

# Anglo-Israelism Refuted.

A lecture delivered February 20th, 1879 by Robert Roberts of Birmingham in reply to a lecture given the previous evening by Mr. Edward Hine.

THERE can be no question of the interest and importance of the question raised by Mr. Hine in his lecture last night. The nation of Israel, wherever they may prove to be at the present time as regards the ten-tribed section of it, is incomparably the most important nation upon the face of the earth, whether we consider it from a historical or prospective point of view. Its history, in the shape of authentic records, reaches into a very remote antiquity, when as yet the great nations of what we may call profane history and profane times had not begun their career.

Not only is the nation of Israel the most ancient nation as regards reliable history, but everything that appeals to literary, or antiquarian, ethical, or ethnological interest, is found to be concentrated in them. The brightest line in the history of mankind is that traced by inspiration when message-communication arrived from God upon earth. That line is to be found in connection with the house of Israel-alone. To them were committed the oracles of God. The greatest light--nay, the great light, for there is none other properly to compare with it--that ever arose upon the dark night of human history is the light of Bethlehem--Jesus of Nazareth, who has already shed lustre upon human life, and imparted efficiency to human achievement in so many departments, and who is destined in due time to illumine the whole earth with surpassing glory--a glory dreamt of by poets, desired by philosophers, but attained by none, unattainable by all in the natural order, but which shall be attained and realised in this particular channel of things--by the hand of Jesus Christ at his re-appearing on earth. That-great light, I need scarcely say, belongs alone to the nation of Israel, so far as his origin and his historical relation to mankind are concerned. Nay, we may go much farther than that, and say that it is only in connection with Israel, historically and prophetically considered, that the goodness that is coming in the purpose of God will be realised, as revealed by His servants the prophets who arose in Israel, and as communicated to us by inspired apostles sent forth by Christ; it is a goodness to be developed in connection with that nation.

We are informed in many forms of phrase that "salvation is of the Jews". Christ himself made this declaration, as recorded in John iv. 22. Paul averred that to them appertain the promises (Rom. ix. 4). Paul, again, in defining the general character of the cause for which he was judged before Agrippa, said that he was judged "for the hope of the promise which God had made unto the fathers"--the fathers of the house of Israel (Acts xxvi. 6), and the mission of Christ, as defined by Paul in the 15th chapter of Romans, at the 8th verse, is that he appeared upon earth "to confirm the promises made unto the fathers".

The subject of the Israelites is therefore a very important subject--a very interesting subject: these terms, indeed, are a great deal too unemphatic to express the degree of importance attaching to it. The whole question of the house of Israel in its past, and still more in its future, involves individual salvation and the destiny of the human race. It is a first-class question and one that by no means receives the attention it ought to receive at the hands of professed believers in the Bible. However much we may dissent from Mr. Hine's particular views, we ought to be thankful for an agitation which, at all events, tends to bring an important subject before public notice and consideration.

- [Wherein We Agree.](#)
- [The Question in Dispute.](#)
- ["The Cradle of the Human Race."](#)
- [Alleged "Marks of Identity".](#)
  - [1.--"As the Sand of the Sea Shore."](#)
  - [2.--"A Nation and a Company of Nations."](#)

- [3.--"The Head and Not the Tail."](#)
  - [4.--"They That War Against Thee, Shall Be as Nothing"](#)
  - [5.--Jews "A Taunt"; Israel "not Recognised."](#)
  - [6.--"Called by Another Name."](#)
  - [7.--"The Place is Too Strait For Me."](#)
  - [8.--"The Desolate Heritages."](#)
  - [Queen Victoria and the House of David.](#)
  - [The Coronation Stone.](#)
  - [Jews and "Israelites."](#)
-

## WHEREIN WE AGREE.

Now there are one or two things connected with the subject in which we shall all agree, and upon which, therefore, it is easy for me to say I entirely agreed with Mr. Hine in the oral evolution of last evening, and also in the various pamphlets and other forms of literature which he has issued to the public. Let us look at what we agree in first. This will greatly simplify the controversy. It will help to make distinct and naked the kernel of the matter, and enable us to handle it in a more palpable manner, and with more satisfactory results, than if we left that part of the case out of account.

The historic facts of the case are beyond cavil. I will assume that the majority here present are familiar with them. You know that the Israelitish nation is a nation that God constituted for Himself in the beginning, by first making choice of Abraham, a dweller in Ur of the Chaldees. Abraham was summoned to leave his native country, to separate himself from his friends, to come into a land that God would show him, concerning which land a promise was made to him that God would give it to him for an everlasting possession in connection with a time when all the families of the earth should be blessed in him. We are told by Paul, in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, verse 8, that by faith Abraham, when so called, obeyed, went out, not knowing whither he went, and was guided into the land that is now known as Palestine.

While there he had a promised son, Isaac; in due course, Isaac had a promised son, Jacob; in due course, Jacob had twelve sons, who constitute the basis, in their family development, of the question that is mooted so extensively now-a-days in regard to the tribes of Israel; in due course, these twelve sons of Jacob, with their families, went down into Egypt, under circumstances we need not stay to consider in detail; in due course of time they multiplied into a great nation, and in due course, in fulfilment of a promise, Moses appeared upon the scene and led them out of Egypt by many marvelous exhibitions of power needful to effect the work of redeeming an unorganised rabble from the clutches of a powerful military nation.

They were led into the wilderness, and there they were organised as a nation. To that nation Moses delivered many stately, sublime addresses, which we have in our possession in **the** early books of the Bible, speaking particularly of the Book of Deuteronomy. I will not enlarge upon the features of these addresses just now. Suffice it to say, that Moses said to them, as you find on record in the 7th chapter of Deuteronomy, at the 6th verse, and the 14th chapter, at the 2nd verse: "*The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth*"; and in the 19th chapter of Exodus, at the 5th verse, God says to them, through Moses, "*Now, therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people: for all the earth is Mine: and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.*" Moses delivered that general message to the people, and we are informed that he took back their answer, an answer given representatively; for this matter was placed before the elders of the people. That answer was: "*All that the Lord hath spoken we will do*" (verse 8). Moses took back this answer to the Lord, and, ensuing upon that distinct understanding, and upon the basis of that covenant, God proceeded, through Moses, to give to them a political and social and religious constitution, which in all its elements and details goes to constitute the Mosaic economy--the law of Moses, which also we have extensively in our possession, and which is distinguished by many features, the excellence of which we are scarcely competent to judge, because we have been so long accustomed to the recognition and currency of its principles. These have emanated from the Bible and permeated society so unconsciously from this source, that we are not able to make a due comparison between the Mosaic code and the barbaric state of mind existing in the world at the time that constitution was bestowed.

Particulars connected with that constitution having been settled, and the assembly having been organised into twelve distinct sub-nationalities, called tribes, the Israelites then proceeded on their journey to the land into which God had promised He would lead them; and, leaving out of account the many interesting incidents connected with

their sojourn in the wilderness, we will at once pass with them under Joshua into the land of Canaan. Of what took place there you are well aware. Israel, under Joshua, exterminated or nearly exterminated the seven nationalities occupying Canaanitish soil. The legitimacy of that proceeding, or the meaning of it, has been very much called in question, at various times, but it is placed in a very simple light by Moses--so simple that a child may understand, and so true that a man of judgment cannot object. Moses said to them, "*Speak* not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them [these nations] out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land .... Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go to possess their land, but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out "; and in Leviticus xviii. he enumerates the dreadful enormities of behaviour into which they had sunk, making it a righteous retribution that they should be swept off the face of the earth, as multitudes had been before by the flood, and as two great neighbouring cities had been still more recently by fire from heaven.

You will observe, of course, from these remarks, that I implicitly accept the Biblical narrative, and I do so advisedly. I believe the Bible to be true for many and for good reasons. Some reject it for reasons which are plausible on the surface merely. Some reject certain portions while receiving others in a qualified way. I take it in its entirety. You must either accept all or reject all, not now speaking of proved interpolations which are absolutely insignificant in number. The whole of the Scriptures are linked together inseparably one part with another. You cannot hold on by Christ and part with Moses. Christ on numerous occasions placed the seal of his sanction in a deliberate and solemn way on the Scriptures of Moses and the prophets, and if you accept him as true, you are bound also to accept the Scripture of which he said that it cannot be broken. And can we hesitate in accepting Christ as true? Surely not, with all the facts in view. The basis of our confidence in him is solid and immovable, notwithstanding the scientific speculations of the day, which are very nebulous, and very shifting and changing from year to year, as men happen to catch glimpses of varying and limited phases of infinite Nature.

By-and-by, the people, having been settled in Canaan about 400 years, under circumstances we need not stay to dwell upon asked a king, and received one; and finally, after Saul, received David, a man after God's own heart, whose kingdom comprised the whole of the twelve tribes of Israel settled in the Land of Promise.

David was *king of the twelve tribes*, a fact important to recognise, as you will see in a later part of the argument. In course of time, within 80 years of David's accession to the throne, after the reign of his son, Solomon, that division occurred which gave rise to the distinction between the ten tribes and the two, which lies at the foundation of the present controversy. That division was a retributive one: it was judicial; it was in punishment of Solomon's idolatries. That we need not look at in its details. Suffice it to say that the division did occur' the ten tribes broke away from the government of the house of David, and set up a king of their own in Samaria, namely, Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who set up a religion of his own--a system of worship differing altogether from the Mosaic one, and consecrated to an idolatry borrowed from the neighbouring nations. The tribes of Judah and Benjamin remained faithful to the house of David, whose sons continued to reign over the diminished kingdom.

The two kingdoms so constituted, separately co-existed for a while, yet not long--long absolutely, but relatively to the immense periods of history, not long; in about 300 years a political catastrophe overwhelmed the kingdom of the ten tribes. Of the nature of that catastrophe we are all agreed. Shalmaneser, the king of Assyria, invaded the country; destroyed Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of the ten tribes; laid waste the kingdom, and took away the inhabitants. The ten tribes were bodily deported, as many, that is, as had escaped the ravages of war. The ten tribes were totally removed, with the exception of stragglers, perhaps somewhat numerous, whom it was scarcely possible to secure. Where they were taken to is plain. They were conveyed into regions lying eastward of the country from which they were taken. The record is brief, but clear and emphatic. It is to be found in II. Kings xvii. 3--" Against him (Hoshea, the king of the ten tribes) came up Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and Hoshea became his servant and gave him presents. And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea; for he had sent messengers to So, king of Egypt, and brought no present to the king of Assyria, as he had done year by year; therefore the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison. Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria, and besieged it three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away

into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes".

The kingdom of Judah survived the kingdom of Israel for several centuries, but I will not follow the fortunes of that kingdom, but just stop at this point' that the ten tribes, so far as their connection with the Holy Land is concerned, disappeared from the stage of history 700 or 800 years before Christ.

Up to this point we are all entirely agreed. We will now turn our faces to futurity, and say that there is another thing we are entirely agreed about' that with reference both to the kingdom of Judah, afterwards scattered, and remaining scattered at the present day, and the kingdom of Israel broken up by Shalmaneser over seven centuries before Christ, these prophecies will be fulfilled' "In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers" (Jer. iii. 18). "He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" (Isa. xi. 12). "Say unto them [the children of Israel]: Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all" (Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22).

I could read a great deal more of the same kind of prophecy, as those people must be aware who are acquainted with the Scriptures, going to show that it is the purpose of God, as declared by the prophets, to bring about a restoration of the people of Israel, in all their twelve tribes, to their own land in connection with the one king, of whose identity we shall have something to say before the evening is over, to whose government we are told all the nations of the Gentiles shall be subject, that all kings shall fall down before him, that all nations shall serve him, in harmony with what Daniel tells *us*" "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom "--you will find the statement in the 7th chapter, at the 14th verse; I like to give chapter and verse; I wish Mr. Hine had done the same--" that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed".

---

## THE QUESTION IN DISPUTE.

Now we have a past, about which we are agreed; and here we have a future state of things about which, as I understand Mr. Hine, we are also agreed. Now, what is the quarrel? It is about the interval reaching from the time that the ten tribes were taken out of the land, about 720 years before Christ, up to the time in which we are now living: that is the question in dispute. Mr. Hine says the British people are these ten tribes, who were driven out of their land for disobedience, and against whom many sore curses were pronounced, to which I may have to call your attention. Why does he say that? His reasons may be divided into two classes. He first alleges that on historical grounds his opinion is demonstrable; that is to say, he thinks he can find in various documents which have been inspected by others, and summarised in books which he has been reading, traces by which, inverting the process of history, and going backwards, he can trace the British people slowly and circuitously from here through various times and countries, finally to Media, and then to Samaria, by which process of argument he comes to the conclusion that we must be the expatriated ten tribes.

Well, with regard to that, we may make very short work of it, for this reason: at a meeting of the Anthropological Society, at which this question was discussed, Mr. Carpenter, a believer in the Anglo-Israel theory, said, as reported in the published report: "*He* for one could not be content to rest the question upon the evidence of secular history and geographical tests alone. If he had found nothing beyond that, he (Mr. Carpenter) would not have been of the number of those against whom Mr. Lewis's paper was *directed*. *He frankly admitted that profane history alone was not conclusive of their theory*". If it is not conclusive, why trouble ourselves with it? Evidence that is evidence is conclusive, and if evidence is not conclusive it is wrongly called evidence, because it may be something else. If a thing is not conclusive, it may be that it is quite compatible with some other theory lying in the opposite direction from that which it is quoted to support. It is therefore of no value, unless the theory is established from other sources. It may then be used as collateral evidence. This theory is said to be established from other sources--that is, from Scriptural sources. We will go directly to this source, and see whether the evidence relied upon is evidence at all.

---

## "THE CRADLE OF THE HUMAN RACE."

Last night even Mr. Hine himself surrendered this argument, unconsciously perhaps, in a remark which I took down at the time. He said: "*Although* the Germans can trace their ancestry to Media and to Assyria, and although some other small tribes can trace their ancestry to Assyria and Media, it does not follow that they are one family with the ten tribes". Now observe, Mr. Hine was well aware of the circumstance that other peoples besides the Saxons and other presumable ancestors of our heterogeneous British stock can be traced into that quarter of the world, and it was necessary to make this remark by way of anticipating the objection that might be raised; but what is the effect of the remark but this, to destroy the value of any argument he may use for Anglo-Israelism, from the circumstance of our ancestry being traceable to the neighborhood of Median districts; for, if other peoples can be traced historically to these parts, and not be Israel (as Mr. Hine admits), why not the British also? Why are we to claim for the circumstance of the British being traced there, a meaning and a conclusion not allowed to the same fact in the case of other peoples? There must be some other element brought into the argument before the fact of their being traceable to Media can be used as an argument of Israelitish extraction. There must be a stable foundation of evidence somewhere before these elements can be built into the edifice, and where is this stable foundation? If people will critically examine they will find how cloudy, how uncertain, how contradictory, the whole of the historical evidence upon this question happens to be. The fact of the matter is, that all peoples upon earth have radiated from the quarter of the globe where the countries lie to which the ten tribes were deported by Shalmaneser. It is notoriously known in all circles as "*the cradle of the human race*"; and if these regions be the cradle of the human race, where is the force of the argument which would found the theory of our Israelitishness on the fact of our coming out of *the common cradle*? If there is any force in it at all it would prove that every race is Israelitish, for every race can be traced to the common region from which all races sprung.

We may therefore make short work of the historical part of the argument, and go to that section of the subject which Mr. Carpenter, on the same occasion, said there was something in. He said, "*When* they looked into the Old Testament Scriptures, and compared what they there found about Israel--that is the ten tribes--with the fragments of secular history they could refer to, he believed their position to be, as he had said, unassailable". Let us go to the part of the argument which Mr. Carpenter considers "unassailable ", because if we can assail and demolish that which is said to be unassailable, we need not take much trouble about the part that is allowed to be in itself inconclusive.

---

## ALLEGED "MARKS OF IDENTITY".

Now upon this branch of the subject, Mr. Hine spoke of "300 marks"--three hundred marks of identity--and he said that although we might find one or two of the marks in some other nations, yet only one nation--and that our own nation--answered to all the three hundred marks, and that we must accept as the nation to be identified by the marks; which, in the abstract, is a very proper observation. If the premises of this argument are true, the conclusion doubtless is inevitable. If there are 300 marks by which the ten tribes are now, at this moment, to be recognised, and if we can find these 300 marks anywhere, doubtless the process of identification is very simple and very complete. But, to begin with, where are the 300 marks? Mr. Hine did not give us them last night. We cannot reasonably complain of that, because the mere definition of them would have been enough to occupy the whole of the evening, but he did give us a few, and I jotted them down; and we will go through those *seriatim*, and see if any one of them is a mark at all. And, if in the process of this examination, I make remarks which may appear to be somewhat vigorous, I hope nobody will take offence. Mr. Hine last night pleaded several times for a "Christian spirit", a mild, kindly, Christian spirit. Well, a Christian spirit is a good thing, provided you get the genuine article. (Marks of disapprobation.) Well, by that I simply mean this, that a Christian spirit does not necessarily consist of smooth and flattering speeches and bland manners. (Applause and hisses.) Those who disagree with that are Mr. Hine's friends, of course, and I am sure that Mr. Hine would not think hissing was evidence of a Christian spirit. (Applause.) I merely had in mind the fact that Paul must be supposed to be a very good illustration of the genuine Christian spirit, and you will find him when in the Island of Cyprus, before Sergius Paulus, when opposed by a certain subtle, plausible man, turning upon him and saying, "*Thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the ways of the Lord?*" Paul was a Christian, surely, of the unquestionable type, if ever there was one, and he did not evidence an unchristian spirit in characterising a bad thing truly. There is nothing unchristian in that. If you wish to see proof, you have only to read the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, which is one long scathing denunciation by the very Head of Christianity of the Scribes and Pharisees, whom He characterised as "*like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness*". Jesus, the Fountain head of Christianity, would appear at that moment in a very unchristian attitude in the estimation of some people. Therefore let no man misjudge me if I should find occasion to speak hardly in denunciation of "*marks*" which are no marks.

If I desire support in this matter, I fall back on Mr. Hine. Presumably Mr. Hine's remarks are characterised by what he thinks a Christian spirit. If so, I shall not be likely, in his estimation at all events, to transgress much to-night, however vigorously I may speak, after this quotation which I will make from Mr. Hine, which it is very curious should be circulated last night, as if it were a sort of precious morsel out of Mr. Hine's writings for the people to relish. The book from which it is quoted is "*Cui Bono?*" pages 27 and 38 :--

"Men who, with cramped and narrow minds, are forced at every turn to become apologists for God, who, in effect, profanely declare that God cannot be understood in His declaration through the sure word of prophecy, unless the literal meaning be extracted, and another one, supplied by themselves, be accepted: that the word of prophecy cannot be 'a more sure word', 'a light that shineth in a dark place', unless they be indulged in *the iniquity of twisting God's Word, DIVERTING HIS MEANINGS* by dressing it up in what they call their spiritual constructions, most generally *the conveyance of pure nonsense and direct untruths*, by which the ministry have made themselves, as a class, above all other classes, the laughing-stock of the million, who consider themselves by these absurdities shut out from the House of God by the very men who ought to know better".

And then again, on page 48 :--" It is *the merest nonsense* to assert that all sections of dissent are agreed upon the essential doctrines, only differing upon minor points. This *iniquitous statement* is *the dishonest cry of priestcraft*. They tell us that, being agreed in little details, there is no need for Christian union. We never hear this idle tale without being impressed of the possibility of our standing before SOME CLERICAL SWINDLER, for it is these very differences in minor details that have done all the damage".



Well, now, if Mr. Hine does not think that unchristian, I am sure that nobody here to-night ought to think any remark I may make unchristian, for I certainly shall not exceed these extracts in zest. I do not find fault with those extracts at all: I think they are richly deserved. At the same time I thought I would just call attention to them by way of disarming an anticipatory criticism with regard to the tenor of my remarks.

*[Here Mr. Hine came by invitation from the body of the hall to the platform]*

Well, then, we will go through so many of the "300 marks" as Mr. Hine was able to get into his discourse last night, and presumably as he was able to get in only a few, we may conclude that they were, in his estimation, tolerably pithy ones, because a man having to make a selection out of 300 would not select the weakest. And I will take them, therefore, in the order in which he gives them, and we shall see what they are like.

---

## 1.--"AS THE SAND OF THE SEA SHORE."

He said, " *They, the ten-tribed people, were to be as the sand of the sea-shore*", and then he appealed to the British people being as the sand of the sea-shore. He did not give us the chapter and verse; I wish he would do so; I should advise him in future always to do it, for if his case is good it will strengthen it, and if it is weak it will give other people the opportunity of doing what they ought to do, and helping them out of a bad position. I will go to the place from which he gets this "mark"---*Hosea 1:10*--in order to find whether it is possible that the statement quoted can be made to apply to the British nation: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not My people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." Question: Apart from the point who this Israel may be, when is this prophecy to be fulfilled--this prophecy that Israel were to be as the sand of the sea? The context answers it: "THEN shall the children of Judah AND the children of Israel be gathered together, and APPOINT THEMSELVES ONE HEAD." Have the children of Israel and the children of Judah been gathered together? Have they appointed themselves one head yet?

A VOICE: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Then it cannot apply to the present moment. If this be not the moment, how can we say that the British are the people? Are there no other people equally numerous with the British? I admit that this will be fulfilled: I rejoice to know that in the futurity of God's purpose the children of Israel will be unlimited in number. Yea, in process of due time the whole earth will be occupied with Israelites, and Gentile nationalities will entirely cease, and will be absorbed and obliterated in the perfection of the eternal ages, when the one head spoken of in this prophecy will have become the leader of a multitudinous people. But how is this a "mark" for the British, if it applies to a time that has not yet come? That is mark number one.

---

## 2.--" A NATION AND A COMPANY OF NATIONS."

The next mark is--" *God declares that the ten-tribe people shall be a nation and a company of nations*" ( *Gen. xxxv. 11*). By this, Mr. Hine asks us to understand England as the one nation and her colonies as the "*company of nations*," referred to in this promise; but let us see whether it is the ten-tribe people of whom this is said at all. Verse 10: "*And God said unto him, Thy name is Jacob; thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and He called his name Israel. And God said unto him, I am God Almighty; be fruitful and multiply a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins.*" "*Of thee*"--Jacob whatever the meaning may be, it applies to Jacob, and not "*the ten-tribe. people*" of Mr. Hine's phraseology. And about that meaning there can be no difficulty' Jacob was multiplied, not into ten, but into twelve minor nationalities in one nationality. Why separate this promise in the least degree from the Jews, who were equally constituents of the national "*Jacob*" with the ten tribes who are cast off? It applies equally to all the tribes. The translation given us by certain translators sets this in an even clearer light. This gives us the word "*even*" for "*and*." It will not be disputed by any Hebrew scholar that "*even*" is an admissible rendering of the Hebrew *wav* in construction with a substantive' "*A nation, even a company of nations, shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins.*" And that was so a nation consisting of twelve nations has come out of the loins of Jacob, and played an important part in history.

---

### 3.--" THE HEAD AND NOT THE TAIL."

Then Mr. Hine said, *"When Judah shall serve their enemies in all countries, God declares the ten-tribed people shall be the head, and not the tail, above only, and not beneath, the strongest upon the face of the earth."* Where does God declare that? Nowhere. Mr. Hine did not tell us where he professed to get the statement from, but I will direct your attention to the place from which the phraseology is borrowed, and you will see that it is a sheer misrepresentation that God has thus distinguished between the positions to be contemporarily occupied by Israel and Judah. The place is the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, verse 13: *"The Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail, and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath."* Now, to whom is this addressed? Observe, Moses called the elders of Israel, the elders of the whole congregation, comprising the *whole twelve tribes*, and therefore including the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and therefore the Jews. This applies equally to them all: it applies as much to Judah as to Simeon, as much to Benjamin as to Ephraim: *"thou"*--the twelve. There was no division of the people into Israel and Judah when Moses uttered those words: there was one nation of twelve tribes. The *"thou"* of the prophecy therefore covers all the twelve tribes, Israel and Judah alike. But then, observe there is *a condition attached* to the statement that the twelve-tribed Israel should be the head, and that condition occurs in the very verse from which the statement is quoted. It is a pity Mr. Hine did not quote the whole verse. He ought not to do what he justly accuses the clergy of doing. He accuses them of "twisting God's words," and "diverting His meanings." Let us see whether Mr. Hine has not been guilty of this in this case: *"The Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; IF that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and to do them: and thou shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day, to the right hand, or to the left, to go after other gods to serve them."*

"IF thou shalt not go after other gods." Did the ten tribes go after other gods? Yes. Mr. Hine claimed it as a *"grand identity,"* as he called it, that the so-called Israelites, upon their arrival on British shores, were idolaters. If, then, they went aside after other gods, how can he claim for them a promise which was expressly conditional upon their not doing so? But Moses proceeds to tell them what would happen, if, in the other case, they did not hearken, and were not obedient. Verse 15: *"It shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes which I command thee this day: that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee."* It is the same *"thou"* as in the early part of the chapter; therefore, if it is the ten tribes in one case it is the ten tribes in the other. Therefore, let us read British history by the light of this. *"Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field; cursed shall be thy basket and thy store; cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep; cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken Me."*

Now if it be legitimate on Mr. Hine's part to lift out a blessing from its connection of conditionality, and say, "There is a prophecy about England," why is it not legitimate for me to go a little further down the chapter, and lift out these curses, and say, here is a prophecy about England: therefore, England cannot be the ten tribes, because England is blessed, England is the head, and not the tail, England lends money, and does not borrow? There would be just as much force in that argument as in the other, and that is, no force at all. That is the third mark.

---

## 4.--" THEY THAT WAR AGAINST THEE, SHALL BE AS NOTHING."

Then the next mark he gave in order was a quotation from Isaiah to this effect: "*They that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought.*" We must go to the 41st chapter of Isaiah, to the 12th verse, to look at the quotation in the light of the context, so as to be quite sure that there is no "diverting of the meaning." Who is it of whom it is said that there was a time coming when those who made war against them should be as nothing? You will find it in the 8th verse: "Thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend." At the 10th verse, "Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee, yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness. Behold all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded: they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish," and so forth. It is a promise that refers to the comprehensive Jacob, the seed of Abraham; and will Mr. Hine attempt to limit the term "Jacob," the head of the whole twelve tribes, to ten of them? There is no ground for such a proceeding. The truth lies the other way, that "Jacob" when used concerning his natural seed, comprehends Judah as well as Israel; the Jews, as well as any people who may be supposed to be the ten tribes. This therefore takes its place with the others, as a quotation of Scripture which is not at all to the point--a "twist," a "diverting of the meaning"; for, there is nothing in it that can be connected with England, and whatever blessing it pronounces belongs as much to the Jews as the ten tribes, and will in due time be realised.

---

## 5.--JEWS "A TAUNT";ISRAEL "NOT RECOGNISED."

Then we are told that *"God declares that the two-tribe people should be known and recognised as a hissing, a taunt, and a proverb; while the ten-tribe people should for a time, even till the fulness of the Gentiles came in, be lost upon the face of the earth, existing but not recognised; that they should not be recognised among the nations."*

*"They were not to know themselves,"* he said; *"they were to be under the impression that they were Gentile people."* Where is the statement that the two-tribe people were to be known as a hissing, a taunt, and a proverb, as distinct from the ten who were not so to be known? There is no such statement. There is a statement in Deut. xxviii. :37, from which evidently Mr. Hine has derived the phraseology of his proposition. It is this--" *And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee.*" Who is the *"thou"* of this statement? For this we have Mr. Hine's answer in the early part of the chapter. He says it is the ten tribes; because, he said, the ten tribes were meant where it reads, *"Thou shalt be the head and not the tail";* and this is the same *"thou"* the same chapter; therefore, on Mr. Hine's authority, I say this *"astonishment, proverb, and byword"* recognition was to apply to the ten tribes, and not to the two tribes--not that I believe in any such distinction in this particular prophecy, but that is the logical result of Mr. Hine's own contention. It is the destruction of his allegation by his own reasoning.

Then where is the information *"that the ten tribes were to be lost on the face of the earth, existing, but not recognised?"* It does not exist; it is a mere assertion, an invention, a statement of Mr. Hine's made without the least proof. Perhaps we shall have an opportunity of putting that to the test more specifically on a future occasion; but I make that assertion at the present time, that there is no declaration in the whole Scripture to that effect. There are certain phrases from which the exigencies of this theory have led Mr. Hine to endeavour to extract the idea; but when we come to examine these phrases in detail, we shall find that not one of them has the idea claimed for them by Mr. Hine. I gather that one of them is the prophecy of Balaam, because he quoted it in this immediate connection: *"They shall not be reckoned among the nations."* He quoted that in illustration of his meaning. Therefore let us go to the prophecy of Balaam and see what that means. Mr. Hine says it means that the ten tribes should not be recognised as the ten tribes in their dispersion amongst the nations. Let us see.

It is in Numbers xxiii. 9. Israel had just arrived in their twelve tribes out of Egypt under Moses; they had approached the borders of Moab, and were assuming a threatening attitude; and Balak, the king of the country, sent for this prophet Balaam to curse the tribes of Israel, that is, *the twelve tribes*, for the whole twelve were there. Verse 7: *"And he took up his parable, and said, Balak, the king of Moab, hath brought me from Aram, out of the mountains of the east, saying, Come, curse me Jacob, and come defy Israel. How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy whom the Lord hath not defied? For from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him: lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."* Now, did not this prophecy apply to the whole twelve tribes? Unquestionably; for there they were spread out in one camp at the feet of Balak and Balaam as they stood looking at them from a hill. If so, then if *"not reckoned among the nations"* means that they were to be unrecognised while among them, we ought not to be able to recognise the Jews, because these two tribes were amongst the twelve of whom it was affirmed. But that is not the meaning: the meaning is, that they were to be absolutely separate from all other nations. They were not to intermarry with them. They were not to have dealings with them. They were not to be reckoned among them. They were to stand apart in law, in religion, in principle, in their relation to God: in everything. They were to dwell alone. What had this to do either with England, or even with the ten tribes in their dispersion? This *"mark"* you will see is no mark at all, but a phantasy of Mr. Hine's imagination.

---

## 6.--" CALLED BY ANOTHER NAME."

The next "mark" is: "God says they should be called by another name." Mr. Hine did not exactly tell us what he understood by that, but from the connection of the statement I should judge that he meant that it is a prophecy that the ten tribes of Israel should lose the name of Israel, and should be known as Englishmen. Well, let us go to the prophecy and see: Isaiah lxv. 15. I would remark that this process of going to the passages and examining them may be more tedious than declamation, and less pleasant to listen to than a string of entertaining assertions such as you were entertained by last evening; but, you know, this is a legal process of testing evidence, and is therefore necessarily less interesting perhaps to the ordinary run of hearers, but as regards minds which are anxious to test the grounds on which they are asked to entertain a certain conviction, this process is more interesting than any amount of declamatory assertion of ingenious *ex parte* illustration.

The particular "mark" upon which Mr. Hine apparently relies in this case is to be found in the 15th verse: "*The Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name.*" Now let us remember Mr. Hine's charge against the clergy of "*diverting God's meaning.*" Let us ask what is God's meaning here, and see how Mr. Hine stands. Let us not merely clip out the sentence, and put it into connection with a preconceived Anglo-Israel theory, and hold it up as a proof. Let us see what the prophet is talking about. Beginning at verse 2, we read: "*I have spread out My hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts,*" and then we have an enumeration of various infractions of the Mosaic law which they had committed; and then, at verse 6, we read: "*Behold, it is written before Me: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the Lord, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed Me upon the hills; therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom.*" There is no room for uncertainty as to who is spoken of here: for Paul, in Rom. x, 21, applies it to Israel. It is the nation of Israel as a whole, guilty of idolatry. God here denounces judgment against them; but "*Thus saith the Lord*"--though the nation as a whole is guilty, there is not to be a total national destruction, as you will see from what follows: "*As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all.*"

What is the exception? According to Mr. Hine, it is ten-tribed Israel. Hear what this very prophecy which he quotes says: "*I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and OUT OF JUDAH an inheritor of My mountains; and Mine elect shall inherit it, and My servants shall dwell there.*" Judah, not Israel, is associated with the blessing reserved in this prophecy. "*But ye [the transgressors in Israel denounced in the beginning of the prophecy] are they that forsake the Lord, that forget My holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the drink-offering unto that number. Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter; because when I called ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before Mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, My servants shall eat,*" who have been already associated with Judah in the prophecy, "*but ye,*" Israel, the idolatrous, "*shall be hungry. Behold, My servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, My servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed*"; and in the 15th verse: "*And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call His servants by another name.*"

This is the sentence quoted by Mr. Hine to prove that the idolatrous ten tribes were to be called Englishmen ! If this is not "*twisting*" and "*diverting*" the meaning," there can be no such thing. By what other name have the servants of God been called, as contradistinguished from the rebels under the Mosaic constitution of things? Mr. Hine suggests "*English.*" What a mockery of the subject to ask us to recognise in English society the idea of Divine perfection and blessedness as contrasted with what existed in Israel. Let us go to the Scriptures and ask what is this other name. The New Testament furnishes the answer. There we find how that 1,800 years ago, the apostles, by divine command, proclaimed *the name of JESUS* as a name to be named upon all who should desire to come unto God for worship and salvation. Writing to such, Paul says, "*Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from*

iniquity" (2 Tim. ii. 19). That is the new name which God has named upon His servants--the name of Christ, of which Peter proclaimed (Acts iv. 12), "*There* is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Here is a glorious fulfilment of the prophecy which Mr. Hine trails in the mud by asking us to understand that it meant that the ten tribes were, by an extraordinary miracle, to forget who they were, and to be called by some other name. He reduces the prophecy to absurdity. He makes it of no consequence whatever; for what does it matter whether the rebellious ten tribes should be called *English* or *Israel*, as a mere matter of words? It is a matter of utter insignificance. When the Bible speaks of names, it means things. The Bible deals with realities, and when it speaks of His servants being called by another name, it is pointing to a glorious reality, that in due course of time, the Lord Jesus Christ--"the prophet like unto Moses"--shall come forth as the substance prefigured by Moses and bless all the earth with the true and substantial blessings which will be enjoyed under the shadow of His wings when the present era of faith and preparation shall have accomplished its object.

---



## 7.--"THE PLACE IS TOO STRAIT FOR ME."

The next "mark" is alleged to be found in Isaiah *xlix.* 20; and here we are invited to recognise England's overstocked population and migratory departures into unoccupied parts of the earth for the formation of British colonies. Well, let us see if it is so. The particular words quoted are to be found in verse 20: "*The place is too strait for me: give place to me, that I may dwell.*" Why! the very verse before suggests the entire inapplicability of the statement in the manner contended for by Mr. Hine, for what do we read in the verse before? "*Thy waste and thy desolate places, and the land of thy destruction, shall even now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away.*" Why! is England "*the land of Britain's destruction?*" Mr. Hine makes it one of his points that England has never been defeated. I do not admit the fact, nor the meaning he claims for it if it were a fact; but it is one of his points. Well, if so, how can an undefeated country be "*the land of England's destruction?*" The land of the nation spoken of in the prophecy has been to that nation "*the land of its destruction,*" for it has found its grave by disaster in the land as regards the bulk of the population, and from that land the survivors have been driven by one invader and another until they are scattered to the ends of the earth, as was foretold ages ago by Moses.

But the context is even more confounding from an Anglo-Israelitish point of view, when we ask who it is that speaks and is addressed in this prophecy. In verse 14 we read: "*Zion said, 'The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me.'*" "*Zion.*" Why, Zion was the topographical seat of the Judaic royalty. If it had said "*Samaria hath said*"--for Samaria was the capital of the ten tribes--then there might have been a little ground--not much--but there might have been a little ground for Mr. Hine's suggestion that here Britain speaks, if the ten tribes were from other sources made out to be the English. But "*Zion hath said.*" Zion is one of the hills upon which Jerusalem is built, as you are aware, and therefore it is the kingdom of Jerusalem that is introduced to us here, and not the kingdom of the ten tribes--the Jews, and not what Mr. Hine calls "*Israel.*"

Then, observe this: "*They that swallowed thee up shall be far away.*" Mr. Hine makes it a boast, as one of his so-called "*identities,*" that England never has been swallowed up; and a gentleman last night, who delivered an expository prayer, referred in this sense to the prophecy of Moses, that five should chase a hundred, and a hundred should put ten thousand to flight, and remarked, that notwithstanding what had gone wrong in Zululand, which he said somebody was to blame for, though they did not yet know who, the thing would come out all right. (Laughter and applause, mingled with hisses.)

I do not desire to be irreverent; I am simply referring to the fact that the gentleman who prayed last night did make that statement, as showing that their very arguments are inconsistent one with another; for while they apply to England, absolutely, a promise of military superiority conditionally guaranteed to Israel, and boast that England has never been defeated, the)' with equal indiscrimination apply to her, as in this case, prophecies that involve that the power spoken of has been subject to devastation. The meaning of the prophecy is perfectly plain when unmystified by this Anglo-Israel gloss. It is a promise of the restoration of the scattered race of Israel to their own original land, when the land of their destruction shall be too narrow for the multitude of Israel gathered from all parts of the earth. The attempt to make it apply to Britain and her Colonies, instead of shutting up the mouth of infidelity, as the Anglo-Israelites boast about their views, is enough to bring the Bible into even more contempt than it has ever yet been held in by the lowest class of unbelievers.

---

## 8.--" THE DESOLATE HERITAGES."

The last material point--there were a great many assertions, but I snatched hold of those only in which there was some semblance of Scripture proof; because you can deal with argument when you are obliged to leave assertions untouched. The last material point was Isaiah xlix. 8, where again the subject of the Colonies is supposed to be illustrated. The words relied upon are at the end of the 8th verse, "*To cause to inherit the desolate heritages,*" and these desolate heritages Mr. Hine asks us to suppose are the uninhabited parts of the earth. Well, let us look at the context. Let us beware of "*diverting* the meaning." What is the meaning? Of whom is this causing to inherit the desolate heritages affirmed? Verse 7: "*Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and His Holy One, to Him whom man despiseth, TO HIM WHOM THE NATION' ABHORRETH, to a servant of rulers.*" Who is that? Who was "despised and rejected of men"? Who was abhorred and cast out by the nation of Israel to whom He was sent? You know. To Him this is said: "*I will preserve Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages.*" Why! it is a part of the work of Christ, not of England.

And what heritages are they that are desolate? A heritage is an inheritance, and an inheritance is that which is bequeathed; and what land is there which having been bequeathed is now desolate? This is very easily settled. You have only to go to Hebrews xi. 8 to see: "*By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out.*" What place or land was this which he (Abraham) was afterwards to receive for an inheritance? Stephen settles it in his speech before the Sanhedrim, as recorded in Acts vii. 4. "*He (Abraham) came into this land [Palestine where ye now dwell.] Is the land--the appointed place of heritage --desolate? Yes; and has been for centuries. Has Christ's work anything to do with the recovery of these desolate heritages? Yes; for look at Isaiah lxi., and here we are in no fear of" diverting the meaning,*" for this prophecy was quoted by Christ as he stood in the synagogue at Nazareth, as recorded in the fourth chapter of Luke. He read this prophecy on the occasion, and declared that it applied to him. He only read so much of it as applied to his first coming, and I will read you now the part that refers to his second, and you will see: verse 3 :--

"*To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them' beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified. And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the DESOLATIONS OF MANY GENERATIONS.*" The chapter before, verse 14, says: "*The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The City of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel. Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee AN ETERNAL EXCELLENCY, A JOY OF MANY GENERATIONS.*" The recovery of the land of God from the judicial desolations that have prevailed for many centuries is a part of the work of Christ which is assigned to him in various parts of the Scripture, and, among others, it is assigned to him in that part which Mr. Hine, without the least reason, and diverting it entirely from its meaning, applied to the English nation!

---

# QUEEN VICTORIA AND THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

Then we have *an attempt to establish a connection between Queen Victoria and the House of David*. I will not take you through the mythical legends of Scotch and Irish barbarians of ancient days. Mr. Hine had much to do with this last night, and he called it "*history*." Well, in refuting his contention, I will leave out no pages even from his so-called "*history*." I will leave them all there. I will gladly make him a present of them all, and say that even if they were all true, and that even if it could be established beyond a doubt that Queen Victoria was descended from Zedekiah, it would still remain a fact that she has no connection with the throne of Israel. For this reason: *Zedekiah was an interloper, and not reckoned in the royal genealogy*. You will find the evidence of that if you turn to 2 Kings xxiv. We here have an account of the last days of the Kingdom of Judah, just before the Babylonish captivity. Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, and the result of it is here briefly stated that he put down the reigning king Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah. Did this Jehoiachin die without issue so as to necessitate the accession of a collateral branch to fill the gap? Let us see. Concerning this Jehoiachin, the rightful occupant of the throne, we read at the 10th verse: "*At that time the servants of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came up against Jerusalem, and the city was besieged..... And Jehoiachin, the king of Judah, went out to the king of Babylon, he, and his mother, and his servants, and his princes, and his officers; and the king of Babylon took him in the eighth year of his reign.*" At the 15th verse: "*And he carried away, Jehoiachin to Babylon, and the king's mother, and the king's wives, and his officers, and the mighty of the land: those carried he into captivity from Jerusalem to Babylon.*" At verse 17: "*And the king of Babylon made Mattaniah, his father's brother*"--that is, Jehoiachin's father's brother--"*KING IN HIS STEAD, and changed his name to Zedekiah.*" The uncle of the king was put in his place as Nebuchadnezzar's nominee.

Now if it could be shown that Jehoiachin, when he went to Babylon, had no children, and that his pedigree was thus cut off, then you might fall back upon Zedekiah as a collateral branch of the royal family, but even then you see the line would not be direct. But that cannot be shown: the reverse can be shown. Jehoiachin (or, as he is sometimes called, Jeconiah) in Babylon had male issue, and you will find that the royal line is carried forward through this issue, and that Zedekiah is altogether ignored in the true royal genealogy given in the first chapter of Matthew. If you turn to that chapter, verse 11, leaving out the immaterial parts of the genealogy, you will find this: "*And Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon; and after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel, and Salathiel begat Zorobabel,*" and so on, and it conducts the chain down to JESUS OF NAZARETH (the putative son of Joseph), in whom therefore the genealogical line of the House of David terminates. The royal rights are in the last link of the chain.

They are vested in Christ, concerning whom there are many declarations in the Scriptures as to his destined occupancy of the throne of David. Let one suffice. It is the statement of the angel who came to Mary to apprise her of Christ's approaching birth. "*The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob (Israel) for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end*" (Luke i. 32). The royal rights of his pedigree he took away with him to heaven, and he is coming back by-and-by to give them effect in the restoration of the kingdom of Israel and the government of the whole earth in subjection to that monarchy--but Mr. Hine prefers the interloper set up by Nebuchadnezzar, and ignores the legitimate line of succession as settled by the New Testament, and patent even in the reading of the Old. It is in reality a question between Jesus Christ and Queen Victoria, which, with all respect to Her Majesty, she will not expect wise men to settle in her favour. Mr. Hine stakes his theory upon a line of descent which is legendary, uncertain, improbable, and full of fatal gaps and flaws; and a line of descent which, even if it could be proved, would be as utterly worthless as any other line of barbarians by which any of us has descended from Adam.

---

## THE CORONATION STONE.

I will not trouble you with the nonsense about *the stone in Westminster Abbey*, which is sufficiently refuted by the geology of the case. The stone is of the *old red sandstone formation* of Scotland, and has nothing in common with the *limestone* rocks of Palestine.

---

## JEWES AND "ISRAELITES."

Then Mr. Hine remarked that *unless the distinction between Judah and Israel was recognised, it was impossible to understand the Scriptures*. With the remark in that form I agree, but with the application he gives to the remark I think every reasonable man, in view of the evidence, is bound entirely to disagree. The remark he makes in one of his publications, which I find I have not with me, is to the effect that the Jews and Israel are as distinct one from another as England is from France, that they are so separate and incompatible that you might as well talk of mixing fire and water, or something to that effect. Probably Mr. Hine himself will recollect the sentence to which I am alluding. Now while it is true that the house of Jacob was divided into two political sections, which, for the sake of distinction, were known--one as the Kingdom of Judah, and the other as the Kingdom of Israel, it is entirely untrue that there is a distinction between the terms *Jew* and *Israel*, as defining two parts of the same stock in all succeeding time. Jews are Israelites, and Israelites are Jews, in Scriptural usage. (*Cries of No, no, no.*) I will prove that it is so. (Applause.) There is a very great deal of proof, I assure you, upon this point. I shall only have time to give a sample or two.

The first illustration I ask you to look at is to be found in connection with Paul, who says, Romans xi. 1: "*I say then, Hath God cast away His people?*" and, in order that you may be sure what people He is speaking about, look at the verse immediately before, the last verse of the preceding chapter. "*To Israel* He saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people. I say then, Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For *I also AM AN ISRAELITE*"--I, Paul, am an Israelite. Is he therefore not a Jew? (*Voices, "No"; Some voices, "Yes."*) Let us see. Look at the twenty-second chapter of Acts. Paul is just taken into custody by the Roman governor, and he is standing on the castle stairs before a turbulent Jewish crowd, and he has obtained permission to address that crowd in self-defence; and listen to his opening words, verse 3' "*I am verily a man which am a Jew.*" (Applause.) Therefore in Bible language, an Israelite may be a Jew, and a Jew may be an Israelite.

I will give you further evidence. You will recollect the restoration from Babylon, and I presume there will be no difference of opinion amongst Anglo-Israelites that those who came from Babylon were Jews, for this is a strong point in their theory. That being so, I invite their attention to the following fact, to be found in the 2nd chapter of the book of Nehemiah. Taking the first chapter for the sake of the connection, Nehemiah was an office-bearer of Artaxerxes, the king of Persia he had not taken part in the return from captivity, but he was very much interested in his fellow-countrymen, who had gone back to Jerusalem from Babylon, and accordingly we read in the 2nd verse of the first chapter, that "*Hanani, one of my brethren, came, he and certain men of Judah; and I asked them concerning the Jews that had escaped, which were left of the captivity, and concerning Jerusalem.*" Afterwards he obtains permission of the king to go to Jerusalem, to build it up. And he went, and what happened? At chapter two, verse 10, we read, "When Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the servant, the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a man *to seek the welfare of the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL.*" Therefore the Jews were children of Israel. (Anglo-Israelites' Hear, hear.) If so, what argument can you rest upon the term Israel, seeing that it may, for anything you know, apply in any case to the two tribes as well as the ten? I do not know whether the logic of that is perceived, but I think the force of it is pretty evident.

Yielding to the cogency of this line of argument, those who believe England to be Israel, and rest that belief on the distinction between Israel and Judah--which distinction, however, if proved, would not prove the case--yielding to the force of these considerations, *they have invented the formula' "All Jews are Israelites, but all Israelites are not Jews."* (Anglo-Israelites' Hear, hear.) Very well, then, let us see. We will take the book of Esther. Artaxerxes, here described as Ahasuerus, reigned as king over the 127 provinces of Persia. Now that jurisdiction covered the whole of the region to which the ten tribes had been removed; and how are they described? How are the kinsfolk, the national relations, "*the people of*" Esther and Mordecai, described' for Haman, their adversary, contrived to obtain a decree for the extermination of their whole people; the entire nation. Esther iii. 13 "*The letters were sent by post into all the king's provinces, to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, ALL JEWS, both young and old, little*

children and women,. in one day, even upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth month," and you will find it stated in the 12th verse, that that decree was sent "to the governors that were over every province, and to the rulers of every people of every province according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language." So that this decree covered a variety of nationalities, and in all these nationalities the Jews were to be extirpated, whereas, according to Mr. Hine's theory, the Jews, having been a short time in Babylon, had gone back to Jerusalem, and were there at this time. The ten tribes were Mordecai's people, as well as the two tribes; they were in the Empire of Persia, and they are here described as Jews.

How comes this to be? What is the meaning of the term "*Jews*"? Well, it doubtless comes from Judah. (Anglo-Israelites: Hear, hear.) Yes: that is the philology of the word; but you know the conventional use overrides the philology in thousands of cases in our every-day talk. Why, the very word English, of which so much is made in this controversy, is an example. It comes from the Angles, who, in conjunction with the Saxons, invaded England to help the Britons against the Picts and Scots of the north. Afterwards came Danes and Normans and others, and laid the foundation of our heterogeneous stock. But the name Angle-land, which the country early acquired in connection with the Angles, remained; and the people occupying it came to be called Angle-ish or English, quite irrespective of original extraction. There is a very small Angle element in the English population, and yet we are all Angle-ish according to the philology of our name. So in this case we must not tie ourselves up in the philology. We have to ask, what is the Scriptural usage in regard to this term "*Jew*," which was originally and popularly derived from the Jewish kingdom, having outlived the Israelitish for centuries, and in connection with which alone the Hebrew race was politically known. We have to ask whether, as a matter of fact, the Scriptures adapt themselves to popular usage in the matter in speaking of the people of Israel as Jews. And you will find it is so.

What does Jesus say? He says: "*Salvation is of the Jews*" (John iv. 22). Does he mean salvation is of the two tribes, to the exclusion of the ten? If so, what becomes of Mr. Hine's contention, that salvation is the peculiarity of the ten tribes, that while Judah is cursed, Israel is blessed; that while the Jews are exiled from Divine favour, Israel are within the pale of His recognition and blessedness? Well, but do we find these Jews to whom salvation appertained called Israel also? Yes. When Paul arrived a prisoner at Rome, you will recollect the first thing he did on his arrival was to gather his countrymen, to commune with them on the subject of his arrest. We are told (Acts xxviii. 17) that he called the chief of the Jews together, and after telling them certain things, he says at the 20th verse, "*For this cause therefore have I called for you, to see you, and to speak with you, because that for the hope of ISRAEL I am bound with this chain.*" The hope of Israel and the hope of the Jews are therefore the same thing.

But the evening is too far advanced to admit of my elaborating the evidence on this point. I must therefore content myself with alleging, which I can prove afterwards, that the case stands more powerfully than I have been able, in these few extemporised remarks, to illustrate.

Let me remark before sitting down that I should have been glad if Mr. Hine had seen his way to accept my proposal last night, to have an extensive discussion on the question. You will have had illustration this evening that, although twelve nights seemed a long time, yet the period was not too long for the work to be done, because if this matter is to be debated in a manner that shall be profitable either to one side or the other, we must go into all the alleged evidences to be adduced on each side, and to do that satisfactorily requires a very elaborate process, because the arguments that are relied upon are so numerous, although they are so unreal. Mr. Hine has not seen fit to comply with my request. Had he even suggested six nights instead of twelve, I should have thought that a reasonable way of meeting the proposal, and I should have consented at once to six nights. But he says, "*No, let us have one.*" Now it is a matter of impossibility in one night to discuss this question. Mr. Hine occupied the whole of the time last night, and I have occupied the whole of the time this evening, in exhibiting argumentatively in our own way the evidence *pro* and *con*; and if that be so without individual collision, how is it to be expected that we can deal with matters of rejoinder in the course of a single night? It is a matter of impossibility. Oh ! but Mr. Hine says, "*Let us meet at five o'clock, and stay till twelve.*" Surely he does not make that proposal seriously! Does he imagine people will sit and listen all that time? If he does not make the proposal seriously, why does he make it at all? However, the proverb says, "*Better have half a loaf than no loaf at all.*" So if we can only have one night's discussion, let us have it.

It was subsequently arranged privately between Mr. HINE and Mr. ROBERTS that the debate should occupy three nights. The debate came off in Exeter Hall, London, on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of April, 1879. The debate was reported and published under the title, *Are Englishmen Israelites?*

---