841-815 B. C.), king of Israel (II Kings 10:30)

Illustration: Shalmaneser's Black Obelisk

Jehoahaz (814-798 B. C.), king of Israel

Joash (798-782 B. C.), king of Israel

Tribute paid to Adad-Nirari (810-783 B. C.), king of Assyria

Jeroboam II (793-753 B.C.), king of Israel

Israel's "Indian Summer"
Prophecies of Amos and Hosea

Zechariah (752 B. C.), king of Israel

Menachem (752-742 B. C.), king of Israel

Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 B. C.), king of Assyria

Illustration: Assyrians torturing captives (slide #2691)
Campaign Map

1st stage of deportation of Israelites from the Northern Kingdom-- the Galilean
captivity (II Kings 15:27-29, 16:5-9)

Pekiah (740-732 B. C.), king of Israel

Revolt against Assyria (734 B. C.)

Pekah (740-732 B. C.), king of Israel

Rebellion against Assyria (738 B. C.)

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Ahaz (735-715 B. C.), king of Judah (II Kings 16:7-8)

Hoshea (732-722 B.C.), king of Israel

Final revolt against Assyria

Shalmaneser V (727-722 B. C.), king of Assyria

Illustration: Winged bull (slide #2859)
Campaign map

Initiation of campaign against Israel (722/1-718 B. C.)

Sargon II (722-705 B. C.), king of Assyria

Completion of Shalmaneser V's campaign against Israel (718 B. C.)
2nd stage of deportation of Israelites from the Northern Kingdom

Illustration: Sargon II (slide #2045, 2677)
War scenes, captives (slides #2665, 2694, 2699; 2691--
torture scene; 2688--head count; 2646--map of
resettlement)

Hezekiah (729-686 B. C.), king of Judah

Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.), king of Assyria

Revolt of Hezekiah, king of Judah against Assyria (705 B. C.)
Sennacherib's campaign against Judah (704-701 B. C.)

Isaiah 36-39

Illustration: Taylor Prism
Campaign map (slide #1522, 2980, 2600)
Lachish relief (slide #2749, 3051-2, 3052, 8031)

Fall of Nineveh (612 B.C.)

1st Battle of Carchemish (609 B. C.)

Assyrians suffer major defeat

2nd Battle of Carchemish (605 B. C.)

Final Assyrian stronghold falls to Babylonians

Modern Events

The Stuart Restoration (1660)

Ascension to the English throne of the exiled Stuart family
Beginnings of Cabinet system of government
"Declaration of Indulgence for Tender Consciences" (1672)

Illustration: Charles II

Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667)

Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674)

Pro-Catholicism of Charles II (1660-1685) and James II (1685-1688) stimulate renewed immigration to American colonies

Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689

The triumph of Parliamentary supremacy in England
Emergence of political parties in England

Act of Settlement (1701)

Guarantees that the throne of England will be occupied only by Protestant successors

Industrial Revolution (c. 1760s-1790s)

England propelled to worldwide economic supremacy

"Second" Hundred Years' War (1689-1815)

A protracted duel between England and France over sea power, commerce, and colonies

War of the League of Augsburg (1689-1697)

William III's Grand Alliance checks the expansion of French power

War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714)

British navy becomes largest in all of Europe; England gains Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Hudson Bay territory, Minorca, and Gibraltar; world power

status of England is confirmed

Career of Sir Robert Walpole (1721-1742)

Walpole begins to fill the role of what will become known as "Prime Minister"

The rise of Cabinet government

Policy of salutary neglect prepares American colonial mentality for revolution

French & Indian War (1754-1763) & Seven Year's War (1756-1763)

Annus Mirabilis--"The Glorious Year" (1759)

English victories at Quebec on Plains of Abraham, Plassey in India, and the destruction of two French fleets

England emerges as world's foremost colonial power with India and North America firmly under her control--but with colonials no longer in need of British military protection. While America would soon break out of the colonial orbit, India would become the "Crown Jewel in Britain's Imperial Diadem"

War costs caused England's national debt to nearly double preparing the way for increased pressures to tax the American colonies

Stamp Act Congress (1765)

The seminal step in welding the colonies together to take common action

Townshend Duties (1767)

Levies on a variety of products prompt American boycott of British goods

Boston Massacre (1770)

Subsequently, all but the tax on tea is repealed

Tea Act of 1773

In spite of actually lowering the price paid by colonials for tea, Americans resist what they perceive as a mandate for submission to Parliamentary rule

Boston Tea Party (1773)

British images of Americans as disrespectful, unruly ruffians

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Quebec Act (1774)

Territory north of Ohio River and east of Mississippi become "Quebec" and as such open to settlement by Roman Catholics

American Revolution (1775-1783)

Lexington and Concord (1775)

The Revolution begins

Declaration of Independence (1776)

Americans formally dissolve their relationship with the mother country

Battle of Saratoga (1777)

American victory prompts open French support of the revolutionary cause

Yorktown (1781)

Washington wins the decisive engagement of the war against Cornwallis

Ephraim and Manasseh separate (Gen. 48) and France inherits a war debt creating financial problems which contribute to the French Revolution of 1789; loss of American colonies heightens British interest in India

Signing of U. S. Constitution (1787)

Brings governmental stability to the struggling American democracy

Adoption of U. S. Bill of Rights (1789)

Guarantees freedom of religion, speech, press, and right to assemble in the new American nation-state

French Revolution (1789-1799)

The French Wars (1793-1799)

Napoleon defeated by Horatio Nelson at Battle for the Nile (1798)

Prophetic ministry of Richard Brothers (1790s)

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

War of 1812 (1812-1815)

United States emerges imbued with a new self-awareness and sense of confidence in their own abilities and potential; grudgingly the British become convinced that the Revolution was no mistake--the U.S. would remain an independent country

Louisiana Purchase (1803)

Sale of Louisiana Territory to provide funding for renewed war by France against England

Napoleonic Wars (1804-1815)

War of the Third Coalition (1805-1807)

Battle of Trafalgar (1805)

Lord Nelson's British fleet devastates the Franco-Spanish navy and ends the threat of a French invasion of the British Isles

Battle of Austerlitz (1805)

Napoleon's most spectacular military victory

Battle of Friedland (1807)

Napoleon's victory leads to Treaties of Tilsit and inclusion of Russian in the Continental System

Battle of Borodino (1812)

Bloody battle which mired Napoleon in Russia

Battle of the Nations/Leipzig (1813)

Napoleon defeated by combined Austro-Prussian armies

1st Abdication of Napoleon (1814)

Napoleon exiled to Elba

The "Hundred Days" or the Return of Napoleon (1815)

Battle of Waterloo (1815)

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

Napoleon's final, decisive defeat

2nd Abdication of Napoleon (1815)

Napoleon exiled to St. Helena

Congress of Vienna (1815)

The foundation of a century-long epoch of general peace and international equilibrium is laid--in this context the English establish a *Pax Britannica*

Britain enjoys unparalleled ascendancy with her navy ruling the high seas and her economy greatly stimulated by the war

American independence was assured as a result of the War of 1812; the territory gained through the purchase of Louisiana insures eventual world power status for the U. S.; and the diminishing Indian threat cleared the way for Westward expansion

The French bid for European hegemony had decisively failed

British withdrawal from the Concert of Europe (1820)

From about 1820, England moves toward a policy of "Splendid Isolationism"

First English settlers reach Cape of Good Hope in South Africa (1820)

Death of Napoleon on St. Helena (1821)

Monroe Doctrine (1823)

Closed the Western Hemisphere to further colonization

Coronation of Queen Victoria (1837)

Ascension of England's longest reigning queen, during whose years the British Empire would grow into the largest and most benevolent empire in world history

Publication of John Wilson's *Our Israelitish Origins* (1840)

1st thorough development of the British-Israel theory

End of Text Border

To appreciate this process and have an enlarged understanding about the 2,520 year withholding of the Birthright, we should consider the broader sweep of Assyrian-Israelite contacts. Roman Catholic theologian Lawrence Boadt describes that relationship writing:

The two hundred years from 922, when Jeroboam [I] began to rule, down to 722, when the northern kingdom fell to the Assyrians, were mostly taken up by war: either battles against Assyria, border disputes with Judah, revolt by subject peoples such as Moab, or the struggle against the growing power of the new Aramean state of Damascus in Syria. . . . But it was above all the age of the rise of Assyria, the great Mesopotamian power. Assyrian ambition was to conquer all the western lands, and it slowly but surely moved against its neighbors in the two centuries after Solomon's death. . . . By the end of the ninth century. . . . [Assyria] placed enough pressure on all the others to force an end to the fighting between northern Israel and Damascus. . . . Under a series of strong kings in the ninth century B.C., Assyria began a program of systematic conquest and empire-building that spread in all four directions, especially toward the south to control Babylon, and toward the west to gain access to the forests of Syria and Lebanon which would insure a steady wood supply for the largely treeless homeland (*Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 294, 309).

It is probable that anxieties about Assyrian interference in Israelite affairs date to the reign of Assurnasipal II (883-859 B. C.). Eugene Merrill writes that:

he initiated a program of annual western campaigns which became notorious for their cruelty. By around 875 he had brought all the northern Aramean states as far as Bit-Adini under Assyrian control. Even so, Israel, Judah, and Damascus were given a reprieve for twenty-five more years until, at last, even they were drawn in into the maelstrom of international upheaval occasioned by the inexorable westward and southward sweep of the Assyrian war machine under Shalmaneser III. . . . The frenetic machination of Ben-Hadad, Ahab, Jehosaphat, and the other rulers of the Mediterranean littoral [were a response to the burgeoning power of Assyrian]. . . . The revived empire had begun a sustained westward movement under Adad-nirari (911-891). This was intensified under Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884) and, by the time of Ahab and Jehosaphat, had achieved extremely threatening dimensions under Assur-nasirpal II (883-859). By about 875 he had pressed west as far as Bit-Adini on the upper Euphrates, bringing all the Aramean states of that region under Assyrian control (*Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 337, 348-349--see also Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 120, 122).

Another authority, Julian Reade writes, "the first time, so far as we know, that the Assyrians became directly involved with one of the main biblical kingdoms was in 853 B. C. Shalmaneser

III (858-824 B. C.) was then advancing through Syria towards Lebanon and Palestine” (*Assyrian Sculpture*, p. 44).

And so it was that relations between Israel and Assyria began to sour as early as the mid-ninth century B. C. when Ahab (874-853 B. C.), second monarch of the Omride dynasty, took military precautions in anticipation of confronting Assyria’s imperialist-minded Shalmaneser III. Ahab furnished 10,000 soldiers and 2,000 chariots as his contributions to an Israelite-Syrian alliance designed to forestall Assyrian advances to the southwest. Three generations of Israelite kings later, Jehu (841-814 B. C.) felt the brunt of Assyrian pressure to the extent that he became a tributary of Shalmaneser III.

TEXT BOX: Shalmaneser’s Black Obelisk

Relations between the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom and the Assyrians began to sour as early as the mid-ninth century B. C. when Ahab (874-853 B. C.), second monarch of the Omride dynasty, took military precautions in anticipation of confronting Assyria’s imperialist-minded Shalmaneser III (858-824 B. C.). As subsequent history demonstrated, Ahab’s anxieties were with good cause. Three generations of Israelite kings later, Jehu (841-814 B. C.) felt the brunt of Assyrian pressure to the extent that he became a tributary of Shalmaneser III.

Shortly after the mid-9th century B. C.:

Jehu voluntarily became a vassal of the Assyrian monarch Shalmaneser III. He began paying tribute to Assyria as soon as he ascended the throne. . . . Jehu evidently considered it prudent to reverse Israel’s policy toward Assyria, which had been one of hostility, in order to secure Assyrian help against Israel’s chief enemy, Hazael of Syria” (Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 125-126).

This Assyrian ruler immortalized Jehu’s subservience in stone on the renowned Black Obelisk (slides #3006, 3658, 3772, 3881, 5199, 5200, 5996-7, 5982) which prominently resides today in the British Museum. The great Austen Henry Layard (slides #2860, 3026, 4177, 5173, 5231,

5277-8, 8056) discovered Shalmaneser's Black Obelisk in 1846 at Nimrud. It bears the earliest known depiction of an Israelite in any type of artistic form.

There remains some dispute about who exactly is represented on the Black Obelisk.

Theologian P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. argues:

that the *ai-u-a* (or *ia-a-u*) on the stela should be identified with Joram [the son of Ahab--see II Kings 8:16, 21-29], not Jehu. Reading Yaw as a hypocorism for Joram solves two problems: (a) the king in view is called the "son of Omri," an improbable designation for Jehu in that he wiped out the family of Omri and founded his own dynasty [I Kings 16:16-28]; and (b) it is unlikely that a king would pay tribute in his first year (Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 349 note, 361--see also Reade, *Assyrian Sculpture*, pp. 44-45).

If this proposition is true, Israelite tribute to Assyria began even earlier than most scholars tend to believe. McCarter's position remains, however, a minority view.

END OF TEXT BOX

The Assyrian records of Adad-nirari (810-783 B. C.) show Israel's king Joash (798-782 B. C.) also paid tribute to Assyria. Not until the Indian Summer of the early 8th century did these Assyrian intrusions into Israelite life appear to abate. Boadt tells us:

by the year 800 B. C., Assyrian power weakened and the western states of the Near East enjoyed about fifty years of relief. During this time, both Israel and Judah reached their greatest prosperity since the time of Solomon under two remarkable kings, Jeroboam II of Israel and Uzziah of Judah. There was a revival of trade and commerce, towns were rebuilt, Jeroboam was able to extend his control over parts of the kingdom of Damascus, and the number of wealthy citizens increased dramatically, at least if we can believe the archaeological evidence showing that much larger private houses began to appear at this time. . . . [By Jeroboam's death, Israel] faced the difficult problems of an age that had known great prosperity, but was now under a renewed pressure from Assyrian power which robbed Israel of independent movement (*Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 311-312).

The Bible says little of Jeroboam II (793-753 B. C.), devoting only seven verses (II Kings 14:23-29) to his entire administration. Nevertheless, he was a major figure in the line of Israelite monarchs.

[Jeroboam] regained so much lost territory that, with the exception of the territory held by the kingdom of Judah, his kingdom was almost as large as the empire of David and Solomon. He restored Israelite rule over the coastal and inland regions of Syria to the north, conquered Damascus and Hamath, and occupied Transjordan south to the Dead Sea, which probably means that he made Ammon and Moab vassals to Israel. These tremendous gains were possible only because Assyria was suffering a period of political weakness and was unable to interfere. . . . In the midst of its prosperity and evident political security, Israel did not realize that only a few decades later its doom would come, as predicted by the prophets (Hershel Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, p. 127).

It is both interesting and significant that *all* of Israel's rises to regional power status--even that of David and Solomon--were more the product of the eclipse of the kingdoms and empires surrounding the Israelite states than the political and military superiority of Israel in *real* or quantitative terms. In this respect, it is accurate to say that Israel was only *relatively* powerful.

In national Israel's story, we see a physical precursor to its spiritual counterpart, the Church of God. Not surprisingly, Jesus described His people as a "little flock" (Lk. 12:32). Paul shows us that the Christian is typically drawn from the weak and foolish of the world (I Cor. 1:26-28). So it remains in the Church of God today. How ever small or lacking in influence that Church may truly be, it is charged with a monumental responsibility to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God as a witness to all the world (Mt. 24:14). A part of that message involves warning the physical, national people of God about the coming judgments upon them--a theme that will be explored in greater depth in the final chapter of this booklet.

If such a message of coming doom must be delivered in an apparently prosperous and thriving context, it is not the first time that servants of God have had to do so. Micah 5:8-15 predicts a time when "the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver." Such *has* been the character of Anglo-American world dominance over the last two centuries. So it largely remains for the United States today. But it is in just such a time--when the hand of Jacob will "be lifted up upon all thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off"--that God "will cut off

thy horses out of the midst of thee, and I will destroy thy chariots: And I will cut off the cities of thy land, and throw down all they strongholds.”

If the Assyrian captivity of Israel is a forerunner of an end time punishment upon Abraham's modern-day descendants, the implications for the Church at the end of the age are overwhelming. God expects His people to deliver a warning message even if it is in a setting where the outward signs of military and economic decay are absent. Dramatic parallels do exist, however, between the social and moral malaise in 8th century B. C. and the 20th century A. D. Israel. As God expects His servants today to condemn such decadance, so He did in ancient times.

It was in a benign setting of physical and material Israelite prosperity, and just before Tiglath-pileser (745-727 B. C.) (slides #2190, 2590, 3665, 6003, 6010-12) disturbed that peace, that the prophets Amos and Hosea appeared. These men initiated in Israel the age of “Classical Prophecy.” Until this juncture, we read primarily biblical narratives *about* the prophets themselves. After their coming, Scripture richly preserves the actual words of the prophets. Amos broke new ground, indicting not only national leadership but the whole people as responsible for the sins of “Samaria,” a biblical term for the Northern Kingdom. “Spring neither king nor priest, nobility nor common people, Amos castigated them all in simple but sharp messages of reproof and denunciation. . . . Amos warned that only complete repentance by king and people, and a turning again to Yahweh, whom they had forsaken, could avert the approaching catastrophe” (Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, p. 127).

Both Amos and Hosea inveighed against the evils of the day which included oppression of the poor, perversion of judgment, unbridled greed, selfish luxury among the aristocratic classes (particularly its women), and superficial religiosity which found expression in irreverence toward the Sabbath, faithlessness toward the covenant, and worship of foreign gods. Unsuccessfully, these two prophets called for national repentance.

Boadt summarizes the fidelity of Amos' message writing, “God does not stand idly by and watch evil go on. The political moves of Assyria and its fearful military victories are not accidents

of history but permitted and directed by God to punish Israel" (*Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 304, 317-318). Ultimately, the Assyrians proved to be "the rod of God's anger" about which Isaiah wrote (Isa. 10:5-6). Amos' younger counterpart, Hosea, probably lived to witness the awful fulfillment of his own predictions. He no doubt "saw one king after another change loyalties for and against Assyria, saw the violence of assassination destroy the inner spirit of the country, and watched as little by little the Assyrians conquered and deported parts of the kingdom until the capital itself went down in flames" (Boadt, *Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 323-324).

Very shortly after the death of Jeroboam II (753 B. C.), the Northern Kingdom plunged into political chaos.

Civil wars, assassinations and internal fighting between groups which supported Assyrian policies or opposed any capitulation to them racked the northern state. . . . The deaths of Jeroboam and Uzziah. . . came at the very moment when Assyria regained her power and renewed her push to the west (*Ibid.* pp. 311-312--see also Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, p. 128).

In the midst of their own domestic and internal difficulties, Israelite policy-makers also had to consider the intrusions of Assyria into their affairs. By the time of Tiglath-pileser III, king Menahem (752-742 B. C.) was forthcoming with "enormous sums of tribute" intended to induce the Assyrian monarch to leave him and his people in peace (Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 129-130).

In 738 B. C., king Pekah (752-732 B. C.) rebelled against Assyria, only to surrender later and pay a huge ransom in order to retain his throne (II Kings 15:19-20). Typical of the Assyrian policy of the time, Pekah's disloyalty set in motion the usual Assyrian response of converting the offending kingdom into a vassal state. This re-defining of Israelite-Assyrian relations was the first in a sequence of three levels of response which were automatically and successively introduced as a matter of Assyrian imperial policy in dealing with unruly subject peoples.

Second time offenders forfeited their political control and were replaced by a vassal-king whom the Assyrian government believed would be loyal. In stage two, the Assyrians also reduced the amount of territory that the new vassal controlled. The Assyrian monarch took direct rule over at least some of the original kingdom. The new vassal king was less independent than his

predecessor. As an additional dimension of punishment, the Assyrians deported limited segments of the population. Finding themselves among strangers whose language they did not understand (cf. Jer. 5:15) and whose culture was unfamiliar, the deportees had little hope of successfully revolting against their Assyrian masters. Even if they did, they were hundreds of miles from their original homeland and unlikely to find their way successfully back to it.

Tiglath-pileser initiated this second stage of punishment upon Israel in response to Pekah's alliance with Damascus and a second attempt at revolt in 734 B. C. The first deportation of Israelites (734-732 B. C.), sometimes referred to as the "Galilean Captivity," took part of the population--principally that drawn from the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the portion of Manasseh living east of the Jordan River--to northern Syria as well as northern and northwestern Mesopotamia (II Kings 16:5-9, 15:27-29). Tiglath-pileser III also occupied the greater part of Galilee and Gilead and divided Israelite territory itself into four new provinces: Magidu, Duru, Gilead, and Samaria.

The third and final official Assyrian response in dealing with rebellious subjects was extinction of the people as a nation. This action usually included wholesale removal of almost the entire population. The Assyrians scattered deportees throughout their empire and repopulated the vacated territories with other people from distant and far-flung regions. The pro-Assyrian but unreliable Israelite puppet, King Hoshea (732-722 B. C.), set in motion the events which brought the final deluge. Hoping to receive critical aid from Egypt to the south, Hoshea betrayed Assyrian trust in around 725 B. C. (II Kings 18:9-10). Shalmaneser V (727-722 B. C.) eventually responded with a three year siege (722/1-718 B. C.) which resulted in the fall of the kingdom's capital city, Samaria. At that point, the Northern Kingdom ceased to exist.

There is an important postscript to the fall of Samaria in 718 B. C. For Judah, the deterioration continued beyond Shalmaneser V's major military campaign of 721-718 B. C. Hezekiah's kingdom (slides # 2193-4, 5257-8, 5261, 5268, 5336-9, 5348-9, 8021--Hezekiah's tunnel) experienced part of a final denouement in failed Israelite-Assyrian relations. In 701 B. C. Simeon, the final tribe outside of Judah proper, was taken captive by the army of Sennacherib

(704-681 B. C.) in part of the general Assyrian campaign described in II Kings 18, II Chronicles 31, and Isaiah 36.

TEXT BOX: Sennacherib's Western Campaign

Just before the end of the 8th century B. C., Assyrian monarch Sennacherib launched a highly destructive assault through the edge of the desert in that territory of the Kingdom of Judah known as the Shephelah. He considered his siege of Lachish, located south of Judah and between Gerar and Beer-sheba, the crowning achievement of this campaign. Sennacherib immortalized the siege in his limestone bas reliefs (slides #2749, 3051-2, 8031), originally paneling for the walls of his palace in Nineveh. These reliefs now grace several of the walls in the Assyrian rooms of London's British Museum (on the Lachish reliefs, see Mitchell, *The Bible in the British Museum*, pp. 60-64; and Reade, *Assyrian Sculpture*, pp. 47-52).

The story of Sennacherib's western campaign of 701 B. C. (slide #2600, 2980--map showing Sennacherib's campaign/location of Simeonites) is related in the little hexagonal Taylor Prism (slide #5233) which also can be found today in the British Museum. "The best known passage in this description states that because [king of Judah] Hezekiah had not submitted to the Assyrian 'yoke,' Sennacherib laid siege to forty-six fortified Judean cities, deported 200,150 people, and invested Hezekiah in Jerusalem" (T. C. Mitchell, *The Bible in the British Museum*, p. 59). The Assyrian monarch claims to have trapped Hezekiah in his capital city "like a bird in a cage." But what Sennacherib's account does *not* say is as important as what it does.

Placed alongside of the biblical accounts of II Kings 18:17-19:36 and Isaiah 36:1-37:37, we find much more to the story. These passages tell how God delivered Jerusalem by striking the Assyrian army under Rabshakeh with a devastating plague while they were encamped about the environs of the city (II Kings 19:32-35). The Hebrew tradition places this dramatic rescue of Hezekiah's Jerusalem on the Passover. The *Soncino* commentary on Isaiah 36 observes, "Traditionally Hezekiah's illness occurred three days before Sennacherib's fall. On the third day

Hezekiah went up to the Temple to offer his prayer; and on the same day, which was the first day of passover, Sennacherib's armies were miraculously destroyed while he himself fled to Nineveh."

END OF TEXT BOX

Working from the assumption that Assyrian-Israelite relations were generally troubled from the reign of Shalmaneser III through the final campaign of Sennacherib (slides #1522, 5303, 8060), the period between A. D. 1660-1820 becomes a particularly significant. As Assyrian intrusions into Israelite affairs inexorably increased and the impending catastrophe of massive deportation became inevitable, might it be logical to assume that we would find a corresponding crescendo of Israelitish power across a century and a half leading to the expiration of the withholding of the Birthright? Indeed, as we shall see in the following chapter, this is precisely what history demonstrates.

VII

Prophecies About Israel

Retrospect and Prospect

If it is a *fact* of history that about 2,520 years after ancient Israel ceased to be an independent kingdom, the Anglo-Saxon people were on the verge of exercising unparalleled influence. It is also a matter of clear, unquestionable historical record that during the century and a half from 1660 to 1820, developments in Britain and the United States *laid the foundation* for the Anglo-American military, political, and economic dominance of the last two centuries. Is this mere coincidence--or is it precisely what we should expect based on the Bible prophecies foretelling the near-unbelievable greatness of Abraham's heirs "in the last days" (Gen. 49:1)?

In fact, there are three sets of prophecies, all of which provide some of the most convincing evidence available about the modern-day identity of the descendants of Israel. The first arises from those astonishing predictions about the double-portion of the Abrahamic blessing to fall on the people of Joseph (Gen. 48:21-22, 49:22-26, Deut. 33:13-17, I Chron. 5:1-2). The second relates to Jacob's prediction of an eventual separation between Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 48:1-20)--his forecast that descendants of the two boys would grow together into a great people; that eventually they would experience a parting of the ways with each group enjoying continuing prosperity and blessings in their own right. We can locate the people of Joseph in history by looking backward in time, identifying the modern-day peoples who have fulfilled the predictions at the time and in the way that prophecy leads us to expect.

The third set of prophecies, scattered liberally throughout the writings of both Major and Minor Prophets, foretells of monumental end time events yet to overtake the Israelitish peoples. They are of value to us not only in demonstrating that a physical, national people of Israel exists today; they give us an enlarged understanding of the very job of the Church of God as humanity moves inexorably toward the return of Jesus Christ and the establishment of His Millennial rule

over the all the earth. In this chapter, we will examine in order each of these three sets of prophecies, how they have been fulfilled, and what remains ahead for Israel.

The Prosperity of Joseph

The words of Jacob predict marvelous and wonderful things for Joseph's end time descendants:

Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well; whose branches run over the wall. The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him: But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel: Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb: The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on the crown of the head of him that was separate from his brethren (Genesis 49:22-26).

Moses reiterated these words in his farewell address to the Israelites about to cross the Jordan River and enter the Promised Land. He declared:

And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, And for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, And for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, And for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh (Deut. 33:13-17).

Separate from His Brethren

These magnificent prophecies have been fulfilled in the stories of the British and American peoples. Like Joseph, the son of Jacob, the descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh have been physically separated from the descendants of the other tribes. Throughout European history, the English Channel has served as a beneficent buffer separating the Celts, the Angles, and the Saxons

international relations came in 1917 with her entry into World War I (slides #1818, 2330, 2831). Disillusionment over the peace process led to a temporary lapse into isolationism, but by the late-1930s, the world had become "too small" for the United States to stand aloof much longer. American involvement in World War II (December 7, 1941 -- slides #) began a sustained participating by the United States in world affairs. Today, America is the recognized leader among the nations of the world.

Along with brother Ephraim, the descendants of Manasseh have had the power to "push the people together to the ends of the earth" (Deut. 33:17). Little wonder that the prophecies inform us that Joseph's "bow abode in strength" (v. 24).

Climate and Geography

If the luck of geography made possible Anglo-American dominance of the past two hundred years, much of that strength sprang as well from favorable climate and a seemingly endless supply of natural resources. The "blessings of heaven above" (Gen. 49:25--cf. Deut. 33:13-14) have come to both peoples whose territories lie squarely within the temperate zones (slide #239, 1771, 240, 2576, 2653, 2792, 2579). Auspicious climate has enabled both the British and Americans to capitalize agriculturally on the abundant supply of rich and fertile soil of their territories (cf. Deut. 8:9, 28:3-5) (slides #241, 242, 243, 244, 1770).

A dependable food supply has yielded the steady population growth in British regions of the world and the United States from the 18th through much of the 20th centuries. Certainly in terms of population growth, the descendants of Joseph have been a "fruitful bough" (Gen. 49:22--see also v. 25, Lev. 26:9, Deut. 6:3, 7:13-14, 28:4) providing both the labor force and human ingenuity which helped to make possible the industrialization (slides #290-2, 301-4, 306, 309, 268, 296, 1017, 1677, 1679, 2893) which changed the face of the world (slide #247).

In addition to favorable climate, weather, agricultural production and a large population base, the British and American peoples fell heir to a treasure trove of natural resources (slides #1772, 251, 252, 255, 256, 253, 254, 257, 1452, 1454, 707, 258, 1626, 259, 260, 262, 1619, 2124, 2574, 2566, 1281, 263, 501, 264, 265, 266, 499, 1928, 267). What the British lacked

within their own isles, they drew from an empire encircling the globe. The Americans found everything necessary for national economic greatness--fertile top soil; iron ore and coal deposits; reserves of gold, silver, diamonds; and petroleum--within the confines of the continental U. S. Both peoples possessed "the chief things of the ancient mountains"--the "precious things of the lasting hills" and "the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof" within the territories they exclusively controlled (cf. Deut. 8:9, 28:1, 6, 8, 13).

TEXT BOX: The Great Exhibition of 1851

In London's Hyde Park, on May 1, 1851, one of the most remarkable architectural marvels of the 19th century--the Crystal Palace (slides #287-9, 788, 1682, 1759, 2807, 1758, 1920, 288, 289, 2893, 2934, 1685, 1679, 290)--opened its doors to an eager worldwide public. It was at this venue that Queen Victoria and Prince Albert opened the "Great Exhibition of 1851"--a convincing display of overwhelming 19th century British industrial and technological superiority. The Queen considered the moment to be the happiest and proudest day in her life. Her husband considered the Great Exhibition a turning point in human history and anticipated the time when trade and commerce would supplant the folly of war.

The Exhibition celebrated half a century of British progress. The Crystal Palace itself testified to the engineering marvels of the contemporary age. Built by Sir Joseph Paxton with the help of 2,200 English and Irish workers, it was an 1,800 foot long hall constructed essentially out of cast iron and glass. More than 6 million visitors passed through its corridors to inspect and marvel over exhibits placed there by 34 participating nations.

The majority of exhibits were, of course, British in both use and origin. Visitors saw examples of the great inventions and mechanical wonders of the day. The Exhibition was an overwhelming demonstration of why contemporary Europeans considered Britain the unrivaled "Workshop of the World." It was in fact a celebration of of a half century of British progress--a "world's fair" showing how the western nations in general and Britain in particular were striving for a better industrial world. It testified to Britain's industrial supremacy and leadership.

End of Text Box

Forty Decisive Years

All of the things promised in the prophecies about Joseph "in the last days" (Gen. 49:1) began to converge near the end of the 18th century A. D. It is worth examining what happened to the descendants of both Ephraim and Manasseh during this period. We find England and France locked in a life-and-death struggle over European--and by extension world--hegemony. The outcome of that struggle determined who would dominate the world during the following two centuries. The final results were not entirely clear until the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1804-1815).

Napoleon's defeat brought closure to what is arguably the most decisive 40 year period in modern history: 1775-1815. The Bible makes repeated use of the number 40 as symbolic of judgment or as a unified block of time denoting stages of life or reignal periods (cf. Ex. 2:1-10, 15, Num. 14:34, Josh. 3:14-17, 5:6, 24:31, Judg. 3:11, 30, 5:31, 6:1, 8:28, 12:9, 13:1, II Sam. 5:4, I Kings 11:42, I Chron. 29:27, II Chron. 9:30, Acts 13:21). The events unfolding during these four decades confirmed the Anglo-American character of the 19th and 20th centuries.

The epoch began on the Lexington Green in the midst of the Days of Unleavened Bread and ended on the fields of Waterloo in present-day Belgium on the day of Pentecost (slides #3118, 62, 2094, 3019, 7986--Congress of Vienna). Within this time frame, we see the parallel fulfillment of two prophecies critical to our examination. Genesis 48 addresses the separation of Ephraim from Manasseh and the foundation of two separate independent polities. Jacob predicted that Manasseh:

also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations (v. 19).

The first part of this grand prophecy was fulfilled in the setting of the American Revolution (1775-1783) and the War of 1812 (1812-1815). The American Revolution severed

the political connection of the American colonists to England. The wars between France and England on the European Continent had an indirect influence as well. The Louisiana Purchase was the product of Napoleon's need for ready cash to pay for the costs of impending war with England (slides #1389-90, 2020). The acquisition of the Louisiana Territory (1803) insured world power status for the United States. The War of 1812 confirmed the separation of the U. S. from Britain (slide #1154--Treaty of Ghent). And finally, the death of Tecumseh (October 4, 1813, the day following Atonement, at the Battle of the Thames) (slides #1280, 647) effected a subduing of the Indian threat which opened the way for relatively unhindered westward expansion--a development which gathered increasing momentum and reached a kind of climax with the growth of the spirit of "Manifest Destiny" and the Mexican War (1846-1848).

The second aspect of Jacob's prediction--that Ephraim would become "a multitude of nations" (v. 19)--also began slowly but inexorably to be fulfilled as a result of the French defeat in 1815. At the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the Royal Navy ruled the world's oceans. The British economy, greatly stimulated by the conflict, had been propelled to unparalleled world supremacy (William H. McNeill, *The Ecumene: The Story of Humanity*, p. 528-529; see also the F. Crouzet essay, "England and France in the Eighteenth Century: A Comparative Analysis of Two Economic Growths," pp. 167, 173-174, in *The Causes of the Industrial Revolution in England* edited by R. M. Hartwell; and *Age of Aristocracy*, pp. 217, 277-278). The French bid for world hegemony--more-or-less continuous since the days of Louis XIV (1643-1715) and the opening rounds of the "Second Hundred Years War"--had decisively failed.

Britain found herself free and in possession of the necessary political, economic, and military power to build an empire which extended around the globe. If brother Manasseh move forward to construct a nation that would extend from "sea to shining sea," Ephraim fell heir to the world. The British built an empire on which the sun never set. This imperial structure was almost infinite in its diversity, comprised as it was of people from virtually every known ethnic group and governed by means a centralized as the Raj in India or the British Agent-General's Office in

Egypt. . . or as independent as the dominion status granted to the territories of settlement in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

Genesis 49 relates the details of Joseph's inheritance--not Reuben's (I Chron. 5:1-2)--of the double portion of the Birthright passed from Abraham to Isaac to Jacob. Napoleon's fall was an essential prelude to Britain's ascension and the fulfillment of this prophecy. After 1815, Anglo-French tensions (slide #1570) remained, particularly in the sphere of colonial and imperial rivalries (the most dramatic example of which is the Fashoda Crisis of 1898), but even in that arena, there are novel examples of attempts at Anglo-French cooperation (e.g., the Anglo-French Commission which managed Egyptian economic affairs (slide #566--Gladstone) from 1876-1881 (slide #2079) or the dividing of the Middle East into spheres of influence by the Sykes-Picot agreement [slide #5133] of 1917). From 1815, there generally ensued a decrescendo of tensions which culminated in the Entente Cordiale of 1904 (slides #2098, 3100, 3130) and the joint Anglo-French resistance to the Triple Alliance and later the Central Powers against whom both French and English fought during World War I (slides #3813-24--Eurotunnel).

TEXT BOX: Israel and God's Holy Days

In his own writings on the subject of Israel's modern-day identity, Herbert W. Armstrong observed "few have realized it but a duality runs all the way through the *plan of God* [emphasis ours] in working out His purpose here below" (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 17). One facet of this insight relates to Mr. Armstrong's unique understanding of the meaning of the God's holy days described in Leviticus 23. Those special days provide us with a blueprint of the "master plan" of God.

Each respective festival season and holy day portrays something special in this master plan (see our booklet "God's Holy Day Plan" on the spiritual significance of these holy days of God). The holy days are significant both in terms of physical Israel's national history and spiritual Israel's blueprint for salvation. Significantly, in the stories about the patriarchs and the ancient Israelites, numerous key events of literally fell on specific holy days:

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

- c. 1873 B. C. 1st Day of Unleavened Bread -- God gives Abraham the most extensive elaboration of the promise recorded in scripture (Gen. 17:1-6 -- see also Ex. 12:40-41, Gal. 3:17)
- c. 1443 B. C. Passover and Days of Unleavened Bread -- the Israelites make their Exodus from Egypt (Ex. 12-14)
- c. 1406 B. C. Fall Festival -- rebuilding of the decimated tribe of Benjamin (Judges 21) begins
- c. 965 B. C. Fall Festival -- dedication of Solomon's Temple (I Kings 8, II Chron. 5)
- c. 710 B. C. Passover -- Sennachirib's army smitten with plague--consequently, the siege of Jerusalem is lifted (II Kings 19:35-36, II Chron. 32:21, Isa. 37:36-37)
- 537 B. C. Fall Festival -- Zerubbabel's revival of sacrifices on the rebuilt altar in Jerusalem (Ezra 3)

There is also a hint in Isaiah 27:12-13 that the literal deliverance of physical, national Israel out of its end time captivity might occur on the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev. 25:8-10).

It is an unusual fact of history that numerous events impacting the history of the modern British and American people have conformed to this pattern. This holy day connection runs like a scarlet thread through the fabric of Israelite history both ancient and modern.

In this coincidence of history are we looking at the Hand print of God? Attempts to answer such a question defy objective verification. . . but the possibilities are intriguing. In several of the text boxes accompanying this chapter, you will see how history-making developments coincided with events which occurred on God's holy days.

For confirmation of most of the dates and events cited in the text boxes below, see William Langer's *Encyclopedia of World History, Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Chronologically Arranged*.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: William the Conquerer and the Battle of Hastings

Nestled along England's southeast coastline is the quiet little town of Hastings (slides #5076, 5078). Judging only by present appearances, today's visitor to the site would scarcely realize that this was once the location of one what historian C. Warren Hollister describes as "the most decisive battle in English history" (*The Making of England*, pp. 98-99,107). This engagement was the result of the death in A. D. 1066 of Edward the Confessor (slides #1380, 1806, 3022), England's peculiar monarch who on the day of his marriage reputedly took a vow of perpetual chastity. However well-intentioned Edward's vow may have been, it left England without a direct successor to the throne in 1066.

There reupted among several parties a lively competition for the crown. Harold Godwinson, the Earl of Wessex appeared to have secured the royal title. But an illegitimate nephew of Edward the Confessor--William of Normandy (slides #229, 1366, 1829, 2536)--took exception to Harold's claim. Supported by a military force of between five and six thousand men and armed with the special blessing of the Pope in Rome, William made preparations to invade the British Isles and unseat his rival claimant to the throne (slides #1-2, 227, 584, 584b, 5077--Bayeau Tapestry).

Due to contrary winds which delayed his expedition, William's crossing of the English Channel came six weeks later than he desired. What initially seemed a frustrating delay turned to William's advantage. Walter P. Hall observes, "the winds turned favorable just at the unluckiest time moment for Harold, when the threat from Scandinavia was drawing him northward" (*History of England*, p. 41). Only three days before William landed at Pevensey on September 28, Harold's army had fought a major engagement against Norse warriors under Tostig and claimant to the English throne, Harold Hardrada of Norway, at Stamford Bridge.

Harold marched his battle-weary troops 240 miles south to engage his Norman adversary. The Normans confronted the Saxons on the Last Great Day--October 14, 1066. Battle of Hastings began at 9:00 a.m. and continued until dusk. By the end of the day, Harold lay dead on

the battlefield, the victim of an arrow fired aimlessly into the air by a Norman archer. . . and William, entering his fortieth year of life, became the king of England. The change from Saxon to Norman rulership defined the direction of British history for centuries to come.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: Columbus and the Discovery of America

In the sweep of world history, one of the defining events of early-modern times was the "discovery" of America by the Italian sea captain, Christopher Columbus (slides #6, 722-3, 825, 1411, 1414, 1410, 1790, 1862, 7092, 1472, 5043-4, 5050). Sailing in the service of Spain, he opened contact with the "Novus Mundus"--the New World--and changed the history of the Western world forever. In the final analysis, his voyage in the late-summer and early-fall of 1492 was *the* seminal event which set in motion an unfolding of history leading to the fulfillment of prophecies in both Genesis 48 and 49.

An examination of Columbus' voyage reveals part of an interesting pattern which persists through ancient and modern Israelite history--critical historical events in conjunction with the holy days of Leviticus 23. Official Spanish approval (slides #1515, 1970, 2782) for the Columbus mission came on April 17, 1492--the sixth 6th Day of Unleavened Bread. His expedition did not depart, however, for another three and a half months.

The *Nina*, *Pinta*, and *Santa Maria* left port on August 2 of that same year. On the Hebrew calendar, that date fell on the ninth day of the fifth month, Ab. It is interesting that in Israelite history, bad things tend to cluster around this particular day. Conservative Jewish communities traditionally observe the day with a fast (cf. Zech. 8:19) to commemorate the destruction of the Solomon's Temple by Nebuchadnezzar (585 B. C.) and, in later times, also the destruction of the Herodian Temple by Titus (A. D. 70). It was also on the 9th of Ab--August 2, 1492--that the 15th century Spanish government officially expelled the Jews (slides #860-1) from Spain. For an

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

interesting treatment of the Columbus story and its relevance to the location of the Lost Ten Tribes, see Simon Wiesenthal's *Sails of Hope: The Secret Mission of Christopher Columbus* (especially pp. 7, 10-11, 16, 22, 34, 44-45, 50, 157, 160).

A little more than two months after Columbus set sail, he sighted land and made first contact with the Amerindians in the Caribbean, quite possibly at a location known today as Watling Island. His landing occurred on October 12, 1492--the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles. If Columbus failed to find a shorter route to the Far East, the treasures he opened to his fellow-Europeans have proved worth far more than what he aspired to obtain. The dropping of his anchor in the Caribbean set the stage for the inheriting of the Birthright by Joseph's modern-day descendants.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: The Coronation of James I, King of England

No doubt breathless after his furious and unauthorized Pony Express-style 300 mile dash up the Great North Road from London to Edinburgh, a young courtier named Robert Carey stood inside Holyrood Palace (slides #979, 1076). In spite of his more than 30 hours in transit--and the fact that he had taken one bad fall along the way--he was delighted to be the man to inform Scottish King James VI that, upon the death of English monarch Elizabeth I, James had become James I, king of England. Carey delivered these momentous tidings at the end of the day of March 26, 1603--shortly after the beginning of the Passover or Nisan 14 on the Hebrew calendar.

If the Throne of David went from Jerusalem to Ireland to Scotland, then the succession of the Stuart king, James I, at the death of Elizabeth I constitutes the final planting of the Davidic throne in England. The possibility that the Scottish line of kings represents the Davidic family is particularly interesting. This is especially true in light of Nathan's prophecy of the fate to befall David's family in the aftermath of the Bathsheba-Uriah the Hittite debacle (II Sam. 11:1-27). The

prophet inveighed, “Now therefore the sword shall never depart from thine house. . . . I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house” (II Sam. 12:10-11).

This prophecy finds a fascinating echo in the observations of Prince Michael of Greece:

Scotland, whose very ancient historical beginnings remain obscure, made her first appearance as a coherent kingdom in the ninth century under Kenneth I McAlpin. The descendants of his dynasty include such famous historical figures as Duncan and Macbeth. Dominated by wars with England, the history of Scotland is a romantic tapestry of acts of great heroism and great brutality. The Stuarts came to the throne with Robert II in the fourteenth century (see text box on “Declaration of Aberbrothock in Chapter IV). Although engaging and often seductive in their storybook quality, they were for the most part markedly incompetent [cf. the royal descendants of David as described in the accounts of Kings and Chronicles], and perpetuated the Scottish tradition of assassinated kings. No country has endured so many violent deaths among its rulers. This long and bloody tragedy was, however, to end as peacefully as could be, when in 1603 the King of Scotland James VI inherited the throne of England as James I from his cousin Elizabeth (*The Crown Jewels*, p. 78).

It is also worth noting that James had a decided interest in things religious. He is said to have translated some of the Psalms into doggerel English, and is the monarch responsible for the landmark creation of an “Authorized (or King James) Version” of the English language Bible (1611). James I viewed his tenure in Scotland as a period of years in the wilderness (I Sam. 27:1-12) and believed himself to have various affinities with King David of ancient Israel. Perhaps this was truer than he ever knew.

See Antonia Fraser’s *King James* (p. 89), Helen G. Stafford’s *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England* (pp. 290-291), G. P. V. Akrigg’s *Jacobean Pageant* (p. 15) and the Robert Greenhalgh Albion and Walter Phelps Hall volume *History of the British Empire*.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: Protestant England

The Anglo-American people have enjoyed a considerable measure of religious freedom during the modern period of history. One of the most significant landmarks on the road to

securing these freedoms was the Act of Settlement enacted on Pentecost, June 12, 1701. The Act itself is one of the numerous attempts by British legislators to resolve the religious controversies springing out of the Protestant Reformation. Much of England's religious trouble had its origins at the very highest levels of British government.

Since the ascension of the Stuart dynasty in 1603, Englishmen has witnessed an unusual occillation of policy. Much to the disappointment of English Catholics, James I (1603-1625) granted no concessions for those who favored the theology of Rome. These individuals fared better under the king's son, Charles who ascended to the throne in 1625. If Charles I (1625-1649) (slides #592, 606, 742, 750, 758, 760, 767, 795-6, 822, 1368, 1521, 2723) remained officially Anglican, his marriage to the 15 year old French-Catholic princess, Henrietta Maria (slides #2512, 2544, 2726) did much to alienate him from his Protestant English subjects. Part of the marriage agreement included granting certain concessions to Catholics living in England. Predictibly, the English Protestant majority alledged that idolatry was being restored--that apostasy had entered the royal household. They likened the queen to the biblical Jezebel (I Kings 16:31).

In addition, the appointment of the king's chief adviser, William Laud (slides #863, 989), as Archbishop of Canterbury led to the introduction of High Church ritual in Anglican services--practices which looked suspiciously Roman Catholic. Laud's attempt to impose a new prayer book in 1637 led to the revolt in Scotland which precipitated the English Civil War (1642-1651). Before that conflict had run its course, both Laud and Charles I had fallen victim to the executioner's axe.

A Puritan interregnum, presided over by Oliver Cromwell (1649-1658) (slide #757), proved to be something of a mixed blessing for English men and women. If vestiges of Catholicism were supressed, so were many of the customary recreational pursuits enjoyed by Catholic and Protestant alike. The banishment of theaters, cockfighting, church festivals, swearing, flirting, immorality, and other such merriments led to a burgeoning dissatisfaction with

Cromwell's restrictive government. The general population despised the repressive blue laws and attempts to enforce an extravagant righteousness as well as grim, harsh, gloomy Puritan sabbaths.

The Restoration of Charles II (1660-1685) (slides #589, 2997, 3339), witnessed a tremendous release of the pent up frustrations. The years of his rule are known as a time of licentiousness and moral decline.

Charles remained outwardly Anglican, but like his father, he married a Catholic princess. Moreover, he was tied by blood to his cousin, French King Louis XIV (1643-1715). Much to the dissatisfaction of his English subjects, Charles allowed Louis to influence the formation of his foreign policy. In religious matters, Charles favored toleration. . . not because he believed in freedom of religion, but because he secretly supported Roman Catholicism. He wished to extend liberties to English Catholics under a general umbrella which benefitted all who departed from the Established Anglican beliefs. On his deathbed, Charles betrayed his religious preferences by declaring himself a Catholic.

The ascension of James II (1685-1688) (slides #655, 1373, 1973 [flees]), Charles' brother, led to startling developments in the eyes of the Anglican majority of Englishmen. The new king made numerous illegal appointments of Catholics to peerages as well as positions in the military service, the universities, local government, the government in Ireland, the privy council, and the episcopal bench. His Declaration of Indulgence (1687) sought to extend freedom of worship to Catholics and Nonconformists. In spite of James' recklessly independent and flagrant actions, Englishmen were willing to tolerate him as monarch since his lawful successors were both Protestant daughters from his first marriage to Anne Hyde (slide #2531). His second marriage to Italian Catholic, Mary of Modena (slides #794, 1428), had produced no offspring. . . until 1687 when Mary unexpectedly became pregnant after fifteen years of childlessness.

In 1688, she bore the king a son. The specter of a Catholic heir to the English throne produced a tremendous negative reaction--once which drove James into exile. The Convention Parliament declared the throne vacant. Shortly thereafter, both Whig and Tory leaders in England issued an invitation to William of Orange, the Protestant Stadholder of the Dutch Republic, and

his wife Mary, the daughter of James II, to come to England as king and queen. William and Mary died without an heir. Under the rules of strict primogeniture, the son of James II had the strongest claim to the throne. Anxieties over a second Stuart Restoration inspired legislation to prevent any future Catholic ruling over England.

Anne (1702-1714) (slides #585, 744), the other daughter of James II, became the new English monarch. Parliament gave to itself the authority to decide for the future which royal line would receive the succession. The Act of Settlement "designated as Anne's successor her next Protestant kin," guaranteeing that the throne of England hitherto will be occupied only by Protestant successors.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: The Holy Days and the American Revolution

The American Revolution (slides #1251-4, 1256-9) marks the fulfillment of Jacob's prediction of Genesis 48:19 (cf. Deut. 33:17)--that Ephraim and Manasseh would grow together in numbers until one day the two would go their separate ways. Each would become a great people in their own right. When this prophecy began to be fulfilled in the second half of the 18th century, many of the key events fell in conjunction with the holy days of Leviticus 23.

On the Last Great Day--October 7, 1765--the Stamp Act Congress (slides #642, 668, 1250, 1737) met in New York. This assembly became the forerunner of the First Continental Congress and constituted a seminal step forward in welding the colonies together for common planning. On the 5th Day of Tabernacles--September 30, 1768--British soldiers debarked on Long Wharf at Boston Harbor (slide #573). This peace time deployment of troops implied the use of troops to enforce the law. Perceived by Bostonians and other American colonials as a purely vindictive act, the event led to a series of petty incidents (slide #1417, 1905, 721, 1803, 1815) which culminated in the Boston Massacre (slides #587, 1795), March 5, 1770. It is one of many British miscues characterized by Barbara Tuchman as "wooden-headedness" (slide

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

#769)--or a self-defeating determination to act against one's own best self-interest (*March of Folly*, pp. 196-197, 200-201). British actions like this one made the separation of Britain and her colonies unavoidable.

On the 5th Day of Unleavened Bread--April 19, 1775--American Revolution began (slide #692, 1040, 1419, 1863--Revere's ride) at Lexington (slides #597, 720, 1788, 1925) and Concord (slides #595, 1218). If the English Crown is a continuation of the Davidic Throne (see text box "The Davidic Throne" in Chapter V), there is a remarkable echo of Israelite history found in the story of the colonists' rejection of George III (slides #628, 640). Eighteenth century clergyman John Wesley (1703-1791) (slides #2003, 282) wrote more than perhaps he knew (cf. Jn. 11:47-54) when he made an impassioned appeal to common sense following the events on the Lexington Green. Realizing that the colonists were both serious and united, he wrote George III, concluding his entreaty with the words: "For God's sake, remember Rehoboam!" How ironic that he used as his culminating allusion a Davidic king who, over the issue of taxation (slide #1244) perceived to be oppressive, lost the Josephite-Israelitish component of his kingdom (II Kings 12:1-20) (slides #490, 624, 629--Declaration of Independence).

At one level, the American Revolution was a Manassite rejection of the institution of monarchy. In that respect, Manasseh has a lengthy history dating from the time of Gideon (Judg. 8:22-23) who, like George Washington (1732-1799) (slides #711, 1240), gained popular acceptance based on a successful war record. Washington turned down the opportunity to become a king over the newly formed United States. As an aside, the leader of the Puritan Rebellion (1642-1648), Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) (slides #654, 662, 671, 775, 1050, 2707-8, 3337, 5032), may also have been of Manassite heritage. He came from the geographic area in England where large-scale immigration to America occurred (slide #1674--map). He would have immigrated himself in 1641 had not the Great Remonstrance received approval. And, like Gideon, Cromwell outright rejected the invitation of the Protectorate Parliament to assume the

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

English Crown (slides #1705, 2867) (Hall, *History of England*, p. 351; Justo Gonzales, *The Story of Christianity*, vol. 2, p. 162).

The early battles of the Revolution did not go as well as the colonial rebels had hoped. Finally, two years into the conflict, the revolutionary forces scored a major victory. On the 2nd Day of Tabernacles--October 17, 1777--the British army under General John Burgoyne surrendered to Americans at Saratoga (slides #768, 1243, 1332, 1826). After this victory, the French adopted a policy of openly aiding the American revolutionaries. The decisive engagement of the American Revolution came in 1781 at Yorktown (slides #759, 596, 598-9, 712, 1044, 1150, 1215, 2491). It was between the 6th and 7th Day of Tabernacles--October 6--that George Washington touched off first shot in the bombardment of that city.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: Napoleon and the Holy Days

Historians commonly identify the French defeat in the Napoleonic Wars (1804-1815) as the watershed event which guaranteed British supremacy through the remainder of the 19th century. Napoleon's (slides #547, 866-8, 870-2, 4058, 4011, 1526, 1402, 2765, 4032, 4052, 4056) military career, which began with his enrollment in a French military academy at age nine, coincides with the grand climax in a struggle between brothers--Joseph and Reuben (I Chron. 5:1-2)--over who would receive the double portion of the Birthright passed on by the patriarch Jacob.

On the Passover of April 22, 1795, Napoleon defeated the Piedmontese at Mondovi (slides #1971). This was the first in a long series of significant events in Napoleon's life which coincide with the holy days. His career is unexampled in this respect. No other historical figure's accomplishments or defeats fall so frequently on the holy days. Later in the fall of 1795, on the

Last Great Day--October 5--Napoleon's "whiff of grape-shot" completed the political victory for the French Convention.

Some four years later, in the midst of his Egyptian campaign (slides #3414, 41, 1432, 1552), Napoleon prepared a dispatch proclaiming a Jewish homeland in Palestine. He pre-dated the dispatch April 17, 1799--the date of the Passover in that year. Regarding this dispatch, Barbara Tuchman observes: "So confident [of his triumphant conquest of Jerusalem in the spring of 1799] was he [Napoleon] that he allowed an official dispatch to be sent to Paris dated April 17, the day after [Napoleon's great military victory at] Mount Tabor. . . stating: 'Bonaparte a fait publier une proclamation dans laquelle il invite tous les Juifs de l'aise et l'afrique a venir se ranger sous ses drapeaus pour l'etablir l'ancienne Jerusalem.' In other words, Napoleon 'suddenly declare[d] himself the sponsor of a restored temporal kingdom of the Jews. . . . He was the first head of state to propose the restoration of a Jewish state in Palestine."

In all of this we see a future European Emperor, in the tradition of Rome, ruling over the disinherited tribe of Reuben. He anticipated what brother Ephraim, through Edmund Allenby's conquest of Jerusalem (slides #2031, 2051) and the Balfour Declaration (both in 1917) (slide #5086), would in actual fact accomplish over a century later.

Of course, it [Napoleon's declaration] was a self-serving gesture only, and totally empty of religious significance. . . . His proclamation to the Jews, whom he addressed as "the rightful heirs of Palestine," was, to begin with, simply a military stratagem like his previous call to the Arabs to rise against their Turkish overlords [cf. the early-20th century career of T. E. Lawrence, a.k.a., Lawrence of Arabia]. . . . This was pure play-acting. "Israelites, arise! . . . Ye exiled, arise! Hasten! Now is the moment, which may not return for a thousand years, to claim the restoration of civic rights among the population of the universe which have shamefully been withheld from you for thousands of years, to claim your political existence as a nation among nations, and the unlimited natural right to worship Jehovah in accordance with your faith, publicly and most probably forever." . . . The proclamation was a meaningless gesture, as artificial as any heroic strutting on stage. . . . But Bonaparte was never to set foot in Jerusalem, or even Acre [where British adviser, Sir Sidney Smith [slide #2008, 40], helped the Arabs repel his advances] (Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, pp. 162-166).

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

It is interesting that Field Marshall Allenby (slides #1729, 1964, 2695, 334, 5103, 5126, 5128, 5130, 5135, 5181, 5191, 5194, 5326--also T. E. Lawrence #1965, 5111, 5329, 634, 7980) accepted the surrender of Jerusalem from Arab representatives (the Turks has prudently evacuated the city beforehand) on December 9, 1917, exactly 2,520 years *to the very day* on the Hebrew calendar (the 24th of the 9th month) that Nebuchadnezzar had accepted the surrender of Jerusalem by the Jews. The famous "Balfour Declaration" established a British-sponsored home for the Jews in Palestine in the form of a letter dated November 2, 1917 from British Foreign Secretary, Arthur J. Balfour (slide #5189) (actually written by member of the British War Cabinet, Alfred Lord Milner--slide #2069) to Lord Rothschild.

As was the case with Napoleon, the motives of British statesmen in this undertaking were not wholly pure. Prime Minister David Lloyd George (slides #1159, 1172, 1960, 2714, 5062-3) was concerned with strategic considerations, particularly the protection of the linchpin of Britain's Empire, India (slide #21). He was eager to block any French initiative (slides #1550, 1564) in the Middle East. A nostalgic, sentimental fascination with the Hebrew Scriptures also motivated the Prime Minister. Balfour too was moved by a strong sense of biblical history. He had a keen admiration of the Jewish people, a desire to remove an ancient stain from the relations of European peoples in their mistreatment of the Jews. He considered the concept of a "Return" of the Jews to the Holy Land as a great ideal (*Bible and Sword*, pp. 313-315, 317-318, 332-333). Whatever the motivations, French or British, considering I Chronicles 5:1-2, it is appropriate that the French initiative foundered and the British one flourished.

Not long after the failure of France to subvert the British Empire through Napoleon's Egyptian campaign, a transient peace returned to Europe. Napoleon beat the new of his defeat back home and by late-1799, effectively had seized control of the French government. Anticipating renewed conflict with his English nemesis, he explored ways to secure the funds necessary to finance a future Anglo-French war (slide #1739). In part for that very purpose, on April 11, 1803--5th Day of Unleavened Bread--Napoleon instructed his foreign minister

Talleyrand to propose the sale of Louisiana Territory to American officials (slides #897, 1046, 8003, 43, 1464, 2862, 1787, 46, 2118).

On Pentecost--June 14, 1807--Napoleon defeated the Russians at Battle of Friedland (slides #2900, 7981) setting in motion developments which led to the inclusion of Russia in the Continental System-- Napoleon's attempt to foment revolution in England by crippling her economically. This system aimed to eliminate trade between the nation-states of the Continent and the British Isles in hopes that the British economy would collapse. The Berlin Decree (November 21, 1806) closed ports in the Napoleonic Empire and its dependencies to all British ships. It made British goods liable to seizure and declared the British Isles in a condition of blockade. In response, the British enacted their the Orders in Council (1807). This retaliatory measure effected a Continental Blockade and raised concern in the U. S. over freedom of the seas. Eventually the Orders in Council became a central issue contributing to the War of 1812 between Britain and the United States.

The Treaties of Tilsit (July 7-9, 1807) (slides #1406, 2503, 2174, 2881), a product of Russia's loss on Pentecost at the Battle of Friedland, brought Russia into Napoleon's imperial structure. In fact, the Continental System did more damage to Continental economies than it did in England. In the final analysis, Tsar Alexander I (slides #3165, 2004) perceived that Russia had to renew trade with the British, particularly the exportation of Russian grain to the isles. His refusal to stay within Napoleon's economic orbit precipitated Napoleon's disastrous invasion of the *Grand Armee* into Russian territory, a pattern which would be repeated about a century and a half later by Adolf Hitler.

In both cases, we see a kind of forerunner of the 1st and 2nd Woes described in Revelation 9:1-12 (see also Dan. 11:44). Neither Napoleon nor Hitler ever summoned the courage to launch their carefully planned invasion (slides #37, 212, 214) of the British Isles (see text box on "History and Atonement" below) (slides #7085, 7657-61). Both eventually chose instead to strike at England indirectly in Russia and both met with the same disastrous consequences. These and other parallels are so explicit that even historian Desmond Seward

concludes, on the final page of his volume *Napoleon and Hitler: A Comparative Biography* (slides #2811, 3039, 3126), that:

modern communications made possible the Fuhrer-state [the assessment of Third Reich official Albert Speer (1905-1981)]. If this is really the reason why Hitler was able to do so much more evil than Napoleon--or even only one of the reasons--then technological progress should ensure that the next "national saviour" on the scene will be infinitely more terrible. Antichrist is yet to come. Perhaps the Emperor and the Fuhrer were merely forerunners.

Although he scarcely realized it at the time, Napoleon's fortunes in Russia (slides #1272, 1274, 2049, 2901) turned sour on Trumpets--September 7, 1812--at the Battle of Borodino (slides #54-55, 1391, 3135-44, 3170). This engagement effectively mired him in Russia and set the stage for his ultimate defeat (slides #57, 8117--retreat from Russia). The battle was an enormously bloody stalemate and the final occasion on which the Russians chose to directly challenge the *Grand Armee*. The events at Borodino bring to mind the account of II Chronicles 20:1-25 which relates the story of how Jehosaphat's Judah, embattled by a hostile Moabite-Ammonite alliance, received deliverance when God moved Mt. Seir (the Edomites) to become involved. In this case and in respect to Napoleon's machinations of 1812, Jacob's descendants had only to watch the unfolding of events and see their adversaries diminished by the hand of a nearby Gentile power.

On the Last Great Day--October 16, 1813--Napoleon began the Battle of Leipzig (a.k.a., "Battle of the Nations") (slides #210, 1387-8). The engagement actually extended over three days, October 16-18. Major-General J. F. C. Fuller observes that had Napoleon retreated at the end of the 16th (the Last Great Day), the Lindenau Road was still open. "He did not, and by not doing so sealed his fate" as 110,000 enemy reinforcements were arriving (*Decisive Battles: Their Influence upon History and Civilization*). Napoleon's loss at Leipzig set the stage for his first abdication (slides #505, 517, 1455, 1723).

On the Last Day of Unleavened Bread--April 11, 1814--Napoleon, under pressure of the Allied armies occupying Paris, relinquished his imperial crown. Most history textbooks will cite

the date of Napoleon's first abdication as April 6 (the second day of Unleavened Bread). In one respect, this is accurate. Napoleon tendered his resignation on that date, abdicating in favor of his son. But the Allies rejected this proposal. Five days later, on April 11, Napoleon abdicated unconditionally (Langer, *Encyclopedia of World History*, 5th edition revised and updated, p. 650). This time the Allies accepted and granted him the island of Elba (slides #1275, 1277, 1466, 1494) as a sovereign principality.

In these events lie a remarkable forerunner of the fate of Satan as described in Revelation 20:7-9. Like Napoleon's banished to Elba, Satan will be bound or restricted from action--in his case, for a thousand years--after the return of Jesus Christ (v. 3). We find this banishment from involvement in human affairs symbolically acted out by the Atonement ritual in which the live *azazel* goat is sent into the "wilderness" (Lev. 16:20-22). At the end of his thousand year incarceration, Satan will make one last grand and final bid to foil the plan of God. At the close of Christ's Millennial rule, he will stir up Gog and Magog, hoping to roll back the accomplishments of the Kingdom on earth. Similarly, Napoleon remained bound on Elba, restrained from affecting the affairs of the European world. . . but only for so long.

On February 26, 1815, he left his island prison for France to make one last bid to recapture lost glories--the final "Hundred Days" before his final and decisive defeat on Pentecost 1815, on the fields of Waterloo in Belgium. Like Satan will be in the post-Millennial period, Napoleon was quick to disrupt the peace. . . and like Satan, Napoleon's machinations were destined to failure (cf. Rev. 20:10). One British cartoonist was prescient in his illustration entitled, "The Corsican's Last Trip Under the Guidance of His Good Angel" (published April 10, 1815) (slides #518-519, 1276, 1444). This cartoon portrayed Napoleon in flight off of Elba with Satan superintending his journey. Napoleon's attempt to regain control was no more successful than Satan's will be. He ultimately returned to exile at a site far more remote than Elba ever was. One observer appropriately calls Napoleon's final destination--exile on a distant and inhospitable South Atlantic island--"the *abyss* [emphasis ours] of St. Helena" (Keith Stump, *History of Europe and the Church*, p. 37--cf. Rev. 20:3 which renders the term for "abyss" as "bottomless pit").

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

(slides #1456-7, 3031, 7962, 2789, 2932, 2965, 3167-3169, 516, 4041-2, 4068-9, 4070--death of Napoleon)

Before that final exile, one last and decisive battle remained for the Emperor. It fell on Pentecost--June 18, 1815--at Waterloo (slides #818, 1394, 59-61). The site of this decisive battle is replete with irony. The fields of *Waterloo* were an appropriate location for a battle waged on the day of Pentecost (slide #658--Wellington). The founding of the New Testament Church occurred on that very day 1,784 years before. It was a day which witnessed the great outpouring of God's holy spirit in a general way for the first time in human history. Scripture represents that spirit by water (Jn. 7:37-39).

Moreover, Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo was in no small way the consequence of too much water. "On June 17 a torrential rain slowed his pursuers, and that evening the British commander [Wellington] found what he wanted: a low ridge south of the village of Waterloo"--that rainfall put Napoleon's troops at a disadvantage in the battle which began the following day (William B. Wilcox and Walter L. Arnstein, *Age of Aristocracy: 1688 to 1830*, p. 273). Victor Hugo observed: "if it had not rained the night between the 17th and 18th [during the early hours of Pentecost] of June, the future of Europe would have been changed. . . . Providence required only a little rain, and a cloud crossing the sky at a season when rain was not expected. That was sufficient to overthrow an empire. . . . It was time for this vast man to fall" (Keith Stump, January 1982 *Plain Truth*).

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: As the Stars of Heaven

On several occasions, we find reference in the Bible to Abraham's descendants numbering "as the stars of heaven" (Deut. 1:10, 10:15, 22, 28:16, 62, Gen. 15:4-5, 22:17, 26:4, 32:13, 37:9-10, I Chron. 27:23, Neh. 9:3, 23, Heb. 11:12). Some have suggested that this reference has found expression in the modern day flags of the Israelitish nations.

ILLUSTRATION: Slides #1726,1852. all such national flags, plus the evolution of the U. S. flag and shots of Francis Scott Key, Washington & Betsy Ross. Caption for the Ross-Washington: The above picture celebrates the well-loved but mythical story that George Washington and Betsy Ross (slides #1726, 1852) collaborated to design the American flag. "As that story goes, Betsy, having early in the Revolutionary period supposedly been assigned the task of constructing the very first Stars and Stripes from Washington's own design (actually the Betsy Ross legend, propagated by a grandson almost a hundred years later, never maintained that she designed the flag), made bold to offer a suggestion of her own--meant to facilitate not merely her current task but that of all future American flagmakers. . . . While historians negate the possibility that Betsy Ross made the first Stars and Stripes, let alone designed it, they do know that she was employed in making flags for the Navy. Thus we may perhaps justifiably retain a small shred of the fanciful fabric of the Ross tale: that at some time in the course of her occupation Betsy may have initiated this easier way of mass-producing stars. It does sound so American, this converting of the proud heraldic device into a simpler, assembly-line pattern, and may thereby also be the first truly popular contribution to the making and designing of the flag" (Boleslaw Mastai and Marie-Louise D'Otrange, *The Stars and Stripes: The American Flag as Art and as History from the Birth of the Republic to the Present*, pp. 19-20, 31-32, 37).

Certainly many commonwealth nations have adopted the star (slides #649, 969, 1030, 1032, 1220, 1227, 1229, 1855) as part of their respective national banners. This is also the case with the United States. America's national anthem is even known as *The Star Spangled Banner*. The story of how Francis Scott Key (slides #612, 1245, 1347) composed the lyrics to that song is an interesting one.

Near the end of the War of 1812, Key found himself temporarily detained by the British while trying to negotiate the release of a fellow-American held prisoner on board a British vessel. As he watched the unfolding events, Key jotted down the words to what became the American national anthem. This young lawyer sat off the Atlantic coast, a temporary prisoner aboard one of the British vessels about to rain down shells on the American gateway to Baltimore.

If Revere's renowned "Midnight Ride" on the evening of April 18 (the start of the 5th day of Unleavened Bread) was made easier by the light of a relatively full moon, then Key's view of the enormous U. S. flag--42 feet by 30 feet--flying over Ft. McHenry was obscured by the proximity to the new moon on the evening of September 13, 1814. Only when British shells exploded was Key's view illuminated. On each occasion, he saw the flag still aloft giving reassurance that his countrymen had not yet surrendered.

On September 14, he returned to the mainland, taking his finished product (originally titled "Defense of Ft. McHenry") to a print shop. On Trumpets--September 15, 1814--Key published and began distribution of what would become the lyrics of the national anthem. Eventually, the lyrics were set to music and sung to a popular English tavern song "To Anacreon in Heaven," not to be adopted as the national anthem by the U. S. Congress until 1931. Key, perhaps accurately, saw in the successful defense of Ft. McHenry the turning point in the war. After their failure there, the British along America's east coast withdrew in the last weeks of the summer of 1814.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: The War that Nobody Won

Although no territory changed hands as a result of the War of 1812 (slides #697, 984, 1900, 2235, 2177), this conflict was an important and necessary vignette in the fulfilling of the prophecies of Genesis 48 concerning the separation of Ephraim and Manasseh. Historians often style it as "the war that nobody won." However, two important *psychological* outcomes resulted from the war. After the American Revolution, Ben Franklin (slides #1423, 337, 2071) rightly observed, "The war of the Revolution has been won, but the War of Independence is still to be fought" (Robert Leckie, *The War Nobody Won: 1812*, pp. 3-18 and dust jacket cover comments; see also Philip P. Mason, *After Tippecanoe: Some Aspects of the War of 1812*; Eugen Weber, *History of Modern Europe*, pp. 490-491; Kate Caffrey, *The Twilight's Last Gleaming: Britain vs. America*, pp. 11-12; and Samuel Carter III, *Blaze of Glory: The Fight for New Orleans, 1814-1815*). Franklin understood the realities of the time.

It took the War of 1812 to convince the British that the Revolution was no mistake--it demonstrated to them that the fledgling United States would remain an independent nation. The war also imbued Americans with a new self-awareness and confidence in the abilities and potential of their new nation-state (slides #719, 806, 1151, 1339, 2113--Constitution; 2489--Bill of Rights;

875, 543-5, 619, 623--Parliament). It is no accident that one of the most frequently reproduced commemorative paintings of the period is entitled "We Owe Allegiance to No Crown" and represents the conflict as America's "Second War of Independence."

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: Passover and American History

For Christians in antiquity as today, the Passover is the most solemn occasion of the sacred year. It is a time to renew our baptismal commitment to God the Father and Jesus Christ. It is a time to remember our decision to be united and at peace with God by bringing our lives into conformity with His laws, judgment, and ways. It is a time to declare war (II Cor. 10:3) on those behavior patterns and actions in our own lives which prevent peace with our fellow man and woman.

With these thoughts in mind, perhaps it is no accident that two important events in American history fell on this special day. Less than two hours before the sun set on April 9, 1865, General Robert E. Lee (slides #637, 763), the commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, rose from his seat. He then bid farewell (slide #763, 1977) to his tenacious and victorious adversary, the future president of the United States, General Ulysses S. Grant (slide #752). The site of their meeting was the Appomatox Court House, only a short distance from Manassas Junction (slide #586), where the first major battle of the American Civil War (1861-1865) had occurred in 1861. As such, this was a most appropriate site at which to determine the fate of a nation comprised largely of the descendants of Josphe's son Manasseh.

Recognizing the hopelessness of his military position, Lee chose discretion over valor and surrendered to the Union delegation gathered in the parlor of the house of Wilmer McLean (slide #637, 3122). Cessation of hostilities and the Union victory guaranteed that the American nation

would remain a united political entity with full access to one of the greatest concentrations of material and agricultural resources on planet earth.

On the following day--the Passover of April 10, 1865--General Lee addressed his troops, praising their gallantry and informing them that the war was over (slide #762). He told them to return to their homes and families. Robert P. Jordan observes that what Lee and Grant produced at Appomattox "proved the greatest triumph of either, for they closed the war with honor for all, without rancor or exultation, with magnimity and respect by the one and wisdom and courage by the other." Jordan calls this Grant's "finest hour. . . . He achieved the beginning of reconciliation [a Passover concept] for the nation. . . with marvelously simple terms" (*The Civil War*, pp. 90, 203).

Exactly half a century later, as the Passover began on the evening of March 28, 1915, a German submarine sank the *S. S. Falaba*, the first passenger ship to go down as a result of attack by a German U-boat. Relations between German and the United States progressively deteriorated and two years later to the day--Passover, April 2, 1917--American President Woodrow Wilson stood before a Joint Session of the American Congress urging a declaration of war (slide #919). So it was that the U. S. entered the war. Germany had transformed the original conflict in the Balkans into "The Great War" when she became one of the belligerent European powers on August 1, 1914--the 9th of Ab on the Hebrew calendar. Thus began the bloodiest and most costly general conflagration in recorded human history to date.

In spirit resembling the approach of Christ when He will come a second time (Rev. 19:11-16), America entered the war with righteous indignation and high hopes of restoring a just, equitable, and disinterested peace--of contributing to an effort described in the U. S. as the "war to end all wars" (cf. Isa. 9:7). In a very real sense the American entry into the war was a missionary venture designed to usher in a new age of peace and prosperity founded upon American liberal-capitalist-democratic values. What began with such noble expectations on the Passover of 1917 came to a tragic conclusion on the Feast of Trumpets in 1919 (see text box below "When They Shall Say, 'Peace and Safety'").

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: The "Gate of His Enemies" and God's Holy Days

The promise to Abraham included one unique and unusual provision which some have understood to apply to control of important and strategic passageways around the world. This idea is drawn from Genesis 22:17 which promises, "and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." This promise is repeated to Rebekah, mother of Isaac, in Genesis 24:60. It is a fact of history that the British and Americans have come to control the majority of both land and sea gates which have been critical to the economic and military dominance enjoyed by Britain and America in the 19th and 20th centuries (slide #718--map of sea gates; 495--Singapore; 496--Khyber pass).

The acquisition of the three of the most important sea gates occurred in the context of God's holy day seasons. The first example took place as a result of the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) (slide #3092). This conflict began as the result of a decision made in a Spring holy day setting. Over the last three decades of his reign, Spanish King Charles II (1661-1700) (slide #2015) had "been a walking medical exhibit of half a dozen fatal diseases" (Joseph R. Strayer, *et. al.*, *Mainstream of Civilization*, p. 451). Historian Charles Blitzer describes Charles as "half witted and sickly. . . . the most grotesque monarch of the 17th century." He was not weaned until age five, and could not walk until age ten. He was the defective product of generations of royal intermarriage.

His brief life consisted chiefly of a passage from prolonged infancy to premature senility. . . . In Charles, the famous Hapsburg chin reached such massive proportions that he was unable to chew, and his tongue was so large that he was barely able to speak. Lame, epileptic, bald at the age of 35, Charles suffered one further disability, politically more significant than all the rest: he was impotent. (*Age of Kings*, pp. 25, 168).

The absence of a royal heir led to a controversy over succession to the Spanish throne. For a time, it appeared that the matter could be peaceably resolved. However, when Charles designated Philippe d'Anjou, the grandson of French King Louis XIV, as his lawful successor, he destabilized the European balance of power. That decision occurred on October 2, 1700--the fifth Day of Unleavened Bread.

Charles' decision confirmed the worst fears of fellow-European statesmen concerning French intentions. At Versailles, the Spanish Ambassador, kneeling before the new king--now Philip V of Spain--was heard to murmur, "*Il n'y pas de Pyrenees*"--there are no more Pyrenees. He implied that the king's ascension amounted to the union of France and Spain (slide #1525). By 1701, the Grand Alliance constructed by English King William III was at war with France. William hoped to restore a favorable balance of power. In the end, the French bid to dominate the Continent failed. In fact, England emerged from the conflict with the largest European navy and her status as a world power confirmed. As a result of the war, she acquired Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, the Hudson Bay territory, Minorca, and most importantly, Gibraltar (slides #2817, 20) which controlled entry and exit to the Mediterranean Sea. These terms of settlement--the Peace of Utrecht (slides #2813, 2945) among others, were reached on the first day of Unleavened Bread--April 11, 1713.

Over a century and a half later, the British gained direct control of another critical sea gate at the other end of the Mediterranean. Since 1875, Britain had owned controlling interest in the Suez Canal (slides #223, 2607, 3475). A short time later, Britain became more directly involved in Egyptian affairs along with the French, as part of the so-called "Anglo-French Condominium" (1876-1882). Financial mismanagement on the part of the Egyptian government led to the establishment of a joint Anglo-French commission and "Dual Paramountcy" to restore Egyptian economic stability. But Egyptian political problems persisted.

The continuing difficulties of the Egyptian government led Ishmail, the Khedive of Egypt (slide #1642) on Pentecost--May 28, 1882--to recall Colonel Ahmed Arabi Pasha (slides #2073, 1642, 1624) and other nationalists. This turn of event set the stage for the British to occupation

of Egypt from 1882 until 1956. Soon thereafter, Arabi eventually led a nationalist rebellion. Strongly influenced by the popular anti-colonialism in France during the early-1880s, the French government refused to get involved. On the other side of the English Channel, Arabi's actions prompted a different response. The British dispatched an expeditionary army of 40,560 men to quell the rebellion.

Commanding officer General Garnet Wolseley's (slide #1659) bout with illness delayed any actual military engagements. When action came, it was overwhelmingly successful for the British. On September 13, 1882, Wolseley defeated Egyptian rebels under Arabi at the Battle of Tel-el-Kebir (slides #2068, 2074-5) about 50 miles northeast of Cairo. On the following day, Trumpets, Wolseley's triumphant army marched into Cairo (slide #2075). Under the rulership of the "Veiled Protectorate," Britain stood supreme in Egypt--in sole control over Egyptian affairs while the French found themselves on the outside looking in. The British remained there for nearly three quarters of a century.

The third great sea gate acquired by Joseph's seed in a holy day context was the Panama Canal. Like Thomas Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana territory or Benjamin Disraeli's acquisition of Suez Canal stock (see text box "Maestro of Empire"), American President Theodore Roosevelt's (slides #2042-3, 1322, 4134, 683, 894-5, 912-14, 917, 920, 926, 932) actions to secure Panama were taken with bold decisiveness but questionable legality. About his presumption, Theodore Roosevelt remarked, "I took the Isthmus, started the Canal, and then left Congress--not to debate the Canal, but to debate me" (*The American Past*, p. 323).

Certainly, Roosevelt was one of America's most decisive leaders. Moreover, the circumstances of his rise to the presidency were rather unique. The assassination of President William McKinley brought Roosevelt into that office on Trumpets--September 14, 1901. And of the American presidents, who better to become the Chief of State and Commander-in-Chief on a day which points to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth under the rulership of Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding TR's various human faults and foibles, his administration was distinguished by justice. Roosevelt's "Square Deal" and "reputation as an honest and competent

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft – Rick Sherrod – February 1997

reformer” bears witness to this aspect of the fairness of his administrative style (slide #4176). He is also well-remembered as the president of the New York City Board of Police Commissioners and his quest to eliminate corruption in the police department (cf. Isa. 1:26, 11:3-4, 62:8-9, Zech. 9:9, Mt. 20:25-28, Eph. 6:5). Roosevelt exercised dynamic leadership such as his charge up Kettle Hill (slide #2040, 3499, 4132) during the Spanish-American War while calling “Follow me!” (cf. I Cor.11:1). He well demonstrated his brand of benevolent but realistic and tough-minded leading of America in his motto, “Speak softly but carry a ‘big stick.’” (slide #2059) Roosevelt put his maxim into practice with his aggressive strengthening of the U. S. Navy from his office of Assistant Naval Secretary, and the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine.

In the role of international peacemaker (slide #856), Roosevelt hosted of peace negotiations in Portsmouth, New Hampshire which ended the Russo-Japanese War of 1905. For his troubles, Roosevelt received the Nobel Peace Prize). He also performed a mediating role in arranging the Algeciras Conference in 1906 (cf. Isa. 9:6) (widely published TR cartoon from *Judge*, 1905, entitled “The World’s Constable”--cf. Rev. 19:11-16). Roosevelt’s rise to the highest political office in the land ironically confuted the Republican political Establishment which had chosen him as the vice-presidential running mate for McKinley. His selection was largely intended to neutralize him politically. As such, McKinley’s assassination (slides #1860-1, 1938, 3486) by anarchist Leon F. Czolgosz overturned the plans of party leaders (cf. Ps. 118:22).

Roosevelt played a critical role in the fulfilling of the Abrahamic promise relevant to Israel’s possession of important sea gates (Gen. 22:17, 26:40). He was *the* central actor in the American construction and acquisition of the Panama Canal (slide #82). On Trumpets--September 22, 1902--French engineer Philippe Jean Bunau-Varilla (slides #2082-3) from Panama arrived in New York City to set in motion events which would lead to U. S. to accomplish what the Compagnie Universelle du Canal Interocianique and renowned engineer Ferdinand de Lesseps (slide #80, 2056) had failed to do between 1881-1889 (slide #2082). On the fifth Day of Tabernacles--October 10--Bunau-Varilla met with President Roosevelt and

predicted a revolution against the ruling Columbian government by those living on the Isthmus. Roosevelt was reported to have remarked in private: “I took Panama (slide #82--map of Canal Zone) because Bunau-Varilla brought it to me on a silver platter” (David McCullough, *Path Between the Seas*, p. 384) (slides #81, 2056). Again, we see a historical example of Reuben’s passing of the Birthright to Joseph (I Chron. 5:1-2).

Working in cooperation with Panama’s Dr. Manuel Amador, Bunau-Varilla moved to receive the canal project under different auspices. On the Last Great Day--October 13--Bunau-Varilla held a meeting at Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in which the Panama Republic was born (slides #2087, 2083). Thereafter events moved quickly making possible American success in the canal zone region (slide #161).

See David McCullough, *Path Between the Seas: The Creation of the Panama Canal 1870-1914*, pp. 342-343, 347-350, 356, 384, 392-393, 401.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: “When They Shall Say, ‘Peace and Safety’”

A frustrated and fatigued American president travelled to Pueblo, Colorado to continue his idealistic quest. Stymied by a hostile Republican Congress and disappointed by the selfish ambitious of European statesmanship which had undermined the objectives embodied in his Fourteen Points, Woodrow Wilson (slides #896, 919, 1350, 1939, 4165, 2970) now made one last speech designed to generate popular support for America’s entry into the League of Nations. It was Trumpets--September 25, 1919--after 34 other major addresses, scores of interviews, parades, and rear platform talks in defense of the Versailles Peace Treaty (slides #5141, 706) that Wilson (slide #1350) succumbed to a stroke while in Pueblo.

Wilson’s collapse on Trumpets is somewhat like man’s many attempts to implement peace through recorded history. None have been quite good enough. In this sense, Wilson becomes a

kind of embodiment or personification of man's best efforts (Ps. 39:5) as expressed in the Versailles Peace Treaty--a settlement aspiring to end war and establish equity among the peoples of Europe. Wilson's idealism fell victim to the national self-interests of the peace delegates in Europe and America as well as the mistrust of the American Congress. There is a certain appropriateness to Wilson's collapse on Trumpets, the day which pictures the complete failure of human solutions (cf. I Thes. 5:3). It is significant that the Versailles settlement laid the foundation for an even greater war than the one it concluded. Far more importantly, Trumpets represents the deliverance of humankind by the only One with the real solutions to human problems (Mt. 24:22).

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: History and Atonement

As the Day of Atonement pictured many things for ancient Israel, so it does for modern Christians. Among other things, it is the holy day which portrays one of the most important events in salvation history: the binding of Satan the devil for the thousand years rule of Jesus Christ on earth (Rev. 20:4, 6-7).

It is also a day on which several important events, both ancient and modern, have impacted the course of the history of the Israelitish people. Some historians believe that Atonement--September 23, 63 B. C.--was an important day in Israelite history (Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book XIV, Chapter IV, Section 4, and *Wars of the Jews*, Book I, Chapter VII, Sections 4-6). Bo Reicke writes, "In 63 B. C., on a feast day, probably the Day of Atonement, [Roman General] Pompey and his staff, as a symbol of Roman occupation, entered the Holy of Holies" (*The New Testament Era*, p. 83)--a grand irony considering that the sole entrance allowed into that holy cubicle was to take place on that very day of the year, but *only* by the High Priest of Israel (Lev. 16:2-17). It was Pompey's occupation of Jerusalem that marks the

beginning of the Roman Period in Judea. Coincidentally, that same Day of Atonement was the birth date of Octavian (Augustus Caesar), the founder of the Roman Empire.

Nearly two millennia later, an important event relevant to the separation of Ephraim and Manasseh took place on Atonement--October 6, 1783. Although negotiators signed the official peace treaty in Paris on September 3, 1783, the public proclamation of the end of the American War of Independence did not come until over a month later. The notion of peace between brothers accords nicely with the meaning of the Day of Atonement as expressed in Lev. 25:9-10:

Then shall you cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of Atonement shall you make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And you shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim *liberty* [emphasis ours] throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a Jubilee unto you; and you shall return every man unto his possession, and you shall return every [enslaved] man unto his family.

"Liberty" was a clarion call of the revolutionaries in the colonies. Rebel colonists adopted British politician John Wilkes, the champion of liberty in Britain, as their own, and rang their "Liberty Bell" (slide #3953) on July 8, 1776 in Philadelphia to celebrate the public reading of the "Declaration of Independence." See also the period cartoons "Proclamation of Peace" and "The Reconciliation Between Britannia and Her Daughter America." See Michael Wynn Jones' *The Cartoon History of the American Revolution* (slides #1222x, 1247, 1320).

Less than three decades later, Russians retreating from Napoleon's advancing *Grand Armee* set Moscow on fire (slides #3171-2, 56, 873, 7998) the day before Atonement--September 15, 1812. That blaze continued to burn until the day which preceded the Feast of Tabernacles. A host of scriptures come to mind regarding the fire which foiled the Emperor's designs: II Pet. 3:10-11, Jude 6-7, Rev. 19:20, 20:1-3, 10, and from the Hebrew Scriptures, Isa. 29:20, 66:23-24, Ez. 28:18, Mal.4:1. Napoleon is one in a long succession of rulers embodying the spirit of the Roman Empire. The Bible prophesies that there will be an end time culmination in which the spirit of Rome will take the form of the end time "Beast" ruling over a united Europe (Rev. 13:1-8, 17:1-6) (slide #2037--map of Napoleonic Empire). The

Beast's fate is to be tossed into a perpetually burning fire (cf. Mt. 25:41) and destroyed along with his ecclesiastical alter ego, the "False Prophet" (Rev. 19:20, 20:10). One 20th century sociologist observes:

Napoleon had been frequently personified as the anti-Christ, so monstrous did his attempt at world conquest appear to his enemies, and the types of prophetic exegesis to which his ascendancy gave rise, were by no means stilled by his eventual defeat (John Wilson, "British Israelism: Ideological Restraints," p. 353).

British caricaturists of the early-19th century did not overlook these kinds of connections. The record of the period is replete with characterizations and illustrations which make Bonaparte no less than the filthy, rotten instrument of Satan the devil (slides #511-515, 527). If Napoleon's career was a forerunner of end time events, these observers may have been closer than they realized (cf. Dan. 8:23-24).

Finally, on Atonement--October 12, 1940--the Fuhrer Adolf Hitler called off Operation Sea Lion, the German code name for invasion of Britain. As was the case in Napoleon's day, many contemporary observers perceived Hitler as Satan's own agent. Viewed from such a perspective, Hitler's abandonment of his plan to invade the British Isles accords nicely with the theme of Atonement relevant to the binding of the devil.

Perhaps considerations similar to these inspired the observations of historian Desmond's Seward who concludes his volume *Napoleon and Hitler* writing that:

modern communications made possible the Fuhrer-state [the assessment of Third Reich official Albert Speer (1905-1981)]. If this is really the reason why Hitler was able to do so much more evil than Napoleon--or even only one of the reasons--then technological progress should ensure that the next 'national saviour' on the scene will be infinitely more terrible. Antichrist is yet to come. Perhaps the Emperor and the Fuhrer were merely forerunners.

NOTE: This quote also appears in the text box "Napoleon and the Holy Days" above. It should not be included in both places if there is a use for both of these text boxes in any UCG publication.

END OF TEXT BOX

TEXT BOX: Benjamin Disraeli -- Maestro of Empire

What is in a name? God often names things what they are. When the light-bringing cherub Lucifer rebelled against the authority of God (Isa. 14:12-16--cf. Ez. 28:14-19). He renamed him "adversary" or Satan. Adam's name literally meant "red earth," the substance from which the first man was formed and shaped (Gen. 2:7). Abram received a name--Abraham (Gen. 17:5)--which connoted his very fatherhood--"father of a multitude" (Gen. 17:4-6). Solomon, whose name derives from the Hebrew root word for "peace," presided over one of the most pacific periods in all Israelite history (I Kings 4:24).

Is it so strange that God might still provide us similar signposts along the way through human history (cf. Heb. 13:8)? One possible example of this is found in the story of growth and development of the British Empire. One of the most remarkable figures in English political history was Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881) (slides #64, 1169, 1174, 1335, 1950). This son of a Jewish family which had converted to Christianity rose to the pinnacle of British political life and served twice as Prime Minister (1868, 1874-1880). He is sometimes described as the "Maestro of Empire," the British statesman who gave the late-19th century British Empire a new emotional force. Historian Walter P. Hall and R. G. Albion observe, "Disraeli, it has been said, was the first modern statesman to pursue a frankly imperialistic policy (*History of the British Empire*, pp. 705-706). Slides #1335, 1950

During "Dizzy's" second administration, England underwent a revival of interest in empire and territorial expansion. Acting boldly and with remarkable independence, Disraeli paid nearly four million pounds--money borrowed from the Bank of Rothschild with "the British government" as security--for the purchase of 44% of the shares of stock controlling the recently constructed Suez Canal (1869 -- slides #801, 987, 2062, 2077, 66, 224, 2081, 2088, 2079). It was the engineering masterpiece of Frenchman Ferdinand de Lesseps (slides #66, 138-9, 1553, 2077, 3475). German Iron Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (slides #1958, 1946) aptly described

this passageway as the spinal cord of the British Empire. Indeed the construction of the Suez Canal (slide #2081) had dramatically altered the balance of power in the Middle East. It necessitated British presence, or, better still, direct control of the region. The canal became Britain's "lifeline" to India (slide #357).

The next and perhaps most grandiose expression of Disraeli's imperial policies was in connection with the linchpin of Empire, India itself (slides #69, 70, 1600). On May 1, 1876 Disraeli saw that the Royal Titles Bill (slides #69-70, 1261) made Queen Victoria (slides #1600, 1789--Victoria & Disraeli--68, 883-4, 1213, 1363, 1372) "Empress of India." In January of the following year in Delhi, India, with great fanfare and ceremony the Viceroy of India pronounced Victoria Empress as a grand celebration in her honor. Later that same year, Disraeli annexed the mineral-rich Transvaal in South Africa. Three years later, at the Congress of Berlin, he acquired the strategic outpost of Cyprus in the Mediterranean Sea.

It is a remarkable coincidence that one of the chief architects of the British Empire literally bears the name of "Israel." Or is it? Given what we know about the identity of Jacob's modern-day descendants and the timing of the issuance of the physical, material, national promises to Abraham, the name Disraeli reads more like a providential signpost.

End of Text Box

TEXT BOX: Battle of Quebec and the Plains of "Abraham"

The French and Indian War (1754-1763) (slides #26, 31) was a major turning point in the struggle between England and France for control of North America (slides #1899, 26). The decisive engagement of the war came at an appropriate site for the descendants of Reuben and Joseph--two brothers battling for the double portion of the inheritance passed down from father Abraham (I Chron. 5:1-2). It involved control of the "impregnable" city of Quebec (slides #27, 198, 1418, 4091, 4093-5, 1786, 1899, 1945, 2092), the key to a British victory in North America

(slide #1945). Until the fall of 1759, French forces under the direction of Field Marshal Louis Joseph de Montcalm controlled the city.

The youthful and enterprising English General James Wolfe puzzled for weeks over how to penetrate the city's defenses. With winter fast approaching and time to take the city running out, Wolfe initiated a stealthy and daring staging operation (cf. Josh. 10:9, II Sam. 5:8) (slides #1786, 27). Under cover of darkness, Wolfe marched his army up a narrow pathway leading to a plateau just outside the city. This ascent led to the Plains of Abraham where the British army engaged and roundly defeated the French defenders of the city (slides #28, 1418, 198, 2092).

In light of what was at stake in both this specific individual battle and the French and Indian war in general, it is fascinating that the site of the most decisive engagement occurred on a plain bearing the name of the very patriarch through whom the blessings to the modern Israelites have come.

End of Text Box

And so, the 19th and 20th centuries have seen the domination of world history by the Anglo-American peoples. As we rapidly move toward the 21st century, will this pattern continue? British world dominance is already a thing of the past. The two great world wars of the 20th century took a terrible toll on Britain and her people. These conflicts robbed her of much of her manpower. They drained her economically. By the end of World War II, the British found themselves with neither the resources nor the will to preserve their empire (slide #1284--map of disimperialization). From the realization of Indian independence (1948), the dissolution of Britain's imperial edifice occurred with dizzying speed. British superiority has given place to American dominance during the final half of the 20th century.

ILLUSTRATION: Map of Decolonization since 1948

If American military, economic, and technical power remains supreme, the moral decay of the United States does not bode well for the future. The biblically based values on which the

founding fathers and American people built the U. S. A. have given place to the same kind of selfish, self-serving materialistic orientation which led to the collapse of the Roman Empire of antiquity. Without a change in direction and emphasis, will the outcome for America be any different?

It is both interesting and important that Bible prophecy depicts God's people Israel in dire straits--even captivity (e.g., Deut. 4:27-28, Jer. 29:14, Amos 9:14)--at the time of Jesus Christ's return. Israel will be punished for her departure from the ways, truths, and laws of God--a theme which we shall explore in the final chapter of this booklet. Happily, prophecy also reveals that God will *not* abandon Israel forever. There is coming a great exodus and restoration which will form a bridge into the new Millennial age established by Christ at His Second Coming.

A Future Exodus and Final Restoration?

Is there unfinished business in Bible prophecy? There is good news and bad news. Numerous Bible prophecies portray a repentant Israel, turning at last to God and obedient to His laws. Mr. Armstrong frequently reminded us, that punishment was effected with a positive end--a "glorious purpose"--in mind:

God is going to keep multiplying chastening--correction--upon our peoples *until* they *do* turn from their evil ways--until they turn *to* the ways that *cause* peace, happiness, prosperity, all the *good things!* . . . The prophecies record also the RESULT of that intensified punishment. The *result* will be a corrected people. The result will be an eye-opening realization of what we have done to ourselves. The supreme punishment will teach us, at last, our lesson! The punishment will *break* our spirit of rebellion (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 167-168, 170).

Not only will this generation of Israelites repent; they will receive deliverance at the Hand of the returned Jesus Christ.

The time is just before the RESURRECTION of the just, at Christ's coming. As Moses delivered the ancient Israelites from Egyptian slavery, so CHRIST is coming to deliver modern Britain and America from the now-impending *Babylonish* slavery (See Deuteronomy 18:15; Acts 7:37; Jeremiah 23:5-8) (*Ibid.*, p. 177).

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

This deliverance entails the fulfillment of some of the most exciting and encouraging prophecies in all the Bible. These predictions foretell a second and coming exodus of unparalleled magnitude--one which will literally dwarf the experience of Moses and the Israelites:

Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, the Lord liveth, that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, the Lord liveth, that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north, and from all the lands whither he had driven them: and I will bring them again into the land that I gave unto their fathers (Jer. 16:14-15).

or:

Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord that they shall no more say, the Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all the countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land (Jer. 23:7-8).

Jeremiah continues:

And I will be found of you, saith the Lord: and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive (29:14).

Isaiah writes about the same unprecedented regathering of Israel:

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the *second time* [emphasis mine] to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from their thrones all the kings of the nations. 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 (11:11-12).

Moses forecast this event as well.

And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bond women, and no man shall buy you. . . . And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell. But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord your God, thou shalt find him, if you seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. When thou art in tribulation [cf. Mt. 24:21-22] and all these things are come upon thee, *even in the*

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

latter days [emphasis mine], if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient to his voice (Deut. 4:27-30, 28:68).

The prophet Amos wrote of a time when God promised to:

bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them (9:14).

Zephaniah adds to this chorus of voices:

At that time will I bring you again, even in the time that I gather you: for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord (3:20).

Those prophecies about an end time restoration of Israel give us much to anticipate. Inspired by these passages, Mr. Armstrong wrote:

The house of Israel is *yet* to return, at Christ's coming, to their original homeland--yet to plant grapes in Samaria, their original country. . . . At the future exodus, at Christ's coming, they are to return to the Holy Land out of the land of the NORTH! [Hosea 11:8, 10]. . . . This prophecy is for consideration in the "latter Days" (Jer. 30:24, 31:1), and is addressed to 'Israel' (verses 2, 4, 9), to "Ephraim" (verses 6, 9), and "Samaria" (verse 5). Here is added another hinge--"the coasts of the earth" (verse 8)--evidencing that they are dominant at sea and indicating they have spread abroad widely by colonization. Referring to the house of ISRAEL, not Judah (Isa. 49:3, 6), God says: "Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these *from the NORTH and from the WEST*; and these from the land of Sinim" (Isa. 49:12) (*Ibid.*, p. 95. See also Ps. 107:3-7, Isa. 48:20-21, 49:12, 60:4, Jer. 31:7).

These predictions tell about a bringing of physical, national Israel together to Palestine from all four corners of the earth at the return of Christ.

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall beat off from the channel of the river unto the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpet shall be blown [cf. Lev. 25:8-10], and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem (Isa. 27:12-13).

The prophecies of Ezekiel point to a dramatic reunion of "lost Israel" with brother Judah.

Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions. And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. . . . And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them] all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. . . . And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. . . . and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore (Ez. 37:16-17, 22, 24-26).

“For the first time in some three thousand years, for the first time since the days of Solomon, the house of Israel (the Ten Tribes) will be reunited with the house of Judah. They will become one twelve-tribed nation!” (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, p. 184).

This regathering of Israel is a physical aspect of the “restitution of all things” (Acts 3:21) about which Peter spoke shortly after the founding of the Church on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2). The physical and logistical implications of regathering of a people scattered literally around the globe are breathtaking. The task seems practically impossible. Our minds boggle at the scope of such an enterprise.

Is God big enough to make it happen? Christ assertion, “with God all things are possible” (Mt. 19:26), inspires faith that these prophecies can and will be fulfilled. If God can resurrect a human body--one of the most essential elements of the Christian claim--He can also regather his national physical people from points far distant.

The fact that the restoration prophecies have physical as well as spiritual fulfillment demands that Israel have a post-captivity existence. In fact, the notion of a restoration and reunion of the 12 tribes is as old as the Assyrian captivity itself.

The belief in the restoration of the Twelve Tribe Kingdom of Israel survived every storm which subsequently broke over its remnants. . . . Even in the course of the Exile itself the prophets started to proclaim the return of the people and the restoration of the destroyed Twelve Tribe Kingdom. It crystallized as a central conviction in late Jewish eschatology and apocalyptic literature. . . . The author of the Letter of Aristeas presupposes this restoration in his story of the seventy two

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: *Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?*
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- February 1997

scholars, six from each of the twelve tribes, who produced the Septuaginta (A. S. Geysler, "Some Salient New Testament Passages," pp. 305-306).

The expectation of a reunion of the tribes was alive and well in the days of Jesus and the 1st century Church. "In parables and debates he [Jesus] taught them [the Twelve] its nature and the signs of its coming, and to pray for it daily. The 'Twelve' (eleven) asked him after the resurrection, 'Are you now going to establish the Kingdom for Israel?' (Acts 1:6)" (*Ibid.*, p. 310).

From that time to this, the restoration of Israel has been a periodic focus of theological interest among the Christian ecclesiastical hierarchy and the religiously sensitive laity. The history of Christianity shows the ebbing and flowing of pre-millennialist enthusiasm since the 1st century A. D. The 19th century concentration on these very restoration prophecies was a critically important part of the theological climate which helped popularize the idea of Anglo-Israelism. Barbara Tuchman describes how around mid-century well-meaning men like Lord Shaftesbury (slide #1942) actually nurtured the formation of government policy designed to promote "an Anglican Israel [by which he meant the Jews] restored by Protestant England, at one stroke confounding popery, fulfilling prophecy, redeeming mankind" (*Bible and Sword*, pp. 175-207). His efforts, like those both before and after, failed to hasten the anticipated return of Jesus Christ and Millennial conditions.

In a spirit which is admirable, Shaftesbury and many others have aspired to do their part. But how much is that, and what exactly should it be? As we reflect today on the prophecies about Israel's punishment, repentance, and restoration, what exactly is our responsibility? Is this message about Israel's modern identity a part of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God? And if it is, how should this understanding affect and influence our personal behavior? We will examine these questions in the chapter which follows.

VIII

But Is It the Gospel?

or

The Unfinished Business of the Bible

What if the British and American peoples of the late-20th century are indeed the descendants of the ancient Israelites of the Bible? What effect should such knowledge have in our lives today? In an essay about the history of the British-Israel movement, one scholar summarized the practical impact of the 19th century understanding of Israel's modern-day identity writing:

British-Israelism could be accepted in greater or lesser degree as an entertaining, perhaps titillating, set of speculations. The audiences need feel neither committed to it, nor incensed by it: it was offered, certainly by one [John Wilson, the author of *Our Israelitish Origins*, 1840] who believed it, but without obligation to decide finally about it, and without all the persuasions and antagonism with which it would have been inevitably been associated had it been the creed of a particular sect or demonination (John Wilson, "British Israelism: The Ideological Restraints on Sect Organization" in *Patterns of Sectarianism*, pp. 354, 359).

But is that all there is to the matter? Or are there dimensions to this understanding which have important--in fact--*critical* implications for the Church of God and the preaching of its Gospel of the Kingdom of God as a witness to all nations upon whom the end of the age is come (Mt. 24:15)?

Just What Is the Gospel?

Most people today would likely think that an understanding of Israel's modern-day identity is irrelevant to the Gospel message. Certainly it is subordinate to the spiritual aspects of the Abrahamic promises, something which the Church of God has always understood, appreciated, and valued. The Church preaches and teaches that regardless of race (Acts 10:34-38, Rom. 10:17, Gal. 3:26-29), salvation is open to all who believe on Jesus Christ and bring themselves under His beneficent rule in their lives.

There nevertheless remains a physical, material, and national aspect of God's covenant with Abraham. An awareness of these physical promises is useful to our understanding of

prophecy. If Jesus Christ is the centerpiece of the Gospel message, we must remember that Christ came preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God (Mk. 1:15)--*not* solely a message about His personal role in the opening phase of God's master plan. The Gospel message has several different facets and aspects. In fact, it is three dimensional.

The Gospel has a past, present, and future dimension. Each dimension is reflected in the sequence and symbolism of the holy days of Leviticus 23. The past dimensions probably the best known aspect of the Christian message. It deals with the life, crucifixion, and death of Jesus Christ--with the redemption available to those who would repent of sin and accept His as their personal savior. It is no mere coincidence that the death of Christ occurred on the literal day of Passover, probably in the year A. D. 31. The Spring festival season which immediately follows teaches us about many aspects of God's salvation plan.

The present dimension of the Gospel relates to the establishment of the Church of God, an event which occurred on Pentecost about a month and a half after the crucifixion of Jesus. From that time forward, the Kingdom of God in embryonic form has existed on earth as the "little flock" of God's spiritual Israel. If the Church is not the Kingdom in full blown form, its members enjoy a foretaste of what it will be like to live under the laws, judgments, statutes, and principles of Jesus Christ's benevolent government (cf. Mt. 11:28-30). Christians from the 1st century A. D. until now have been writing the Gospel story as part of the "living Book of Acts." They will continue to do so until Jesus Christ ushers in the new and globe-girdling Millennial age.

TEXT BOX: Thy Kingdom Come

Establishment Christianity's shift away from an emphasis on the future dimension of the Gospel has led some to the misguided idea that the Kingdom in its fullness exists on earth today. That perception has inspired many Christians to become aggressively active in attempting to solve many of the world's difficulties and problems. While this has produced some good fruit, in many cases, members have become involved in futile programs or personal quests to rid the world of evils which are systemic and so deeply rooted in society's structure and fabric that nothing less

than the establishment of Christ's rule on earth will effect the necessary changes. For now, we continue to live in a world fraught with evil, war, murder, dishonesty, immorality, and all the other human vices which living within the boundaries of the laws of God would remedy.

ILLUSTRATION: Depictions of war, murder, immorality, etc.

The historical record is filled with accounts of well-intentioned attempts to bring the Kingdom of God to earth in its fulness *before* God intends it to arrive. One such example is the concerted 17th century Puritan attempt to change humankind, in this case, through strictly legislated morality. Lord Protector of England, Oliver Cromwell, and his associates sought to "inaugurate a new millennium. . . . Cromwell's failure was the tragedy of all men of good will who recognize evil but find it difficult to describe the right." As a "soldier-saint" he took on the "responsibility of forging a New Jerusalem" but "was eventually destroyed by the means forced on him to attain his ends. The kingdom of God belongs to heaven, the city of man to earth, and not even a Cromwell could unite the two" (Lacy Baldwin Smith, *This Realm of England*, pp. 266, 275-277).

An awareness of the time table of God's plan as revealed in God's holy days helps us to understand *why* so many attempts to reform society have failed. Renegade Roman Catholic theologian Hans Kung put his finger on just the problem in his reflections about the near universal failure of revolutionary movements through human history. He writes:

even if revolution succeeds, there is often no more than a change of rulers, while the problems and the oppression remain unchanged. . . . Since Jesus' time, it has become difficult to find God in the event of such a liberation, which is simultaneously an event of violence. . . . This is the plan of all who want to make great structural changes, the educators and politicians, technocrats and revolutionaries. . . . They have had only a partial success in changing man inwardly, in his innermost core, in changing his 'heart,' with the aid of environment technology or psychoanalysis or even political revolution. . . . The message of Jesus Christ is aimed precisely at this change, at this new man. . . . With all the many reforms are we not merely painting over the surface and not getting at the cause of evil. We seem to be engaged less in necessary radical reform than in bustling, flustered *reformism* which in various spheres of life (university, industry, Church, education, state legislation) has produced a great deal of change and little improvement. At any rate there has been no change in man himself, no different

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- December 1996

basic attitude, no new humanity. . . . Liberal reformers and disappointed revolutionaries meet one another at the grave of their expectations (*On Being A Christian*, pp. 55-56, 554, 569-570).

True Christians have made the change of heart about which Kung speaks (Jer. 31:31-33, Ez. 36:26-27, Heb. 8:8-10, 10:16). The majority of humanity has not. All men and women will have the opportunity to do so, but *only* after the return of Jesus Christ.

End of Text Box

It is the return of Christ and all those events surrounding the literal establishment of His thousand year rule on earth that are portrayed in the Fall festival season--those holy days beginning with the Feast of Trumpets and running through the Feast of Tabernacles. A critical element in that story pertains to the future for the physical, national people of Israel. One of the many things which Christ will do upon His return to the earth is to deliver an enslaved Israel out of the lands of their captivity.

This future dimension of the Gospel message deals with events leading to the end of this age and Second Coming. *That message includes* Israel's impending punishment, repentance, and restoration. Those elements of the story *are* equally a part of the Gospel. How, then, do we locate the yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecies about Israel in Scripture?

Israel in Prophecies for Today

In many Bible prophecies, the use of the word "Israel" points us exclusively to the descendants of the tribes of the Northern Kingdom-- decidedly *not* Judah. Mr. Armstrong writes:

Wherever you see the name "house of Israel," or "Samaria," or "Ephraim" used in prophecy, remember this: IT REFERS TO THE NORTHERN TRIBES of Israel, who composed the nation. . . . Thus it is that many of the prophecies about "Israel" or "Jacob" do not refer primarily to Jews or to any of the nations that are today the descendants of the other tribes of Israel (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 43, 64--see also pp. 60-62, 65-66, 70-71, 88, 107, 122).

Unfortunately, in many cases the biblical use of the name "Israel" is far more ambiguous than we might like it to be. It is often difficult to know for certain whether the biblical narrator or prophet intends it to describe Israel, Judah, Israel *and* Judah, a portion of Judah, or a portion of Israel. The difficulty is illustrated in several passages from the Book of Jeremiah (2:4, 9, 26-28, 5:1, 9b-15, 20, 29, 11:9-12, 17, 18:6-11, 31:31-33). Many of these Scriptures show that this prophet addressed not only Judah, but Israel as well, even though the Northern Kingdom's captivity had come well over a century before Babylon intruded into the affairs of the Judean kingdom. A similar point can be made from the writings of Ezekiel (3:4, 7, 11, 15, 8:3-11, 9:6-7, 8b-10, 11:1-2, 6b).

Some commentators argue that these warnings were *only* to those Northerners who, through the centuries, had relocated within the confines of Judah's territory--in other words, the Israelites who lived in Jerusalem. Were the Israelites mentioned by them only that "remnant" (e.g., Jer. 31:7, Ez. 11:13, Micah 2:12, 5:7-8) of the Northern Kingdom which had taken refuge in Jerusalem from the 9th century B. C. "religious" reforms of Jeroboam I or the 8th century B. C. Assyrian onslaught of Tiglath-pileser III, Shalmaneser V, and Sargon II? If there were Northerners among the Jewish community--and there absolutely were--we have to ask the question, "How many?" and "What percentage of the total community did they comprise?"

The population of Judea and Jerusalem was overwhelmingly Jewish in its tribal makeup. Moreover, by definition, the word "remnant" means a small number. A case in point is the 6th century B. C. Restoration of Judah to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (note the use of the term "remnant" in the context of Zech. 8:6, 9-13). The startling thing that is often overlooked is the paltry number of Jews who chose to leave the comforts of their Babylonian "captivity"--a state which Bible historians generally believe to be quite benign and hospitable (Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 470-471, 473, 483; Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, pp. 156-158, 160, 162; Boadt, *Reading the Old Testament*, p. 436). Relatively few Jews--only 42,360 by the biblical reckoning (Ezra 2, Neh. 7:66)--were prepared to take on the challenge of rebuilding the nation in a setting which still

bore the scars of the havoc wreaked by Nebuchadnezzar's army in the late-7th and early-6th centuries.

Were prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and many others writing for only the people of their own time. . . or do their prophecies have dual application. The warnings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, like those of Daniel (12:9), are written as a messages for a future generation as well as people living in the times of the prophets themselves. In Jeremiah's case, the duality extend both into the past *and* the future. For example, he asserts that "both the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken the covenant I made with their forefathers. Therefore. . . I will bring on them [both houses] a disaster" (11:9-12, 17).

Could not this allude backward in time to Israel's Assyrian captivity, forward in time to the coming Babylonian invasion, and still further ahead to an end time punishment to overtake Israel at the end of the age? There is nothing in Jeremiah's references to both Israel and Judah (e.g., Jer. 5:11, 20) that confirms the location of the former house. Neither do Jeremiah's prophecies require that both houses reside in the same place at the time of the writing. Considering the highly personal way in which God dealt with and revealed information to Jeremiah (e.g., 1:4-10), it seems altogether likely that he possessed some inkling that his prophecies had implications for a time beyond his own.

Certainly, the Israelites of old and today were a people without regard for the laws of God. From idolatry to adultery to Sabbath-breaking, historically the Israelites have had difficulty obeying God. In fact, Sabbath-breaking is literally linked to Israel's disappearance from the record of history. Israel's abandonment of the fourth commandment transformed northerners into the "Lost Ten Tribes." Why? *Because* the Sabbath was the sign by which Israel could be identified among the nations of the world.

The Sabbath was not solely an aspect of the Old Covenant sealed at Sinai (Exodus 24:6-8) but part of a separate, independent covenant (see *United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 133-134, 141-142) received by Israel subsequent to the giving of the Law. This special "Sabbath Covenant" is described in Exodus 31:14-17. If the Sabbath is included in the Ten

Commandments received by Israel at Sinai. It was important enough for God to reinforce its importance, making Sabbath observance *the* identifying sign of God's human, physical people. "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you" (Ex. 31:13). Indeed, the Jews have retained their ethnic identity through history *because* the majority of them continued to keep the Sabbath through their long and troubled history.

It is significant that Ezekiel 20 and 22 are excoriating indictments for Sabbath-breaking. From passages like these, we learn that in ancient times Sabbath-breaking was a significant reason for God's punishment upon the House of Israel. Will this be the case again?

The Coming Punishment

If God was honor-bound by His unconditional promise to pass the Birthright to the descendants of Abraham, He is today no longer "obligated by His promise to *continue* our undeserving peoples in world prestige, wealth and greatness." Mr. Armstrong predicted that God would even "strip entirely from them [the modern Israelites] this colossal, unprecedented national blessing--returning them to captivity and slavery. . . . *At the very time* their power reaches its zenith, He suddenly" will break it, cutting "off their implements of war and" destroying "their cities" (*United States and Britain in Prophecy*, pp. 10, 163, 166).

If such dire predictions are true, we may draw again from Leviticus 26, and the reference to "seven times" in verse 21. In this case the reference is to "intensity" rather than "duration" of punishment. Mention of breaking "pride of your power" in verse 19 could be nothing other than the Great Tribulation forecast by Jeremiah (30:5-7), Daniel (12:1), and Jesus Christ (Mt. 24:21-22). In the words of Jesus, "for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days be shortened, there should no flesh be saved." This "time of Jacob's trouble" (Jer. 30:7) shows Israel in dire

straits at the time of Jesus Christ's return. Israelites will find themselves an abused and captive people, dislodged from their homeland.

The Church's Mission

As this terrible and awful time approaches, what is the Church of God to do? It has a sobering responsibility to perform. The true Church of God--the "holy nation and kingdom of priests" of the New Covenant (Ex. 19:5-6 and I Pet. 2:5, 9)--has inherited the spiritual responsibilities of ancient Israel. One of those duties was to sound, when necessary, a prophetic warning. God chose prophets from Israel to make just these kinds of pronouncements. We read them today as a permanent part of the Hebrew Scriptures. Malachi 3:6 and Hebrews 13:8 remind us that God does not change.

It is logical that God would use his Church--spiritual Israel--as a prophetic voice in the New Testament dispensation at such times when a prophetic warning should be delivered. That Church is built on the foundation of the apostles *and the prophets* (Eph. 2:10-21). It is described in the Book of Acts as having had prophets in a limited sense (e. g., Acts 21:10-11). There are New Testament prophecies (e.g., II Tim. 1:6). Is it not then be the job of the "holy nation"--the Church of God--to witness as did the prophets of ancient Israel and Judah?

Amos implies He does not intervene in human affairs without first giving fair warning through "his servants the prophets" (3:7). We should expect the Church of God to perform this role as the end of the age approaches. That end time Church has a warning message to deliver. In ancient times, the city watchman was accountable to warn his fellow-citizens if danger approached. Ezekiel 33 describes this duty in poignant terms.

Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say unto them, When I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man of their coasts, and set him for their watchman; If when he seeth the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn the people; Then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the sword come and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head. He heard the sound of the trumpet, and took not warning; his blood shall be upon him. But he that taketh warning shall deliver his soul. But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them,

he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand. So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me (v. 1-7).

This example from Ezekiel is more relevant than it immediately appears. In Shanks' *Ancient Israel*, we read that:

the preaching of Ezekiel shows that not all of these communities [of deported Israelites] had been assimilated by pagan cultures; much of this biblical book is concerned with the reunification of the Judean and Israelite branches of the nation after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B. C. Indeed, some passages in Ezekiel read as if they are actually directed at specific Israelite--that is, northern--communities in exile (pp. 130-131, 154).

In fact, Ezekiel's message is as relevant for the British and American people today as it was for Israelites in the 6th century B.C. There is a dual aspect to his warning message.

If this principle of duality magnifies our appreciation of God's holy days and other aspects of the Word of God, it also shows how predictions, written by prophets of antiquity for people of old, often has a double and quite modern application. It gives us the confidence that God will act today as He has acted in the past. Indeed, many prophecies, as well as biblical stories like that of Abraham or Joseph, foreshadow the future or have multiple fulfillments. Thus, the principle of duality makes possible a variety of complimentary interpretive possibilities.

For example, were Christ's disciples sent to Judah or Israel or both? To whom is today's Church supposed to go? Some modern commentators argue that the apostles of Jesus' day fulfilled their commission to go into all the world preaching the Gospel in their own lifetime (Mt. 28:19-20). The Church of God, however, has traditionally connected Christ's charge to "go to the lost sheep of Israel" (Mt. 10:6, 15:24, 18:4-14, Lk. 19:9) to the of responsibility not only of preaching a Gospel about Jesus Christ, but delivering the message of a coming Kingdom of God on earth. As such, the Church becomes responsible to inform the modern-day British and American people about their Israelitish origins. Application of the principle of duality helps us better to understand what Jesus meant for us to do.

The majority of Christians through history have *not* had an understanding of Israel's post-captivity identity. . . . nor have they necessarily needed it for salvation. If it is the job of an *end time* Church to warn Israel of a coming Tribulation, then this information takes on critical significance. A. S. Geyser's exegesis on Matthew 15:24 throws the seriousness of this issue into high relief. According to the Matthean record:

Jesus countered the appeal of a Syrophenician woman with a harsh, "I am sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." . . . Apart from lending support to the authenticity of Mt. 10:5b and 6, the passage conveys that the gathering-in of the lost sheep of the house of Israel was *Jesus's own task*. When he appointed and commissioned the Twelve to it, he was in fact *delegating* HIS personal task and authority to them ("Some Salient New Testament Passages," p. 308).

If this charge to the apostles is the forerunner of an end time work of God, we are then dealing with a commission which Jesus Himself *expects* His Church at the end of the age to fulfill.

TEXT BOX: Joseph of Arimethaea

Various traditions about proselyting--taking the Gospel message to the world (Mt. 28:19, Mk. 16:15)--are connected to the original apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ (slide #2172). These stories very likely indicate that these early Christians delivered the Gospel to both the Jewish community in 1st century A. D. Judea *and* to pockets of Israelite tribes broadcast across the globe from India to Europe. Many different traditions exist.

Relevant to this theme of 1st century evangelism, there is a persistent belief in some quarters that Joseph of Arimathaea (Mt. 27:57-60, Mk. 15:43-46, Lk. 23:50-53, Jn. 19:38-41) (slide #1979) was one of the early Christians who carried the Gospel to the British Isles, particularly the West Country (slides #5946, 5964, & after 6182 [Glastonbury]). Although the story varies in certain details from one writer to the next, most accounts explain how Joseph's financial interest in the tin trade led him to frequent travel to England. Some who believe in the Joseph legends even allege that the lost 18 years in the life of Jesus (from age 12--Lk.

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?
Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- December 1996

2:40-52--until the beginning of His public ministry at about age 30--Lk. 3:23) were spent with Joseph of Aramithaea who according to the story was His uncle.

It is somewhat ironic, given her critical assessment of British Israelism, that Barbara Tuchman devotes an entire chapter of *Bible and Sword* to "Apostle to the Britons: Joseph of Arimathea" (pp. 13-21). Even more surprising is her conclusion that:

no one could pry Joseph out of the British tradition. It may even be that he rightfully belongs there, for, as so often happens when modern science goes to work on the stuff of legend, the available facts tend to confirm the legend. Archaeological findings have in fact confirmed the existence of a Stone Age lake village at Glastonbury. It is pictured by the archaeologist Jacquetta Hawkes in terms that fit exactly the story of Joseph and his wattled church in the marsh" (pp. 20-21).

Tuchman was free to conclude what most university faculty members would never dare. Having married into wealth and not beholden to any system of tenure or kudos from colleagues, she was not as confined as the historians of academe to the restraints of textbook historiography--the rules for what can and cannot be done to create "legitimate" history.

Finally, in addition to the Joseph of Aramithaea legends, some British-Israelite writers have insisted that part of Paul's ministry was directed to Israelites in Britain. They identify a mission to Israel in Jesus' prediction recorded in Acts 9:15--that Paul would become "a chosen vessel. . . to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, *and the children of Israel.*" Some have even suggested that Paul's reference to his travels to Spain (Rom. 15:24, 28) is an allusion to an unrecorded evangelistic journey which eventually took him to the British Isles.

Assuming that at least some of the traditions of the apostles' journeys to Europe are true, we must ask ourselves whether this evangelistic endeavor was a forerunner of the commission which Jesus expects the end time Church, armed with the knowledge of the identity of Israel, is to duplicate. Such an idea is *not* as preposterous as it might at first glance look. A. S. Geysler, writing in *L'Apocalypse johannique*, observes:

Nathan the prophet on behalf of God promised David that to his twelve tribe kingdom there would be no end. It hardly survived the next century, but that was

long enough to imbed it for good in the faith of the people as their political and religious ultimate. . . . It is unthinkable that Jesus and the first generation Judean church would have held a different view [other than the belief in a restoration of the Twelve Tribe Kingdom of Israel]. For them as for John and for Qumran, the physically restored Twelve Tribe Kingdom was here. They were preparing, not its coming, but themselves and their people for its dawn. To this end, according to the unanimous tradition of the earliest Judean church, Jesus appointed a college of twelve from his disciples which came to be known simply and predominantly as *the Twelve*. . . . The *ingathering*, triggered by Jesus' commission of his Twelve is seen by the visionary as so close to fulfillment and completion that for all practical purposes David's Twelve Tribe Kingdom is already and physically and palpably restored ("Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel," 1980, pp. 305-306, 310).

If 1st century A. D. apostles and disciples made it their business to deliver the Gospel to God's physical national people, their behavior can and should be used as a model for the Church today.

END OF TEXT BOX

Since the founding of the Church, some leaders of God's Work have taken on the task of preaching the Gospel with a sense of urgency. Their belief in the soon-coming return of Christ was premature, but such was also the case in the days of Zerubbabel. Stirred by the prophets of his own time--Haggai and Zechariah--Zerubbabel's acute sense of imminent 6th century B. C. Messianic Expectation revived the work of God (Ezra 5:1-2, Hag. 1:1-14). More importantly, it led to a great accomplishment: the completion of the Temple of God (Ezra 4:24, 5:1-2, 14-15).

In similar fashion, an enthusiasm for the Second Coming today can fuel the construction of the spiritual Temple of the Church (II Cor. 6:16, Eph. 2:19-21). In the cases of both Zerubbabel and Church leaders of the New Testament era, progress in accomplishing God's work has often been largely due to the sense of urgency imparted by the *erroneous conviction* that their own respective generations would be the one to see first-hand the coming of Messiah (e.g., I Thes. 4:17).

If the teaching about Israel's modern-day identity is not *the* central message of the Gospel, it nevertheless has historically been a facet of that Gospel in recent times which attracted a

following to Christ by revealing a new and often unknown dimension of relevance to the Bible itself. For those living in Britain, the Commonwealth nations, and the United States, this aspect of God's Word applies to their lives in the here and now. It adds a dimension of immediacy and personal significance to the Gospel message.

Awareness of this terrible time to come upon the Israelite people should inspire a repentant spirit and a willingness to change. For those who hear and do repent, there is a loving God who will forgive, restore, protect, and prosper (cf. Jonah 3:2-10). Scripture even suggests in places that the Church will receive protection from the holocaust to come (Rev. 12:9-17--cf. Ps. 91:1-16). However, we are overly optimistic if we think that today's messengers of God are more persuasive than Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, or later still Jeremiah (Jer. 38:6--cf. Ex. 4:21, 7:3, 9:12, 35). "Neither Hosea's ministry nor Amos's warnings seem to have made a lasting impression on the nation; the people did not change their lifestyle" (Shanks, *Ancient Israel*, p. 127). Conditions are much the same today. The message of the coming Kingdom of God is no more palatable now than it was to many in Jesus' 1st century A. D. audiences. It threatens to overturn principalities and powers (Eph. 6:12), to upset the political, social, and economic systems in which we all to one degree or another have a stake.

The message about Israel's modern identity it is more likely to attract sharp criticism than new converts. The understanding about Israel's modern identity has *always* had its share of opponents. If God's warnings to Israel in the writings of the prophets went unheeded, can we expect wide acceptance of a similar warning message today? Even if the answer is "no," the message nevertheless *must be preached*.

The Bible has a promise regarding the physical heirs of Abraham's Birthright as the end of the age approaches. Modern Israel must be made aware of its heritage and its destiny. As Malachi observes:

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: And he shall turn the heart of the fathers [Abraham,

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY: Where Are the Lost Ten Tribes?

Booklet Draft -- Rick Sherrod -- December 1996

Isaac, and Jacob] to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse (4:5 - 6).

May this booklet contribute in our modern day to an increasing awareness of the same revelation we read about in Genesis 45:3. Like the sons of Jacob standing in the ancient court of Pharaoh, may today's descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh be able to read with understanding and conclude: "I am Joseph!"