

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

GLORY AND EMPIRE: THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE JEWS AND THE ROAD TO THE BALFOUR
DECLARATION

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

By
MARGARET M. WILLETTS
Norman, Oklahoma
2016

GLORY AND EMPIRE: THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE JEWS AND THE ROAD TO THE BALFOUR
DECLARATION

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

Dr. Judith Lewis, Chair

Dr. James Hart

Dr. Alan Levenson

© Copyright by MARGARET M. WILLETTS 2016
All Rights Reserved.

To my mother, for instilling in me a love for history and for being my dedicated
proofreader.

Acknowledgements

My interest in the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews began as an undergraduate at the University of Oklahoma. Since then I have embarked on a journey that would not have been possible without the help and support of many people.

I would like to thank the College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of History for supporting my research trip for this thesis. Many thanks to Jacki Turnbull, Alex Jacob, and Paul Hames of the CMJ for permitting me access to the Society's archives at Oxford University.

I am grateful to Dr. James Hart, Dr. Alan Levenson, and especially Dr. Judith Lewis for their insight and guidance for this project. I want to express my sincere thanks to Professor Lewis for her mentorship and encouragement during my time at the University of Oklahoma.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude to my loving and supporting family. To my sister, Jane, and my brother, John, for being great academic and personal examples to me. To my parents, Mark and Margaret, for teaching me to always love learning, and for instilling in me that I can accomplish anything I set my mind to. Lastly, to my husband, Taylor, for giving me unconditional love and supporting all my dreams. I love you all.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Conversionism, Restorationism, and the Holy Land, 1809-1841.....	16
Chapter 3: Building an Empire, Bishop Alexander, and Jewish Emancipation, 1841- 1860	39
Chapter 4: The London Society, the Zionist Movement, and the Balfour Declaration, 1860-1917.....	68
Chapter 5: Conclusion	100
References	105
Appendix A: Letter to Herzl and Leaders of the Zionist Movement	113
Appendix B: Letter to Lord Balfour from Conference of Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland.....	115

Abstract

The Balfour Declaration has often been seen as the culmination of the restorationist tradition and Christian Zionism in Britain. The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was an Evangelical mission that sought for the conversion and restoration of the Jews. This thesis examines the LSPCJ's founding in 1809, the London Society's activities in Britain and Palestine, the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric, the London Society's views on Jewish emancipation, the rise of the Zionist movement, the First World War, and the Balfour Declaration. This study focuses on the LSPCJ's mission and place in the development of Christian Zionism of the nineteenth century, and how it was a central part of the Evangelical culture that helped legitimize Britain's imperial interest in Palestine.

Chapter 1: Introduction

On November 2, 1917, British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour wrote to Lord Walter Rothschild, a prominent leader of the British Jewish community, to pass on to the Zionist Federation:

His Majesty's Government view with favour for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.¹

This letter famously came to be known as the “Balfour Declaration” which signified the British government's support for the creation of a Jewish national homeland. Written toward the end of the First World War, the Balfour Declaration would affect British foreign policy for the rest of the twentieth century. 2017 will mark the one hundred year anniversary of the Balfour Declaration whose meaning continues to be relevant in current geopolitics. For Britain and her empire, the road to the Balfour Declaration began well before the late nineteenth century Zionist movement. The rise of restorationism and conversionism had a significant impact on British society, missionary organizations, the Church of England, and politics during the nineteenth century. With these influences at work, the salvation and welfare of Jews became an important concern of Britain's destiny.

In 1809, The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was established by Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey, a Jewish convert to Christianity.

¹ The Balfour Declaration, 1917.

This society (also abbreviated as the London Jews' Society, the London Society, LSPCJ, LJS, or CMJ) became the first missionary effort in Great Britain with the sole purpose of evangelizing Jews in London and later other parts of Britain and the empire. The LSPCJ has been credited by historians and religious scholars for sparking the Hebrew Christian movement, which was an independent movement primarily of converted Jews, and for influencing Christian Zionism among Evangelicals during the nineteenth century. Many scholars attribute its importance to some of its successes, its outreach to the poorer Jewish community in London, its establishment as a non-denominational organization, and its influence for Jewish evangelism in Europe, the United States, and other parts the world.² According to Barbara Tuchman, "If the Jews' Society had concerned itself only with conversion we could ignore it. It was that vital linked factor, the restoration of Israel, that gives the Society's work historical importance."³ Well before the advent of Zionism, the

² B.Z. Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe* (New York: Wiley, 1974), 139. There have been numerous books, articles, dissertations, and publications on the LSPCJ's history that detail information vital for this discussion including missionary work outside Britain and Palestine, medical missions, conversionist methods, and negative responses. See M. Eisen, "Christian Missions to the Jews in North America and Great Britain," *Jewish Social Studies* 10 (1948): 31-66; R.H. Martin, "United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46 (1977): 437-452; Yaron Perry, *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*, (London: Cass, 2003); "Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem: The London Jews' Society and the Protestant Bishopric," *Jewish Culture and History* 4:1 (2001): 65-80; Michael Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion: "The Jewish Question" & English National Identity*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995); Mel Scult, "English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation," *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973): 3-17, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, (Leiden: Brill, 1978); R.M. Smith, "The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801-1859," *Jewish Social Studies* 43 (1981): 275-290; John M. Yeats, "'The Time is Come': The Rise of British Missions to the Jews, 1808—1818," PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2004; "'To the Jew first': Conversion of the Jews as the Foundation for Global Missions and Expansion in Nineteenth-Century British evangelicalism," *Southwestern Journal Of Theology* 47 (2005): 207-223. For a parallel account in Germany see Christopher M. Clark, *The Politics of Conversion: Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728-1941*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

³ Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 122.

LSPCJ promoted Jewish restoration to the land of Israel, while at the same promoted their conversion to Christianity.

The London Society's involvement in the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1841 and the promotion of the restoration of the Jews, for example, was part of the restorationist tradition within British Evangelicalism. Interestingly enough, the LSPCJ's history is not over. It still exists today as one of the official ten outreaches of the Church of England as the Church's Ministry among Jewish People (CMJ).⁴ The fact that the CMJ was not disbanded or dissolved means that the Church of England still considers the CMJ's central mission to be relevant.⁵ The LSPCJ's founding and history are also central to the existence of Christian Zionism and Messianic Judaism today. This is not to say that the Balfour Declaration, Christian Zionism, and even Messianic Judaism would not exist without the influence of the LSPCJ. This cannot be proven. However, it is certain that the LSPCJ had an important role in the acceptance of Zionism in Britain. This thesis focuses on the London Society's role in perpetuating the restorationist tradition during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and places the LSPCJ in a central role in the context of both Christian and Jewish Zionist historiography.

Jews in Britain, as a whole, were more tolerated and better off than their fellow Jews on the Continent, particularly in Eastern Europe. In the English-Speaking world,

⁴ For more information visit the official website: www.cmj.org.uk

⁵ The CMJ's Jewish mission has been under scrutiny in recent decades within the Church of England. Stephen Sizer has been one of the outspoken critics of the CMJ and its Zionist position. Sizer has written on Christian Zionism in Britain inducing: "The historical roots of Christian Zionism from Irving to Balfour: Christian Zionism in the United Kingdom (1820-1918)," in *Challenging Christian Zionism: Theology, Politics and the Israel-Palestine Conflict*, edited by Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis, and Muarine Tobin, 20-31, (London: Melisende, 2005).

there was an aura of philosemitism. According to William and Hilary Rubinstein, in Britain “there was little or no social discrimination of any kind against Jews.” Jews were seen as “a small, low-profile minority.”⁶ Many Jews immigrated during the mid-1700s to 1800s to England, because of the religious tolerance and better standard of living.⁷ In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the majority of the Jewish population in Britain were middle class, although they were only a very small portion of this demographic.⁸ As the nineteenth century progressed, there was a significant influx of Jewish immigrants who were mostly poor, uneducated, and were seen as aliens to native Britons. Despite these initial hindrances, throughout the nineteenth century, the Jewish community prospered.⁹ However, like Dissenters, Jews did not have the same legal status as their Anglican counterparts. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, only practicing Anglicans had the right to vote if they met the proper qualifications. Catholics and Dissenters were not full members of society. Dissenters, also known as Nonconformists, were emancipated in 1828 with the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act. In 1829, Catholics were also emancipated with the passage of the Catholic Relief Act. Jews wanting to make a new life in Britain were often under pressure to convert, because of the restrictions placed on them because they were not Christian. The Jewish Naturalization Act, which was passed in 1753, granted Jews the same rights as other non-Anglican Britons. However, Jews were still not allowed to hold a seat in Parliament or vote. Attempts were made in 1833, 1834,

⁶ William D. and Hilary L. Rubinstein, *Philosemitism: Admiration and Support in the English-Speaking World for Jews, 1940-1939* (London: Macmillan, 1999), 5.

⁷ T.M. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000* (Berkeley: University of California, 2002), 76-77.

⁸ By the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were approximately 20,000 to 26,000 Jews living in England. Among those, 15,000 to 20,000 lived primarily in London: Jewish immigrants, most of which were from Eastern Europe, settled in East London. The majority of the Jewish population of London lived in Spitalfields or Whitechapel. V.D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*, (London: Watts, 1954), 6-7.

⁹ Endelman, *The Jews of Britain*, 79.

and 1836 for Jews to be in Parliament, but were turned down by the House of Lords. By 1858, Parliament passed the bill and the full emancipation of the Jews of Britain was finally accomplished.¹⁰

During the nineteenth century, it became popular among British Evangelicals to proselytize those in the British Empire who were not already believers of Jesus Christ. To many Evangelicals, it was viewed and accepted that converting those at home would lead to more success in converting those abroad.¹¹ This notion provided grounds and reasons for converting Jews to Christianity in a way that was directed toward who Jews were as the People of Israel, instead of as “heathens.” John M. Yeats maintains that the underlying cause for British Missions to the Jews was part of the primary effort for global evangelism and expansion of the Empire.¹² In other words, Jewish evangelism was another facet of general missionary growth and imperialism during the nineteenth century. Inevitably, if the British were able to convert the Jews, than not only would their other missionary movements succeed, but God would ultimately bless the Empire for her good work. *A Concise Account of the LSPCJ*, which was written in 1816 by Hannah Adams, furthered this claim in that “The ultimate triumphs of Christianity itself are represented, as in a measure, suspended upon the conversion of the Jews. The world is to

¹⁰ W.T. Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, (London: LSPCJ, 1908), 28-29.

¹¹ According to Ian Bradley, Evangelicalism played “a major part in determining imperial policy.” For Evangelicals, the conversion of the natives was a major reason for the empire’s existence. *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976), 74-76.

¹² John M. Yeats, “To the Jew first,” 208.

wait for them.”¹³ With the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, there would be no better or more successful people to deliver the message of God to the rest of the world.¹⁴

The restoration of the Jews to Israel was part of millenarianism during the nineteenth century. Restoring the Jews to Israel meant fulfilling God’s ultimate promise to His People. N.I. Matar expounds upon this assessment in his analysis of the restorationist movement. He states that during this period “Restoration was now part of the white man’s burden and of the colonial enterprise that would dominate the nineteenth century.”¹⁵ Thinking along these lines, the restorationist tradition was a precursor to the Christian Zionist movement. Evangelicals believed that the restoration must be orchestrated by efforts of evangelism from the British toward the Jews. Yet, they also believed that Jews should return to the Holy Land as believers in Christ. Moreover, to be the cause of the Redemption of the People of Israel meant a role of great importance to Britain. *A Concise Account* of the LSPCJ explains this further:

Great Britain, in particular, is eminently distinguished for the variety and importance of her benevolent institutions; among which the London *Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, must be peculiarly interesting to all who are devoutly waiting for the redemption of Israel.¹⁶

In other words, Britain’s distinguished position as the world’s global power and her benevolent nature made her the most qualified to pursue evangelizing efforts to the Jews and help return God’s People to the Holy Land to be blessed. Her example would lead to

¹³ Hannah Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*. (Boston: Printed by John Eliot, 1816), 10.

¹⁴ Yeats, “To the Jew first,” 215.

¹⁵ N.I. Matar, “The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.” *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 39.

¹⁶ Adams, *A concise account*, 2.

many more societies and organizations with similar pursuits of restoration and conversion.

The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews is a central part of the story of the history of Christian Zionism and the Balfour Declaration. It must be emphasized that first and foremost the main purpose of the LSPCJ was to convert Jews to Christianity. This remained the primary goal throughout the nineteenth century. The Society was very adamant that it did not publically promote restorationism, or that it tried to predict biblical prophecy. However, as we will see, many leaders and members of the LSPCJ did have restorationist views. While the Society did inadvertently promote restorationism, Christian Zionism was not created by the London Society. Nevertheless, many Evangelicals and Christian Zionists were involved with the LSPCJ, the most famous being the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley-Cooper. Lord Shaftesbury served as the president of the LSPCJ from 1848 until his death in 1885. Shaftesbury had “an ardent desire for the complete redemption of God’s people Israel, and for their restoration both to His favor and to their own land.”¹⁷

Shaftesbury’s vision of a nation rested on Evangelical faith carried over to his vision of an Evangelical empire. He believed that social and political affairs could serve the religious interests of mankind. While Shaftesbury has been mostly remembered as a great philanthropist, he was vigorously interested in not only social reform, but also in foreign and imperial affairs.¹⁸ Shaftesbury’s involvement in the LSPCJ, Parliament, and

¹⁷ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, 402.

¹⁸ G.F.A. Best, *Shaftesbury*, (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1964), 53, 72.

in Palestine have made him one of the most celebrated Evangelicals of the nineteenth century. More importantly, he was one of the most important supports and leaders of the LSPCJ.

The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland, by Donald M. Lewis, examines Christian Zionism from Lord Shaftesbury to the Balfour Declaration. Many prominent British Evangelicals and members of the LSPCJ, who supported and advocated the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, are key players in Lewis's book. Lewis argues that the Balfour Declaration represents the fulfillment of the efforts of British Evangelicals of the nineteenth century. Christian philosemitism and Christian Zionism became "identity makers" for many Evangelicals and that their "interest in the Jews was part and parcel of a wider process of evangelical identity construction that took a decisive turn in the early nineteenth century."¹⁹ Furthermore, Lewis expounds upon the perceived role of the Church of England:

Protestant Britain, characterized by its state church, was itself an 'elect nation' and as such exercised a special leadership within international Protestantism and had a particular affinity with the Jews. The guardian of the true Reformed faith, Britain, was to style itself as the protector of the Jews and to take seriously its role in their return to Zion.²⁰

Primarily during the 1830s and 1840s, "lobbying of the British government on behalf of the Jews became a major concern" of the LSPCJ and Shaftesbury.²¹ If the British Empire

¹⁹ Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 10-12.

²⁰ Lewis, 166.

²¹ Lewis, 175.

provided the secular motives to promote involvement in Palestine, then the Church of England, with the help of the LSPCJ, provided the spiritual motives to do so as well. Throughout Lewis's book, Shaftesbury is the focal point of the influence of Christian Zionism, the establishment of the British Consulate in Palestine, and the Jerusalem Bishopric. While there is no denying Shaftesbury's importance and efforts, for our study we will look at Shaftesbury's importance as a member and president of the LSPCJ. Without the London Society, it would be hard to imagine how Shaftesbury would have made these accomplishments.

In contrast to Lewis, Eitan Bar-Yosef challenges the accepted sentiment of the Balfour Declaration as the "culmination of a rich tradition of Christian Zionism in British culture."²² He takes aim at Zionist historiography, especially Nahum Sokolow's *History of Zionism*, which has emphasized the religious impetus and restorationist influence behind the Balfour Declaration.²³ Bar-Yosef questions the validity that first there was "an

²² Eitan Bar-Yosef, "Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture," *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 18. Abigail Green, Ragina Sharif, and Mayir Vereté, have also argued against the simplicity of the Christian Zionism narrative. Sharif claims that there has been too much emphasis on "Christian" Zionism and not on "Gentile Zionism." According to Sharif, "More often, though, non-Jewish Zionism is relegated to the background, too insignificant to warrant more than perhaps an introductory mention of those Christians who supported Jews in their Zionist endeavors." *Non-Jewish Zionism: Its Roots in Western History*, (London: Zed Press, 1983), 2. Green has analyzed Jewish involvement in the British Empire outside the restorationist tradition, and takes a humanitarian approach to understanding Britain's policy toward Palestine. "The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?" *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 175-205. Vereté has shown that Palmerston's attitude toward Palestine was not because of the Evangelical views of Lord Shaftesbury, but rather from his general concern about the expansion of British influence and interests in Ottoman lands. "Why Was a British Consulate Established in Jerusalem?" *The English Historical Review* 85:335 (1970): 316-345.

²³ See Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism 1600-1918*, 2 Vols. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919); Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, Franz Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, (London: Lincoln-Prager, 1956); Norman Bentwich and John M. Shaftesbury, "Forerunners of Zionism in the Victorian Era," in John M. Shaftesbury ed., *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth*, (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1966), 207-239; Ronald Sanders, *The High Walls of Jerusalem: A History of the Balfour Declaration and the Birth of the British Mandate for Palestine* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983); Michael Polowetzky, *Jerusalem Recovered: Victorian Intellectuals and the Birth of*

impressive gallery of Victorian individuals and institutions promoting, sometimes vigorously, the Jewish colonization of Palestine,” and second “that these eminent Christian Zionists were men and women of their time, and that their restorationist views were somehow characteristics of a more prevalent cultural climate.” Bar-Yosef claims that this view has not taken into account that British projects for Jewish restoration to Palestine were not seen with the same fervor by the British public at large. Moreover, these projects were “associated with charges of religious enthusiasm, eccentricity, sometimes even madness.”²⁴ The influence of Shaftesbury and the LSPCJ are reexamined by Bar-Yosef. He does not necessarily deem them as solely fanatical or without merit, but rather their restorationist views and projects were not a major element of the cultural Victorian consensus. This thesis neither challenges nor defends Bar Yosef’s critique of Christian Zionism paving the way toward Britain’s wartime policy, rather it traces the transformation of restorationism and the LSPCJ. However, while Zionist historiography has emphasized the connections between Christian Zionism and the Balfour Declaration, there has not been enough emphasis on the LSPCJ’s involvement and influence leading up to the Declaration.

Michael Darby’s book *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain* provides a fascinating look into the history of the

Modern Zionism, (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995); .Paul C. Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism: 1892-1948*, (London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 1998)

²⁴ Eitan Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799-1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 183-184.

establishment of the LSPCJ during Britain's Evangelical revival and its connection to the Hebrew Christian movement. Darby presents a relatively positive view of the Society:

The LSPCJ brought about the most important changes in the civil, political, literary and religious conditions of the Jews in Britain. Its supporters removed much of the prejudice which oppressed the Hebrew people in the realm, initiated a general kind attitude among the English towards the Jews and thus paved the way for the removal of their civil and political disabilities.²⁵

Darby's approach is more theological and doctrinal in nature. The role of the LSPCJ is primarily in the first half of his book and focuses on its ideological and theological motives. His book centers on converted Jews (Hebrew Christians) who wanted to retain their Jewish identity and examines the conflict between religious belief and social identity. He provides a comprehensive look into the increased role of Jewish missions among both Anglicans and Nonconformists. Moreover, Darby examines the rise of the Children of Abraham and the Hebrew Christian Alliance, which marked the beginning of the Hebrew Christian movement's independence from the LSPCJ and other missionary societies.

While the LSPCJ's conversionist methods and motives, and its history of missions in Palestine have been examined, the social and imperial dynamics of the LSPCJ's history have been analyzed to a much lesser extent. This does not mean that the social status of Jews in Britain has been ignored, rather it has focused mainly on the conversion of poorer Jews and the desire to convert in an Anglican dominated society for social gain. Todd Endelman has probably devoted the most attention to the role of conversionism,

²⁵ Michael R. Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 137.

evangelical missions to Jews, and involvement in emancipation and restoration than any other modern Anglo-Jewish historian. According to Endelman, the LSPCJ “was not an isolated effort of a handful of fanatics, but a small part of a wide-scale undertaking to revitalize religious life in England.”²⁶ Endelman’s approach shows what is unique about Anglo-Jewish history in the context of radical assimilation and conversion, while at the same time explains how it fits in the overall context of Jewish and British religious historiography. However, despite Endelman’s efforts, what seems to be lacking is how the LSPCJ is to be situated in the context of British social history, church history, and to some extent Anglo-Jewish history. The nineteenth century was monumental for Jews living in Britain, especially with the achievement of emancipation in 1858. Examining the changes of the LSPCJ pre-and post-emancipation, for example, may provide a better understanding of how the London Society operated under changing social norms.

Hebrew Christianity and Christian Zionism are both legacies of the London Society. It seems that these two roads in scholarship are the most popular discourses on the LSPCJ, although other aspects in the historiography have not been ignored. While these components will certainly be at the forefront of this thesis, my objective is threefold: to examine the conversionist and restorationist motives of the LSPCJ, its influence on Britain’s religious identity and Christian Zionist thought, and its influence on religious and imperial conceptions of the British Empire’s purpose. The primary objective is to

²⁶ Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 71. See also ed. *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*, New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1987); *Leaving the Jewish Fold*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015); *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990); *The Jews of Britain, 1650 to 2000*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002).

discuss these aspects with attention on social attitudes toward Jews among members of the London Society and Evangelicals.

I depart from previous scholarship in three ways. First, I will examine the London Society as the most prominent factor in fostering philosemitism and restorationism within British society, especially among Evangelicals. Rather than focusing on a single figure, like Shaftesbury, this thesis will concentrate on the LSPCJ as its own entity that gave credibility to the efforts of these individuals. Second, I will examine why many members and leaders of the LSPCJ believed in restorationism, even though the Society itself officially denied that it promoted in any prophetic views. Over the course of the nineteenth century, its official stance did not change, but many leaders, including Shaftesbury, were public about their restorationist views. Third, I will examine the LSPCJ's views of the political motives of restorationism and Zionism as it pertained to the British Empire. This does not necessarily depart from recent scholarship, rather I will devote more attention as to how restoring the Jews to Palestine was thought to have both religious and imperial gains. I argue that supporting Jewish conversion and Jewish restoration appeared to have both spiritual and imperial appeals for Britain, and the LSPCJ was a part of this dialogue. The Zionist movement also presented a paradox for the LSPCJ: it promoted restoration, but not conversion. Moreover, it is important to consider why the LSPCJ has so often been mentioned in the history of Christian Zionism, yet has not been seen as a focal point.

The CMJ manuscript collection at the Bodleian Library at Oxford University is the largest primary source collection of the London Society for Promoting Christianity

amongst the Jews. Some of these primary sources include many of the LSPCJ's pamphlets, sermons, tracts, periodicals, letters, data, and other materials that pertain to missionary and conversionist activities, as well as other information about the LSPCJ's structure, message, and support. Among some of the documents I collected from the CMJ collection were pamphlets and letters from committee members. Analyzing these sources will provide multiple viewpoints about the LSPCJ itself and attitudes about Jewish conversion and restoration. Among other important primary sources of the LSPCJ will be the works of William T. Gidney who served as the society's secretary during the early twentieth century. His *The History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908* thoroughly chronicles the one-hundred years of the LSPCJ by segmenting chapters into different periods of its existence. In the historiography of the LSPCJ, this thesis will examine and evaluate different books, articles, publications, and other secondary sources concerned with Britain's religious landscape during the nineteenth century, the Evangelical movement, Christian Zionism, and British imperialism. Of particular interest will be the works of Kelvin Crombie, the current historian of the CMJ, whose works include *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel*.²⁷

The scope of this study will be from 1809, the founding year of the London Society, to 1917, the year of the Balfour Declaration. This timeframe will provide a thorough look into the LSPCJ's establishment, its most popular period, and the advent of the Zionist movement. I will first examine the LSPCJ's founding in 1809 to the

²⁷ Kelvin Crombie, *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel*, (Bristol: Terra Nova Publications, 2008). See also *Restoring Israel: 200 Years of the CMJ Story*, (Jerusalem: Nicolayson's Ltd, 2008).

establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1841. The next chapter will explore the Bishopric, the Society's work in Palestine, and the Society's views on Jewish emancipation. Finally, the last chapter of this thesis will analyze the second half of the nineteenth century focusing on the role of the British Empire, the rise of the Zionist movement, the London Society's activities during this period, and events leading up to the Balfour Declaration. I conclude that the LSPCJ did foster an accepting (or even zealous) environment for Zionism, while at the same time legitimizing the British Empire's role in making a religious and/or imperial ideal become state policy.

Chapter 2: Conversionism, Restorationism, and the Holy Land, 1809-1841

The violent events of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars made many Evangelicals in Britain believe that the new millennium was upon them. These tumultuous events were seen as signs of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. However, in order for biblical prophecy to come true, some Evangelicals believed the conversion of the Jews and their restoration to the Holy Land had to happen first.²⁸ England was to have “a special role to play in ushering it in,” rather than Roman Catholics or atheist France.²⁹ In 1799, Admiral Nelson’s victory over Napoleon at the Nile was proof of Britain’s “providential purpose” to protect the Holy Land. England was considered the new Israel, and God had a divine plan for spreading Christianity throughout the empire.³⁰ Not only would the conversion of the Jews better Christianity but it would also influence other non-Christian groups to convert. Thus, Jewish evangelism took primacy over other missionary projects in a way, according to Michael Ragussis, that “both strict millenarians and the larger Evangelical public began to see themselves as the benevolent guardians of the Jews.”³¹ Britain and her empire would ultimately be blessed for accomplishing this divine plan. Keeping this in mind, the ideals of restorationism and

²⁸ Michael Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion: “The Jewish Question” & English National Identity*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995), 4.

²⁹ Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000*, 69-70.

³⁰ Stewart J. Brown, *Providence and Empire: 1815-1914*, (Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education, 2008), 8.

³¹ Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 5.

conversionism were the roots of Christian Zionism that will begin in early nineteenth century Britain.³²

The Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century led to a general growth in missionary projects and evangelism. The London Missionary Society (LMS), which was an interdenominational group established in 1795, was the primary organization for evangelism in London and other parts of Great Britain. Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey saw that the LMS's effort to promote Christianity among the Jews was not sufficient. Born in the Duchy of Franconia in 1770, he was the son of Samuel Levi Frey, a Jewish private tutor. Frey had been trained to be a synagogue Cantor and ritual slaughterer for ceremonial religious services.³³ Frey converted to Christianity on May 8, 1798 and was baptized as a Lutheran.³⁴ After his time at seminary in Berlin, Frey came to England in 1801 to work as a missionary in Africa for the LMS. By 1805, Frey was working in London often visiting different synagogues to learn English and to discuss the

³² For further reading on the Evangelical movement see David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from 1730s to the 1980s*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Ian Bradley, *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976). For more on the evangelical background on Jewish missions see Michael R. Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), Part I; R.H. Martin, "United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46 (1977): 437-452.; N. I. Matar, "The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews," *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 29-44; Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, (Leiden: Brill, 1978); Mayir Vereté, "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in Protestant Thought," in N. Rose, ed., *From Palmerston to Balfour: Collected Essays of Mayir Vereté*, (London, F. Cass, 1992), 78-140. John M. Yeats, "'To the Jew first': Conversion of the Jews as the Foundation for Global Missions and Expansion in Nineteenth-Century British evangelicalism," *Southwestern Journal Of Theology* 47 (2005): 207-223.

³³ Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 4th ed., (New York: W.B. Gilley, 1817), 1-12.

³⁴ Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 9th ed., (New York: Printed for the Author, 1832), 28.

Gospel wherever he traveled. Frey wanted to devote his time to his Jewish brethren and share Jesus Christ with them. Frey believed that:

The conversion of the Jews to Christianity, whether it be considered with regard to the glory of Jehovah—their own degraded and guilty state—or with reference to that happy influence upon the Christian church, and the world at large, which the Holy Scriptures encourages us to anticipate, is a most desirable object.³⁵

However, he perceived that the work of the LMS was not enough for truly evangelizing the Jews of London. Moreover, Frey saw that Jewish converts needed more attention after their conversion. Since converted Jews came from background different than new Gentile Christians, Frey believed that they needed to deal with their identities as Jews and as new Christians. Frey resigned from the LMS with the reason that the mission of Jewish evangelism had not worked in helping in their transition and livelihood. Thus, in 1809, he formed the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews which became the first organized missionary society specifically to evangelize the Jews in England.

The LSPCJ was established to help the Jews in London and to preach the gospel to them. The London Society primarily evangelized the Jews of East London, who were mostly of the poorer classes. The LSPCJ leased an eighteenth century Huguenot Church building on Church Street in Spitalfields in London and named it the Jews' Chapel.³⁶ Many LSPCJ institutions, like the Jews' Chapel, encouraged involvement from Jewish Christians as well as Gentile Christians. *The Concise Account* describes that “Men of

³⁵ Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 11th ed., (New York: J.K. Moore, 1834), 119.

³⁶ Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 11th ed, 125.

piety and benevolence, of talents and learning, of influence and rank, of nobility and royalty, have come forward to assist in promoting the temporal and eternal welfare of the Jews.”³⁷ The LSPCJ’s mission to help the Jews, both in spiritual and temporal spheres, was a major aspect of Frey’s outlook on Jewish evangelism.³⁸ It promoted education, social welfare, and missionary training among those involved with the new converts. The LSPCJ tried to provide jobs and ways for converted Jews to make a living after being rejected by the Jewish community. In 1810, The London Society established a House of Industry to manufacture cotton for candle wicks; however this effort failed after a year and became a printing office in the Jews’ Chapel.³⁹ More jobs were also created for a short period initially. The printing office, which made the Hebrew New Testaments and other publications of the LSPCJ, was able to pay for its own expenses and to furnish “useful employment to the Jewish youths under the Society’s care.”⁴⁰ The LSPCJ passed out these tracts and pamphlets to the London Jewish community.

While the London Society’s publications were written about Jews, they were primarily read by a wide Christian audience.⁴¹ This may come as no surprise. The LSPCJ needed to garner support and the necessary funds to continue its missionary work.⁴²

³⁷ Hannah Adams, *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, (Boston: Printed by John Eliot, 1816), 3.

³⁸ Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 9th ed, 112-125

³⁹ Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 56.

⁴⁰ London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, " *Christian Observer, Conducted by Members of the Established Church 17*, (1818): 857.

⁴¹ Agnieszka Jagodzińska, “‘For Zion’s sake I will not rest’: the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews and its nineteenth-century missionary periodicals,” *Church History* 82: 2 (2013): 385. The publications of the LSPCJ often included essays or segments on Jewish history or the tenets of Judaism. This strategy may have been used as a way to teach Christians about Judaism, while at the same time promoting why Jews needed to be converted to Christianity.

⁴² John M. Yeats’s dissertation is an excellent examination of the London Society’s early years. Yeats explores the LSPCJ’s finances and why it garnered support from Protestants during its first decade. This study primarily highlights how the LSPCJ raised and used its funding. Yeats’s work is also one of the few secondary sources that explicitly examines the London Society’s early years before it was reorganized in

Moreover, most Britons living outside London had little to no interaction with Jews. The Society's publications gave Evangelicals and other Christians in Britain an image of Jews who needed to be converted.⁴³ Despite being a missionary organization concerned about the welfare of Jews in England, the LSPCJ did not involve itself in addressing the political and civil disabilities of Jews in Britain. This has been one of the largest critiques of the LSPCJ. It has been argued that the London Society only concerned itself with Jews in order to convert them to Christianity and did not help them attain rights and liberties as Jews.⁴⁴ This argument will become the foremost reason why non-converted Jews, and even other Protestants in Britain, will denounce the missions of the LSPCJ during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Before its reorganization, the LSPCJ did not advocate for Jewish emancipation nor was it a social welfare organization. However, members of the LSPCJ did want to improve relations between Jews and Christians, as well as deter prejudices against Jews.

The LSPCJ's supporters and patrons were vital to the Society's mission. During the London Society's first decade, the Prince Regent, George IV, was asked to become the first Patron of the LSPCJ, but declined the position. However, the Duke of Kent,

1815 under the Church of England. See John M. Yeats, "'The Time is Come': The Rise of British Missions to the Jews, 1808—1818," PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2004. See also Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties*. For official histories see W.T. Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, (London: LSPCJ, 1908); Thomas D. Halsted, *Our Missions: A History of the Principal Missionary Transactions of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, (London: MacIntosh, 1866).

⁴³ Both Michael Ragussis and Nadia Valman explore how Jews were represented in nineteenth century literature, particularly with conversionist elements. See Michael Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*; Nadia Valman, *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

⁴⁴ See Mel Scult, "English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation," *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973): 3-17; John S. Conway, "Protestant Missions to the Jews 1810-1980: Ecclesiastical Imperialism or Theological Aberration?" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1:1 (1986): 129.

future father of Queen Victoria, was elected to the position in 1813 and held it until 1815. He had an integral part in helping the LSPCJ establish the first Jewish Christian compound for Jewish converts, which included a church and school, called Palestine Place. At the grand opening, Gidney described that the foundation, both spiritual and temporal, “was laid by His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, on April 7th, 1813, in the presence of nearly 20,000 spectators.” There were other prominent supporters present, including William Wilberforce and religious activist Lewis Way.⁴⁵ The legitimacy of the LSPCJ’s mission to convert Jews relied on patronage from prominent members of British society.

The London Society was founded on the principle in which “the Established Church and Christians of various denominations of Dissenters can cordially unite.”⁴⁶ Initially, the LSPCJ helped create a bond between Anglicans and Dissenters, in order to foster comradery in trying to convert Jews to Christianity. R.H. Martin maintains that this pan-evangelistic movement “was based on the hope that if Anglicans and Dissenters could cooperate in a common mission to the Jews, they could also resolve ecclesiastical differences that had divided them for centuries.”⁴⁷ Problems arose when changes and differences such as the use of the sacraments, the establishment of new churches, ordination, and the practice baptism surfaced. Denominational issues forced the LSPCJ to have two different types of lectures to preach to the Jews on Sundays: one by the Dissenters, the other by the Anglicans. Ultimately, though, this desire for cooperation did

⁴⁵ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 37-41.

⁴⁶ Adams, *A concise account*, 5.

⁴⁷ Martin, “United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain,” 448.

not occur and the LSPCJ was a failure as a nondenominational movement.⁴⁸ After more disagreements and financial issues, the LSPCJ fell under Anglican leadership and control on March 14, 1815.⁴⁹ By 1816, missionary work in London grew and that “lectures to the Jews and also to Christians on Jewish subjects were continued in Ely Place Chapel, St. Swithin’s, London Stone, Bentinck Chapel and elsewhere.” The Jews’ Chapel at Spitalfields had to be given up, because the bishop refused to allow it to be a place of worship for the Anglican Church.⁵⁰ By this time, Frey had already decreased his involvement in the Society. In May 1816, Frey resigned from the Society and left for the United States, where he would be involved in Jewish Missions and teach Hebrew.⁵¹

With the failure of the cordial union between Anglicans and Dissenters, the LSPCJ was reorganized as an Anglican missionary society under Lewis Way.⁵² Evangelicals and members of the Clapham Sect such as William Wilberforce and Charles Simeon influenced Way from an early age.⁵³ In 1804, Way became independently wealthy after a generous donation of £300,000 from John Way (no relation) after his death. With this financial gift, Way decided to devote his support to the conversion of the

⁴⁸ Martin, 438.

⁴⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews* 47, 51.

⁵⁰ Gidney, 46, 57.

⁵¹ Frey, *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*, 11th ed, 144-150. Frey also allegedly left under scandalous circumstances. Frey apparently had an affair with the wife of a Jewish convert. See Sailman, *The Mystery Unfolded*, (London: 1817), 45.

⁵² Way also helped the Society’s financial troubles. Charles Simeon wrote to Rev. Thomason on July 3, 1815: “I informed you of the change which had taken place in the Jews’ Society; it being now committed to the exclusive management of the members of the establishment... The assists, with the debts (£12,500), were delivered over to us. Mr. Way gave the thousands, and a few friends gave the hundreds, so that the whole debt is paid.” Rev William Carus, ed. *Memoirs of the Life of Rev. Charles Simeon*, (New York: Hatchard and Son, 1847), 238. According to Gidney, Way reorganized the LSPCJ “as we know it.” Gidney, 58.

⁵³ Robert Brown, “Way, Lewis (1772–1840),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2009.

Jews.⁵⁴ Between 1817 and 1818, Way traveled to Holland, Germany, and Russia to begin the LSPCJ's missions abroad. Way met with Alexander I at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 to discuss the state of the Jews in Russia.⁵⁵ According to Mel Scult, the real importance of Way's trip was that he "exerted significant influence over Czar Alexander and had the idea of establishing a colony of Jews in the Crimea who would be rewarded with land for having converted to Christianity."⁵⁶ Way's involvement and journeys helped establish auxiliaries in Holland, Prussia, Poland, France, Italy, and Palestine.

The importance of the LPSCJ's Evangelical leadership is exemplified by William Wilberforce and his colleagues of the Clapham Sect. According to Donald Lewis, their leadership "seems to have been sympathetic to the new profile being given to Jewish evangelism," though they were less enthusiastic about prophetic beliefs about the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. Charles Simeon was an exception to this rule. He earnestly believed that the conversion and the restoration of the Jews was at hand. A leading Evangelical of the Church of England during the early nineteenth century, Simeon helped popularize Jewish missions. He promoted them among Anglican leadership while he was at Cambridge, and later by his fundraising and itinerant preaching for the LSPCJ in England and Scotland.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Scult, *Millennial Expectations*, 106.

⁵⁵ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 58-59, 150.

⁵⁶ Scult, *Millennial Expectations*, 107.

⁵⁷ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 60-61, 65.

Simeon, like many other Evangelicals, believed that the salvation of God and the Gospel should be “to the Jew first.”⁵⁸ The conversion of the Jews would lead to the conversion of all mankind. Their restoration was vital according to Evangelicals and those who believed in God’s Divine plan. According to Simeon:

As religion advances in his soul, he takes deeper views of divine truth, and enters into considerations which, in the earlier stages of his career, found scarcely any place in his mind... He now begins to view with wonder the dealings of God with His ancient people, who from the days of Abraham to the present have been such remarkable objects of His care. He sees their separation from all the rest of mankind, and their wonderful preservation as a peculiar people in all ages: he sees their miraculous redemption from Egypt, their establishment in the promised land, and their final expulsion from that land their manifold transgressions, and especially for their murder of the Messiah. Whilst he beholds them dispersed through the world as objects of universal hatred and contempt, he contemplates God’s design to restore them in due season in their former inheritance, and to a state of piety and blessedness far exceeding anything, which, in their national capacity, they ever possessed. He sees further, the connection which subsists between the restoration of that people, and the salvation of the whole Gentile world; the latter being, in the Divine purpose, the effect and consequence of the former... Now he desires to co-operate with God, so far as his feeble influence can extend, in production of this great event; and he thankfully avail himself of any opportunity that is afforded him to promote the eternal welfare of the Jews.⁵⁹

In other words, when a person becomes “born again,” that person will ponder the state of God’s ancient people.⁶⁰

Thus, the desire for the restoration of the Jews became an “identity marker” for Evangelicals, providing the roots of Christian Zionism.⁶¹ To Simeon, a believer will see

⁵⁸ See Romans 1:16 and 2:10.

⁵⁹ To Rev. J.B. Cartwright, on the effects of Religion in its rise and progress, October 29, 1834. Carus, *Simeon*, 432.

⁶⁰ Being “born-again” or “regenerated” is a common conception within Evangelicalism. It usually denotes a life-changing religious experience where a person chooses to devote his or her life to God.

⁶¹ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 10.

that God has a divine plan and purpose for the conversion and restoration of the Jews. Moreover, a religious person should encourage the welfare of the Jews in order for this great event to occur. Yet, at the same time, Simeon used a negative conception about Jews being “Christ Killers.” This explained why the Jews were scattered throughout the world and lived in an undesirable state. That was their punishment. Nevertheless, the return of the Jews to the Holy Land was so important that Simeon continued that “we cannot but feel ourselves bound to promote this great object to the utmost of our power, and for that end to aid the efforts of the only society in Britain that has that object in view, THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY AMONGST THE JEWS.”⁶² Evangelical leaders like Simeon believed that the LSPCJ had a special role to play in the conversion and the restoration of the Jews, not only in Britain, but throughout the world.

By the 1820s, the LSPCJ had already expanded its missions beyond Britain. Here we see the London Society’s global mission emerge. While the importance of the home mission did not falter, according to Gidney:

The Home field, and especially the metropolis, must indeed ever remain the first consideration of a *London* Society, but only one of a number of others. Wherever the Jews are, there lies the Society’s work. Moreover, the Jews abroad are not surrounded by the same pure and sound Christian principles and life as those in England, and their spiritual need is proportionately greater.⁶³

The establishment of missionary stations abroad was a common strategy of missionary societies during the nineteenth century. The LSPCJ was no different, except for the fact that it established most of its stations in countries where Christianity was already the main

⁶² Carus, *Simeon*, 433-434.

⁶³ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 58.

religion. The first foreign station was established in Holland in 1820. Holland had been the first country Way visited in 1817 when he investigated the “religious condition of the Continental Jews, and the chances of any organized attempt to evangelize them.”⁶⁴ Several more mission stations were established in India, Russia, Poland, and other parts of Europe. In 1820, the LSPCJ established a mission station in Jerusalem. The LSPCJ’s role as an Anglican missionary society was to have “momentous consequences” for Britain’s growing involvement in Palestine in the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ The LSPCJ took, what they earnestly believed, was the next step toward Jewish Restoration by establishing a missionary presence in Palestine.

While the LSPCJ received a significant amount of attention from prominent political and clerical figures, there were also plenty of critics. B.R. Goakman was one of the first major critics of the LSPCJ. Goakman had worked for the London Society’s printing station and left in 1813. In 1816, he published *The London Society Examined*, which was based on his involvement and correspondence with the LSPCJ and Frey.⁶⁶ Moses Sailman, who was a Hebrew teacher from Southampton, published *The Mystery Unfolded* in 1817. Sailman mainly criticized Frey’s behavior, as well as the Society’s converts.⁶⁷ Henry H. Norris, was one of the most out-spoken critics of the LSPCJ during its early years. Norris, who was the head of the High Church Party and a well-known

⁶⁴ Gidney, 82-88.

⁶⁵ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 118.

⁶⁶ Goakman concludes that “It may be necessary to observe that HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE of KENT has withdrawn his patronage from the Institute.” B.R. Goakman, *The London Society Examined*, (London: W. Lewis, 1816), 64.

⁶⁷ Moses Sailman, *The Mystery Unfolded*, (1817).

Tory, criticized the LSPCJ's strategy and leadership.⁶⁸ In 1825, Norris published an inquiry on the London Society and claimed that its mission to convert the Jews was a total failure. Moreover, Norris criticized the fact that the Society had collected £135,000, yet it wasted money to the point where the LSPCJ was left with £12,500 during its first sixteen years.⁶⁹ Norris's animosity toward the LSPCJ, and for that matter Frey, also stemmed from his dislike of religious enthusiasm and the Evangelical movement. Despite the negativity, the LSPCJ continued to grow during this period and expand its missions.

No surprisingly, there were charges of religious "enthusiasm" made about the London Society. In Gidney's history of the LSPCJ, he explained that during the Society's first decade, it was "fully recognized that the duty of supporting Missions to the Jews was altogether a thing apart from the necessity of holding any special views on prophecy."

According to the Second Report of the LSPCJ:

A charge of enthusiasm has been made by some persons concerning the view of the Society; and it has been asserted that your Committee are influenced by foolish and Utopian expectations. Your Committee have already expressed their sentiments in respect of the present circumstances and events of the world. They certainly consider the occurrences of a few years past a peculiarly awful and surprising, and are roused to exertion by the signs of the times. Nevertheless, they are not determined to any measures which they adopt by visionary and uncertain calculations. They wish to distinguish between the restoration of Israel to their own country, and the conversion of Israel to Christianity. If nothing peculiar appeared in the aspect of the times – if neither Jews nor Christians believed the future restoration of Israel – if no expositions of prophecy had awakened

⁶⁸ Peter B. Nockles, "Norris, Henry Handley (1771–1850)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, May 2007.

⁶⁹ H.H. Norris, *The Origin, Progress, and Existing Circumstances of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews: An Historical Inquiry*, (London: J. Mawman, 1825), 1-2. Gidney also mentioned Norris's book: "We cannot deny the truth of some of his statements; we are not concerned to defend all that he attacked. We merely refer to the matter because it is a part of the history of the Society, and caused a great deal of trouble to its managers on account of the high position of the writer." Gidney, 78-79.

attention or excited expectation in men's minds – if it were possible to place things as they stood many centuries ago – still your Committee would urge the importance and propriety of establishing a Jewish Mission. They cannot conceive any just reason should be wholly neglected, and no means employed for their conversion.⁷⁰

A decade later, on October 27, 1823, after some “dissatisfaction was caused by certain prophetic views attributed to the Society,” the LSPCJ “disclaimed all intention of promulgating any particular views as to the nature of the Millennium, their object being the conversion of the Jews to vital Christianity.” As a result, according to Gidney’s account, the Society decided it should maintain a neutral position on prophetic views.⁷¹ It is intriguing that Gidney made a point to claim that the LSPCJ had a neutral position about Jewish conversion. As we have already seen, many prominent figures in the LSPCJ believed that the future restoration of Israel was imminent and that they had a special role in making it come true. Moreover, it was through the restorationist argument that the conversion of the Jews was necessary. It is interesting though that Gidney mentioned this since he wrote this history of the LSPCJ several generations later. Gidney’s point may be to show that the LSPCJ did not try to predict when the Jews were to be restored or they had to be converted first. However, it is hard to deny that the LSPCJ did promote restorationism at all. Yet, many members of the London Society and several of its publications will continue to promote a restorationist message.⁷²

⁷⁰ “Second Report” (1810), 23, quoted in Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 35.

⁷¹ According to Gidney, “This is, of course, the only possible attitude that a missionary society can take up.” Gidney, 71.

⁷² Eitan Bar-Yosef comments on the Evangelicals and the LSCPJ’s reluctance to promote restorationism: “The numerous charges of fanaticism, the derision and the mockery could be said to reflect the contest between competing parties over the definition of and inclusion in the mainstream; but nothing testifies more to their liminal position within Victorian culture than the Christian Zionist’s self-awareness of this

By the 1830s, philosemitism had also become a marker of Evangelical identity. Moreover, it was seen as a distinguishing feature that separated Protestantism from Catholicism and Tractarianism. Lewis claims that the Evangelicals' "sense of Britishness was being refined with philosemitism" becoming a new layer of British identity. Moreover, Britain was seen as "Protestant Israel" whose purpose was to "protect and defend 'Israel according to the flesh' from Roman Catholics."⁷³ Evangelical missions to the "heathen" grew immensely during the nineteenth century as well.⁷⁴ With the establishment of Jewish missions in Palestine and the general growth of missionary activity, the expectation that the Jews were to finally be physically restored became a wide spread belief among British Evangelicals.⁷⁵

Yet, to Jews living in Britain, conversion to Christianity was also a way to integrate into English Society. Most Jews who did convert during this period did so not because of religious impetus, but for political and social recognition. Throughout the nineteenth century, Jewish conversion was by and large a result of assimilation.⁷⁶ Jews

liminality; their own understanding of what cannot, or should not, be articulated openly." "Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture," *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 25.

⁷³ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 102-103.

⁷⁴ For more on Christian missions during the nineteenth century see Ian Bradley, *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*; Stewart J. Brown, *Providence and Empire: 1815-1914*; Hilary M. Carey, *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c. 1801-1908*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Andrew Porter, *Religion versus empire?: British Protestant missionaries and overseas expansion, 1700-1914*, (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004); Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700-1850*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

⁷⁵ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 115.

⁷⁶ Todd Endelman has by far devoted the most attention to this subject. See *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990); *The Jews of Britain, 1650 to 2000*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002); *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999).

who were converted by missionaries were not representative of converted Jews in England.⁷⁷ Historian Todd Endelman maintains that:

In England, instead of inciting the poor to loot and slaughter the Jews, the belief that great events were at hand worked to encourage Jewish resettlement and, at a later date, to ease the legal disabilities from which they suffered. This kind of ‘philo-Semitic’ tradition was ultimately not pro-Jewish, insofar as toleration was intended solely to promote the conversion of the Jews.

Endelman calls this “conversionist” philosemitism.⁷⁸ This type of philosemitism is exactly what the LSPCJ promoted. Moreover, this variation of philosemitism will be important to consider while examining how the status of Jews changed during the nineteenth century. For the London Society, the conversion aspect will remain the main objective by 1917. The need to convert will become more concerned about the physical restoration of the Jews. This is one of the main reasons why Christians Zionists, like Shaftesbury, will not advocate for emancipation but will want to restore Jews to the Promised Land.

The late 1820s were monumental for Catholics and non-Anglican Protestants. Nonconformists achieved emancipation in 1828 with the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act, and Catholics were as well with the Catholic Relief Act in 1829. In the wake of civil disabilities being lifted from Catholics and Dissenters, Jewish emancipation received attention again. With the Jewish Naturalization Bill of 1753 (commonly known as the “Jew Bill”), some members of Parliament, mostly Whigs, believed that giving Jews

⁷⁷ Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 5.

⁷⁸ Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 52, 64.

a home would make them want to convert.⁷⁹ According to Mel Scult, this conversionist way of thinking or tradition is “also part of the history of proto-Zionism.”⁸⁰ In 1830, a bill was proposed which would allow Jews to be able to take seats in Parliament without the requirement of taking a Christian oath. Supporters of the bill believed that it was an extension of what had been achieved for Catholics and Dissenters. Those against the bill wanted to preserve the Christian character of Britain. The bill did not pass, but was reconsidered in 1833 only to be turned down again.

Interestingly enough, two long-standing members of the LSPCJ, Lord Bexley, who had also served as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Robert Grant, son of the director of the East India Company Charles Grant, introduced the bill to the House of Lords and House of Commons, respectively.⁸¹ Bexley and Grant established the Philo-Judean Society to address the social disabilities of British Jews. Both men felt that the LSPCJ did not do enough to help Jewish civil disabilities within British society. Members of the London Society did want to change negative attitudes from others about Jews, but in a way that promoted their conversion. The Philo-Judean Society’s major role was “to prepare the way for divine intervention on the fate of the Jews.” Some members of the LSPCJ were also members of the Philo-Judean Society. The primary difference between the two societies, according to Endelman, was “the commitment of the Philo-Judeans to promoting the integration of the Jews into English life through the removal of discriminatory statutes at the national and local level.”⁸² The London Society would

⁷⁹ See Scult, *Millennial Expectations*, 56-58, 61-62.

⁸⁰ Scult, XV.

⁸¹ Scult, XIV.

⁸² Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 79.

continue to be silent on the subject of Jewish emancipation, and set its eyes on restoring the Jews to the Holy Land in hopes of their ultimate conversion.

Anthony Ashley-Cooper, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, is considered one of the greatest reformers and Evangelicals of the nineteenth century. Shaftesbury was the most prominent and influential supporter of the LSPCJ. According to his official biographer Edwin Hodder, Shaftesbury was “a Christian gentleman first, then a patriot, a statesman, a social reformer, and all that is implied in the word he liked so little – a philanthropist.”⁸³ Most importantly, Shaftesbury became the leading Christian Zionist and was the first parliamentarian to try to pave the way for Jews to establish a homeland.⁸⁴

Shaftesbury was born on August 28, 1801, in London to Cropley Ashley-Cooper, sixth earl of Shaftesbury, and Lady Anne Spencer-Churchill. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford and earned his MA in 1822. Shaftesbury entered parliament in 1826 as a Tory MP for Woodstock. He married Emily Cowper, the step-daughter of Lord Palmerston, in 1830.⁸⁵ During the early 1830s, Shaftesbury became an Evangelical. His close friendship with Edward Bickersteth led him to embrace Evangelicalism. Soon after Shaftesbury became involved with the LSPCJ and other missionary societies.

Shaftesbury’s “spiritual mentor” was Edward Bickersteth, one of the leading Evangelical figures in the Church of England after the death of Charles Simeon in 1836.

⁸³ Edwin Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*, K.G. (London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1892), vi.

⁸⁴ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 107.

⁸⁵ John Wolffe, “Cooper, Anthony Ashley, seventh earl of Shaftesbury (1801–1885),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Jan 2008.

It was Simeon who sparked Bickersteth's interest in Jewish conversion and restoration. Bickersteth became a prominent supporter and Evangelical clergyman of the LSPCJ.⁸⁶ Shaftesbury's close relationship with Bickersteth impacted his pre-millennial and restorationist outlook. In Bickersteth's *The Future Destiny of Israel*, his sermon entitled "The Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel, and our Present Duties to be Witnesses for Christ" details the biblical basis for Jewish restoration, both physically and spiritually:

You will see at once, that this gives an indescribable magnitude and reality to all affecting the Jews. It makes their restoration the crisis of all nations, the fulfillment of the largest hopes of the Church, the momentous event on which all the kingdoms of this world are suspended, and at the arrival of which, they pass away, to give place to him who is King of kings and Lord of lords.

This also makes the establishment of a distinct society, for their spiritual welfare, a matter of vast importance. It answers one of the most plausible objections against the formation of the Jews Society; that other Missionary Societies might undertake this work. No! their case is peculiar; it lies at the root of all other good. It demands, by the magnitude of its consequences, a distinct effort and an undivided attention.⁸⁷

According to Bickersteth, the LSPCJ was vital for the future restoration of Israel. The restoration of the Jews and their conversion to Christianity became one of Shaftesbury's main goals. He became involved in the LSPCJ shortly after his own Evangelical conversion experience. For the rest of his career, Shaftesbury would continue to advocate on behalf of the restoration of the Jews. Shaftesbury believed that this restoration was "a

⁸⁶ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*. 61-62.

⁸⁷ Edward Bickersteth, *The Future Destiny of Israel*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Orrin Rogers, 1840), 10-11. See also *The Restoration of the Jews to Their Own Land in Connection with their Future Conversion and the Final Blessedness of our Earth*. (London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1841).

divine end,” saw “his efforts as the divine means.”⁸⁸ While he was opposed to their civil emancipation, he felt that Britain was destined to be the protector of the Jews.

At this time, Palestine was under the control of the Ottoman Empire, and had not yet become a focal point of British imperialism. The LSPCJ sent Joseph Wolff to Palestine in 1822 to see the state of the Jews under Ottoman rule. Wolff was a Jewish convert originally from Bavaria, but came to England in 1819. He became a missionary for the LSPCJ with a desire to convert the Jews of the Middle East.⁸⁹ John Nicolayson, who was the head of the Jerusalem mission, first went to Palestine in 1826. Nicolayson visited Jerusalem again in 1833 in hope of establishing a permanent base for the LSPCJ. He acquired land on Mount Zion, where the LSPCJ built Christ Church in 1849, the first Protestant church in the Ottoman Empire, which still stands today.⁹⁰

In 1838, the British established a consulate in Jerusalem. This, according to Donald Lewis, “was to be pivotal to Britain’s future involvement in the Near East, and to the engagement of other major powers in the area.”⁹¹ The LSPCJ believed that the establishment of a British Consulate in Jerusalem would help advance Jewish Missions in Palestine.⁹² Britain was the first power to establish such a consulate in Jerusalem. Shaftesbury and members of the LSPCJ believed that its establishment was to protect the

⁸⁸ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 183. Shaftesbury first publically advocated for the restoration in an article for the *Quarterly Review*. In it he anonymously reviewed Lord Lindsey’s *Travels in Egypt and the Holy Land*. Most of the article details the state of European Jews, Jewish missions, and restorationism. “State and Prospects of the Jews,” *Quarterly Review*, 63: 126 (1839): 166-192.

⁸⁹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 101-102. For more on Wolff’s journey see Gidney, 103-116; Lewis, 217.

⁹⁰ Yaron Perry, “Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem: The London Jews’ Society and the Protestant Bishopric,” *Jewish Culture and History*, 4:1 (2001): 65-67.

⁹¹ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 225.

⁹² A.L. Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 14.

legal rights of Jews in Palestine. It was a “turning point” for European involvement in the Middle East.⁹³

The next step to further the aims of the LSPCJ in Palestine was to establish an Anglican Bishopric. The idea had already been considered for several years. In 1840, it was proposed that a joint Protestant Bishopric should be established between the Church of England and the Prussian Lutheran Church. The chosen bishop would alternate between the two churches. The joint-bishopric was an alliance against Roman Catholics and Tractarians. The proposal was ideal for the LSPCJ because it employed many German-speaking missionaries and had a network of missions throughout Europe. The Society’s importance as an Anglican mission “came to the fore.” The LSPCJ wanted to assert its position with the official state church and to bolster support among Anglican bishops.⁹⁴ On September 23, 1841, Shaftesbury wrote: “The Bill for creating the Bishopric of Jerusalem passed last night! May the blessing of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob the Farther of our Lord Jesus Christ, be with it now and for ever!” Shaftesbury believed that the establishment of the bishopric was a sign from God. But he also knew he did not accomplish this alone. On October 12, he wrote in his diary: “the

⁹³ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 236. See also discussion on 240-241. There has been a debate about Lord Palmerston’s motives for establishing a consulate in Jerusalem. Some credit Shaftesbury’s restorationist views to have persuaded Palmerston. The other argument is that Palmerston was more concerned about Russia’s growing influence in Palestine and his objection to the creation of an all-Arab nation. According to Abigail Green, “Despite his awareness of popular restorationism, Palmerston’s real concern was politics, not prophecy.” “The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?” *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 193; M. M. Farzaneh, “British Orientalists, Lord Palmerston, and the British Imperialist Origins of Political Zionism, 1831—1841,” MA thesis, (California State University, Fullerton, 2004), 41; Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine*, 29-57; Mayir Vereté, “Why Was a British Consulate Established in Jerusalem?” *The English Historical Review* 85:335 (1970): 316-345; Ronald Sanders, *The High Walls of Jerusalem: A History of the Balfour Declaration and the Birth of the British Mandate for Palestine*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 3-18

⁹⁴ Lewis, 272-273.

Archbishop confesses that without the Jewish Society he cannot proceed, and that the question is deeply rooted in the heart of England. He is right, and I bless God. This incarnation of love for God's people is the truest Conservative principal, and will save this country."⁹⁵ Again, here lies the importance of the London Society. There is no doubt that without Shaftesbury lobbying for the efforts of the LSPCJ in Parliament or his close relationship to Palmerston, the foreign secretary, it would not have been possible to accomplish these goals. However, it is also clear, that without the LSPCJ's position and efforts as the Church of England's Jewish mission, there would not have been the missionary impetus to do so.⁹⁶

Lord Shaftesbury's Evangelical goal was twofold: the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric and "restoration of an Anglican Israel on the soil of Palestine." Yet, as Barbara Tuchman points out:

Actually it was not the love for the Jewish nation, but concern for the Christian soul, that moved all these good and earnest people. They were interested only in giving to the Jews the gift of Christianity, which the Jews did not want; civil emancipation, which the Jews did want, they consistently opposed.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Diary, quoted in Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*, K.G, 200.

⁹⁶ Lewis claims that, "Only a strictly Anglican society would have been able to cooperate with Frederick William IV of Prussia, in his determination to establish a joint Anglican-Lutheran bishopric in Jerusalem – hence the 1815 decision to make the LJS a strictly Anglican society was to prove momentous in terms of both British and Prussian involvement in Palestine," 119. Lewis explores the establishment of the consulate and the bishopric, as well as Christ Church, in enormous detail. I am indebted to the scholarship he has published. Lewis not only details Shaftesbury's involvement but also how the LSPCJ played a major role. See *Origins of Christian Zionism*, Part III. For the LSPCJ's missions in Palestine, see Eitan Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799-1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Yaron Perry, *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*, (London: Cass, 2003). For more on the establishment of the consulate and bishopric see Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine* and Mayir Vereté, *From Palmerston to Balfour*, 45-77.

⁹⁷ Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 118-120.

This was the conundrum that the Jews of Britain faced during the first half of the nineteenth century. Evangelicals wanted to save the Jews, but not grant them emancipation. So while the LSPCJ wanted to convert the Jews, Tuchman argues that it was not primarily to save Jews on their own accord. Rather, it was for Christians, namely an Anglican nation, to do so for their own salvation. Hence, “Britain out of gratitude if nothing else should return the gift of Christianity to the Hebrews of today.”⁹⁸ Here Tuchman presents the LSPCJ not simply as an Evangelical missionary group, but also as one concerned with the restoration of the Jews. What is interesting is the fact that she makes the LSPCJ historically significant because of their work in restoring Jews to Palestine, and Shaftesbury’s involvement. In a way, Tuchman credits England for promoting restoration decades before Zionism become a movement.

The London Society thus had an historic role in establishing a British foothold into Palestine. It was set apart from other missionary societies. Moreover, the first bishop was a well-known Hebrew Christian clergyman of the LSPCJ, Michael Solomon Alexander. The fact that the London Society was Anglican gave it the legitimacy and authority to have a member become an Anglican Bishop. As will be seen, it is evident that the establishment of the joint-bishopric in Jerusalem gave the LSPCJ an advantage and also fostered the beginnings of Evangelical imperialism in Palestine. Yet interestingly enough, Shaftesbury, like Bickersteth, was very critical of British imperialism. Lewis aptly puts the situation missionaries were in:

Even though the evangelical missionaries were not in Palestine for the greater glory of the British Empire, they generally did believe that the

⁹⁸ Tuchman, 121.

empire had a special responsibility toward the Jews; therefore it was not always easy for the evangelical laymen on the LSJ board of governors in London or its workers on the ground in Palestine, to distinguish between the interests of the empire and those of the Kingdom of God.⁹⁹

The establishment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric in Jerusalem set up the “Protestant agenda” in Palestine.¹⁰⁰ The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews not only helped set up Jewish missions in Palestine, but instilled the idea that the British foothold in Palestine served a divine purpose.

Many British Evangelicals desired the restoration of the Jews, instead of advocating for their emancipation. It is important to consider the LSPCJ’s role with the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric and the controversy over Jewish emancipation. When the LSPCJ was established in 1809 its main purpose had been to convert the Jews of London to Protestant Christianity. By 1841, the London Society had expanded its efforts beyond the British Isles. Yet, while conversion never ceased being the primary goal of the LSPCJ, it became more and more of a mission that sought to restore the Jews to the Holy Land, despite claiming it did not support prophetic views.

⁹⁹ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 232-233.

¹⁰⁰ Perry, “Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem,” 77.

Chapter 3: Building an Empire, Bishop Alexander, and Jewish Emancipation, 1841-1860

The establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1841 was a pinnacle achievement for the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. Many members of the LSPCJ and others in Britain believed the restoration of the Jews to the Promised Land and the fulfillment of God's plan was upon them. The conversion of God's Chosen People was still the primary objective of the LSPCJ and their restoration was to be a direct result. Between their conversion and restoration, Jews were seen as souls to be saved by the missionaries of the LSPCJ who were called for this special purpose. Yet, British interest in Palestine stemmed from both prophetic and imperial interests. As Barbara Tuchman aptly claimed in regards to British interest in Palestine, "Shaftesbury represented the Bible, Palmerston, so to speak, the Sword."¹⁰¹ Shaftesbury's prophetic and philosemitism idea of Jewish restoration was also favorable politically, because, according to Regina Sharif, "Jewish settlement in Palestine became an imperial desideratum for England."¹⁰²

During the nineteenth century, the primary concerns of British statesmen over Palestine involved three major concerns: the balance of power in Europe, the security of India threatened by Russia and France, and the route of communication with India via Syria. The geopolitical position of the Ottoman Empire was critically important in European politics. The "sick man of Europe" held a significant amount of territory in the

¹⁰¹ Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 114.

¹⁰² Regina S. Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 5 (1976): 128.

Middle East, but the threat of its collapse had become a principal concern for the British and other European powers.¹⁰³ For Lord Palmerston, there were two advantages connected with a Jewish presence in Palestine. First, having a “pro-British” partisan group in Palestine would be important for British imperial interests. Second, the Turkish Sultan needed a financial influx of capital to help maintain his empire, thus keeping it from total collapse.¹⁰⁴

Religious and imperial influences both made their mark on British foreign policy during the nineteenth century. Regina Sharif, Abigail Green, and Mateo Farzaneh argue that there has been too much emphasis on the Christian Zionist seeds of Shaftesbury and Palmerston in Zionist historiography. Eitan Bar-Yosef contends that Zionist interpretation has not taken into account the charges of religious enthusiasm and madness associated with nineteenth century projects for Jewish restoration. However, Bar-Yosef does identify that there was an uneasy relationship between millenarian and the imperial in regards to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. He argues that Tuchman’s “Bible and Sword” analogy oversimplifies the relationship between religious and imperial attitudes toward Jewish restoration.¹⁰⁵

During the Palmerstonian era, Britain emerged as a champion of Jewish rights in Muslim lands. Incidents of Jewish persecution such as the Damascus Blood Libel of 1840 instilled sympathy in many Evangelicals. According to Abigail Green, Jews were proxies

¹⁰³ M. M. Farzaneh, “British Orientalists, Lord Palmerston, and the British Imperialist Origins of Political Zionism, 1831—1841,” MA thesis, (California State University, Fullerton, 2004), 29.

¹⁰⁴ Sharif, “Christians for Zion,” 130-131.

¹⁰⁵ Eitan Bar-Yosef, “Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture,” *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 27-28.

for British imperial interests in ways in which Jewish relief now coincided with the legacy of anti-slavery and Christian humanitarian activism. In this way, Green presents the idea that the British Empire represented an “imperialism of human rights” for Jews.¹⁰⁶ Restorationists, and later Christian Zionists, stressed that restoration of the Jews to Palestine was strategically important for the British Empire. Their religious interest did not discount their political interest in the Jews in the Middle East.¹⁰⁷ The three interlocking pillars of Commerce, Christianity, and Civilization defined British ideology and foreign policy. All three of these, Green claims, “had special resonance for the Jews.”¹⁰⁸ It becomes necessary to understand British imperialist policy in Palestine in terms of Evangelicalism and Protestant Theology. This historiographical debate between the legacy of Christian Zionist and British imperialist motives needs to be understood from both sides. Both the Bible and the Sword are a part of Britain’s objectives toward Palestine during the 1840s.

Restorationism and conversionism were the main ideals of the LSPCJ in regards to the Jews of Britain, Europe, and the Middle East. Between 1835 and 1860, Evangelicals were at the peak of their influence. However, during the 1840s there was a split between restorationists who believed that Jews should be converted before their restoration and conversionists who thought that such attempts were ineffective, because Jews were to be converted *en masse* after returning to Palestine. They believed that Jews would retain

¹⁰⁶ Abigail Green, “The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?” *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 178, 188.

¹⁰⁷ Green, 181-182.

¹⁰⁸ Green, 187.

their distinctly Jewish national characteristics.¹⁰⁹ Also during this time, the question over Jewish emancipation continued to be debated in Parliament. Shaftesbury believed, according to Mel Scult, that Jewish restoration to Palestine was the only viable answer to emancipation. It was Shaftesbury's deepest desire to see the Jews restored to Palestine and then become Christian believers. Shaftesbury, who became president of the LSPCJ in 1845, was concerned about the Christian character of Britain's government. This feeling was common among members of the LSPCJ.¹¹⁰ The period between 1841 and 1860 was critical for the debates over restoration and emancipation, but this period also set the tone for Britain's imperial agenda in Palestine.

The establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric joined Britain and Prussia in their pursuit of Protestant dominance in Palestine. Prussian support for the Bishopric stemmed from its Pietist tradition of the eighteenth century. Early nineteenth century Pietists, claims Donald Lewis, were usually "arch-conservatives, fiercely patriotic and avidly promonarchists." Friedrich Wilhelm IV was a strong advocate for the Prussian state church and believed that he had been called by God to help the conditions of Christians in Palestine. Moreover, he wanted to support missionary agencies working in Palestine, especially with Jews.¹¹¹ The architect of the Jerusalem bishopric was the King of Prussia's friend and confidant Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen. Both Friedrich Wilhelm IV and Bunsen shared religious and political values. The Prussian King wanted to emulate

¹⁰⁹ William D. Rubinstein and Hilary L. Rubinstein, *Philosemitism: Admiration and Support in the English-Speaking World for Jews, 1940-1939*, (London: Macmillan, 199), 132-133.

¹¹⁰ Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 139-141.

¹¹¹ Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 276-279.

Britain's model relationship between government and state church. According to Yaron Perry, the idea of establishing a joint Anglo-Prussian Protestant Bishopric had compelled Bunsen for a long time. Bunsen had served as the Prussian envoy to the Vatican until 1838. In December, Bunsen met with Lord Shaftesbury to draft together the "Jerusalem Plan."¹¹² Bunsen proposed to his English friends that the LSPCJ's recently acquired property and mission station could be the central location for the Bishopric. Friedrich Wilhelm supported this plan and believed it would foster a harmonious relationship with the British. Thus, Friedrich Wilhelm suggested to the British that the two countries should establish a joint bishopric at the LSPCJ's station in Jerusalem.¹¹³

According to the agreement the Bishopric was founded to unite and strength the Protestant Churches of Europe "against the encroaches of the See of Rome," and to spread the Gospel of truth and grace.

In the mean time the spectacle of a Church freed from those errors and imperfections, planted in the Holy City, and holding a pure faith in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace, will naturally attract the notice of the Jewish nation throughout the world, and will centralise, as it were, the desultory efforts which are making for their conversion. It is surely impossible not to recognise the hand of Providence in the remarkable events which have lately happened in the East, opening to Christians, and especially to our own nation, (so signal an instrument in bringing those events to pass,) a door for the advancement of the Saviour's kingdom, and for the restoration of God's ancient people to their spiritual birthright.¹¹⁴

The agreement reflected a firm Protestant stance against the Roman Catholic presence in Palestine. Moreover, the conversion of the Jews in Palestine was paramount for the newly

¹¹² Yaron Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, (London: Cass, 2003), 54.

¹¹³ Yaron Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799–1845)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009.

¹¹⁴ Quoted in Alexander McCaul, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, (London: Hatchard and Son, 1845), 10-11.

created Bishopric. Britain had a providential duty to bring Protestant Christianity to the Jews of the Holy Land in order to restore God's Chosen People. Anti-Catholic feelings were prevalent in Britain, which contrasted the philosemitic sentiments among Protestants.¹¹⁵ The partnership with Prussia was a way to strengthen Protestantism by utilizing the LSPCJ's foothold in Palestine.¹¹⁶

To allow Prussia to choose a bishop and have protective authority over Anglican members in Jerusalem, Parliament passed the Jerusalem Bishop Act, which permitted a non-British subject to be an Anglican bishop outside Britain.¹¹⁷ The "Statement of Proceedings relating to the Establishment of the Bishopric" continued that:

His spiritual jurisdiction will extend over the English clergy and congregations, and over those who may join his Church and place themselves under his Episcopal authority in Palestine, and for the present, in the rest of Syria, in Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia; such jurisdiction being exercised, as nearly as may be according to the laws, canons, and customs of the Church of England; the Bishop having power to frame, with the consent of the Metropolitan, particular rules and orders for the peculiar wants of his people. His chief missionary care will be directed to

¹¹⁵ Rubenstein, *Philosemitism*, 142.

¹¹⁶ Another reason for the Bishopric, at least in Shaftesbury's mind, was to fight against Tractarianism. Also known as the Oxford Movement, Tractarianism originated at Oxford University under a group of High Church Anglicans in 1833. It advocated for renewal of Christian traditions and ritual innovations that were lost since the time of the Reformation. Its principal leaders were John Henry Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey. The *Tracts for the Times* were a series of publications produced by this movement under the editorship of Newman. Those who shared these views were called Tractarians. Henry Edward Manning, who was an Anglican Archdeacon, opposed the establishment of the Bishopric. According to Rowan Strong, Manning's initial positive response to the bishopric, shows that he had "greater awareness" of imperial Anglicanism. On the other hand, he claims Newman's negativity toward the project was in part because of his lack of understanding of the Church of England in the context of the British Empire which ultimately caused his "Anglican demise." Rowan Strong, "The Oxford Movement and the British Empire: Newman, Manning and the 1841 Jerusalem bishopric," in *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, Stewart J. Brown and Peter B. Nockles, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 78-80.

¹¹⁷ Perry, *British Mission to the Jews* 52-56.

the conversion of the Jews, to their protection, and to their useful employment.¹¹⁸

The role of the Jerusalem bishop was first and foremost to convert the Jews through the missionary efforts of the London Society and their Prussian counterparts. It should be interesting to note that the protection of the Jews was written as a second concern to their conversion. Jewish relief was one of the main arguments for establishing a British presence in Palestine, thus legitimizing imperial interests. The Bishopric had been established with the understanding that the British and Prussians were there to help protect Jews who were subjects of the Ottoman Empire.

The establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric solidified the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews as the premier Jewish mission in Palestine. Much to the credit of Shaftesbury, Palmerston, the Archbishop of Canterbury Howley, and the Bishop of London Blomfield, the bill to establish the joint Bishopric passed on October 5, 1841. Through their exhibited “full fervor of Evangelical light, spiritual courage and Christian patriotism,” a Protestant Bishop was established in Jerusalem.¹¹⁹ The LSPCJ voted to endow £3,000 toward the British half of the Bishopric fund. The agreement allowed Britain the option to choose the first Bishop. The Archbishop and the Prussian King offered the position to Alexander McCaul, one of the leading missionaries and Hebrew scholars of the LSPCJ, but he declined the offer and felt that a Hebrew

¹¹⁸ Quoted in McCaul, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 11.

¹¹⁹ W.T. Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*, (London: LSPCJ, 1908), 206.

Christian was much more suited for the position. In agreement with McCaul's sentiment, Michael Solomon Alexander, a LSPCJ missionary, was chosen as the first Bishop.¹²⁰

Michael Solomon Alexander was not only one of the LSPCJ's missionaries; he was also a Hebrew Christian. Alexander was born in Schönlanke, a town in the Duchy of Posen in 1799. He grew up in a traditional Jewish household with a father who was an English-born rabbi. In 1820, Alexander went to Britain and became a private tutor in Colchester. In Colchester, he was exposed to the New Testament, and was later offered by the chief rabbi to be the rabbi of Norwich. He also became the *shochet* and prayer leader in Plymouth. On November 3, 1824, Alexander married Deborah Levy, whom he met while he was in Plymouth. In 1825, as a result of his flirtations with Christianity, Alexander finally converted. He was baptized on June 22 at St. Andrew's Church in

¹²⁰ Gidney, 207. Alexander McCaul became a missionary for the LSPCJ in 1821 and was sent to Poland. There he studied Hebrew and German in Warsaw. In 1822, McCaul went to St. Petersburg where he met with the Tsar, and returned that year to England and was ordained. McCaul served as the head of the Warsaw mission from 1823 to 1830. He settled back to England at Palestine Place in 1832 in order to support the London Society and to found the Jews' Operatives Converts Institution. In 1840, McCaul became the principal of the LSPCJ's Jewish college. He later became the professor of Hebrew and rabbinical literature at King's College, London when Alexander became the Bishop in 1841. McCaul was also elected the chair of divinity in 1846, as well as became a professor of ecclesiastical history. W. A. J. Archbold, "McCaul, Alexander (1799–1863)," rev. H. C. G. Matthew, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009. McCaul published several sermons and pamphlets relating to Judaism, restorationism, the bishopric, and biblical texts. See *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews*, (London: B. Wertheim, 1838); *The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews, two sermons*, (London: Benjamin Wertheim, 1838); *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, (London: Hatchard and Son, 1845); *The Old Paths; or a Comparison of the Principles and Doctrines of Modern Judaism with the Religion of Moses and the Prophets*, (London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1846); *New Testament Evidence to prove that the Jews are to be Restored to the Land of Israel*, 3rd ed. (London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1850). McCaul's daughter, Elizabeth, married James Finn who served as the British consul in Palestine from 1845 to 1863. Both were very involved with the LSPCJ. Finn wrote and published several books about his and Elizabeth's time in Palestine, as well as his activities as the consul and with the LSPCJ. See James Finn, *Stirring Times, or, Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles 1853 to 1856*, Volumes I and II, (London, C. Kegan Paul, 1878).

Plymouth, and his wife Deborah was baptized later on November 9 at All Hallows Church in Exeter.

Shortly after his baptism, Alexander became the secretary for the Church of Ireland's Jews' Society in Dublin. In 1827, he was ordained as a deacon and later as a priest by letters of emissary from the archbishop of Dublin. It was also during this time that Alexander met Joseph Wolff and followed him to join the LSPCJ. Alexander was sent to serve as a missionary in Danzig, West Prussia for the London Society. While in Danzig, he helped open a school for the children of the Jewish community, but this project was abandoned when he returned in England in 1830. During the 1830s, Alexander helped revise the London Society's editions of the Hebrew Bible and the Hebrew translation of the New Testament. In 1832, Alexander became the professor of Hebrew and rabbinical literature at King's College, London, and also received a doctorate of divinity from Trinity College, Dublin.¹²¹

On Sunday, November 11, 1841, Alexander was consecrated as the first Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem in Lambeth Palace chapel. Shaftesbury and other prominent supporters of the LSPCJ were present for the momentous occasion. The Jerusalem Bishopric Act enabled Alexander to become an Anglican Bishop, even though he was not

¹²¹ Yaron Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799–1845)." For more biographical information about Michael Solomon Alexander and his work in Palestine see Muriel W. Corey, *From Bishop to Rabbi: The Biography of the Right Reverend Michael Solomon Alexander, Bishop in Jerusalem*, (London: Church Missions to the Jews, 1956); Kelvin Crombie, *A Jewish Bishop in Jerusalem*, (Christ Church, Jerusalem: Nicolayson's Ltd., 2006); Todd Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990), 158-159; W.T. Gidney, "Biographies of Eminent Hebrew Christians: Bishop Alexander," (1903), Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 156/12; Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism*, 271-298; H.J. Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century*, (London: Duckworth, 1936), 216-219; Perry, *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*; A.L. Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

a British subject.¹²² In his farewell sermon on November 8, Alexander thanked the LSPCJ for the past fourteen years of his service. He encouraged the missionaries of the LSPCJ to promote God's ultimate plan and that the Lord would sustain them in their efforts. He declared that they were "God's chosen instruments" and "to be the bearers of glad tidings unto Zion." They were to be the representatives of the Church of England to spread the Gospel to the Jews.¹²³ Alexander insinuated that the missionaries of the LSPCJ were chosen by God to convert His chosen people.

On December 7, Bishop Alexander sailed on the *Devastation* to the Holy Land. Alexander entered the Jaffa Gate on January 21, 1842. Alexander met with the pasha of Jerusalem and received his approval to enter Palestine.¹²⁴ Bishop Alexander was the "heart and soul" of the LSPCJ, according to Yaron Perry, who had "raised great hopes in its members as to the possibilities for the development of its small mission station in Jerusalem." Before his departure to Palestine, Shaftesbury wrote to Alexander that "We [the members of the committee] confidently trust that the Faith, and zeal for the conversion of Israel which marked your course in a humbler station and a foreign land, will by God's grace, burn with tenfold brightness in the land of your Fathers." His statement is quite interesting considering the fact that Alexander grew up in the province of Posen, not Palestine. Shaftesbury, like many other Evangelicals, categorized Alexander's Jewishness in both racial and national terms. Alexander represented the most earnest desire of the London Society: a converted Jew "returning" to the Holy Land for

¹²² Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 209-210.

¹²³ M.S. Alexander, *Farewell Sermon, Preached at the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, Palestine Place, Bethnal Green*, (London: B. Wertheim, 1841), 17-18.

¹²⁴ Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799-1845)."

the first time. His appointment as the first Protestant Bishop in Jerusalem solidified the LSPCJ's mission in Palestine and gave it political legitimacy. The LSPCJ took no time in reaping the benefits of the Jerusalem Bishopric to further its own aims in Palestine.¹²⁵

Since 1820 the LSPCJ had had a missionary presence in Palestine, but the arrival of a new bishop dramatically changed the Society's position. The mission in Palestine to convert the Jews to Christianity was Alexander's first and foremost task upon his arrival. During his tenure as the Jerusalem Bishop, Alexander helped pave the way for establishing intuitions and building ties with the Jewish communities in Palestine. Almost one month after arriving, Alexander laid down the foundation of the site of the first Protestant church to be built in Jerusalem on February 28, 1842. The ceremony was held for this momentous achievement, where the Bishop's wife left the inscription in the cornerstone:

The foundation stone of this church erected on Mount Zion Jerusalem by the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was laid this first day of November (All Saints Day) in the year of our Lord MDCCCXLII [1842] and the seventh year of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by Mistress Alexander the lady of the Right Reverend the Anglican Lord Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem.¹²⁶

This church became the LSPCJ's Christ Church, which was inaugurated on January 21, 1849.¹²⁷ Bishop Alexander left his mark both literally and figuratively in Palestine and on the London Society.

¹²⁵ Quoted in Yaron Perry, "Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem: The London Jews' Society and the Protestant Bishopric," *Jewish Culture and History*, 4:1 (2001): 72-73.

¹²⁶ Quoted in Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799–1845)."

¹²⁷ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 244.

Alexander continued to establish important mission outlets in Palestine. In 1843, he dedicated the New Hebrew College which was to train new converts to become missionaries. Alexander also helped the LSPCJ establish a school of industry to teach converts specialized working habits and skills. In 1844, he founded a book depot near the Jewish quarter in order to sell Jewish scriptures in various languages and handout New Testaments. The depot was managed by converted Jews who would read passages from the Hebrew Bible and New Testament to other Jews. On December 12, the LSPCJ opened the Jews' Hospital on Mount Zion which became the most important asset of the mission in Palestine during the nineteenth century. According to Perry, the joint bishopric in Jerusalem, under Alexander and his successors, established the basis for all Christian activity in Palestine. The new Protestant communities emerged as their legal status improved in the Ottoman Empire. With the help of the LSPCJ and other missionary organization, institutions for education, charity, health and welfare were established which attracted more people to Palestine.¹²⁸

The main objective of the LSPCJ's efforts under Alexander was to show Jews that anti-Semitic attitudes had been abandoned and that Evangelicals were truly concerned for their well-being. According to Lewis, Evangelicals saw the appointment of a Hebrew Christian as a "major breakthrough in overcoming English anti-Jewish attitudes, in a curious way a righting of the wrongs done by Christians to Jews in the past."¹²⁹

¹²⁸ Gidney, 232-239; Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799–1845)." Yaron Perry has written a significant amount of scholarship on the LSPCJ's history and involvement in Palestine during the nineteenth century. For more information on the LSPCJ's missions and activities in Palestine see *British Mission to the Jews*, 57-77. For medical missions see Yaron Perry and Efraim Lev, "The Medical Activities of the London Jews' Society in Nineteenth-Century Palestine," *Medical History* 47:1 (2003): 67–88.

¹²⁹ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 292-294.

Alexander's appointment represented the LSPCJ's ultimate goal. The 1842 Report stated that the establishment of the Bishopric and Alexander's appointment were:

far beyond our most sanguine hopes, and almost beyond the contemplation of our prayers: may we say, in the pious language of our Liturgy, that "God who is always more ready to hear than we to pray, and is wont to give more than either we desire or deserve," has exceeded all that we could ask or think. We saw a Hebrew of the Hebrews, after centuries of contempt, degradation, and suffering, raised from the mire in which we Gentiles had trampled his nation, and elevated to the highest office in the Christian Church, – consecrated to those services which, during seventeen hundred years, had never been listened to from Jewish lips, – destined in God's mercy, to carry back the message of peace to the source from which it had originally flowed, and on the very scene of the life and passion of our dearest Lord, to present, the more conspicuously by his eminent station, the first-fruits of an humbled, penitent, and returning people.¹³⁰

Bishop Alexander's career epitomized the LSPCJ's mission. While not explicitly a restorationist, Alexander believed that the Jews were to return to the Holy Land. His position as Bishop was focused more on converting and helping the Jewish community in Jerusalem and other areas of Palestine. His labors in Jerusalem were seen as evidence of God's approval of the establishment of the Bishopric by the British.

In May 1845, at Exeter Hall in London, Shaftesbury spoke at a meeting with several other missionary societies about the revival on behalf of "God's ancient people," and about the good labors of Bishop Alexander in Jerusalem. He continued:

Our Church and our nation have been called to the glorious service of making known the Gospel of Christ to the many thousands of Israel. Now in whatever light I view this great question, where I regard it as purely secular, whether I regard it as purely religious, or whether I regard it as

¹³⁰ LSPCJ Report (1842) quoted in Thomas D. Halsted, *Our Missions: A History of the Principal Missionary Transactions of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, (London: MacIntosh, 1866), 158-159.

partaking both characters, I see no subject which can surpass, or even approach it, in magnitude and in all those attributes which feed the imagination and stir into life the warmest energies of the heart.... We rejoice in the end and hopes of this Society, as seeking the fulfillment of a long series of prophecies, and the institution of unspeakable blessings both in time and in eternity, for all the nations of the world. We believe (and we act, too, as we believe) that, if the casting away of the Jewish people be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead; and turn where you will to examine the operations of this and all kindred Societies, and every people on earth, and you will see in our tardy progress, and in our comparative unfruitfulness, the necessity of this revival.... It is our duty, our most high and joyous duty, that every effort be made, that no exertion be spared, that all our toil be given, by day and by night, that into every prayer, with all our souls, this special supplication should enter, for the revival and exaltation, be it figurative or be it literal, of repented and forgiven Jerusalem.¹³¹

Shaftesbury's eyes had been set on the restoration of the Jews and their ultimate conversion. This was the Evangelical vision Shaftesbury and the members of the LSPCJ had of the Jerusalem Bishopric. Yet, Shaftesbury was also fiercely anti-Catholic. He viewed Catholicism as a threat to the Church of England and to the mission to the Jews in Palestine. It was the duty of Britain and the Church of England, not the Roman Catholic Church, to bring the Gospel to the Jews in Palestine. Shaftesbury was calling on all Protestant missionary societies to band together to fulfill God's promise.

The establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric and the appointment of Michael Solomon Alexander signified a momentous achievement not only for the London Society, but also for the emerging Christian Zionist movement. However, the benefits that the LSPCJ reaped from having one of their own missionaries was short lived. Bishop Alexander suddenly died on November 23, 1845, from a ruptured blood vessel near his heart while he was on his way to Cairo in the village of Ras el-Wadi. Bishop Alexander

¹³¹ *Jewish Intelligence*, May 1845, quoted in *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 12.

was buried on December 20, in the LSPCJ's cemetery near the Jaffa Gate.¹³² Members of the LSPCJ and the Church of England were shocked and saddened by the news. Many of them believed that Alexander's appointment was a sign of God's good will for Palestine, for Britain, and for the Jews. Shaftesbury was heartbroken, and had earnestly believed that Alexander signified the important work of the LSPCJ. He lamented that it had "seemed to us that we acted in faith for the honour of His name, and in the love of His ancient people; but now it would appear that the thing was amiss, and not according to God's wisdom and pleasure."¹³³

Alexander's death came too early, and the expectation of Israel's restoration had not been fulfilled.¹³⁴ The LSPCJ's mission in Palestine would continue, but it would not be the same. Kelvin Crombie, the current historian of the CMJ, asserts that Bishop Alexander's restorationist legacy still remains today.¹³⁵ Alexander may even be considered one of the first Christian Zionists who was originally Jewish. The establishment of the British Consulate in 1838 was the first step toward making Jerusalem ripe for restoration. Yet, it was also the Jerusalem Bishopric with the installation of Alexander that solidified the LSPCJ's role as a major British and missionary presence in Palestine.

After the death of Bishop Alexander, it was Friedrich Wilhelm's turn to select the next bishop. Bunsen proposed Samuel Gobat, a native of Crémone, near Moutier, in the

¹³² Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 240-242; Perry, "Alexander, Michael Solomon (1799-1845)."

¹³³ Quoted in McCaul, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 13.

¹³⁴ Crombie, *A Jewish Bishop in Jerusalem*, 238.

¹³⁵ Crombie, ix.

canton of Bern, Switzerland, who was the deputy director of the Protestant College in Malta. Gobat came to England in 1825 and became a missionary for the Church Missionary Society (CMS). Gobat had made a name for himself through his missionary work in Syria, Egypt, and Ethiopia. In July 1846, Gobat was consecrated as the Jerusalem Bishop and arrived in December.¹³⁶ The LSPCJ urged Gobat to become a vice-patron of the society which he accepted. However, Gobat's vision for the Bishopric was not centered on the conversion and restoration of the Jewish People. Gobat wanted to build better relations with the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, and direct efforts more to Muslims than Jews.¹³⁷

During Gobat's time as the Jerusalem Bishop, the LSPCJ premier status began to decline. In 1851, the CMS entered Palestine with a mission not exclusively to Jews but also to the Eastern churches. Moreover, the LSPCJ's status as the representative of British interests in Palestine eroded.¹³⁸ Gobat remained the Bishop until his death in 1879. The British chose Joseph Barclay as his replacement, who had served as the head of the LSPCJ in Palestine during the 1860s. However, Barclay died prematurely in 1881.¹³⁹ In 1882, the Germans decided not to nominate a new bishop, as it was their turn, and wanted to end their arrangement with the British. The joint bishopric formally ended in 1886, but remained exclusively Anglican. This allowed the British full jurisdiction of the Bishop of Jerusalem, but kept a harmonious relationship with their German brothers at Christ

¹³⁶ Yaron Perry, "Gobat, Samuel (1799–1879)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2007.

¹³⁷ Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 92-95. For information more on Gobat's years as Bishop see Perry, 92-120; Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 299-213; Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine*, 86-121.

¹³⁸ Perry argues that the 1850s and 1860s were a period of decline for the LSPCJ. By the late 1870s there was a resurgence in the Palestine mission. Perry, 98-104.

¹³⁹ Perry, "Anglo-German Cooperation," 75.

Church.¹⁴⁰ Yet, despite the agreement's end, the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric established the Protestant agenda in Palestine for the rest of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, it solidified the LSPCJ's foothold, according to Perry, that "riveted the imagination of millions of Protestants in the Western world."¹⁴¹

Between the 1840s and 1850s, the LSPCJ's mission station in Palestine remained its crowning glory, yet the original mission to the Jews of Britain remained central. In 1840, the Hebrew College was opened at Palestine Place to train missionaries under Alexander McCaul. According to Gidney's records, there were 542 baptisms of adults and children between 1843 and 1849. The 1849 Annual Report stated that the average number of Hebrew Christian communicants were fifty to sixty. However, by the 1850s the "palmy days" of the LSPCJ's London mission were over. The LSPCJ's relative success, as far as converting Jews, was never surpassed after this period.¹⁴² The 1858 Jubilee Report offered several statistics of the Society's spending over the last fifty years and the number of missionary stations. According to the report the LSPCJ collected £881 between 1838 and 1844, £1,031 between 1845 and 1851, and £1,006 between 1852 and 1858 in annual subscriptions. The total income during these same three periods were £22,561, £28,171, and £30,452 respectively.¹⁴³ So while the London Society did not necessarily grow in the average number of converts during the 1850s, it did grow significantly in annual income. It was also reported that there were 30 LSPCJ mission

¹⁴⁰ Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 117-119.

¹⁴¹ Perry, "Anglo-German Cooperation," 77.

¹⁴² Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 216-217.

¹⁴³ The total income included annual subscriptions, donations, associations, legacies, special funds, and dividends. *A Jubilee Memorial; or Record of Proceedings of the History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews During the Jubilee Year of 1858*, (London: William Macintosh, 1867), "Septennial Average Income & Expenditure," 17.

stations including several major European cities such as Paris, Berlin, and Turin. There were a total of 112 agents of which 29 were ordained missionaries, 35 unordained missionaries, 24 colporteurs, scripture readers, and other agents, and 24 school masters and mistresses. The highest number of agents were in Posen, Jerusalem, and London. There were 13 agents in Jerusalem, 6 of whom were Jewish converts. London had 10 agents, 3 of whom were Jewish converts.¹⁴⁴

Both restorationism and conversionism formed the Evangelical creed of the LSPCJ, which would have a lasting effect on British interests in Palestine for the rest of the nineteenth century. The LSPCJ professed that the mission's purpose was "solely a missionary one."¹⁴⁵ However, many of the leaders and members of the Society shared prophetic restorationist views about the state of the Jews. While it seemed most of those who were prominent figures within the LSPCJ, like Simeon, Bickersteth, Shaftesbury, Way, and McCaul were outspoken restorationists, there were other members who did not believe in these prophetic views. William W. Ewbank, a minister of St. George's Church in Everton, delivered a very controversial speech at the Liverpool Auxiliary anniversary meeting on October 21, 1849, in which Shaftesbury was also present. Ewbank felt it was his duty to share the anti-restorationist side of the Jewish question and why restorationism was "repugnant to the word of God." The nature of Old Testament

¹⁴⁴ *A Jubilee Memorial*, "Historical and Tabular Statements," 18-20. The report also highlighted the breakdown of the Society Jubilee collection. Its main purpose was first, to help fund the new mission station in North Africa, second, to print new editions of Hebrew Scriptures and tracts, and third, to help fund new building projects for various mission stations. The total sum of the fund was £7,358. A summary of contributions from auxiliaries and associations between 1857 and 1860. The report broke down the contributions list by county in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, and listed each amount per auxiliary. The list also included auxiliaries in the empire including Canada and Australia. *A Jubilee Memorial*, 25-36.

¹⁴⁵ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 35, 71, 211. Also see Rules and Regulations I and IV.

prophecy was not intended to be unconditional or destined to be literally accomplished. Instead, Ewbank added that the Jews were to be restored to the one true Church of God.¹⁴⁶ J.A. Pieritz, a Jewish convert who worked for the LSPCJ in western England, issued a lecture from 1848 in response to Ewbank. Pieritz's speech defended restorationism with his scriptural interpretation and stated, in reference to Ewbank, "that if a *Gentile* proves Jerusalem's Destruction, a *Jew* ought to prove its Restoration." Moreover, he explained that:

My answer is, that none has more right to stand up to defend, on Scriptural Grounds, the National Restoration of the Jews, than a Baptized Jew. Every Jew has a right; nay, is bound to believe that the Jews, as a nation, will be restored to their Land; not because they *deserve* it, but because God has *promised* it.¹⁴⁷

Here Pieritz explained restorationism from the view of a converted Jew. Both converted and unconverted Jews were a nation to be restored as promised by God. However, Ewbank did not back down from his anti-restorationist views and continued to defend his argument. To Ewbank, the doctrine of Jewish restoration was "directly opposed to the true idea of Apostolic Christianity."¹⁴⁸

In a way, Pieritz's statement about the inherent right that Jews, both converted and unconverted, had to be restored to the Holy Land is thought-provoking. Pieritz was speaking on their right to be restored, not their civil disabilities. But, if Jews were to be

¹⁴⁶ William Withers Ewbank, *The National Restoration of the Jews to Palestine Repugnant to the Word of God*, (Liverpool: Deighton and Laughton, 1849), 2-23, 31.

¹⁴⁷ J.A. Pieritz, *The Prophetic Promise of the National Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*, (London: Wetheim & Mackintosh, 1850), 5-6.

¹⁴⁸ William Withers Ewbank, *A Distinction without a Difference*, (Liverpool: Deighton and Laughton, 1850), 14, Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 148/1.

treated in such high regard by Evangelicals, then would it not have been advantageous to help with their civil disabilities? They were seen as a nation, recognized by Evangelicals as a special group that would help advance England and the British Empire by their own restoration to Palestine. The LSPCJ continued to maintain that its first priority was to the spiritual welfare of the Jews, and assisting them with their livelihood was second. By establishing hospitals, schools, places for employment, and other outreaches, the LSPCJ tried to promote Christianity through missionary stations and establishing a presence in Jewish areas. The London Society saw that they were doing God's providential work and advancing British interests in Palestine, while at the same time, most Jews wanted civil emancipation at home.¹⁴⁹

The inherent need for British protection of the Jews and Evangelical philosemitism impacted the underlying religious and political agenda for Britain in the Middle East. The establishment of the consulate in 1838 and the bishopric in 1841 were a result of the efforts of Palmerston and Shaftesbury. While there has been significant attention on British protection of the Jews, there has been a lack of attention on Jews as

¹⁴⁹ In *Palestine: The Rebirth of an Ancient Nation*, Albert Montefiore Hyamson, who was an English civil servant, a renowned historian, and an official in Palestine under the British Mandate system, includes a chapter on Jerusalem and explains the Britain's involvement in Palestine, as well as restorationism. He details Sir Moses Montefiore's involvement in Palestine, as well as the status of poor Jews in mid-nineteenth century. Hyamson briefly mentions two types of charities available to Jews, with the LSPCJ being one he does not particularly admire: "Of two house of industry one, that for men, was conducted by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. It was doomed to inefficacy from its initiation. The conversionist movement had never had the slightest success among the Jews of the Holy Land, despite their extreme poverty. The institution aroused suspicion on account of its sponsors, and the Jews of Palestine preferred death from starvation to living by bread which to them was tainted." Albert M. Hyamson, *Palestine: The Rebirth of an Ancient Nation*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1917), 71-72. His take is that the Jews of Palestine were experiencing a high rate of unemployment. According to Hyamson, this bad predicament allowed the LSPCJ an opportunity to help poorer Jews in Palestine. Yet, he argues that their main goal tainted their work and probably produced insincere conversion if at all. For his discussion on the Jerusalem Bishopric and other projects see also *British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews*, The British Palestine Committee, (Leeds: Petty & Sons, Ltd., 1917).

active contributors within the British Empire. Green asserts that Sir Moses Montefiore's role as an agent of British interests has been overshadowed. His visit to Palestine in 1839 impacted early Christian Zionists and members of the LSPCJ. Moreover, Montefiore has been remembered primarily for his philanthropic efforts for Jews in Palestine, which he visited several times from 1828 to 1875. Most importantly, Montefiore helped instill a British identity among Jews in Palestine. He also wished for the restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land, but not for the same reasons as Shaftesbury and members of the LSPCJ did. Jews in the Ottoman Empire, Persia, and Morocco, according to Green, emerged as key intermediaries for the British as both employees for the consular corps and as local partners for British traders. In this way, Jews were treated as "fully fledged" British imperial subjects well before their civil emancipation in 1858.¹⁵⁰

The London Society did not officially take a stance on Jewish emancipation. As mentioned in the previous chapter, not all members of the LSPCJ were against Jewish emancipation. However, many, including Lord Shaftesbury, were opposed to supporting emancipation on the basis that Britain was a Christian nation and allowing Jews to become members of Parliament would violate its Christian character. The Jews had the right to be restored and converted (or vice versa) but not become members of Parliament. Shaftesbury did vote in favor of the Jewish Disabilities Act of 1845, which allowed Jews to hold local offices, because they were only to carry out the law. Shaftesbury's take on the emancipation issue rested with restorationism and conversionism.¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ Green, "The British Empire and the Jews," 179-183.

¹⁵¹ Scult, *Millennial Expectations*, 138-139.

In 1847, Baron Lionel de Rothschild, who was one of the most prominent Jews in British society, had been elected a representative for the City of London. However, he did not take his seat because he refused to take a Christian oath. Between 1846 and 1848, the Conservative Party experienced an “identity crisis.” Protectionists were a faction of Conservatives who opposed the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. After election of the 1847, Conservatives had to face the crisis within their party and were confronted with the issue of Jewish emancipation. The Jewish Disabilities Removal Bill of 1847 would allow Jews to become members of Parliament and not be required to swear a Christian oath. The bill signified to Conservatives that allowing Jews to become MPs would constitute a crucial constitutional change. Moreover, if Jews were allowed to become MPs, then the door would open up for other non-Christian religious groups as well. Heera Chung argues that the question over Jewish emancipation shows how the Protectionist party kept its identity “as a party of the Church establishment.”¹⁵² Also, to some degree anti-Semitism was a factor on Conservative objection to Jewish emancipation. Jews, they argued, denied the divinity of Christ, and were the descendants of those who crucified Him. There were moderate Evangelicals, including some members of the LSPCJ, who felt a strong antagonism toward Jews who denied Christ and that their conversion was the only way to qualify. Shaftesbury opposed on the principal that he could not agree to abolish the oath.¹⁵³ Lord George Bentinck and Benjamin Disraeli, who was himself a converted Jew, supported the bill, unlike the majority of the Protectionist Conservatives. However, Bentinck’s support lost him his leadership over the Protectionist party. Bentinck argued

¹⁵² Heera Chung, “From a Protectionist Party to a Church Party, 1846-48: Identity Crisis of the Conservative Party and the Jew Bill of 1847,” *Albion* 36:2 (2004): 256-264.

¹⁵³ Chung, 267-269.

that Jewish disabilities should be removed on the basis of religious liberty. Disraeli contended that Jews were the theological and historical forerunners of Christianity, and therefore they had a right to be members in a Christian Parliament.¹⁵⁴

While the LSPCJ formally did not directly involve itself in the debate over the Jewish Disabilities Removal Bill, there were several members who did. James J. Reynolds, the associate secretary of the LSPCJ, published six lectures that were delivered at the Church of St. Saviour in York in order to “promote an interest in the welfare of God’s ancient people.” In the sixth lecture, “The Duty of the Christian Church Toward the Jews,” Reynolds detailed why Jews should not be granted emancipation, despite acknowledging that Christians had neglected the needs of Jews. He argued that:

It is not our intention to enter upon the question of the admission of the Jews to political power. We believe that as a Christian people we ought never to do this. It is the duty of the State to protect them equally with its other subjects; to give them all the rights of citizens, which are consistent with its character as a Christian institution; but we cannot admit that it is any part of its duty to make those who reject Christ, who regard him as an impostor, lawmakers for a Christian land. To the Jews, as an industrious, a peaceable, a loyal part of our population, be all kindness and justice manifested but when they say give up the Christianity of your Legislature; affirm that the true faith of a Christian is an empty thing; admit us, as the representatives of your people, even though we reject their religion, though we deny the claims of Him from whom it takes its very name; then not only the constitution of our land, but the principles of the Scriptures of truth should compel us to reply: Ours is a Christian country; our constitution is that of a Christian land; the name and the religion of Christ

¹⁵⁴ Chung, 272-275; Ursula Henriques, “The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *Past & Present*, 40 (1968): 137. Benjamin Disraeli is considered to be one of the most famous Jewish Christians of the nineteenth century. Disraeli’s father, Isaac, left the Jewish faith and baptized his son when he was twelve years old. Disraeli’s conversion was not an outcome of the works or influences of missionary groups like the LSPCJ, but rather as a way to assimilate and be fully integrated into British society. Although he was not a direct supporter or a product of the Society, Disraeli was the ideal Jewish Christian who the Society promoted. See also T.M. Endelman. and T. Kushner, eds., *Disraeli’s Jewishness* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002) and Cecil Roth, *Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952).

are dear to us; our national prosperity depends much on our national obedience even as that of your nation did, and we are therefore bound by every holy principle to reject your claim to have a voice in the legislature of a Christian people.

We do not pursue this matter further, because it would divert us from the subject before us, which is, *our duties towards the Jews as immortal beings*, who are ignorant of the way of salvation; duties which are incumbent on us as Christians desirous of obeying our Master's commands and of promoting his glory.¹⁵⁵

The issue of Jewish emancipation was in direct conflict with the character of Britain's Christian Parliament. In a light similar to Shaftesbury's disapproval, Reynolds insinuated that to be a lawmaker of a great Christian nation, one must be a believer in Christ. Jewish emancipation was a constitutional issue to British Evangelicals. Reynolds did not paint Jews as unreliable or mistrustful, rather he showed them as incompatible with Britain's political system. It was the state's job to protect Jews equally under the law, but they disqualified themselves from Parliament because they would not take a Christian oath. Yet, more importantly, Reynolds stressed that Britain's prosperity depended on being a Christian nation. While the London Society largely stressed on the restoration of the Jews, their conversion was more important to gain their civil liberties.

Reynolds contended "that in exertions for the extension of Christ's kingdom, by the instruction and conversion of men, the Jews have next to our own countrymen, the first and strongest claim." The nation's Christian nature was not bound to the British Isles, but was to be an essential part of the British Empire. He called his listeners and readers to suspect the sincerity of their Christian profession, and to pray for "Our countrymen at

¹⁵⁵ James J. Reynolds, *Six Lectures on the Jews*, (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1847), vii, 177-178.

home, our countrymen abroad in our colonies, in our army, in our navy.” Britain’s duty was to build Christ’s kingdom in Britain and throughout the Empire. Reynolds continued:

The great mass of the population of many of our large towns are almost ignorant of the truths of Christianity: tens of thousands of their children are untaught, uncared for, and vice—the produce of neglected moral culture—abounds; as do rank and poisonous weeds, where no hand the husbandman cultivates the soil. No man can seriously reflect upon “the perils of our nation” — the growth of our neglect of home duties—and not tremble at the result. The elements of a direful convulsion are gathering, and we may justly fear, that ere long the mighty storm will burst, and, if God prevent not overwhelm us in its rushing ruin. Here, then, is our *first* duty,—if we would save our country, if we would preserve our colonies, if we would not have Ichabod inscribed on our national banner, and the generation who may succeed us cursing their fathers’ memories; because that to them were given the means of averting the terrible catastrophe which has befallen, and they used them not.¹⁵⁶

The fate of Britain’s prosperity was tied to its providential empire and Christian identity. The conversion of the Jews and bringing the gospel to the local populations were paramount to sustaining Britain as a sanctified Christian nation. Reynolds continued his lecture with a list of duties. He stated that the “provision for the spiritual necessities of our own countrymen, at home or in our colonies, or in foreign lands, it is the duty of the Church to provide that the Gospel should be preached to the Jews.”¹⁵⁷ Whether in Britain, in the empire, or in other lands, it was the duty of the Church of England to bring to the Gospel to the Jews. It was Britain’s duty to convert and restore the Jews, not let them sit in Parliament.

Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and son of William Wilberforce, led the opposition to Jewish emancipation in the House of Lords. In June 1847 at an LSPCJ

¹⁵⁶ Reynolds, 179-180.

¹⁵⁷ Reynolds, 203.

meeting, Wilberforce claimed that “the Jews have no home for which to fight, no nation for which to feel, no literature by which to be lifted up, no hope, and hardly a God.”¹⁵⁸ Wilberforce argued that admitting the Jews to Parliament would lead to a separation between Church and State. In May 1848, the bill passed through the House of Commons twice, but was ultimately defeated in its second reading in the House of Lords by 128 to 163 votes.¹⁵⁹

The year 1858 marked the Jubilee year of the London Society. For the Jews of England, 1858 was the year of their long awaited civil emancipation. Those in favor of the conversion of the Jews and Jewish emancipation were two important diverging forces during the 1850s. Conversionists would not advocate emancipation, because it allowed Jews to become full members of society without the need to convert to Christianity. Rothschild won his seat again in 1854 and in 1857, but would still not take the Christian oath. In 1858, Lord John Russell, the Liberal leader, introduced another Oath Bill. It was proposed by Lord Lucan that each house should have the right to vote separately and form an oath they deemed acceptable. The Jewish Relief Act passed on July 23, and Rothschild was finally able to take his seat three days later.¹⁶⁰

While the conversionist motives of the LSPCJ seemed to promote the message that Christian Anglicanism was much better than Judaism, the eminent Anglo-Jewish

¹⁵⁸ Quoted in Henriques, “The Jewish Emancipation Controversy,” 137-138.

¹⁵⁹ Chung, “From a Protectionist Party to a Church Party,” 277.

¹⁶⁰ Victor Gray and Melanie Aspey, “Rothschild, Lionel Nathan de, Baron de Rothschild in the nobility of the Austrian empire (1808–1879),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 200, online edn.

historian Cecil Roth argues that the Evangelical movement helped foster a change on Jewish emancipation:

But there was now a new approach to the problem on the Christian side. Scholastic and benevolent institutions were established, which ultimately proved an example as well as incentive to the Jewish community. No longer were unbelievers considered an object for insult and reviling; they were approached in a spirit not only of friendship but almost of veneration, as the ancient people of God. Reasonable arguments were put forward in moderate language; it was freely admitted that Christendom owed a profound debt of shame in respect of the past centuries of persecution and maltreatment; some persons even maintained that the voice of reason could not make itself heard until the last relics of discrimination had been removed. Hence in Evangelical circles the movement resulted in the development of a spirit of friendliness, which insisted on the recognition of the Jews as members of English society.¹⁶¹

In this way, Roth credits some Evangelical members of society for instilling a friendly spirit toward Jews in English society. Furthermore, he commends Evangelical Christians for admitting their history of persecution of Jews and for advocating for their full membership in English society. Of course, this does not automatically mean that Evangelicals were the only ones whose social attitudes of Jew were changing during the nineteenth century. Yet, Roth does pose that Evangelicals did contribute to influencing a positive viewpoint of Jews that impacted the emancipation question. While Evangelical missionary groups tried to convert Jews, principally the LSPCJ, his focus is more concerned with those that were advocates for emancipation. The LSPCJ by and large did not help the cause for emancipation, but may have inadvertently stirred sympathy for the

¹⁶¹ Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 1st ed., (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941), 243.

cause. In this way, according to Ursula Henriques, if Jews owed their triumph to tolerationists and Liberals, then they also owed it to many Evangelicals as well.¹⁶²

In 1858, Lionel de Rothschild became the first professing Jew to take a seat in Parliament, thus solidifying the achievement of Jewish emancipation.¹⁶³ Yet, at the same time, Britain's importance in nineteenth and twentieth century Jewish history is often linked more, according to Todd Endelman, to "its role as an imperial power rather than its treatment of its Jewish citizens or impact on their cultural and intellectual life."¹⁶⁴ This is not unwarranted in the context of British history in general. This is in part because the Jews of England did not experience the same level of violence and lacked in the number of pioneering Jewish intellectuals compared to other Jewish communities in Europe.¹⁶⁵ British support for Jews in Palestine and Muslim lands shows the "religious and humanitarian strands" of British imperial ideology. The Evangelical tradition of anti-slavery and British philosemitism, according to Green, played a crucial role in "legitimizing empire."¹⁶⁶ Evangelicals and members of the LSPCJ like Shaftesbury and

¹⁶² Henriques, "The Jewish Emancipation Controversy," 145.

¹⁶³ Cecil Roth, *Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History*, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962), 267.

¹⁶⁴ Todd M. Endelman, "Writing English Jewish History," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 27:4 (1995): 625.

¹⁶⁵ Todd Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990), 7-8. It has been widely perceived that the Jews of England experienced an "easier" road to emancipation and did not have to live in a hostile anti-Semitic society like the Jewry of Continental Europe. However, it is clear that there is a gap between those who understand Anglo-Jewish history and those who understand Jewish historiography. However, the main areas of focus in nineteenth century Anglo-Jewish history are often assimilation in English society, social status, the achievement of emancipation in 1858, and British involvement in Palestine. The typical topics of attraction in the "well-established themes in the historiography of the modern Jewish experience" include the struggle for emancipation, economic activity, political involvement and behavior, anti-Semitism and Jewish responses, and religious and communal politics.

¹⁶⁶ Green, "The British Empire and the Jews," 191-192.

Reynolds, believed that Jewish relief and protection was vitally important. Yet, they could not agree to the relief most Jews wanted and support—civil emancipation.

While Jews were now able to become sitting members of Parliament by 1859, this achievement did not stop the LSPCJ's approach to Jewish conversion. Jews could no longer be convinced to become Christians on the basis of becoming full members of British society. The establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric with Michael Solomon Alexander significantly boosted the LSPCJ's position in Palestine. However, Alexander's efforts did not have an effect on his successor Bishop Gobat. The "palmy days" of the 1830s and 1840s were over. The LSPCJ would continue its "unofficial" restorationist message that would define its persona for the remainder of the nineteenth century. The London Society's influence was still strong, but its mission in Palestine was not attracting as many converts as hoped. As we will see in the next decades, the LSPCJ would become increasingly restorationist with the emergence of the Christian and Jewish Zionist movements, and Britain's growing global empire.

Chapter 4: The London Society, the Zionist Movement, and the Balfour Declaration, 1860-1917

Conversionism, restorationism, and imperialism became imbedded into British views of Palestine during the nineteenth century. By the early twentieth century, Zionism became a widespread movement with support from both Jews and non-Jews. The outbreak of the First World War would make Britain's stance on Palestine crucial for imperial and religious interests. The LSPCJ, despite professing that it did not advocate the prophetic restoration of God's Chosen People, did publicize the Zionist movement in its periodicals. The pamphlet *Palestine, Russia, and the Present War* by Canon Edward Hoare, which was updated by the LSPCJ's secretary E.L. Langston in 1915, detailed both the prophetic and imperial importance of Palestine during the beginning of the First World War. Langston claimed that "Undoubtedly, God is overruling this present awful War and preparing the way for the opening up of the old Bible Lands of Egypt, Assyria and Palestine."¹⁶⁷ Langston believed that the war would provide the necessary opportunity for the British to help the Jews return to Palestine. In the second chapter, "Conversion," Hoare stressed that "restoration would be a poor gift without conversion, and it would be a very poor blessing to Israel if they were restored to their home, but not brought back to God."¹⁶⁸ This was what missionaries and the leaders of the LSPCJ

¹⁶⁷ Canon E. Hoare and E.L. Langston, *Palestine, Russia, and the Present War*, (London: Chas. J. Thynne, 1915) 21.

¹⁶⁸ Hoare and Langston, *Palestine, Russia, and the Present War*, 41. Langston also wrote another pamphlet dealing with British involvement in Palestine and prophetic meanings. See *The British Mandate for Palestine*, (London: Morgan & Scot, 1920). See also *The Mystery of the Jew*, (London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1915)

continued to stress in their missionary efforts in Palestine, but this stance, as we will see, was in direct conflict with secular Zionists.

Britain's position in Palestine and its attitudes toward imperialism and colonization changed dramatically in the east after the early nineteenth century. The Crimean War (1853-1856) had a great impact on Britain's involvement in Palestine. It was the most significant war for Britain since the Napoleonic Wars and "pushed Palestine into the world economy." It was also the first war in which European and Ottoman forces fought on the same side. Moreover, the idea of a "Jewish client state" in Palestine, which was vital to British colonial interests relating to India, became a popular idea.¹⁶⁹

Britain had officially become an empire after the Indian Mutiny in 1858, Britain needed to develop better communications with India through the Royal Navy. The South African route was too long to get reinforcements to India quickly. The Suez was a much faster route, but required cooperation from the Ottomans. It was because of this dilemma that the idea of establishing a Jewish colony in Palestine became an advantageous idea. The British had been skeptical about creating a canal, because it might entice Egypt to declare its independence from the Ottoman Empire. In March 1866, the Sultan issued a *firman* which allowed a canal to be built with the help of France. The Suez Canal opened on November 17, 1869.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁹ Lorenzo Kamel, *Imperial Perceptions of Palestine: British Influence and Power in Late Ottoman Times*, (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 8-9.

¹⁷⁰ Kamel, 21-22.

During the nineteenth century, there was an overabundance of books, pamphlets, and sermons fixated on biblical prophecy and restorationism. While the LSPCJ continued to claim it did not align itself with prophetic views, it was not an exception to this mass obsession. Palestine was often depicted in an overused Orientalist fashion, being characterized as empty, desolate, and waiting to be colonized.¹⁷¹ Biblical orientalism Western-oriented thinking about biblical lands dominated views of the Holy Land, both for restorationists and imperialists.¹⁷² Restorationism did not become a general belief for British society at large, but the idea that Palestine was promised to the Jews by God did have a significant appeal.

Thomas Clarke's pamphlet, *India and Palestine*, which was addressed to the readers of the *Jewish Chronicle*, outlined several prophetic and imperial justifications for the colonization of Palestine. Clarke emphasized the growing power of Russia since the end of the Crimean War along with France's imperial projects in the East; both posed a threat to the passage to India. He claimed:

It is neither my wish nor inclination, to prove how prophecy apparently bears out my conclusions; nor to discuss the probability of Russia and France, instead of uniting, becoming antagonistic to each other. I merely state the position which each nation is occupying at present, and how fatal such a union would be to the interests of England. Many things tend to prove that a deep-laid scheme exists against her liberty and prosperity; and if time should confirm it, it will certainly be regarded as more than accidental, that, when these are almost at stake, her fate and the prospect

¹⁷¹ Eitan Bar-Yosef, "Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture," *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 23.

¹⁷² Kamel, *Imperial Perceptions of Palestine*, 1; Eitan Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799-1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 6. See also Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).

of the Jews once more inhabiting Palestine should come upon the wheel of fortune together.¹⁷³

Clarke stressed that England must do whatever it takes to occupy Palestine and safeguard India from Russia and France. His statement offered both imperial and religious motives for Britain to occupy Palestine. He continued:

God, in his mysterious Providence, has willed that the land of Palestine should for centuries be despoiled by rapacious hordes, and its original owners be scattered into all the corners of the earth; and as truly are we certain that in His good time His favored people will be recalled, and once more Jerusalem become “the mother of nations.”

Clark warned that if Britain did not take the chance to obtain Palestine, India would be endangered. Moreover, he believed that the Jews would miss their opportunity to return to their own land.¹⁷⁴

In 1865, the Palestine Exploration Fund (PEF) was established in London as an exploratory fund to survey the land of Palestine, and was inspired by the British consul and LSPCJ supporter James Finn. The PEF’s patron was Queen Victoria and Lord Shaftesbury was the president.¹⁷⁵ Unlike the LSPCJ, the PEF was not a religious society, but rather it promoted a scientific purpose. Because of this, the PEF tried to detach itself from biblical prophecy and Evangelicalism. Yet, as Lorenzo Kamel stresses, “the line between imperialism, religious fanaticism and the scientific method remained blurred.” Many of the early archaeological investigations conducted in the late 1860s were sites

¹⁷³ Thomas Clarke, *India and Palestine; or the Restoration of the Jews, viewed in relation to the Nearest Route to India*, (Manchester: William Bremner & Co., 1861), 4-9.

¹⁷⁴ Clarke, *India and Palestine*, 11.

¹⁷⁵ The PEF was initially financed by Queen Victoria’s contribution of £150 and Oxford University’s £500 donation, as well as by public subscriptions. By 1867, the PEF had become mostly dependent on the War Office and the Royal Engineers. Kamel, *Imperial Impressions of Palestine*, 11.

connected to the Old Testament. The PEF's work and interpretations of Palestine's history often instilled an impression of "European superiority," which became a tool for legitimizing British imperial goals.¹⁷⁶ The PEF, claims Eitan Bar-Yosef, was a "fine example of Orientalism in action."¹⁷⁷ The PEF offered strategic information that would help the British military maintain a presence in Palestine. The maps produced by the PEF in the 1880s provided crucial intelligence on the landscape, especially for the defense of the Suez Canal.¹⁷⁸

Jews had been seen by Evangelicals as imperative to accomplishing biblical prophecy through their conversion and restoration. Members and supporters of the LSPCJ were some of the most important promoters of Jewish restoration, especially Lord Shaftesbury. Yet, Jews also became increasingly important for assuring British imperial interests. Many in Britain, either for imperial or religious reasons, believed that Britain had a special part to play in restoring the Jews to the Holy Land. In 1876, Shaftesbury, in response to the work of the PEF, expressed Britain's role in promoting the restoration of the Jews:

Is there no other destiny for Palestine but to remain desolate or to become the appendage of an ambitious foreign power? Syria and Palestine will ere long become most important. On the Euphrates and along the coast old cities will revive and new ones will be built: the old time will come back on a scale of greater vastness and grandeur: and bridging the districts the stream will run in the track of the caravans. Syria then will be a place of trade pre-eminence. And who are pre-eminently the traders of the world? Will there, when the coming change has taken place, be any more congenial field for the energies of the Jew? The country wants capital and

¹⁷⁶ Kamel, *Imperial Impressions of Palestine*, 11-17.

¹⁷⁷ Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture*, 7.

¹⁷⁸ Kamel, *Imperial Impressions of Palestine*, 11-17. See also John James Moscrop, *Measuring Jerusalem: The Palestine Exploration Fund and British Interests in the Holy Land*, (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000).

population. The Jews can give it both. And has not England a special interest in promoting such a restoration? It would be a blow to England if either of her rivals should get hold of Syria. Her Empire reaching from Canada in the West to Calcutta and Australia in the South East would be cut in two. England does not covet any such territories, but she must see that they do not get in the hands of rival Powers. She must preserve Syria to herself. Does not policy then—if that were all—exhort England to foster the nationality of the Jews and aid them, as opportunity may offer, to return as a leavening power to their old country? England is the great trading and maritime power of the world. To England then, naturally belongs the role of favouring the settlement of the Jews in Palestine. The nationality of the Jews exists: the spirit is there and has been there for 3,000 years, but the external form, the crowning bond of union is still wanting. A nation must have a country. The old land, the old people. This is not an artificial experiment: it is nature, it is history.¹⁷⁹

The relationship between the Bible and the Sword, the religious and the imperial, are exemplified in Shaftesbury's statement. To Shaftesbury, England was the only country destined to help orchestrate the restoration of the Jews.

While the new generation of Evangelicals and Christian Zionists were influenced by their religious upbringing, they were no longer “religious eccentrics, but empire builders.” They were well aware of the advantages of British influence in the Middle East for the British Empire.¹⁸⁰ By the end of the 1870s, according to Alexander Schölch, the idea of “restoration” was identified with imperialist tendencies and motives. The belief that the Jews had a natural right to return to Palestine and Britain's role in making Jewish restoration a reality, became common themes in English literature on Palestine. These

¹⁷⁹ Quoted in Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*. Vol I, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), 206-207.

¹⁸⁰ Regina S. Sharif, “Christians for Zion, 1600-1919,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 5 (1976): 133.

themes were essential components of British understanding of Palestine, especially among Evangelicals.¹⁸¹

British and Europe interests in Palestine were defined by two factors: politics and prophecy. During the nineteenth century, there were several plans for colonizing Palestine. There was a growing urgency, not only among Evangelicals, to settle Palestine in order to develop the land.¹⁸² Was it possible that the colonization of Palestine could be merely for imperial interests and not religious interests? Bar-Yosef claims that colonization of Palestine on a purely imperial basis seemed flawed and inadequate, especially to British Evangelicals. Moreover, he raises the question, if motives for colonization were only imperial, then why were Jewish migrants necessary? By involving non-British citizens in colonization projects, it is evident that Palestine was never considered a place for the British to emigrate.¹⁸³

The Suez Canal was the “point of no return” on Britain’s imperial path to Palestine.¹⁸⁴ Benjamin Disraeli, who was Prime Minister in 1868 and from 1874 to 1880, is one of the most famous figures in British history of Jewish descent. While Disraeli did not completely abandon his Jewish identity, his role in advancing British interests in Palestine, as Barbara Tuchman fittingly puts it, was “not as a Jew at all, but as an empire builder.” Disraeli “felt the lure of empire,” and advanced British expansion eastward

¹⁸¹ Alexander Schölch, “Britain in Palestine, 1838-1882: The Roots of the Balfour Policy,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 22:1 (1992): 47-48.

¹⁸² Schölch, “Britain in Palestine,” 48.

¹⁸³ Bar-Yosef, “Christian Zionism,” 34-35.

¹⁸⁴ Kamel, *Imperial Perceptions of Palestine*, 8.

during the 1860s and 1870s.¹⁸⁵ His interest in Palestine had little to do with restorationism and biblical prophecy. In 1875, the Khedive of Egypt was bankrupt and had to sell his shares of the Suez Canal Company. Baron Lionel de Rothschild loaned the £4 million required to the British government to purchase the majority of the shares of the Canal.¹⁸⁶ In 1879, Disraeli also supported Laurence Oliphant's colonization plan for Palestine.¹⁸⁷ British entrenchment in the Middle East continued with the occupation of Cyprus in 1878, followed by Egypt in 1882.¹⁸⁸

During the early 1880s, British Evangelicals became concerned again with Jewish matters. Czar Alexander II was assassinated in 1881 bringing an end to a peaceful and prosperous period for Russian Jews. He had come to the throne in 1855 during the Crimean War and had begun to emancipate the serfs. During his reign, Alexander raised expectations for Jews and relaxed many oppressive policies. In 1863, however, there was a Polish uprising which weakened the position of Jews and other minorities under Russian control. Following Alexander II's death, Jews were an easy target to blame for the social unrest, especially because a Jewish woman was one of the conspirators involved in the assassination.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁵ Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 142.

¹⁸⁶ Kamel, 23-24.

¹⁸⁷ For more detail on this see, Michael Polowetzky, *Jerusalem Recovered: Victorian Intellectuals and the Birth of Modern Zionism*, (Westport and London: Praeger, 1995), 119-143; Ragina Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism: Its Roots in Western History*, (London: Zed Press, 1983), 68-69.

¹⁸⁸ Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 133.

¹⁸⁹ Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 322.

The resulting pogroms and violence caused massive migration of Jews out of Russia. In 1881, around 200 pogroms occurred throughout southwestern Russia, and by 1882, “temporary laws” were enacted which legitimized the persecution of Jews. Before the pogroms, five million Jews lived in the Russian Empire, the largest Jewish community in the world. Between 1881 and 1905, approximately 750,000 Jews left Russia for the West. Another 250,000 Jews from Eastern Europe immigrated to Western countries, principally Great Britain and the United States.¹⁹⁰ Shaftesbury was disturbed and outraged with the violence going on in Russia and wrote a public response to *The Times*.¹⁹¹ On February 9, 1882, Shaftesbury brought up the issue to the House of Lords to encourage Parliament to persuade Russia to change its stance on Jews.¹⁹² The LSPCJ expressed its sympathy to Jews in Russia and prayed for a “speedy end” for the persecutions. The London Society indicated that the mass exodus of Jews from Russia was “the beginning of a fulfillment of the prophetic Scriptures foretelling the return of the Jews to their own land.”¹⁹³ This statement is very interesting considering the committee of the LSPCJ denied having restorationist leanings. Donald Lewis claims that while the LSPCJ had been unwilling to take a stance on prophetic interpretations among supporters, “it now was unabashedly restorationist in its public stance.”¹⁹⁴ The pogroms also strengthened the beliefs of the London Society’s existence and activities among its supporters.

¹⁹⁰ Lewis, 323.

¹⁹¹ *The Times*, January 23, 1882, 8; Lewis, 324.

¹⁹² Edwin Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.* (London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1892), 732; Lewis, 325-326.

¹⁹³ *Jewish Intelligence*, March 1882, 53.

¹⁹⁴ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 324.

The LSPCJ was deeply upset about the violence and anti-Semitic activities in Russia. The Society set up a £100,000 fund to help Jews leave Russia. Yaron Perry points out that the Jewish community had a mixed response to the LSPCJ's relief. For one, some Jews did not change their stance on avoiding missionaries and mission activities. Others, though, shared positive feelings and knew that missionary help could save lives of fellow Jews. With the flood of Russian immigrants to Palestine, the LSPCJ quickly became overwhelmed with their various needs. The Society provided shelter at the mission station in Jaffa and at its Sanatorium in Jerusalem. As a result of hundreds of Russian refugees seeking aid from the LSPCJ, many local Jews in Palestine felt comfortable enough to ask for assistance from missionaries. Members of the LSPCJ were amazed by the number of Jewish refugees needing help from the Society. The missionaries wanted to help the hundreds of refugees in Jerusalem, which caused the Palestine mission's finances to be significantly drained. The London committee established a "Committee on the Persecution of the Jews in Russia" to help the Palestine mission's financial issues. The Temporal Relief Fund was set up as a separate fund, but the money could not support adult Jews with the current budget.¹⁹⁵

William Hechler, an English clergyman who had worked with Shaftesbury on the relief committee, was sent to investigate the unrest in Russia. While in Odessa, Hechler met Dr. Judah Lieb, one of the leaders of *Hibbat Zion* or the Love of Zion movement. During his time in Russia, he encouraged both religious and secular Jews to settle in

¹⁹⁵ Yaron Perry, *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*, (London: Cass, 2003), 126-130.

Palestine, but the project ultimately failed and the group settled in Cyprus.¹⁹⁶ Born in October 1845, in Benares India, Hechler grew up with strong restorationist leanings and connections with the London Society.¹⁹⁷ In 1882, Hechler published *The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*. He later came back to England to work for the LSPCJ and published a pamphlet on the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1883. That same year, Hechler was nominated as a candidate for the joint-bishopric of Jerusalem to replace Bishop Barclay.¹⁹⁸ Hechler was disappointed with the end of the joint-bishopric, because he believed it had been a sign that the English and Germans could work together. According to Paul Merkley, if Hechler had become the bishop of Jerusalem he would have toned down conversionist policies toward Jews. Hechler firmly believed in the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, but did not necessarily think it was vital for them to be converted.¹⁹⁹

Hechler became Theodor Herzl's most important Christian ally and close friend. He had served as a chaplain to Prussian troops during the Franco-Prussian War. He had also been a tutor for the Grand Duke of Baden's son, Prince Ludwig. In 1885, Hechler became a chaplain at the British embassy in Vienna. It was there that he went into a bookstore and saw a copy of Herzl's *The Jewish State* in 1896. He met Herzl in March and told him that he was going to help his Zionist cause. Hechler helped Herzl gain recognition through his contacts with the German Royal Family. Hechler introduced Herzl to the Grand Duke of Baden, Otto von Bismarck, and Kaiser Wilhelm II. They had

¹⁹⁶ This project cost Shaftesbury a significant amount of money. In 1884, he was presented a gift of £640 to pay off the debt. Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 327-329.

¹⁹⁷ Paul C. Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism: 1892-1948*, (London and Portland, OR: Frank Class, 1998), 11-12. His father, Dietrich, was a German missionary who later went to England and was ordained in the Anglican Church in 1844. In 1852, Hechler's father became a missionary for the LSPCJ.

¹⁹⁸ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 328-329.

¹⁹⁹ Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism*, 15.

also met with the Kaiser in Istanbul, and on his tour of Palestine. After 1898, however, Hechler “did not play a leading role in the history of Zionism,” according to Merkley, but Herzl did continue to ask for his advice about meeting with Christian statesmen.²⁰⁰

Hechler never tried to convert Herzl to Christianity, because he believed that restoration of the Jews would happen before their conversion. Moreover, in a letter to a friend, Hechler saw that:

We are now entering, thanks to the Zionist movement, into Israel’s Messianic age. Thus, it is not a matter these day of opening all the doors of your churches to the Jews, but rather of opening the gate of their homeland, and of sustaining them in their work of clearing the land, and irrigating it, and bringing water to it. All of this, dear colleague, is messianic work; all of this the breath of the Holy Spirit announces. But first, the dry bones must come to life, and draw together.²⁰¹

This type of non-converting Christian Zionism was welcomed by Jewish Zionists. Yet, as Lewis mentions, this type of philosemitism was “a critical move from a core evangelical identity.” While there had been some Evangelicals earlier in the nineteenth century who were restorationists, but not conversionists, most Evangelicals still believed that the conversion of the Jews was necessary. Christian philosemitism and later Christian Zionism were influencers of the Evangelical movement, but there continued to be divided opinions on restorationism and conversionism. By the end of the nineteenth century, Evangelicals were trying to “remake” British identity by focusing on their responsibilities to protect and restore the Jews to Palestine.²⁰²

²⁰⁰ Lewis, *Christian Zionism*, 329; Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism*, 16-33.

²⁰¹ Quoted in Merkley, 15-16.

²⁰² Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 330-332.

Most members of the LSPCJ supported Zionism, despite taking a different stance on conversionism than members like Hechler. The Zionist movement itself was not a central focus of the LSPCJ, yet the growth of its popularity was important to the Society. Zionism did not become a viable movement until the 1890s. It was not until 1905 that Palestine was deemed as the only place where a Jewish homeland should be established by Zionists.²⁰³ With the rise of the Jewish Zionist movement, Christian Zionism continued to support the Jewish cause for a national homeland with conversionist motives. The LSPCJ first acknowledged Herzl's work in the April 1896 edition of *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*. In regards to the "Jewish Question," the editor outlined the premise of *The Jewish State* and its relation to the "Eastern Question."²⁰⁴ In the June issue, the editor mentioned the growing interest in the idea of reestablishing a Jewish state as outlined by Herzl's pamphlet. The editor continued:

His scheme is, undoubtedly, great and imposing, we dear we must add, somewhat Utopian and unpractical.... Dr. Herzl's views will probably find favour with the great mass of co-religionists in the East; but not with those in Germany, England, and especially in France, whose sole desire is be "assimilated" with the nations amongst which they dwell, and who are Jewish German, Jewish English, and Jewish Frenchmen.²⁰⁵

The June issue called attention to some of the flaws with Herzl's plan to establish a Jewish state. The editor did not mention Hebrew Christians and what their thoughts might have been toward Zionism.

²⁰³ Lewis, 329-330.

²⁰⁴ *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, April 1896, 54-56.

²⁰⁵ *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, June 1896, 94.

In the pamphlet *Missions to Jews*, Gidney quoted Rev. Prebendary Grant's response to why the LSPCJ was not officially an advocate for the total restoration or conversion of the Jews:

A very great mistake has been made by some, who consider that the Society is formed for the conversion of the Jewish nation in general, and for their restoration to their own land. This is not its object. It presumes not to fulfill prophecy with respect to the nation in general. It only desires and labours to fulfil what its members consider to be their duty, viz., to regard *the individual Jew* as a fallen child of Adam, and to bring him to a saving knowledge of Christ as his Saviour, whom he still despises and rejec[t]s.²⁰⁶

Grant's comments show that despite taking a public stance on Jewish restoration in reaction to the Russian pogroms, the LSPCJ continued to deny restorationist leanings when so many members and leaders were restorationists themselves. Bar-Yosef claims that the LSPCJ's avid denials since the Society's establishment show "that while the missionary conversion of the Jews was considered a legitimate cause, still within the safe boundaries of the Victorian consensus, their restoration to Palestine was not."²⁰⁷ It is possible to speculate the LSPCJ did not want to align itself officially with restorationism so it would not receive criticism from some supporters, even though it continued to share news on the Zionist movement and share restorationist sermons.

In *Missions to Jews*, Gidney discussed the prospect of a "Jewish State" in relation to Herzl's idea. He explained that:

²⁰⁶ Grant Prebendary, quoted in W.T. Gidney, *Missions to Jews: A Handbook of Reason, Facts, and Figures*, (London: Operative Jewish Converts' Institution, 1899), 63-64.

²⁰⁷ Bar-Yosef, "Christian Zionism," 26.

Considerable interest was aroused, in the early part of 1896, by the cry of “Palestine for the Jews,” and this owing to the visible decay of the Turkish Empire. If it goes to pieces, what is to become of Palestine? The Jews are a people *de trop* in every country where they dwell. They are not wanted anywhere; Russia does not want the Jews, that is quite evident; Austria does not want them. In Austria the Anti-Semites have had their own way. Germany does not want the Jews; it is doubtful where any country wants them. Why not send them back to Palestine?

This idea, which once upon a time was thought to be a dream of foolish Christian enthusiasts, bids fair to become a question of practical politics, and is being eagerly taken up by Jews themselves.²⁰⁸

Just a few years after the publication of *The Jewish State*, Gidney acknowledged the “foolish” dream of Evangelicals to restore the Jews to Palestine that had now become a discussion in politics. In *Site and Scenes*, another LSPCJ pamphlet, Gidney recognized the growth of both secular Jewish Zionism and prophetic Christian Zionism had by the end of the nineteenth century. Gidney stated that “We are persuaded that the Jews will one day, in God’s good time, inhabit the land of their forefathers. Whilst not committing ourselves to a belief in any scheme of man to further this end, we cannot but watch the movement with keen and increasing interest.”²⁰⁹ Gidney’s statement is revealing because it shows that the LSPCJ committee did see that Jewish restoration was becoming a reality. Although he clarified that the LSPCJ did not commit itself to any manmade scheme to restore the Jews, but did admit the Society was very interested in this endeavor.

The LSPCJ recognized the significance of the Zionist movement and included opinions from prominent leaders in its publications. In 1898, the Bishop of Jerusalem,

²⁰⁸ Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 94-95.

²⁰⁹ W.T. Gidney, *Sites and Scenes: A Description of Missions to Jews in Eastern Lands*, Vol. II, (London: Operative Jewish Converts’ Institution, 1899), 103.

George Francis Popham Blyth, commented on the “revival” of Jewish nationalism and on “Jewish Nationality.” According to Bishop Blyth:

The revival of national spirit amongst the Jews, their growing power in the world, the awakening of their ambition towards their own land, seem to herald days foretold by their own prophets, as well as by their rejected Messiah, when the spirit of God’s mercy shall react upon them from the mercy shown to the Gentiles on their fall. The ministration of this mercy gracious return appointed to the Gentile Churches for what we have received in their stead, that thus they may also at length inherit the mercy of Christ with ourselves. If we profess no political aim with regard to our presence in the Holy Land, let us give the lead in showing to them this mercy. No nation has, like England, accepted their national claim, and recognized their equal rights of citizenship and of religious freedom. Let the Anglican Communion be foremost in these later times of the Gentiles, to recognize the rights of the Jews under the commission of Christ to the common mercy and privilege of the Gospel of grace.²¹⁰

Blyth alluded to the “political aim” of Britain’s presence in Palestine, and tried to detach it from the religious connection. It seems Blyth was not just speaking on behalf of the LSPCJ or the Church of England, but of Britain itself. He presented Britain as exceptional for emancipating the Jews, offering religious freedom, and “accepting their national claim.” Yet, he still thought Jews needed the mercy of the Messiah just as much as Gentiles did.²¹¹

The Zionist movement continued to fascinate the London Society. In the February 1902 issue of the LSPCJ’s journal, *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, the editor stated that “Zionism is a new power in the world and has come to stay.” By this point the LSPCJ

²¹⁰ Bishop Blyth, 1898, quoted in Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 123.

²¹¹ Blyth had become the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem in 1887. The joint-bishopric with Germany had formally ended in 1886. Blyth was nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but the LSPCJ had not been consulted with maintain and exclusively Anglican Bishopric. Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 131; Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 420.

could not downplay the importance of the Zionist movement and the restorationist beliefs of the Society's supporters. The editor continued that Zionism's "object is the arrangement of the national future of the Jews. Consciously, or unconsciously, Zionists are working out God's purposes for His ancient people, namely their return to the land of their forefathers."²¹²

Many Hebrew Christians became great supporters of Zionism. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, many Jewish converts of the LSPCJ and other missionary societies wanted to continue to identify as Jews. The emergence of Hebrew Christianity as an independent movement in Britain was a reflection of the missionary work of the London Society and other organizations that were established afterward.²¹³ In 1882, the

²¹² *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, February 1902, 17, 21.

²¹³ The need for a separate Hebrew Christian church was important for many Jewish converts in Britain, because it allowed them to hold on to their identity as Jews while believing in Jesus Christ. Although Frey founded the LSPCJ and had no aspiration to create a separate church, he believed that the ceremonial observances of Judaism were no longer necessary, and in comparison to Christianity were more of a burden. Michael Darby assesses that "Despite these reservations, Frey was motivated to assemble Jewish converts in ethnic association for mutual encouragements and edification, and can justifiably be characterized as the father of Modern Hebrew Christianity." However, there were many advocates of Jewish converts retaining their practices and becoming Christian believers. Moreover according to Darby, "It can be seen that the LSPCJ was eager to promote the restoration of the Jewish people to Palestine but was not yet ready to allow Jewish Christians the opportunity to develop a theological system of their own." Therefore, it was not up to the LSPCJ or the Church of England to help Jewish converts make their own Hebrew Christian church, because they had not been restored to their homeland yet. However, Hebrew Christianity and missions to Jews in nineteenth century Britain had a significant impact on the next century for Christian-Jewish relations at home and throughout the world. Among many Jewish converts there was a need to keep some traditional aspects of Judaism in accordance with Christianity caused many theologians and preachers (both Jewish and Gentile) to reevaluate worship and organization in LSPCJ churches. Moreover, as more Jews were being converted by LSPCJ missionaries, the desire for a Hebrew Christian church/denomination emerged. However, as Darby assesses, "It is apparent that the LSPCJ was intent on incorporating its Hebrew Christian converts within a community of Gentile and Jewish Church of England worshippers rather than allowing them the freedom to establish their own independent Hebrew Christian church." Under the Rules and Regulations of the Society, rules eight and nine state that the LSPCJ was under the Church of England, and therefore all missionary matters and styles of worship would be in agreement with Anglican theology. Alexander McCaul had been instrumental in the organization of Hebrew services. It was not that having literature or services in Hebrew was negative, in fact there was Anglican liturgy available in Hebrew; rather it was assumed that eventually converts would assimilate and go to regular Anglican churches. Moreover, he, like many, desired the conversion and Restoration of the Jewish Nation to Palestine, and "When prejudice of the Gentiles had been overcome he wished to see some of them preach to the Jewish people." The

Hebrew Christian Prayer Union was founded by John Bingley, a Gentile Christian, under the auspices of the LSPCJ. Henry Aaron Stern, a Hebrew Christian and LSPCJ missionary served as the President of the committee. In May 1901, the Hebrew Christian Prayer Union and the Hebrew Christian Alliance joined together. Maxwell M. Ben-Oliel was elected president of the Hebrew Christian Alliance and Prayer Union.²¹⁴ The Hebrew Christian Alliance and Prayer Union created a letter addressed to Herzl outlining their respect and admiration for his endeavors, and offered him assistance to meet his goals. In the letter, the supporters called themselves “Messianic Zionists” and claimed that because they were “both Jews by race and Christians by faith” that they could help bridge the gap between Zionists and Christian nations.²¹⁵

The LSPCJ remained the largest Jewish missionary organization into the twentieth century. According to data gathered by A.E. Thompson, who wrote *A Century of Jewish Missions*, in Britain, there were a total of 28 missionary organizations with 120 mission stations devoted to Jews by the beginning of the twentieth century. The London

London Society was not ready for Jewish Christians to establish their own denomination nor was it the intent. Moreover, another problem that faced the LSPCJ and the Anglican Church was too much emphasis was placed on converts becoming missionaries. The Society felt that making Jewish converts into missionaries would help the growth of the LSPCJ and help more Jews become Christians. However, many were unqualified and needed more education. Even by the early twentieth century, the LSPCJ remained in opposition to an independent Hebrew Christian movement. Michael R. Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 67, 119, 95-96, 201; Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*, 53; H.J. Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity*, (London: Duckworth, 1936), 231. See also *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, May 1902, 65-69.

²¹⁴Stern was born in 1820 near Gelnhausen in the Duchy of Hesse-Cassel, Germany. In 1839, he came to England and was taken in by the LSPCJ after his job fell through the LSPCJ took him in at Palestine Place. There he met Alexander McCaul and became a Christian in 1840. In July 1844, Stern was ordained as a deacon by Bishop Alexander in Jerusalem. During his career he served as a missionary in Istanbul and Ethiopia. Darby, *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement*, 190-197; A.A. Isaacs, *Biography of the Rev. Henry Aaron Stern* (London: Nisbet, 1886), Hebrew Christian Alliance and Prayer Union pamphlet, 1901, Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 21/7.

²¹⁵ See Appendix A, “Letter to Herzl and leaders of the Zionist Movement,” undated, Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 21/7; Darby, 198-201; Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 176.

Society, both the oldest and largest missionary group, had 199 missionaries in 52 different sites. In 1902, the annual income of the LSPCJ was £225,600, which was about half of the total income of all other Jewish missions combined.²¹⁶ By the twentieth century, the field of the society occupied over half the world including mission stations in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The LSPCJ gradually withdrew missionaries from Protestant countries in Europe, except for Britain, and sent them “to countries where the Jews are not surrounded by Christian privileges.”²¹⁷ For the home mission in Britain, the LSPCJ had 17 stations, 47 missionary agents, and 8 mission halls by the end of the nineteenth century. Between 1809 and 1895 there were 1,842 baptisms of Jewish converts, primarily at the Episcopal Jews’ Chapel.²¹⁸ In Palestine, the LSPCJ had stations in Jerusalem, Jaffa, Safed, and Hebron with 52 missionary agents.²¹⁹

At the Society’s general meeting on December 17, 1915, the committee members decided to formerly change the name of the society’s lengthy title to “Church Mission to the Jews.” The title “The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews” had been criticized for not really describing the scope of the Society’s work. There were several reasons for the proposed change. For one, there was a Nonconformist society called the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel amongst the Jews, and many often confused the two. Using the name “London Society” in the title was also limiting and

²¹⁶ A.E. Thompson, *A Century of Jewish Missions* (New York: 1902), 279-280.

²¹⁷ Gidney, *Missions to Jews*, 55.

²¹⁸ Gidney, 82-84.

²¹⁹ Gidney, 91. For more information on the LSPCJ’s Palestine missions from 1882 to 1914 see Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 126-202.

confusing, since many of the mission stations and efforts were not only outside of London, but also outside England. E.L. Langston emphasized that:

The time has come when we not to widen our sphere of influence and we must appeal to the Churches of Australia and New Zealand as well as those in the Mission field and we are told that the title of the Society is a very real hindrance towards getting world-wide support amongst Christian people. We are therefore proposing to alter the name of the Society to CHURCH MISSION TO JEWS formerly the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

Langston claimed that “We Evangelicals are not afraid of our Churchmanship and ought not to be afraid of the world ‘Church’ and therefore we should have no hesitation in adopting the new Title.”²²⁰ Langston’s reason to change the name was in part because the Society was not restricted to evangelizing the Jews of London. Moreover, by this time, the LSPCJ had become more focused on Jewish missions in non-Christian lands.

During the early twentieth century, the Zionist movement continued to grow, but Herzl had much more support from Gentiles than Jews in Britain. Herzl turned his attention to England. His efforts to persuade Kaiser Wilhelm II and the Ottoman Sultan did not work. Two British statesmen would become crucial in Britain’s efforts to restore the Jews to Palestine: Prime Minister Arthur Balfour and David Lloyd George. Lloyd George had been employed as a legal Counsel by Herzl to draft the Uganda plan.²²¹ Both Balfour and Lloyd grew up learning about the Old Testament in Sunday school and were deeply influenced by their religious upbringing. Lloyd George, who was raised as a

²²⁰ “Change of Name of Society,” December 17, 1915, Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 30/5.

²²¹ The Uganda plan was a proposal where the British would offered a portion of British East Africa to the Zionists. But the Zionist opposed the project because they wanted the land of Palestine. Sharif, “Christians for Zion,” 133-135; Sokolow, *History of Zionism*, 296-297; Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, 196.

Nonconformist, claimed that he had learned more about the history of the Jews than the history of England while growing up.²²² Balfour was reared in the restorationist tradition, especially under the influence of his very religious mother, Lady Blanche Mary Harriet. Moreover, his own personal philosophy, claims Sharif, had a “Judaic influence” in which he believed history was an instrument for achieving a Divine purpose.²²³

By contrast, Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain did not care about biblical prophecy, but rather the strength of the British Empire. He wanted Jewish colonizers and settlers to extend his efforts for the empire. He listened and worked with Herzl because he saw a legitimate opportunity to extend the British Empire. Chamberlain, Tuchman claims, saw Jews as “a ready-made group of European colonizers available to settle, develop, and hold all but empty land under the British aegis.” At the same time, Chamberlain also wanted to restrict Jews, who were fleeing Eastern Europe, because they could be employed as cheap labor in Britain. In 1905, Balfour supported Chamberlain’s position on Jewish immigration, and signed the Aliens Bill which restricted immigration from Eastern Europe to England. He, like Chamberlain, believed in the uniqueness of the

²²² Lloyd George came from a Welsh Nonconformist religious background. Born on January 17, 1863, in Chorlton upon Medlock, Manchester, he was the second child of William George, a shoemaker, and Elizabeth, the daughter of David Lloyd who was also a shoemaker and Baptist pastor. After his father died in 1864, his family moved to Llanystumdwy to live with Richard Lloyd, his mother’s unmarried brother. Lloyd George’s uncle had a tremendous influence on his life, both politically and religiously. Richard Lloyd was a strong Liberal and also a Baptist lay preacher at the local church of Campbellite, which was a radical offshoot of the main Baptist demonization. He also helped guide his nephew in his early steps in law and politics. Kenneth O. Morgan, “George, David Lloyd, first Earl Lloyd-George of Dwyfor (1863–1945),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011; Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism*, 78-79.

²²³ Balfour was raised as a Scottish Presbyterian. Born on July 25, 1848, in East Lothian, Scotland, he was the third child of James Maitland Balfour, a landowner and MP, and Lady Blanche Mary Harriet, the second daughter of the second marquess of Salisbury and sister of Prime Minister Robert Cecil. Balfour’s father died from tuberculosis when he was eight, and his mother had a strong religious conviction which had a significant influence on her son. Ruddock Mackay, H. C. G. Matthew, “Balfour, Arthur James, first earl of Balfour (1848–1930),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011; Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism*, 78.

Anglo-Saxon race. Yet, Balfour also wanted to find a territorial solution for Jewish refugees. Balfour did his best to support Chamberlain's El Arish project, although he believed Chamberlain's plan was not a Zionist plan.²²⁴ While Balfour continued to support Zionism for the rest of his life, according to Sharif, his earlier inclinations show a revealing mix of "anti-Semitism on the Jewish Question and racism on the subject of history in general."²²⁵

Palestine became a key to the Allies' strategy during the First World War. During the Dardanelles campaign, Palestine and other Holy Places were discussed at length by the British, French, and Russians. The British wanted to put pressure on the Ottomans on the Eastern front by creating an Arab uprising. Russia made an agreement with the Turkish commander in Syria and Palestine that would cause a revolt in Constantinople in order to break Ottoman's alliance with Germany. In return, Russia would allow the commander to become the Sultan over Syria and Palestine. Both Britain and France were alarmed by this agreement, and in May 1916 made their own secret arrangement—the Sykes-Picot agreement. According to the agreement, the British were to gain control of Haifa and access to the sea, France was to get southeastern Turkey, northern Iraq, Syria

²²⁴ The El Arish project was a proposal by Chamberlain for Jewish settlement of the Sinai in 1902. This project was ultimately rejected because it was impractical for the British and Egyptians, and it was also considered economically unstable by the Zionists. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, 189-196; Sharif, "Christians for Zion," 135-136; *Non-Jewish Zionism*, 72-80.

²²⁵ Balfour supported Zionism well before the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Sharif claims that Balfour's earlier relationship "the Herzlian phase" of the Zionist movement has often been is "overshadowed by Balfour's later more pronounced philo-Semitic attachment to Zionism, exhibited so deliberately when he was Foreign Secretary under Lloyd George." Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism*, 75-76.

and Lebanon, Russia was to get Istanbul, the Turkish Straits and Armenia, and Palestine was to be under international administration.²²⁶

Restorationist expectations increased when David Lloyd George became Prime Minister, and Arthur Balfour became the Foreign Secretary in 1916. The Palestine Question, according to Sharif, “had become part and parcel of the war’s most complicated, entangled and mutually conflicting diplomatic maneuvers.” Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, who later became the first president of Israel, was instrumental in convincing the British to support a plan to help the Jews return to Palestine. In January 1915, Weizmann met with Lloyd George and knew of his Zionist leanings, but also knew the restorationist tradition in Britain. Lloyd George supported Herbert Samuel’s memorandum *On the Future of Palestine*, which proposed to combine a plan that would annex Palestine under the British with support for Zionist aspirations. During the war, it became clearer to Lloyd George and the British government that British and Zionists interests were complementary.²²⁷

The new government realized that the Sykes-Picot agreement would not guarantee British strategic interests in Palestine after the war. The British government supported the idea of capturing Palestine and Syria. Weizmann and the Jewish Zionists helped align their own interests with the British. Britain would not be able to claim Palestine by military conquest, because that would not have been popular nor aligned with US President Woodrow Wilson’s principle of self-determination. The British had to connect

²²⁶ Kelvin Crombie, *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel*, (Bristol: Terra Nova Publications, 2008), 128-150; Asia Minor Agreement, May 1916.

²²⁷ Sharif, “Christians for Zion,” 137-138.

their own imperial interests with a plan to help the Zionists. Mark Sykes suggested that once the British occupied Palestine, a Jewish national homeland should be developed under a British protectorate with the World Zionist Organization. On February 7, 1917, Sykes met with Weizmann, with the support of Lloyd George and Balfour, and indicated a future agreement between the British and Zionists.²²⁸

The “mutual relationship” between the LSPCJ and the Jews of Palestine had changed as a result of the Zionist movement and the outbreak of the Great War. Beginning in 1904 with the second wave of Jewish immigration to Palestine, new immigrants treated missionaries differently than other Jews, because they did not actively practice Judaism. However, opposition to the LSPCJ’s mission did not necessarily decline. The leaders of the LSPCJ acknowledged that a spirit of tolerance seemed to replace opposition, because many Jews were apathetic toward religion. Yaron Perry claims that the secular Zionist movement joined the “rational warfare” of rabbis and religious leaders against conversionist missionary activity. Many Zionist leaders were afraid of missionaries and viewed their activities “as an offence against the national feelings of the Jews in the land of Israel.” Both religious and secular Jews were against the London Society, which created a sense of uncertainty among LSPCJ missionaries in Palestine. Missionaries remained sympathetic toward Jews, but continued to stress the importance that they were to play a special role in the Second Coming of Messiah.²²⁹ Unfortunately for the LSPCJ, the beginning of the twentieth century was a “paradoxical” period. The growth of the Jewish population of Palestine should have let the LSPCJ’s mission become even more

²²⁸ Sharif, 139; Crombie, *For the Love of Zion*, 156. See also Mayir Vereté, “The Balfour Declaration and Its Makers,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 6:1 (1970): 48-76.

²²⁹ Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 176-177.

important and vital to the region. However, because of the fierce opposition from both secular and religious Jews, the London Society's activities were reduced to a "bare minimum."²³⁰

The LSPCJ acknowledged that the Zionist movement opposed their mission because it was a secular nationalist movement. J.H. Adeney, who worked for the LSPCJ as a missionary curate of Spitalfields and later as a chaplain in Bucharest, raised some issues with the Zionist movement in his pamphlet *Zionism: An Appreciation and a Criticism*.²³¹ One of his main criticisms was that the Jewish Zionist movement did not promote the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, and many of the leaders of the Jewish Zionist movement were not very religious themselves. Some LSPCJ members, like Adeney, did not like this type of Zionism promoted by Christian Zionists, such as William Hechler, who did not agree with conversionism.²³²

The First World War badly affected the LSPCJ's mission work in Palestine. Once the war broke out, the leaders of the LSPCJ helped missionaries and other Society member of British nationality return to Britain. Paul Nyland, who was Dutch, was left in charge of the Palestine mission, which functioned in a limited capacity during the war.²³³ In November 1917, the conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland sent a letter to Foreign Secretary Balfour about their work in Palestine and Syria. The letter highlights the contributions of the missionary societies in the two areas. There were

²³⁰ Perry, 178-179. For more information on the Palestine mission before the war see pages 179-197.

²³¹ Gidney, *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, 545-546.

²³² J.H. Adeney, "Zionism: An Appreciation and a Criticism," (1918), Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, d. 158/6.

²³³ Perry, *British Mission to the Jews*, 197.

a total of 180 British missionaries before the war among the Churches and Societies.

According to the letter:

Since the commencement of their work the Churches and Societies have expended upwards of £3,000,000 in this mission field. They held property before the war estimated at a value of £477,000. The philanthropic work of Missions in establishing and carrying on Schools and Hospitals had from time to time received recognition from the Turkish Government, which showed its appreciation by granting special immunity from taxation and relief in regard to customs dues...

The devoted labours of several generations of British missionaries, the considerable material interests involved, and the work of accomplished for the moral and spiritual welfare of the peoples of Syria and Palestine and in the spheres of education and medicine are the ground on which we ask the interests of British Churches and Missionary Societies and of the people whom they have sought to serve should receive the consideration and protection of His Majesty's Government in any politically changes that may result from the war....

We respectfully beg of His Majesty's Government that in any arrangement that may come to with other Powers, whether allied or enemy, with respect of the future government of Syria and Palestine, steps may be taken to secure –

1. That both the native inhabitants of these counties and foreign residents shall enjoy full religious liberty, and that the followers of all religions shall be free from interference in the exercise of their religion, and from any political or civil disability on the ground of their religious beliefs or in consequence of their faith.
2. That British subjects in the peaceable pursuit of their calling as Christian Missionaries shall not be hindered or interfered with and shall be of other nations or the followers of other creeds; and that British Churches and Missionary Societies shall be permitted to acquire and hold property and to erect buildings for missionary purposes.

3. That British Missions shall have restored to them their property, claims regarding which have been lodged in the Claims Department of the Foreign Office or in the Office of the Public Trustee.²³⁴

The letter was signed by S.H. Gladstone, the Chairman of Committee of the LSPCJ, and the other leaders of the missionary societies.²³⁵ It also outlined three important requests by the missionary societies that would ensure they would be able to continue their missionary efforts after the war. According to the letter's appendix, the LSPCJ had 29 European staff, 34 native staff, 760 pupils in schools, 3,000 hospital in-patients, and 64,000 out-patients in Syria and Palestine. Only the Church Missionary Society had more staff members, pupils, and patients than the LSPCJ. The Committee received a reply letter from the Foreign Office on December 7. R. Graham of the Foreign Office said in letter:

I am to assure you that Mr. Balfour has every appreciation of the admirable cultural and philanthropic work which has been performed by these institutions in the past, and that he would consider it a serious misfortune if their good work there in any way hampered or curtailed in the future. He is in full sympathy with the three points raised on the fourth page of the Committee's letter.²³⁶

²³⁴ "Letter to Lord Balfour from Conference of Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland," November 1917; Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, c. 105. To see full copy of the letter to Balfour see Appendix B.

²³⁵ They were John Irwin, moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, R. Williams, president of Church Missionary Society, Handley Dunelm, president of the British Syrian Mission, Charles W. Cathart, president of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society, James Cooper, moderator of the Church of Scotland, Alfred J. Crosfield, president of the Friends' Foreign Mission Associate, D. Mackichan, moderator of the United Free Church of Scotland, A.F. London, chairman of the Council of the Jerusalem and East Mission, Alex. Alexander, moderator of the Presbyterian Church of England, John H. Ritson, chairman of standing committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, and Cyril C.B. Bardsley and J.H. Oldham, secretaries of the standing committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland.

²³⁶ "Copy of Reply from Mr. Secretary Balfour to Letter to societies working in Syria and Palestine," December 7, 1917, Bodleian Library, dept. CMJ, c. 105.

This answered assured the committee that Balfour knew of their work in Syria and Palestine, and to know that their concerns would be taken into account after the war.

Without David Lloyd George and Arthur Balfour, as well as Chaim Weizmann, the Balfour Declaration would not have been possible. The restorationist tradition in Britain had a profound impact on both men, because they grew up in Calvinist evangelical homes. Lloyd George, Balfour and other members of the War Cabinet were not members or supporters of the LSPCJ. The War Cabinet was both religiously and ethnically unrepresentative of British society. Lloyd George was a Welsh Nonconformist, Balfour and Andrew Bonar Law were Presbyterians, Lord Curzon was an Evangelical Anglican, Jan Smuts was a Dutch Calvinist, Edward Carson was an Irish Presbyterian, and Arthur Henderson was a Scottish Methodist.²³⁷

In June 1917, Russia had already withdrawn from the war and the British government and the Zionists organized a plan to acquire Palestine. Edwin Montagu, the only Jewish person on the cabinet and the Secretary of State for India, was the only one on the cabinet who opposed the initial proposal. Montagu was an assimilated English Jew who felt “quite settled” in England and argued that anti-Semites would want to deport Jews to Palestine. Moreover, he believed that a Jewish homeland would antagonize Muslims in India. Despite Montagu’s opposition, the Zionist leadership were awakening sympathy for their cause, especially in the United States. In October, President Wilson gave his approval to the proposal. Finally on November 2, Balfour wrote the cabinet’s decision to Lord Rothschild, a Zionist and close friend of Weizmann, a letter which has

²³⁷ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 332-333.

been known as the Balfour Declaration.²³⁸ Barbara Tuchman states that Balfour's motive was:

Biblical rather than imperial. If the Biblical culture of England can be said to have any meaning in England's redemption of Palestine from the rule of Islam, it may be epitomized in Balfour. Though he was the reverse of Shaftesbury, not ardent but a skeptic, not a religious enthusiast but a philosophical pessimist, he was nevertheless strongly infused, like the Evangelicals and the Puritans, with the Hebraism of the Bible.²³⁹

Balfour had imperial motives as well, but the restorationist tradition, as exemplified by the LSPCJ, certainly had made an impact on him.²⁴⁰ The Balfour Declaration provided the "effective moral attitude," which allowed Britain to obtain Palestine with "a good conscience." Moreover, it "appealed to the imaginative side of the national character."

The objective of the Balfour Declaration:

was the British conscious, not the Jewish. As Lord Shaftesbury once wanted to restore the Jews for the sake of the Second Coming of the Christian Messiah, so now the British government repeated the experiment for the sake of imperialism's requirement of an "effective moral attitude."²⁴¹

The restorationist goals of Shaftesbury and the LSPCJ, and the imperialist goals of the British government became one with the Balfour Declaration.

²³⁸ Crombie, *For the Love of Zion*, 158-159.

²³⁹ Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, 198-199.

²⁴⁰ According to Sharif, while the Balfour Declaration has often been seen as the embodiment of political Zionism, it does not "absolve Balfour of his anti-Semitism." Moreover, Balfour's cryptic attitude on the Jewish Question, especially during his years as Prime Minister, shows that "Zionism, racism, and anti-Semitism are all part of one phenomenon: the very nature of Zionism not only accommodated anti-Semitism, but often welcomed it." In this way, Zionism provided an "easy answer" to the predicament between admiration for the Jews and perceptions of Jewish "otherness." *Non-Jewish Zionism*, 76-77.

²⁴¹ Tuchman, *Bible and Sword*, 214-216.

Lloyd George wanted Jerusalem by Christmas and the goal to restore the Jews to their homeland had become a reality. Moreover, restorationism had “imperceptibly been equated with the goals of Zionism.”²⁴² General Edmund Allenby led the Egyptian Expeditionary Force (EEF) to Palestine. The EEF won victories over Gaza, Ashkelon, Lydda, Jaffa, and Hebron, between November and December 1917, and were making their way toward Jerusalem. On December 8, the EEF was able to advance to the outskirts of the city, and the next day discovered that the Ottomans had withdrawn from Jerusalem. On December 11, during Chanukah, General Allenby entered Jerusalem and formally liberated Jerusalem from the Ottoman Empire.²⁴³ Hebert Sidebotham, a writer for the *Manchester Guardian* and founder of the British Palestine Society, in his pamphlet, *England and Palestine: Essays towards the Restoration of the Jewish State*, impeccably described the link between restorationism and the imperial aims during the war in that:

Before the magnitude of this war, most ideals seem to shrink in size. But one ideal is the peer even of this war in magnitude and grandeur. It is the ideal of the restoration of the Jews to a country which, small and poor as it is, they made as famous as Greece and as great as Rome. And lastly, there is no ideal so grand in its scope and so wide in its appeal, so simple and so assured of ready comprehension and sympathy, nor is there any achievement that would exhibit the contrast between English and German political ideals so favourably to us, and so eloquently vindicate our own, as the establishment of a Jewish State under the British Crown.²⁴⁴

²⁴² Schölch, “Britain in Palestine,” 48.

²⁴³ Crombie, *For the Love of Zion*, 161-162.

²⁴⁴ Herbert Sidebotham, *England and Palestine. Essays towards the Restoration of the Jewish State* (London, 1918), 201; Franz Kobler, *The Vision was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, (London: Lincolns-Prager, 1956), 118-119.

The LSPCJ responded the Balfour Declaration with great enthusiasm. The London Society issued a statement in *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*:

With one step the Jewish cause has made a great bound forward. For centuries the Jew has been downtrodden, depressed, hated and unloved by all the nations. For 2,000 years now the Jew has suffered as no other nation on the earth's surface in his restless wanderings. Wherever he has gone he has been ill-treated, but now there is at least a prospect of his settling down once again in his own country, and of becoming in the eyes of men a Nation amongst the Nations, in place of being a wanderer in every clime. He is now to have a home for himself in his God-given land. The day of his exile is to be ended.

What does all this mean for us Christians? In light of prophetic Scripture we recognise that such an action on the part of our Government and on the part of the Allied Powers, in being united in their resolve to reinstate the Jew in his own land, is full of significance. Our Lord, when asked the question, "What shall be the signs of They coming and of then end of the age," gave one of the signs, in St. Luke 21-24, to be that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles (nations) until the times of the Gentiles (nations) fulfilled." Ever since A.D. 70 Jerusalem and Palestine have been under Gentle domination, and now we seem to be on the very verge of a literal fulfillment of the last prediction, and it is certainly a distinct warning to us that the "Lord is near, even at the very doors."²⁴⁵

The LSPCJ recognized the importance of the Balfour Declaration for Britain and for the restoration of the Jews. The London Society did not deny biblical prophecy in its statement, like it had before, but rather embraced its significance. The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was not responsible for the Balfour Declaration. By the 1920s, there were few leading "Gentile Zionists" who identified themselves as Evangelicals. Yet, the restorationist tradition and religious culture which had influenced them to see Jews as a people and a nation, also predisposed them to "the

²⁴⁵ *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, December 1917, 129-130, quoted in Crombie, *For the Love of Zion*, 160.

idea of a Jewish homeland, and to the idea that Britain had a special role enabling this to happen.”²⁴⁶ However, without the London Society, its leadership, missionary stations, missionaries, prominent supporters, and Lord Shaftesbury it is hard to imagine that the goals of the restorationist tradition in Britain would have been possible.

²⁴⁶ Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 354.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The London Society's place in the history of Christian Zionism is important to consider in the broader context of Britain's religious and imperial interests in Palestine, and its impact on the Balfour Declaration. The seeds of Christian Zionism were sown with the restorationist tradition which began in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Yet, the Christian Zionist movement, according to Stephen Sizer, can "be dated precisely to the founding of the London Jews Society (LJS) in 1809."²⁴⁷ The history of the LSPCJ is an essential element to the history of Christian Zionism and the Balfour Declaration. The LSPCJ was part of the restorationist legacy of the nineteenth century. Despite professing that it did not promote restorationism or biblical prophecy, the LSPCJ did publish sermons, pamphlets, articles, and other materials relating to restorationism. Moreover, it had several members and prominent individuals who did believe that the Jews should return to Palestine in order for Christ to return. When the Jewish Zionist movement emerged in the late 1890s and early 1900s, the LSPCJ found itself in a paradoxical position: it supported the rights of Jews to return to Palestine, yet struggled with supporting Jewish Zionism because it was secular.

The restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land was part of the religious and imperial motives for legitimizing Britain's presence in Palestine. While Zionist historiography has traditionally seen the Balfour Declaration as the culmination of the restorationist tradition

²⁴⁷ Stephen R. Sizer, "The historical roots of Christian Zionism from Irving to Balfour: Christian Zionism in the United Kingdom (1820-1918)" In *Challenging Christian Zionism: Theology, Politics and the Israel-Palestine Conflict*, edited by Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis, and Muarine Tobin, (London: Melisende, 2005), 21.

of Christian Zionism, it also has not ignored the imperial and foreign policy implications either. This study has detailed why it is customary to see the Balfour Declaration as the epitome of Christian Zionism in Britain, by placing the LSPCJ as the center of the story. The LSPCJ represents this narrative of Christian Zionism's influence on British Evangelicals and statesmen, but also shows how the restorationist and imperial facets of Britain's attitude toward Jews and Palestine became intertwined during the nineteenth century.

This thesis has shown that the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews was a leading force in the restorationist tradition in Britain. In the study of the restorationist movement, the LSPCJ is the most famous (or infamous) mission group that evangelized Jews during the nineteenth century. Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey founded the LSPCJ in 1809 as a mission to convert the Jews of London and help their well-being. The conversion of the Jews and their restoration were goals held by the London Society throughout the nineteenth century. The Society has a long list of figures who were influential in British Evangelicalism including William Wilberforce, Charles Simeon, Edward Bickersteth, Lewis Way, and Lord Shaftesbury. Between 1809 and 1841, the LSPCJ transformed from a non-denominational missionary group in London, to an Anglican mission with missionary stations in Britain, Europe, and Palestine. Shaftesbury's millenarian beliefs were the reason for his efforts to promote Jewish restoration, the establishment of a British Consulate, and the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric in Jerusalem. His efforts were the first step in involving Britain in Palestine, and instilling the restorationist tradition. Yet, he did not accomplish this alone. Shaftesbury did not have to establish a Jewish mission, because the LSPCJ already existed. Through the

LSPCJ, Shaftesbury, both as a member of Parliament and as the Society's President, was able to accomplish his Evangelical goals. This is why the London Society's missions and involvement with the Jerusalem Bishopric, and its presence in Palestine, are central to understanding Britain's early involvement in Palestine.

The London Society not only helped set up Jewish missions in Palestine, but instilled the idea that restoring the Jews could also be advantageous for Britain and the British Empire. It should be no surprise that the first Bishop of Jerusalem was an LSPCJ missionary, Michael Solomon Alexander. Alexander's efforts strengthened the LSPCJ and Britain's endeavors in Palestine, although the London Society's success did not last as long as they had hoped. The establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1841 set up the "Protestant agenda" in Palestine that would have a lasting effect on British attitude toward Jews and the Middle East.²⁴⁸ Yet, British support for Jewish relief in Muslim lands also reflected economic and imperial interests for the British in North Africa and the Middle East.²⁴⁹ Britain's objectives in Palestine would continue to transform from religious and humanitarian to imperial.

At the same time, Evangelicals and parliamentarians faced the dilemma of Jewish emancipation. The LSPCJ by and large withheld its opinion on Jewish emancipation, despite the fact that its President, Lord Shaftesbury, had been very vocal about his opinions. The London Society has frequently been criticized, because it refrained itself

²⁴⁸ Yaron Perry, "Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem: The London Jews' Society and the Protestant Bishopric," *Jewish Culture and History* 4:1 (2001): 77.

²⁴⁹ Abigail Green, "The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?" *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 203.

in the matters of political and civil rights for Jews.²⁵⁰ The controversy over emancipation exemplifies this critique of the LSPCJ, because it supported better treatment of Jews, yet wanted their conversion, not their civil emancipation.

After the Crimean War and Indian Mutiny in 1850s, restorationist rhetoric became increasingly convenient for British imperial interests in Palestine. Lord Shaftesbury did invoke an imperial purpose in wanting to restore the Jews to Palestine, but he believed that only Britain should be in charge of this endeavor. During the late nineteenth century, the LSPCJ continued to focus on its foreign missions, especially in Palestine, while bolstering conversionist and restorationist messages. The Russian pogroms of the 1880s, and the emergence of the Zionist movement in the 1890s, elevated prophetic beliefs among British Evangelicals and members of the LSPCJ. At the same time, Britain's interest in Palestine expanded with the purchase of the Suez Canal and colonization projects. The London Society expressed its support for the Zionist movement, although it found itself in a difficult position, because Zionists did not want to be converted.

By the First World War, Britain's interest in Palestine became even more important for the empire. Prime Minister David Lloyd George and Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour credited their religious upbringing for supporting the Zionist cause. Their religious beliefs and the influence of the restorationist tradition in Britain are part of the reason why the Balfour Declaration has been seen as the "culmination of a rich tradition of Christian Zionism in British culture." The LSPCJ, while it may have not directly

²⁵⁰ John S. Conway, "Protestant Missions to the Jews 1810-1980: Ecclesiastical Imperialism or Theological Aberration?" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1:1 (1986): 129.

influenced Lloyd George or Balfour, was a part of this culture. Nevertheless, their restorationist beliefs also expressed a sentiment of British imperialism that was espoused by the London Society.

If restorationism had solely remained a prophetic and Evangelical objective by the First World War, it is hard to imagine that the British government would have wanted to help the Zionist cause. It was the transformation of restorationism to an imperial and humanitarian justification that was behind the Balfour Declaration. The LSPCJ did have an impact on religious and imperial conceptions of Palestine, and the purpose of the British Empire. Moreover, through its conversionist philosemitism and restorationist leanings, the London Society did cultivate an accepting environment for Zionism. Eitan Bar-Yosef has pointed out that restorationism was not as outwardly promoted or accepted, and, as we have seen, the LSPCJ was no different.²⁵¹ However, Evangelicalism was not always a unified force on the question of converting and restoring the Jews. The LSPCJ was caught in the middle between conversionism and restorationism, and tried to appeal to both sides. Despite repeated denials of having restorationist leanings, many members of the LSPCJ did believe that Britain had a special role to play in the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. This belief, along with imperialist motives, instilled the idea that Britain and her empire had a special destiny, and created the legacy of the Bible and the Sword.

²⁵¹ Eitan Bar-Yosef contends that: “Zionist historiography, then, seems correct in its assertion that Christian Zionist ideas were in constant circulation throughout the nineteenth century, and that many of those who circulated these ideas belonged to the social elite. The crucial point, however, is that *despite* their central social position, and *despite* the fact that these views enjoyed such wide visibility, Christian Zionism did not exist – at least up the 1880s – within the cultural, religious or political mainstream.” “Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture,” *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 18-19, 24.

References

Archival Sources

The Church's Ministry among Jewish People (CMJ) Manuscript Collection, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford.

Printed Sources

Adams, Hannah. *A concise account of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*. Boston: Printed by John Eliot, 1816.

Bickersteth, Edward. *The Future Destiny of Israel*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Orrin Rogers, 1840.

———. *The Restoration of the Jews to Their Own Land in Connection with their Future Conversion and the Final Blessedness of our Earth*. London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1841.

Carus, Rev. William, ed. *Memoirs of the Life of Rev. Charles Simeon*. New York: Hatchard and Son, 1847.

Clarke, Thomas. *India and Palestine; or the Restoration of the Jews, viewed in relation to the Nearest Route to India*. Manchester: William Bremner & Co., 1861.

Crooll, Joseph. *The Restoration of Israel*. London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1814.

Frey, Joseph Samuel C. F. *Judah and Israel: or, the Restoration and Conversion of the Jews and the Ten Tribes*. New York: Fanshaw, 1840.

———. *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*. 4th ed. New York: W.B. Gilley, 1817.

———. *Narrative of the Reverend Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey*. 11th ed. New York: J.K. Moore, 1834.

Finn, James. *Stirring Times, or, Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles 1853 to 1856*, Volumes I and II. London, C. Kegan Paul, 1878.

Gidney, W.T. *History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews from 1809 to 1908*. London: LSPCJ, 1908.

———. *The Jews and their Evangelization*. London: Student Volunteer Missionary Union, 1899.

- . *Missions to Jews. A Handbook of Reason, Facts, and Figures*. 5th ed. London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1899.
- Goakman, B.R. *The London Society Examined*. London: W. Lewis, 1816.
- Halsted, Thomas D. *Our Missions: A History of the Principal Missionary Transactions of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*. London: MacIntosh, 1866.
- Hoare, Canon E. and E.L. Langston. *Palestine, Russia, and the Present War*. London: Chas. J. Thynne, 1915.
- Hodder, Edwin. *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftsbury, K.G.* London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1892.
- Hyamson, Albert M. *British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews*. The British Palestine Committee. Leeds: Petty & Sons, Ltd., 1917.
- . *A History of the Jews in England*. 3rd ed. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1928.
- . *Palestine: The Rebirth of an Ancient Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1917.
- Langston, E.L. *The British Mandate for Palestine*. London: Morgan & Scot, 1920.
- . *The Mystery of the Jew*. London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1915.
- McCaul, Alexander. *The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews, two sermons*. London: Benjamin Wertheim, 1838.
- . *The Jerusalem Bishopric*. London: Hatchard and Son, 1845.
- . *New Testament Evidence to prove that the Jews are to be Restored to the Land of Israel*. 3rd ed. London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1850.
- . *The Old Paths; or a Comparison of the Principles and Doctrines of Modern Judaism with the Religion of Moses and the Prophets*. London: The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, 1846.
- . *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews*. London: B. Wertheim, 1838.
- Norris, H.H. *The Origin, Progress, and Existing Circumstances of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews: An Historical Inquiry*. London: J. Mawman, 1825.

Piertz, J.A. *The Prophetic Promise of the National Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*. London: Wetheim & Mackintosh, 1850.

Reynolds, James J. *Six Lectures on the Jews*. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1847.

Sailman, Moses. *The Mystery Unfolded*. 1817.

Sidebotham, Herbert. *England and Palestine. Essays towards the Restoration of the Jewish State*. London, 1918.

Sokolow, Nahum. *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*. 2 Vols., London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919.

Thelwall, A.S. *A brief view of the Scriptural encouragements of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews*. London: Macintosh, 1823.

Thompson, A. E. *A Century of Jewish Missions*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1902.

Periodicals and Newspapers

The Jewish Chronicle

Jewish Intelligence

Jewish Missionary Intelligence

The Jewish World

Manchester Guardian

Quarterly Review

The Times

Secondary Sources

- Ariel, Yaakov. "An Unexpected Alliance: Christian Zionism and its Historical Significance."
- Bar-Yosef, Eitan. "Christian Zionism and Victorian Culture." *Israel Studies* 8:2 (2003): 18-44. *Modern Judaism* 26:1 (2006): 74-100.
- . *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799-1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Bebbington, David. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Best, G.F.A. *Shaftesbury*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1964.
- Bradley, Ian. *The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976.
- Brown, Stewart J. *Providence and Empire: 1815-1914*. Harlow, England; New York: Pearson Education, 2008.
- Brown, Stewart J. and Peter B. Nockles, ed. *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Carey, Hilary M. *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c. 1801-1908*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Chung, Heera. "From a Protectionist Party to a Church Party, 1846-48: Identity Crisis of the Conservative Party and the Jew Bill of 1847." *Albion* 36:2 (2004): 256-278.
- Clark, Christopher M. *The Politics of Conversion: Missionary Protestantism and the Jews in Prussia 1728-1941*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Conway, John S. "Protestant Missions to the Jews 1810-1980: Ecclesiastical Imperialism or Theological Aberration?" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 1:1 (1986): 127-146.
- Corey, Muriel W. *From Bishop to Rabbi: The Biography of the Right Reverend Michael Solomon Alexander, Bishop in Jerusalem*. London: Church Missions to the Jews, 1956.
- Crombie, Kelvin. *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel*. Bristol: Terra Nova Publications, 2008.
- . *A Jewish Bishop in Jerusalem*. Christ Church, Jerusalem: Nicolayson's Ltd., 2006.

- . *Restoring Israel: 200 Years of the CMJ Story*. Jerusalem: Nicolayson's Ltd, 2008.
- Crossman, R. H. S. "Gentile Zionism and the Balfour Declaration." *The Commentary Reader* 33 (1962): 487-494.
- Darby, Michael R. *The Emergence of the Hebrew Christian Movement in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Eisen, M. "Christian Missions to the Jews in North America and Great Britain." *Jewish Social Studies* 10 (1948): 31-66.
- Endelman, Todd. ed. *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*. New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1987.
- . *Leaving the Jewish Fold*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- . *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- . *The Jews of Britain, 1650 to 2000*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.
- . *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Endelman, T.M. and T. Kushner, eds. *Disraeli's Jewishness*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002.
- Farzaneh, M. M. "British Orientalists, Lord Palmerston, and the British Imperialist Origins of Political Zionism, 1831—1841." MA thesis, California State University, Fullerton, 2004.
- Friedman, Isaiah. *The Question of Palestine, 1914-1918*. New York: Schocken Books, 1973.
- Green, Abigail. "The British Empire and the Jews: An Imperialism of Human Rights?" *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 175-205.
- Henriques, Ursula. "The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain." *Past & Present*. 40 (1968): 126-146.
- Jagodzińska, Agnieszka. "'For Zion's sake I will not rest': the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews and its nineteenth-century missionary periodicals." *Church History* 82: 2 (2013): 381-387.
- Kamel, Lorenzo. *Imperial Perceptions of Palestine: British Influence and Power in Late Ottoman Times*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2015.

- Kobler, Franz. *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*. London: Lincolns-Prager, 1956.
- Lewis, Donald M. *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Lipman, V.D. *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858*. Leicester and London: Leicester University Press, 1990.
- . *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*. London: Watts, 1954.
- Martin, R.H. “United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain, 1795-1815: Pan-Evangelism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.” *Church History* 46 (1977): 437-452.
- Matar, N. I. “The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews: From 1754 until the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.” *Durham University Journal* 82 (1990): 29-44.
- Merkley, Paul C. *The Politics of Christian Zionism: 1892-1948*. London and Portland, OR: Frank Class, 1998.
- Moscrop, John James. *Measuring Jerusalem: The Palestine Exploration Fund and British Interests in the Holy Land*. London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000.
- Perry, Yaron. “Anglo-German Cooperation in Nineteenth-Century Jerusalem: The London Jews' Society and the Protestant Bishopric.” *Jewish Culture and History* 4:1 (2001): 65-80.
- . *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*. London: Cass, 2003.
- Perry, Yaron and Efraim Lev. “The Medical Activities of the London Jews' Society in Nineteenth-Century Palestine.” *Medical History* 47:1 (2003): 67–88.
- Polowetsky, Michael. *Jerusalem Recovered: Victorian Intellectuals and the Birth of Modern Zionism*. Westport, CT: Praegar, 1995.
- Porter, Andrew. *Religion versus empire?: British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700-1914*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Ragussis, Michael. *Figures of Conversion: “The Jewish Question” & English National Identity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Renton, James. *The Zionist Masquerade: The Birth of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance, 1914-1918*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

- Rose, Norman. ed. *From Palmerston to Balfour: Collected Essays of Mayir Vereté*. London: Frank Class, 1992.
- Roth, Cecil. *Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952.
- . *Essays and portraits in Anglo-Jewish history*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962.
- . *History of the Jews*. New York: Schocken Books, 1961.
- . *A History of the Jews in England*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- . *A History of the Jews in England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Rubinstein, W.D. *A History of Jews in the English Speaking World: Great Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.
- Rubinstein, William D. and Hilary L. Rubinstein. *Philosemitism: Admiration and Support in the English-Speaking World for Jews, 1940-1939*. London: Macmillan, 1999.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Sanders, Ronald *The High Walls of Jerusalem: A History of the Balfour Declaration and the Birth of the British Mandate for Palestine*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983.
- Schölch, Alexander. "Britain in Palestine, 1838-1882: The Roots of the Balfour Policy." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 22:1 (1992): 39-56.
- Schonfield, H.J. *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century*. London: Duckworth, 1936.
- Scult, Mel. "English Missions to the Jews: Conversion in the Age of Emancipation." *Jewish Social Studies* 35 (1973): 3-17.
- . *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain up to the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Sharif, Regina S. "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 5 (1976): 123-141.
- . *Non-Jewish Zionism: Its Roots in Western History*. London: Zed Press, 1983.
- Shaftesbury, John M., ed. *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth*. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1966.

- Sizer, Stephen R. "The historical roots of Christian Zionism from Irving to Balfour: Christian Zionism in the United Kingdom (1820-1918)." In *Challenging Christian Zionism: Theology, Politics and the Israel-Palestine Conflict*, Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis, and Muarine Tobin, ed., 20-31. London: Melisende, 2005.
- Smith, R.M. "The London Jews' Society and Patterns of Jewish Conversion in England, 1801-1859." *Jewish Social Studies* 43 (1981): 275-290.
- Sobel, B.Z. *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe*. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Stein, Leonard. *The Balfour Declaration*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.
- Strong, Rowan. *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700-1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Tibawi, A.L. *British Interests in Palestine, 1800-1901: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Tuchman, Barbara W. *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
- Valdman, Nadia. *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Vereté, Mayir. "The Balfour Declaration and Its Makers." *Middle Eastern Studies* 6:1 (1970): 48-76.
- . "Why Was a British Consulate Established in Jerusalem?" *The English Historical Review* 85:335 (1970): 316-345.
- Ward, W.R. *Early Evangelicalism: A Global Intellectual History, 1670-1789*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Yeats, John M. "'The Time is Come': The Rise of British Missions to the Jews, 1808--1818." PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2004.
- . "'To the Jew first': Conversion of the Jews as the Foundation for Global Missions and Expansion in Nineteenth-Century British evangelicalism." *Southwestern Journal Of Theology* 47 (2005): 207-223.

Appendix A: Letter to Herzl and Leaders of the Zionist Movement

TO DOCTOR THEODORE HERZL, AND OTHER LEADERS OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

Gentlemen and brethren of the House of Israel,

- I. We, the undersigned, Hebrew-Christians, connected with the Established Church of England, and with the various Free Churches of British Christians, approach you with the assurance of our sympathy in your efforts toward the re-establishment of our People in the Land God gave to our Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their posterity for ever.
- II. Without necessarily concurring in all the details of such a vast undertaking, we agree with you and your national aspirations, believing that these are in accordance with the will of God, as witnessed by our Holy Prophets.
- III. It has been supposed by some of our people, that when Jews embrace the Faith of Jesus Christ they cease, *ipso facto*, to sympathize with their brethren. But it is not so. We can assure you for ourselves and for thousands of others who, like us, believed in Christ as the promised Messiah, that we do not love our race the less, but on the contrary, all the more, after the example of Him who wept over Jerusalem on the day of His joy, when He was acclaimed by the multitude as the "King of Israel."
- IV. Our Nation has had no better advocates in Christendom than the Hebrew-Christians. Most of us are public preachers; and in our addresses and private intercourse we have ever defended our People, and brought to the front those virtues of our race which commend themselves to all godly and honourable men. Nor have we failed to deplore and condemn the ill-usage to which, alas, our fathers and brethren have been subjected by the nations among whom they have sought hospitality and protection.
- V. We therefore, as Messianic Zionists, offer you our hearty welcome and our best wishes, and we would gladly co-operate with you, in any possible manner, in your endeavours to restore Zion. For we share with you the glorious heritage of our past history, and the hopes of the more glorious destiny which awaits our Nation in the future.
- VI. We believe with yourselves that our Nation has a Mission to the whole world in the time to come, as in the past. But, you will forgive our frankness for adding an expression of our belief, that the future Mission of Israel awaits the time when Israel shall accept Jesus Christ as our own Messiah, and not alone of the Gentiles. In view of this deeply-seated conviction, we cannot but rejoice that many Rabbis and writers have of late years began to speak of our Adorable Saviour with admiration and reverence due to His unique character and Mission to mankind; and especially that the study of His life and teaching has been introduced in Jewish circles and Jewish schools in America, with the sanction of such distinguished men such as Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi David Phillipson, Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, Rabbi B. Felsenthal, Professor Richard Gottheil, Dr. K. Kohler, Dr. Joseph Krauskopf and others.
- VII. In our special position as both Jews by race and Christians by faith, we form a natural link between yourselves and Christian nations. And when Christians

witness that we, who are one with them in the Faith of our Devine Master, nevertheless join you in your earnest efforts for the restoration of a “Jewish State,” we have reason to hope that they will be influenced to come to your help in various ways, and, certainly deprecate and condemn the ill-will which anti-Semitism has engendered in many circles.

- VIII. If Hebrew-Christians have been kept away from friendly intercourse with their brethren it has surely not been by their own wish; and we rejoice that the liberal sentiments which prevail in the present age have produced a more tolerant spirit in some quarters. We earnestly pray that the day is not far distant when Christian Jews will be treated by the Synagogue with the liberty conceded to all schools of thought among out Nation.
- IX. We cannot conclude without assuring you, Dr. Herzl, personally of our admiration of the enthusiasm with which you have espoused the cause of our suffering brethren, and thanking God for the ability, judgement and strength with which He has endowed you; and we pray that, like Nehemiah, in reliance upon the mightily arm of the Lord, you have live to see the realization of the scheme you have so nobly initiated.
- X. With these sentiments, Gentlemen and dear Brethren, we subscribe our names not only for ourselves, but also for large numbers of Hebrew-Christians scattered throughout the British Empire, the United States of America, and the other nations of Christendom,

Your faithful servants and well-wishers,

Please sign thus—Name in full_____

Degree, and of what University_____

Official position: Minister, Missionary_____

Of what Society_____

Of what Church_____

How long ordained or appointed_____

Late of, or sometime_____

(i.e. Any previous positon of importance.)

Appendix B: Letter to Lord Balfour from Conference of Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland

Sir,

The British Churches and Missionary Societies working in Syria and Palestine here followed with interest statements which have made and discussion which have taken place regarding the political future of these countries. They are seriously concerned that in any arrangements which say is made on the conclusion of the war, their interests, which are of long standing and considerable in extent, and those of the Christian population of the country may be daily safeguarded.

They are aware that no final settlement can be reached until the close of the war, but they desire that certain matters affecting the work in which they have been engaged should be clearly before the mind of His Majesty's Government in any preliminary negotiations before a definite and fixed agreement is reached. A Committee representing these Churches and Societies recently placed their views before Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and have been informed by him privately that you feel that the present time would not be opportune to receive a disputation, but that you are willing to give full and careful consideration to a memorandum.

The British Churches and Missionary Societies carrying on work in Syria and Palestine include the following:-

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews (1833)
The Presbyterian Church in Ireland (1843)
Church Missionary Society (1851)
British Syrian Mission (1860)
Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society (1861)
Friends' Foreign Mission Association (1869)
The United Free Church of Scotland (1864)
Jerusalem and the East Mission (1889)
The Presbyterian Church of England (1895)

The date in brackets after the name of each Church or Society indicates the year which it began work in Syria or Palestine.

In connection with the Churches and Societies named there were at work in these countries before the war 180 missionaries of British nationality. Since the commencement of their work the Churches and Societies have expended upwards of £3,000,000 in this mission field. They held property before the war estimated at a value of £477,000. The philanthropic work of Missions in establishing and carrying on Schools and Hospitals had from time to time received recognition from the Turkish Government, which showed its

appreciation by granting special immunity from taxation and relief in regard to customs dues. The work carried on by British Churches and Mission Societies in Syria and Palestine is shown in fuller detail in an appendix.

The devoted labours of several generations of British missionaries, the considerable material interests involved, and the work of accomplished for the moral and spiritual welfare of the peoples of Syria and Palestine and in the spheres of education and medicine are the ground on which we ask the interests of British Churches and Missionary Societies and of the people whom they have sought to serve should receive the consideration and protection of His Majesty's Government in any politically changes that may result from the war.

Under the Ottoman Government Christian Missions have been able to establish and carry on schools and colleges, to maintain hospitals and dispensaries, to hold meetings for Christians and non-Christians, to publish, sell and distribute moral and religious literature, to acquire and hold property and to erect buildings both for private and private uses. The rights and liberties they have enjoyed have been based upon the privileges accorded to the subjects of foreign Powers under the Capitulations, upon the Hatti-humayun of 1856, authorizing the free exercise of all religions in the Turkish Empire, and upon special Firmans and other permits, which have from time to time been secured by the various Missions after prolonged negotiations, with the advice and assistance , generously accorded, of H.M. Embassy at Constantinople.

We respectfully beg of His Majesty's Government that in any arrangement that may come to with other Powers, whether allied or enemy, with respect of the future government of Syria and Palestine, steps may be taken to secure –

4. That both the native inhabitants of these counties and foreign residents shall enjoy full religious liberty, and that the followers of all religions shall be free from interference in the exercise of their religion, and from any political or civil disability on the ground of their religious beliefs or in consequence of their faith.
5. That British subjects in the peaceable pursuit of their calling as Christian Missionaries shall not be hindered or interfered with and shall be of other nations or the followers of other creeds; and that British Churches and Missionary Societies shall be permitted to acquire and hold property and to erect buildings for missionary purposes.
6. That British Missions shall have restored to them their property, claims regarding which have been lodged in the Claims Department of the Foreign Office or in the Office of the Public Trustee.

The experience of Missionary Societies in different parts of the world has shown the importance of a definite understand in regard to the first two points mentioned if future difficulty is to be avoided.

While these representations are made on behalf of British Churches and Missionary Societies, it may be noted that American Protestant Mission also have important interests in Syria and Palestine, and we have reason to believe that these Missions are seeking the diplomatic support for their Government with a view of securing for their work the same liberties which we desire that His Majesty's Government should obtain for that which we represent.

In view of the importance of the interest involved, we venture to express the hope that when the proper time comes you will find it possible to receive a small deputation in order that we may be able to place our views more fully before you.

We are, Sir,
Your humble and obedient Servants,

S.H. GLADSTONE
Chairman of Committee of the London
Society for Promoting Christianity
amongst the Jews.

JOHN IRWIN
Moderator of the Presbyterian Church
in Ireland

R. WILLIAMS
President of Church Missionary Society

HANDLEY DUNELM
President of the British Syrian Mission

CHARLES W. CATHART
President of the Edinburgh Medical
Missionary Society

JAMES COOPER
Moderator of the Church of Scotland

ALFRED J. CROSFIELD
President of the Friends' Foreign Mission
Associate

D. MACKICHAN
Moderator of the United Free Church of
Scotland

A.F. LONDON
Chairman of the Council of the Jerusalem
and East Mission

ALEX. ALEXANDER
Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of
England

JOHN H. RITSON
Chairman of standing committee of the
Conference of Missionary Societies in
Great Britain and Ireland

CYRIL C.B. BARDSLEY
J.H. OLDHAM
Secretaries of the standing committee of
the Conference of Missionary Societies in
Great Britain and Ireland.