

MERITS & SHORTCOMINGS OF BRITISH-ISRAEL, Part #6

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

This is the 6th critical review of the principal beliefs known as British-Israel, and as with the first five, we will address statements which W.H. Poole made in his book entitled *Anglo-Israel Or, The British Nation: The Lost Tribes Of Israel* (hereinafter *A-I/BN*). The purpose of this series is to praise such a belief system where it is correct and to give constructive criticism where it is in error. In the final third of part 5 of this series, we were beginning to encounter a subject where British-Israel is in great error, but space did not allow it to be addressed in that paper, so we will do it in this issue. That subject was under the subtitle "Union Promised". In his book *A-I/BN*, W.H. Poole quoted Ezekiel 37:16-28 on pages 18-19 thusly, and I will amend it from the KJV:

“¹⁶ 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 it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: 17 And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. 18 And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou *meanest* by these? 19 Say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh *singular*-Elohim; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which *is* in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, *even* with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. 20 And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. 21 And say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh *singular*-Elohim; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: 22 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: 23 Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their *singular*-Elohim. 24 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. 25 And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your

fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, *even* they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David *shall be* their prince for ever. 26 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 will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. 27 My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their *singular*-Elohim, and they shall be my people. 28 And the heathen shall know that I Yahweh do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."

The 37th chapter of Ezekiel is the dry-bones and two-sticks chapter, and must be treated in context with the rest of Scripture. Anything taken out-of-context is liable to be a pretext, or a falsely stated purpose! Now British-Israel reads things into the dry-bones portion which simply are not there, so let us observe how they do it on page 19:

"TWO IN ONE.

"They are said to be united in the prophet's hand, and in the hand of the Lord through the cross of Christ, of which the two sticks are significant emblems. Here you see explained the crossing of the Patriarch's hands as he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh. In this chapter Ezekiel saw the awakening, identity, and restoration of those people so long separated, and he saw the two sceptres, each distinct, and then united, and the one king chosen by both, and he of David's line, and the purification and the divine protection, and the permanent sanctuary, and the obedience most complete, and as the result of the whole, the conversion of the heathen nation to Christ.

"In beautiful harmony with the above, we hear Jer. iii. 18: 'In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers.'

"The marginal reading has it '*to*' instead of '*with*.' 'Judah shall walk *to* Israel.' And Hosea i. 10:

"'Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people, *there* it shall be said unto them, Ye *are* the sons of the living God. 11 Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great *shall* be the day of Jezreel'."

First, W.H. Poole stated: "They are said to be united in the prophet's hand, and in the hand of the Lord through the cross of Christ, of which the two sticks are significant emblems." I fail to see any significance of the cross of Christ with that of the two sticks of Ezekiel chapter 37!

Secondly, W.H. Poole stated: "Here you see explained the crossing of the Patriarch's hands as he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh." While it is true that Jacob did indeed cross his hands when he blessed Ephraim and Manasseh, it has absolutely nothing to do with the "two-sticks" at this passage.

Thirdly, W.H. Poole stated: "In this chapter Ezekiel saw the awakening, identity, and restoration of those people so long separated, and he saw the two sceptres, each distinct ..." Ezekiel absolutely did not see "two sceptres" in this passage! A "stick" is

not a “sceptre”! The term stick is Strong’s #H6086 and sceptre is #H7626. The digital Strong’s *Enhanced Lexicon* states in part for #H6086: “... 328 occurrences; AV translates as ‘tree’ 162 times, ‘wood’ 107 times, ‘timber’ 23 times, ‘stick’ 14 times, ‘gallows’ eight times, ‘staff’ four times, ‘stock’ four times, ‘carpenter + 2796’ twice, ‘branches’ once, ‘helve’ once, ‘planks’ once, and ‘stalks’ once. 1 tree, wood, timber, stock, plank, stalk, stick, gallows. 1A tree, trees. 1B wood, pieces of wood, gallows, fire-wood, cedarwood, woody flax.”

The four times that 6086 is used as a “staff” are: 2 Sam. 21:19 “staff of ... spear” (6086); 23:7 “staff of ... spear” (6086); 1 Chr. 20:5 “spear staff” (6086); Isa. 10:15 as a “staff of ... wood” (6086). After a search of “stick” in the E-sword program, not a single usage could be found where #6086 meant a sceptre! So don’t let anyone influenced by early British-Israel ever tell you that the “stick” in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel means a sceptre! In short, only Judah was given the sceptre, **NOT** Ephraim! Inasmuch as W.H. Poole wrote this book we are critiquing in 1879, and that Strong’s *Exhaustive Concordance* wasn’t copyrighted until 1890 with a first printing in 1894, we can hardly reprimand him for his lack of use of it. The problem lies with those who have read the writings of men like W.H. Poole and parrot their error. I recently had a man call me on the phone trying to convince me that the “stick” in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel was the same as a “sceptre” which it is not. Poole does, though, in the latter part of the same paragraph name David’s line to rule after the two sticks are united. After Poole got finished with the “sticks”, he brought up a very good and important passage at Jer. 3:18 where it states in my KJV:

“ In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers.”

Then Poole comments thusly: “The marginal reading has it ‘to’ instead of ‘with.’ ‘Judah shall walk to Israel.’” Poole is correct, as in the margin of my KJV on verse 18 it says “Or, to”. Off hand, I would render this verse, “In those days the house of Judah shall walk to the house of Israel.” Or “In those days the house of Judah shall migrate to the house of Israel, (or join with the house of Israel).” And indeed in 705-681 B.C. Sennacherib did deport much of Judah into Assyria where the house of Israel had formerly been carried away. The words “out of the north” might be somewhat confusing to some, but it simply means Chaldea. The greater part of Judah when in the Babylonian captivity, joined with the house of Israel in the general movement of the tribes to eventually arrive in Europe, while a minor few Judahites returned to Judaea as recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah. Therefore, there were two opportunities for the house of Judah to join in the westward movement with the house of Israel, never to return to Judaea again.

Continuing, W.H. Poole states in part on page 20:

“The act of choosing one head has in it a wealth of meaning. It means separate and distinct existence, and that each knew of the others existence, and that each recognized the identity of the other ...” This is clear evidence that Poole didn’t read Hosea 1:11 in its proper context. This 11th verse actually declares that Judah and Israel together will appoint themselves one head between them, whereas Poole reads that

Judah will appoint one head while Israel will appoint another head, and that somehow makes them “distinct” from one another.

Poole continues on his overemphasized subject of “distinct”-ion in the same paragraph thusly:

“... Isaiah also speaks of those houses as distinct, and of their future union, xi. 10:

“ And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious. 11 And it shall come to pass in that day, *that* the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. 12 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. 13 The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.”

Here Poole fails to recognize who represents Judah and Ephraim today. By-and-large Germany represents Judah, while Ephraim represents England. I cannot speak at length concerning the envy and vexation between Ephraim (England) and Judah (Germany) as it is long and complicated. England had long been a seagoing power while Germany had been basically a landlocked power, and thus competitors in commerce. Hence England had an advantage in commerce by having a large navy, while Germany depended mainly on land transportation, which was eventually developed into railroads. A movement developed among the German states in Europe in the 1800s called Pan Germanism to attempt to overcome Germany’s disadvantage which caused friction between England and Germany in a commercial sense. During World Wars I & II this envy and vexation between the two reached an apex with all kinds of propoganda being generated by both sides, and has been simmering ever since. Today it is politically incorrect for Germany to defend herself! There is an “enmity” today between Germany and the Canaanite-jews that goes all the way back to Genesis 3:15, and the Canaanite-jews today have England in financial bondage to them.

Yes, there is definitely a distinct difference between the house of Judah and the house of Israel (Ephraim), but Poole has it twisted entirely out-of-shape! Poole’s error lies in the fact that he was unable to differentiate between a racially pure member of the tribe of Judah and the Canaanite-jew, therefore many of his (along with the rest of British-Israel’s) conclusions are flawed. Now back to Poole on page 20:

“ DISTINCT HOUSES.

“ Who can fail to see the distinct houses here, and that they remain distinct until the Lord shall undertake the second time to gather his people to their own land; the first time was, when he led them out of Egypt, the second time he will bring them from the four corners of the earth, ‘ from the north and from the west,’ and ‘ from the Isles of the

west,' and 'from the Isles afar off.' That cannot mean from Babylon. Then the envy of Judah and Israel will depart, and they shall cease to vex one another.

" Daniel ix. 7, saw them as distinct houses, hear him:

" 'To the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, *that are near*, and *that are afar off*, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.'

" He saw them in all countries where for two hundred years they had been spreading to the north and to the west.

" Micah speaking of the restoration of both houses of Israel and Judah, under the terms Samaria and Jerusalem, says, ii. 12:

" 'I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of Israel; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as the flock in the midst of their fold: they shall make great noise by reason of *the multitude of men*.'

" And iv. 6, 7, also v. 3, 8:

" 'In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted; 7 And I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever. 3 Then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. 4 And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; and they shall abide: for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth. 7 And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men. 8 And 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 goeth through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver.'

" Will anyone say that these promises had their fulfilment in any of the past history of those people?

" TWO SISTERS.

In Jer, iii, Isa. li, and Hos. iii, Israel is spoken of as a wife 'divorced' from her husband, as a 'woman forsaken,' as the 'desolate one,' in contradistinction to the married wife. It is very clear that they are speaking of representative persons. Israel was divorced from the old covenant, and one must not look for her as in the same condition as the Jews. For Jeremiah says 'Backsliding Israel did wrong and I put her away, and gave her a bill of divorcement, and her treacherous sister Judah saw it, and feared not,' and Isaiah speaks of Israel's restoration, and calls upon her to sing and rejoice 'for more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married wife saith the Lord,' and the children of the woman forsaken are to be colonizers. In their greatness and in their strength they are to go abroad and fill up the desolate lands, and to become a multitude of nations. It is also remarkable that Israel is not addressed as in their land, but as in the Islands. The last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah belong chiefly to Israel – the forsaken wife is to be gathered with great mercy, and in lovingkindness, 'and I will betroth her unto me for ever – and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou

art my people, and they shall call me *Ishi*, that is my husband. And there shall be peace, and freedom from terror, for God will make them to lie down safely.'

"The Jews now number about six million, who can give the number of Israel!

"STILL DISTINCT.

"In the days of Christ and of his Apostles the distinction was very clearly seen, for they used the terms 'outcast of Israel,' and the 'dispersed of Judah,' as they were used in the prophetic writings. The disciples said of Jesus 'will he go to the dispersed among the Gentiles?' This could not mean 'Jews,' for they had not yet been scattered. The 'dispersed' were the 'divorced' and 'scattered,' who had been sown among the nations.'

"The same distinction is noted by Paul in Rom. xi. where he speaks of the grand old olive tree, not as cut down, for it still grew and was flourishing; but some of the branches (the Jews) were broken off and Gentiles had been grafted on, and made to share in the richness and fertility of the native branches. Here were three sets of branches, the natural, the broken off, and the grafted, and each, in Paul's mind, evidently distinct."

Here again, Poole has things all twisted out-of-shape! He did fairly well when addressing Yahweh's divorcement from Israel, but he sure botched up Paul's allegory about the wild olive tree. He also fouled up when addressing the population of the "Jews" who were in reality Canaanite-jews as six million. He might be somewhat correct as to the number at his time period, but he surely cannot be referring to true pureblooded Judahites.

As for Paul's allegory concerning the grafting in of the wild olive branches, it cannot be fully understood unless one goes to Zech. 4:3, 11 & Rev. 11:14 where it speaks of "two olive trees". Rev. 11:13 explains that the two olive trees are two witnesses that were to witness for a thousand two hundred and threescore days (a day for a year, or 1260 years; not 30 months or 3½ calendar years). At Isaiah 43:10, Israel is told: "**Ye are my witnesses, saith Yahweh, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.**"

In other words, these witnesses were the house of Israel and the house of Judah for a period of 1260 years, and not in the catholic church but against the catholic church. There were not three entities as Poole proposes, and Canaanite-jews don't fit into the equation. The wild branches to be grafted back into the olive tree were Israelites who had been broken off the original olive tree and divorced or cast away, and that would include both houses of Israel and Judah.