

**THE
HINE
DEBATE**

**— ARE
ENGLISHMEN
ISRAELITES?**

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE following report of a Three-Nights' Debate in Exeter Hall, Strand, London, is from the notes of shorthand-writers. Mr. Hine declined to share any risk in the publishing part of the enterprise, but consented to Mr. Roberts' friends doing as they pleased in the matter. The transcript of the shorthand-writers has been carefully revised and corrected by Mr. Roberts. Mr. Hine was offered the manuscript for the purpose of revising his part of the Debate; but he declined to avail himself of the opportunity. He said he had perfect confidence in Mr. Roberts' friends, and that his engagements would not allow him the necessary leisure to go over the manuscript. Consequently Mr. Hine's speeches appear without the advantage of personal revision by him. They are, however, faithfully and accurately reported, as all who heard them will bear witness.

A gentleman who heard the Debate, and who was originally inclined to accept Mr. Hine's views, said, "What does it matter which way it is? It seems to me a matter of indifference whether we are Israel or not. I do not see why it should be made a matter of such earnest controversy". As it is probable that this represents a very common sentiment on the subject, a word or two with reference to it may not be amiss. Such a sentiment is natural in the present posture of the public mind in Bible matters. If our future state is individually entered upon when we die, and has nothing to do with the earth upon which we live and its affairs, it certainly must matter very little, except as a question of curious interest, whether the English are the "lost ten tribes" or no. The perusal of the succeeding pages may possibly prepare the reader for a different view of this point. Though the subject is not expressly discussed (as it is in some other works issuing from the same source) it will be found to be suggested by the whole tenor of the argument, that the death state is not the state of spiritual destiny; that resurrection at the second appearing of Christ introduces to this; and that it has direct and peculiar reference to the purpose of God in connection with the nation of Israel, and therefore connected with affairs on earth in the judicial epoch and beyond.

When Jesus said, "Salvation is *of the Jews*" (John 4:22), and when Paul summoned the chief of the Jews at Rome on the ground that he was manacled "for the hope of Israel" (Acts 28:20), it was no accidental or figurative form of words they employed. The hope of the gospel is a hope so essentially Israelitish in its character and surroundings as to constitute Paul's declaration before Agrippa a natural statement of fact, viz.: "Now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, *unto which promise*, OUR TWELVE TRIBES instantly serving God day and night, *hope to come*" (Acts 26:6). There was no straining of language in the declaration he makes to the Romans (chap. 9:4) that

to the Israelites “pertain the adoption and the glory of the covenants * * * and the promises”. He establishes a direct connection between the work of Christ and these Israelitish hopes and promises, when he says (Romans 15:8) that “Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to *confirm the promises made unto the fathers*”.

The hope of the gospel being the hope of Israel (Acts 28:20; 1:6), it becomes a very important question, whether or not British greatness is the realization of that hope. If it be, then is the hope of Israel a poor affair, and little worth to those who sigh for deliverance from the multiform evils that afflict human life and human society everywhere, and as much in Britain as anywhere else. Anglo-Israelism asks us to regard the House of Brunswick as the House of David, and the kingdom of Great Britain as the kingdom of Israel in the promised exaltation and blessedness. Let this view be accepted, and two results follow: The mind (already sufficiently predisposed by nature) is drawn into a loving alliance with the godless world of British society, and into all the demoralising results that come from such an alliance; while the truly “glorious things spoken of Zion” are eclipsed, and lose all power to influence a man to those present self-denials which the hope of Israel exacts as the condition-precedent of reigning with Christ, when the “present evil world” shall be a vision of the past.

The Hine theory is a mockery. It is a sham and a cheat for all spiritual purposes. It puts off with hollow words the soul that thirsts for the good things promised to Israel. The God of Israel has asked all such to hearken diligently to Him, to eat that which is good, to let their souls delight themselves in fatness, to have a part in the sure mercies of David (Isaiah 55:1-3). What those sure mercies are is known to those who know the Scriptures. Hineism comes forward with British greatness as the sum and substance of them all. What is British greatness to the man who longs for what God has promised to Israel?—who longs to see Divine light upon earth, Divine law enforced, property Divinely distributed, society Divinely constructed, individual life Divinely formed, national life Divinely regulated, physical life Divinely renovated, evil in every form Divinely repressed, and death itself at last abolished? British greatness! What is it? The triumph of unscrupulous might, the success of unprincipled commerce, the prosperity of intolerant pride, the deft management of men and ships in the art of human destruction, the skilful use of mechanics and the subtle employment of intellect in self-aggrandisement, the picturesque and vain-glorious ostentation of caste, the ignominious ease of a few at the sacrifice of the best interests of toiling millions who scarcely know how to subsist, and who have none of the alleviating opportunities and influences which a just distribution of earth’s teeming wealth would ensure for all.

What was the characteristic of Israel’s national life, and Israel’s royal house in the day of their power? The presence and interference of God in their midst for purposes of law and government in the most practical shape. Moses gave expression to the idea in his question: “What nation is there so great who hath

God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for?” (Deut. 4:7). The practical sense in which this was the case is illustrated in the Divine decision of a question of family inheritance (Num. 27:5-7), and the direction of how to deal with an unprovided-for-case of blasphemy (Lev. 24:12-14). In the re-constitution of the nation of Israel — in the re-building of the tabernacle of David that is fallen: the glory of the era ensuing consists of the restoration of this feature in a more direct and personal form than it ever presented under the first covenant. Instead of a dread presence in a typical tabernacle, a son of David — the Lord Jesus Christ — is to occupy the throne in their midst, as the personal symbol and administrator (through His agents) of Divine and irresistible law. “The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. * * * He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, neither shall He judge after the hearing of His ears: But with righteousness shall He judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked” (Isaiah 11:2-4). Those who desire evidence that He will occupy the throne of David personally, have but to consult the following passages:—Luke 1:32, Isaiah 9:6; Jer. 23:5, Psa. 132:11, Acts 2:30; 2 Sam. 23:5, Micah 5:2; Zech. 6:12-13. “The Lord the King of Israel is in their midst” in that day (Zeph. 3:15). Thus the “law goes forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem” (Isaiah 2:3), with the result that all nations walk in the light of it, and abandon the evil traditions of the present barbarised state of society (Jer. 3:17; 16:12). His government is personal government, of the most absolute character, administered through His resurrected and immortal friends. A rod of iron, wielded in Jerusalem with consummate wisdom and irresistible power, will bring all nations into subjection to a Divine autocracy that will bless universal man with true government and endow the nations with every institution required by individual and social welfare.

From this glorious prospect — from this needed and promised salvation, Anglo-Israelism turns the mind utterly away. It directs us to the hollow state of things around us from which we require to be delivered. It asks us to recognise the promised greatness of Israel in the tramp of British soldiers, the prowess of British ironclads, the jangle of British parliaments, the mummery of British ecclesiasticism, and the colonial appropriations of British acquisitiveness. There is nothing Divine in the British constitution, except in so far as it is a tolerated and occultly regulated institution for ulterior Divine ends. It is a purely and intensely human affair, unlike the government of Israel, which was, and is again to be, proximately and visibly Divine. In pointing us to such a thing, Anglo-Israelism for bread gives us a stone. The discussion may be useful as illustrating the fact. At all events it is sent forth with the simple aim which led to the discussion — a desire to draw attention to the much-belauded, but everywhere-neglected Book of God;

which is not understood by reason of the universal acceptance of a false theology, which renders its glorious doctrines of none effect.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Birmingham, May 2nd, 1879.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
PREFACE	339	MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	397
		MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.....	400
		MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH	401
FIRST NIGHT OF THE DEBATE			
MR. HINE'S FIRST SPEECH	345		
MR. ROBERTS' FIRST SPEECH	349		
MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS	356		
MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	359		
MR. HINE'S SECOND SPEECH	362		
MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	365		
MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH	369		
MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH	370		
SECOND NIGHT OF THE DEBATE			
MR. HINE'S FIRST SPEECH	372		
MR. ROBERTS' FIRST SPEECH	377		
MR. ROBERTS OCCUPIES MR. HINE'S QUESTION TIME	383		
MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	389		
MR. HINE'S SECOND SPEECH	394		
		THIRD NIGHT OF THE DEBATE	
		MR. HINE'S FIRST SPEECH	404
		MR. ROBERTS' FIRST SPEECH	409
		MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS	416
		MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	420
		MR. HINE'S SECOND SPEECH	424
		MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE	426
		MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.....	431
		MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH	433
		LECTURE BY MR. ROBERTS	
		ON THE TRUE POSITION OF BRITAIN IN PROPHECY	438
APPENDIX			
<i>For the publication of matter for which there was insufficient time during the Debate.</i>			
	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
1—ISRAEL AND JUDAH	459	9—THE IDOLATROUS BRITONS AND THE BRITISH TONGUE	468
2—THE "BLINDNESS" OF ISRAEL	461	10—MR. HINE ANSWERS HIMSELF	469
3—ISRAEL SAVED AND REDEEMED	463	11—THE NON-JEWISH PHYSIOGNOMY OF THE BRITISH	469
4—THE TRIBE OF BENJAMIN	464	12—A COMPANY OF NATIONS	470
5—A LIGHT FOR THE HOUSE OF DAVID	465	13—THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S PUNISHMENT	472
6—WHY ONE TRIBE?	466	14—THE ISLES	473
7—THE POSITION OF LEVI	466	15—ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND ROMANS 11	474
8—ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE SEED OF DAVID	467		
		ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS	475

ARE ENGLISHMEN ISRAELITES?

Time table each Evening.

Mr. HINE. Speech, Thirty Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Speech, Thirty Minutes.

Mr. HINE to question Mr. Roberts, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS to question Mr. Hine, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. HINE to question Mr. Roberts or make a Speech, Fifteen Minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS to question Mr. Hine or make a Speech, Fifteen Minutes.

The remainder of the time up to ten o'clock to be equally divided in Speeches by Mr. Hine and Mr. Roberts.

FIRST NIGHT.

THE CHAIRMAN (LORD WILLIAM LENNOX):— Ladies and Gentlemen, Some little experience as a lecturer has convinced me that a chairman best fulfils his duties who occupies as little as possible of the time of the audience. I should therefore have addressed you very briefly, but I find that in my instructions I am limited to ten minutes. Now ten minutes will give me ample time to tell you what I have to say. In the first place you are here this evening to listen to a discussion between Mr. Edward Hine and Mr. Robert Roberts. These gentlemen are limited to a certain time, and it will be my unpleasant duty to stop them if, in the height of their argument, they are carried on beyond the limits allowed to them; but I am quite sure that it will not be the case. I have my watch ready, and will give them warning at three minutes before the time expires, but I am quite sure, so able are these gentlemen as disputants or lecturers, that I shall not be called upon to interfere with them. I have only to add that the duty of a chairman is

to see that everything is conducted properly, and I am quite sure that everything will be conducted on the fair English principle of a fair field and no favour. I need only say this, that I am certain that you will listen to these two gentlemen with every attention, and I am instructed to say to you that no discussion from any member of the audience will be permitted. We are to hear these two gentlemen, and to form our opinions on what they state. With these few remarks I beg to call upon Mr. Hine to commence the proceedings of the evening.

A VOICE:—How is this question to be decided at the end of the discussion? Is it to be decided on a show of hands, or otherwise?

THE CHAIRMAN:—There is to be no decision.

Mr. EDWARD HINE:—My Lord, and ye Children of Israel (and I would not give up the point for any consideration, unless the Lord God Almighty came forth with clearer proofs than I have now obtained upon that matter),—Our object is to meet to consider the deep things of God, and if we be right then we lay before your consideration a subject that can be second unto no subject on earth, as far as man is concerned. If we are enabled to show to the people of London — as we have to the people in the North — that you are identical with the people of Israel, then the whole future of your country is made known to you, and legislation becomes easy to your legislators.

God Almighty of old times selected one nation from the midst of all other nations,—a separate nation,—*i.e.*, one nation to be unto Him a peculiar nation; a chosen people, severed and separated from all the other peoples of the earth. I read in my Bible to this effect: “And I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee” (Gen. 17:7). “And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear a son indeed: and thou shalt call his name Isaac, and I will establish My Covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him” (Gen. 17:19). “Sarah said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham’s sight, because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee hearken unto her voice, for in Isaac shall thy seed be called” (Gen. 21:10-12). “And it came to pass after the death of Abraham, that God blessed his son Isaac” (Gen. 25:11). “God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth” (Deut. 7:6). “Thou shalt be blessed above all people” (Deut. 7:14). “Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day” (Deut. 10:15). “The Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth” (Deut. 14:2). “The Lord hath avouched thee (*i.e.*, Israel) this day to be His peculiar people, as He hath promised thee, and

that thou shouldest keep all His commandments; and to make thee high above all the nations (*i.e.*, the Gentile nations) which He hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou (*i.e.*, Israel) mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as He hath spoken" (Deut. 26:18-19). "The Lord thy God will set thee on high above all the nations of the earth" (Deut. 28:1). "Above all", *i.e.*, above the Gentile nations of the earth" "For their (*i.e.*, the Gentiles) rock is not as our (*i.e.*, the Israelitish) Rock, even our enemies (the Gentiles) themselves being judges" (Deut. 32:31). "What one nation in the earth is like thy people, whom God went to redeem for a people unto Himself. For Thou didst separate them (*i.e.*, Israel) from among all the people of the earth (*i.e.*, from among the Gentiles), to be Thine inheritance" (1 Kings 8:53). "What one nation in the earth is like Thy people Israel, whom God went to redeem to be His own people, to make thee a name of greatness and terribleness, by driving out nations from before Thy people, whom Thou hast redeemed out of Egypt. For Thy people Israel didst Thou make Thine own people for ever" (1 Chron. 17:21, 22). "His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law * * * then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail" (Psalm 89:30-33). "The children of Thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before Thee" (Psalm 102:28). "For the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure" (Psalm 135:4). "He hath not dealt so with any nation (*i.e.*, with any other Gentile nation); and as for His judgments, they (*i.e.*, the Gentiles) have not known them. Praise ye the Lord" (Psalm 147:20). "The Lord exalteth the horn of His people (*i.e.*, Israel), the praise of all His saints; even of the children of Israel, a people near unto Him. Praise ye the Lord" (Psalm 148:14).

The Scriptures that we have read, and there are many that we have skipped, declare by the Word of God that His people, the seed of Abraham, shall exist before the Almighty a separate seed — a distinct and severed nation — distinct and separate from the Gentile peoples, God giving His assurance, and making His covenant by a condescension on the part of the Lord, swearing that what He hath said would come to pass—that this seed should be a peculiar seed, a separated seed, a national seed, distinct and separated from all the Gentile sects of the earth; not for a short space of time, but for ever, until the world shall be consumed. So that taking these Scriptures again and again multiplied, we are bound, in my judgment, to believe that until the end of the world shall be, until time shall pass away, until then the seed of Israel must exist a distinct and national seed, until we verge upon the precincts of eternity; and as we all know we have not yet entered upon the matters of eternity, so taking the word of God—my God—I am bound to believe that this seed still exists separate from all the other seeds of the earth.

But after they went into their captivity He then turns His back upon them, as we see. As showing that God Almighty never broke His oath, that they are exiled

from their land and go forth to their captivity, we have these Scriptures: "But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend" (Isaiah 41:8). "Return for Thy servants' sake, the tribes of Thine inheritance. The people of Thy Holiness have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down Thy sanctuary. We are Thine: Thou never barest rule over them; they were not called by Thy name" (Isaiah 63:17-19). "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau" (Mal. 1:2-3). "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying, * * * Go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel" (Matt. 10:5-6). "He hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy; as He spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever" (Luke 1:54-55). "Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" (John 1:47). "Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will He go, that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?" (John 7:35). "That He would give it to him (Abraham) for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child" (Acts 7:5).

We have many more words from God declaring that the seed of Israel should exist as a nation before Him, separate from the other peoples of the earth. God Almighty declaring by covenant that they shall exist for ever, I am bound to believe, and should be very sorry to disbelieve, that the seed of Abraham, the nation of Israel, does now exist as a distinct and separate people from all the other nations of the earth. Hence our object in this little matter of discussion and debate, which by no means can come to the proportion of a great debate; but the object of our debate is to prove that we know that God has kept His word, because we know we can lay our hands upon this seed that God has separated from all the other nations of the earth. But then remembering, and we must do so, having this firmly lodged in the mind, that God declares of the seed of Israel — the nation of Israel after their long captivity — that so long as there be the sun, and so long as there be the moon, so long as there be the day and the night, so long should the seed of Israel exist before Him as a nation, we are bound to believe it. The seed of Israel becomes this very night a nation, a chosen people, distinct and separate from all other nations, and having that firmly lodged in the mind, it really is the key-note to the whole of our discussion. When He required the seed of Abraham, the twelve-tribe people, to be divided into two parts, the two families whom the Lord should bless, Almighty God declared He had broken the bands between Israel and Judah, declaring He had formed one vessel for honour, and the other for dishonour. Then we have to ask ourselves is the Word of God to be fulfilled, because if as Almighty God required one seed to be recognised—*i.e.*, one division of the family to be known, whereas the other division of the same family was to be unknown,—they were to be called by another name, the ten-tribe people. God declared He would hedge in their field that they should not find their way, that they should become the lost people, and we have that to fix upon the mind, that God requires the people to be separate, and yet one branch of the same people in after days to become lost.

We declare and tell you that the ten-tribe people never returned from Babylon with the two-tribe people the second time. We declare that from the scores of Scriptures which are to be found; hence, if you say the people of Israel have returned, then what? God declared through Amos that when the second-time return has taken place they shall no more again be pulled out of their land. Let us say the return has taken place, because this is an important point; as I would fully grant that if the second-time return has taken place, then the ten-tribe people must be allied to and in connection with the two-tribe people of Judah. But God Almighty declared that when the second-time return shall take place they shall no more be pulled out of their land. God cannot lie: therefore if that return had taken place, then the people would not have been pulled up once more again out of their land. God declared that should never be after the second-time return had taken place; hence to say it had taken place would be to give the lie to God, because He has told you over and over again that when the second-time return shall take place, sin and sorrow should flee from His people, and that they shall not go forth to mourn. But the people who returned at the time of Babylon went back to cry, to sob, to mourn, and in a state of mourning that they had never known before. God declares that there is an end to their sighing and suffering when the second-time return shall take place. God declares He will stretch forth His hand to recover the outcasts of Israel, and He will with His mighty hand cause them to go over dry-shod. There shall be another dividing of waters, because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days when they came up out of Egypt. When the Jews returned from Babylon there was no dividing of waters to Israel and Judah. God declared there should be another dividing of waters, a miracle, because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days when they came forth from Egypt. So that if we say the Jews have returned a third time, we cast the lie to Almighty God. Hence we see it becomes very dangerous to say that the return the second time has already been accomplished, because you see by scores of instances we can produce, God Almighty declaring certain things. We tie ourselves to the Word of God, and we declare that the Lord could not lie. We should not have the suspicion, we should not give birth even to the thought, that the Lord might vary from His word; and these things not having come to pass we assert, and boldly assert, in the interests of God Almighty, and as servants of His word boldly declare, that the second-time return has not taken place. (Applause.)

If you would kindly dispense with applause, and allow me to go smoothly on, I should much prefer it. Then, if you say this, the seed of Israel must be quite distinct, they must be existing separately, and must be the lost people biding the time when the Lord will recover them, because then shall the second-time return take place. And that is why we meet together this night, declaring that the second-time return has not yet taken place, is yet to take place. Hence the people must now be a lost people, in obscurity, in darkness, and only waiting the hand of Almighty God to go forth from their hiding when this return shall take place, and when the return has taken place, a Christian people, a godly people, loving their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Why, when this return shall

take place we shall come forth as an evidence to the truth of the Word of God, because we shall be able to lay our finger on every event that prophecy declares shall come to pass,—upon this event, upon the other, and so forth, each one of which shall prove that what the Lord has said that has He brought to pass. Hence we see it becomes exceedingly important that you see the people separated from the Gentile nations, that you say that they never returned the second time, because saying that it leads you again to see the third point, and a very important point,—that the people are in hiding, in obscurity, that they have yet to be recovered and brought forth.

I must draw to a close for my half-hour is gone. We shall have plenty of time; there is no need to hurry: all that we ask is that you should be patient. We are dealing with the things of God, and we are dealing with the most important matter that can come before the consideration of the British people. Before I sit down, I declare to you my own belief is that no other nation upon earth could comply with the prophecy, and correspond to the circumstances with which God has surrounded the Children of Israel, but the British people. (Applause.)

Mr. ROBERT ROBERTS:—My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,—It would be a very pleasant thing to be able to second Mr. Hine's argument, and to maintain that the British people are the modern representatives of God's ancient nation of Israel, and the heirs of all the privileges that are guaranteed in so many ways to that distinguished people. It would be a pleasure to maintain such a proposition, if it could be maintained in accordance with truth. In judging of truth in such a question we must have our eye upon the evidence, and it is to be evidence that I should wish to-night to direct your attention. We have not had much evidence in the remarks that have been made.

That God has chosen Israel to be a special and distinct people to Himself, I admit; and that they are yet to be restored "a second time" to their own land, I also admit; but the question is, where are they now? Are they in dispersion or collection? Are they a scattered race, or do they exist as a great and powerful nation? Are they to be found in all countries, without political form, or are they gathered together as a great and independent people in the British Islands? Mr. Hine says they are in the last described portion, but assertion is not evidence unless the asserter have authority to assert. I do not presume that Mr. Hine claims the authority to establish by his own *ipse dixit* what is truth in this or any other matter; I presume he professes to found his conceptions upon this subject upon Bible declarations. We have not had much of this kind of argument. I do not complain of that exactly, because it is Mr. Hine's opening address, and it was not possible, perhaps, to make very clearly distinct to the mind any very powerful arguments in the brief time at his disposal. Nay, I will go further, and say—and I speak within the bounds of demonstrable truth when I say it—that if he occupy six whole evenings, he will not be able to develop an argument that will appeal to the logical faculty, and that will resist the critical proceedings to which it will be my duty to

subject it. This is virtually the view entertained by an authority upon his side of the question, a gentleman of some standing, who has expressed an opinion upon this point. I do not know whether he be a friend of Mr. Hine or no; it is a matter of little consequence. Bishop Titcombe, who believes that the English people are the ancient Israel in their modern form, says in his published and very clever book, entitled *The Anglo-Israel Post Bag*, as follows:—

“The evidence is not actual demonstration, but it is submitted that the opinion is neither unreasonable nor visionary; and until a better theory can be propounded, it is worthy of our fullest belief.”

I would not stand here this evening if I were not prepared to maintain that a better theory exists — a theory that does not stultify historical facts — a theory that does not outrage every human probability — a theory that does not require prodigious ingenuity in squaring facts and Scripture in harmony with it — a theory which recognises in the fullest and most obvious sense the declarations concerning God’s purposes with the House of Israel, and which find their natural fulfilment in the future restoration of the scattered race, in both houses, from all countries, to their own land, there to occupy a position of sovereignty over all other nations as a monarchy under the promised son of David, whose appearance in the world is an already accomplished fact, though meanwhile he is for a time absent. To this fullest and most obvious fulfilment of all the declarations to which Mr. Hine has referred, it will be my duty to call your attention, as affording the completest refutation of his ideas about Britain.

Before doing so, and in order to pave the way for a satisfactory canvass of the subject, I must recall to your mind a few simple historical facts with which presumably the bulk of the present company must be acquainted, I mean Biblical historical facts — the facts to which Mr. Hine has dimly alluded in his Scripture quotations, but which he has not developed before us with the distinctness and continuousness to enable you to see to what they all refer. I recall your recollection to the origin of the Jewish nation, and I will use the term as comprehensive of the twelve tribes, although, perhaps, on reconsideration it would be wise of me not to use a term to which Mr. Hine might take exception; therefore I will say, the Israelitish nation as comprehending its Jewish element as well, for Mr. Hine will not attempt to deny that the Jews are an element at least of the great Israelitish people, whom God has hitherto used as the instruments of His providential designs in the history of the world, and whom it is His purpose to use in a far more effective manner in the future. I will not speak of Abraham, I will not speak of Isaac, the immediate predecessors of Jacob, because Jacob is the one personage who stands before us, as far as the present discussion is concerned, as the individual representative of the whole nation that afterwards occupied the Holy Land under the law of Moses.

You are aware that he had twelve sons; that these twelve sons multiplied in separate families, that these separate families under circumstances which you

probably know, and which at all events it is not necessary to refer to in detail, went down into Egypt; that they, after the lapse of some centuries, when they had multiplied into a great community, were taken out of Egypt by many wonderful manifestations of Divine power by the hand of Moses, under whose leadership they started for the occupation of the land promised to their fathers, at that time in the occupation of the powerful Amorite nation, now known upon the face of the earth as the Land of Palestine, long desolate under Turkish barbarism, but now awaking to a new life. During their short progress to that country, they were delayed under circumstances interesting, but not necessary to consider. While delayed in the wilderness they received the law, and they were organised into a nationality of twelve divisions. By-and-bye, under the law, they entered the Land of Promise, subduing the nations which occupied it. They occupied the land in their stead as a commonwealth — not a monarchy — as a divinely governed realm under divinely appointed judges. For some centuries that state of things continued, until David (after Saul) was given as the monarch of the whole nation. David reigned forty years, and Solomon reigned forty years after him. Immediately succeeding to Solomon comes the national event that gives rise more particularly to the argument which Mr. Hine may, probably in the course of this discussion, elaborate somewhat more distinctly than he has yet done — the argument which seeks to identify the British race with the lost ten tribes. The event I refer to was the revolt of a large part of the nation from their allegiance to the throne of David, as occupied by Rehoboam, Solomon’s son; and the formation of the revolted section, constituting the larger section, viz.: ten of the twelve tribes, into an independent monarchy under Jeroboam, one of Solomon’s servants. That independent, separated, revolted section retained a national independence for about 300 years, and was then broken up, the people being taken away out of the country by the Assyrian invader, and the question, what became of them, we shall by-and-by have to consider.

Meanwhile we will say good-bye to them, so to speak, at this point — at the time when they were taken away by Shalmaneser to regions beyond the river Euphrates. The remaining section of the original kingdom of David consisting of two tribes — Judah and Benjamin — continued to exist in the land as an independent nationality for about 150 years after the deportation of the ten tribes into Assyria. At the end of that time they also were taken captives by another power — Babylon, under Nebuchadnezzar. The bulk of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were taken to Babylon. There was a partial return from Babylon, and a re-settlement in the land in seventy years; and after a while the re-establishment of national independence a second time under Judah Maccabaeus, as you may recollect. The independence thus regained continued to exist, in a certain modified form, lastly under the Romans, until the days of Christ.

Jewish history, so far as Jewish nationality is concerned, culminated in the appearance of the great Light of the World. Jesus, the son of David, as well as the Son of God (Matthew 1:1) told the people of the Jews, among whom He appeared, that upon that generation would come the accumulated guilt of

generations, and that God would send upon them a great military nation who would break their power, overthrow Jerusalem, reduce the land to desolation, destroy the bulk of the nation, and take them into captivity. That fearful prediction, made also ages before by Moses, came to pass, as you are aware. Vespasian, and then Titus, to whom he transferred the command on being called to the Imperial purple, desolated the whole country of Judea, reduced their fortified places, laid siege to Jerusalem and conducted without exception, the bloodiest and most destructive siege ever known in the history of mankind. From that day to this the Jewish race has been in the position described by all the prophets, and particularly by Christ in His prediction of these events, *i.e.*, they have been scattered abroad as exiles, they have been wanderers, they have been objects of contempt and persecution.

That is a brief history of the whole nation, and what I want now to call attention to is the principle underlying that history, which excludes the very possibility of the British nation being any section of that broken nation of Israel. In order to develop this principle I recall you again to the wilderness, into which the whole assembly of twelve tribes were taken by Moses, and I invite you to consider the nature of the transaction by which their nationality was constituted. It was a covenant of agreement on two sides — the nation on the one side, the God of their fathers on the other; and I will read to you the terms of that covenant, and then ask you to consider the application of these terms in the subsequent history of the nation. In the 19th chapter of the Book of Exodus Moses is commanded by God to say as we read in the third verse:

“Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the Children of Israel, ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto Myself. 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 the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.”

“If ye will hearken unto Me” — what was their response? At the eighth verse you will find that: “All the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.” Upon which Moses took back the answer of the people, and then received an extensive communication of God’s requirements in the national existence. In the course of these communications we find some statements to which I now particularly direct your attention. When Moses had delivered in an elaborate form all these statutes and the arrangements under which they were to occupy the land as a nation, he then said to them as found in the 28th chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy:

“It shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all His commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God.” And then he proceeds to enumerate a long line of blessings that were to be realised to them contingently upon their observance of what God commanded them. Many of these blessings are the blessings which Mr. Hine quotes detached for their context, as if they were absolute promises concerning a nation now to be found somewhere amongst the Gentile nations; whereas they are blessings limited to the people who were spoken to by Moses at the time, and expressly conditional upon their obedience. This is made unmistakeably evident by the other side of the case being put — *i.e.*, we are told what the result would be if they were disobedient. These results are very plainly put in the 26th chapter of Leviticus. I will read verses 14, 16, 17, 25, 33, 36-39:

“But if ye will not hearken unto Me, and will not do all these commandments * * * I also will do this unto you: I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it. And I will set my face against you, and ye shall fall before your enemies: they shall hate you and reign over you; and ye shall flee when none pursueth you, * * * And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of My covenant: and when ye are gathered in your cities I will send a pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy. * * * *And I will scatter you, and I will draw out a sword after you, and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste. * * * And upon them that are left alive of you, I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies;* and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee as fleeing from a sword; and they shall flee when none pursueth. And they shall fall one upon another, as it were before a sword, when none pursueth: and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies. And ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies’ lands; and also in the iniquity of their fathers shall they pine away with them.”

I would ask you to read also the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, and the 29th and 31st chapters also. I will read an extract from the 31st chapter, for this reason, that we have in this chapter a prophetic intimation to Moses by God, concerning the futurity of the people to whom he was making these contingent declarations; he was informed how the thing would turn out in the actual event. We read at verse 16 (chapter 31): “The Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up, and go a-whoring after the gods of the

strangers of the land, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake Me and break My covenant which I have made with them. Then My anger shall be kindled against them in that day, *and I will forsake them, and I will hide My face from them*, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them; so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us because our God is not among us? And I will surely hide My face in that day for all the evils which they shall have wrought, in that they are turned unto other gods. Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it the Children of Israel: *put it in their mouths, that this song may be* A WITNESS FOR ME AGAINST THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL."

Now I advise you to read the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy; it is God's prophetic testimony against Israel—a declaration beforehand of what the course of their national history would be. I will not read it to-night, as it would take too long to do so, but you will find it answers the very purpose that is here described. It is a witness against them, in what way? You will find it does not compliment them by predicting great and good things for them; it does not speak smooth things to them. It records evil things of them, the whole pith of which may be said to be condensed into these few verses, which I will read—from verses 22 to 25: "A fire is kindled in Mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them: I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction: I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also with the man of gray hairs."

Now with regard to these predictions, which you will perceive were delivered at the very beginning of the national existence, this has to be said, that *they applied equally to the ten tribes as to the two*, for they were delivered to the twelve, and concerned the twelve in all these particulars; consequently, both the two and the ten-tribed sections must be in desolation together, from which it follows that England cannot be the ten tribes in prosperity while Judah is in affliction. Let me show you how that reasonable, nay, irresistible deduction is borne out by the history of the case. I will take you to the ten tribes, and then to the two, and show you that in both cases these curses have been realised. The prophecy requires that all of them shall be scattered and subject to evil during the time of their banishment, instead of having risen to the position of a great nation, like the British nation. (Applause.)

And this remark, if it has any force, has more force against the ten than against the two; if there is any difference between the kingdom of the ten tribes and the kingdom of the two, it is a difference decidedly in favour of the two, and against the ten. You may ask, How is that? Why, if you take the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes, you will find that that history—brief though it is, extending to only about 300 years, up to the time of the deportation, that history is a dark

history, unrelieved by a single gleam of loyalty to the Divine requirements delivered by Moses. The whole of the eighteen or nineteen kings that sat upon the throne erected by Jeroboam were, one and all of them, idolators, who led the nation away from the commands of God. Whereas, in the kingdom of the two tribes, if you consider the history of the succession of monarchs that reigned over them from Rehoboam to Zedekiah, you will find many bright and glorious reigns. There are Hezekiah, Josiah, Jehoshaphat, and others who will occur to those who are acquainted with Scriptural history. And you will find there is a distinct recognition of this difference between the two kingdoms in the Scriptural records and allusions to their respective peculiarities. This distinction began at the very foundation of the kingdom of the ten tribes. You will find the statement made when Jeroboam established a false worship amongst the ten tribes, in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 11, verses 13, 14, 16: "The priests and the Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him (Rehoboam) out of all their coasts, for the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem. * * * And after them *out of all the tribes of Israel* SUCH AS SET THEIR HEARTS TO SEEK THE LORD GOD OF ISRAEL came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers." That is, the God-fearing part of the ten tribes separated themselves from the ten tribes, and identified themselves with the two; so that the kingdom of the two was a godly kingdom, while the kingdom of the ten was abandoned to idolatry.

You will find the godless and unrecognised character of the ten tribes strikingly illustrated in an incident recorded in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 19, verse 2. Jehoshaphat had made a temporary alliance with Ahab, the king of the ten tribes, and upon his return to Jerusalem he was met by a prophet of God, who says: "Shouldest thou help *the ungodly*, and love *them that hate the Lord*?" Still more pointed is the declaration in the Second Book of Chronicles, chapter 25 verse 7. The king of Judah had hired 100,000 soldiers from the king of the ten tribes, and a prophet came to the king and said: "Let not the army of Israel go with thee; for THE LORD IS NOT WITH ISRAEL, *to wit, with all the children of Ephraim*. * * * And the king said, But what shall we do for the hundred talents which I have given to the army of Israel? And the man of God answered, The Lord is able to give thee much more than this." So he sent them away, and these disappointed soldiers spread havoc and desolation in the northern parts of the kingdom of Judah. You will also find in the prophetic allusions, such instances as these: "Though thou, Israel, play the harlot, yet *let not Judah offend*" (Hosea 4:15). Ephraim compasseth me about with lies, and the House of Israel with deceit; but *Judah ruleth yet with God, and is faithful with the saints*" (Hosea 11:12).

In harmony with the state of the case illustrated by these facts, you next find that the threatened judgment of God, in vindication of His broken covenant,

came *first upon the ten tribes*, for the reason I will now read to you, in a declaration of Scripture concerning the reason of the captivity of the ten tribes, and the circumstances under which these ten tribes were exiled; from which declaration alone you will be able to deduce that, if there were no other evidence, it is a matter of impossibility that a nation in the position of England could be the descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel. Here, in the Second Book of Kings, in the 18th chapter, at the 11th verse, you will find THE LAW OF MOSES particularly mentioned as the basis of their condemnation: "And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel (*i.e.*, the ten tribes) unto Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes: because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord their God, but transgressed His covenant, and *all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded*, and would not hear them, nor do them". What happened to them in consequence of that? Go to 2 Kings 17:20: "The Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hands of the spoilers, until He had cast them out of His sight." (Applause.)

Mr. HINE:—Dear friends, I have had many letters from all parts of the country, asking if a report of this debate would be published in any paper. We are not only speaking to the people now before us, but it is very evident we are speaking before the country. (Applause.) Hence I am going to ask Mr. Roberts, for really he has the whole matter in his hands, if he is aware of any papers, or any other means by which a report of this debate will go forth to the country?

Mr. ROBERTS:—I may say in answer to that question, that I am not aware of any paper that will report the discussion, but it is being reported on private behoof for separate publication in pamphlet form afterwards. (Applause.)

MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

- 1.—May I ask Mr. Roberts if, in his judgment, he would believe God has separated the people of Israel from all the other nations of the earth for ever?—Yes.
- 2.—Might I ask Mr. Roberts if the promises that he has been quoting, whereby God gave certain stipulations, conditional promises to the people of Israel, were given to the twelve tribes or the ten?—To the twelve.
- 3.—Then might I ask Mr. Roberts if God Almighty had given these promises to the twelve tribes, they were afterwards or previously divided?—Afterwards.
- 4.—Then I will ask Mr. Roberts, these promises being given to the twelve tribes unitedly, if afterwards God had divided this people, He did not give certain promises to the two, and contrary promises to the ten?—No.
- 5.—Then might I ask Mr. Roberts, after the division of the two peoples, the ten tribes from the two, can he produce any promise given by God Almighty, whereby He fixes certain promises to the two, and certain to the ten?—The ten are

mentioned separately; the two are mentioned separately, in prophecies coming after the division, but the blessings in both sets of promises are the same.

6.—Would Mr. Roberts suppose that the promises given in Deuteronomy would apply equally, after the division had been made, to the two tribes and to the ten?—As to the blessings, the conditions of the blessings having been breached, No.

7.—Would Mr. Roberts conceive that after the promise pronounced in Deuteronomy after the promise given to Abraham that his seed in after days should become a great nation, could that promise be, by the breach of the conditions, cancelled?—I believe the promises of God made to Abraham could not be cancelled by any power in heaven or earth.

8.—Believing that God Almighty made a covenant, and an everlasting covenant, and that these covenants, these oaths, could not be broken, does Mr. Roberts believe that God has broken His oath?—I do not.

9.—If God Almighty has decreed that the ten tribes should be separated from the two, and that the one should be under certain blessings and the other under certain curses, could any after circumstance alter the mind of God?—I deny that God ever said anything to that effect to Abraham or anybody else.

10.—Would Mr. Roberts conceive or believe, when God declares of a certain people that no weapon formed against them should prosper, that that promise could, after the separation, apply to both the houses?—I believe that promise applies to both houses of Israel in their final re-union under Christ.

11.—If, when God Almighty declares no weapon formed against a certain house should prosper, does Mr. Roberts believe that to apply to the Jewish people?—If Mr. Hine will define what he means by the Jewish people I will answer.

12.—Does Mr. Roberts believe in the separation of the ten tribes from the two?—Yes.

13.—Will he tell us his definition of the two tribes of the house of Judah?—The house of Judah as distinct from the ten tribes which constituted the house of Israel. But they are all Jews, as I shall show afterwards.

14.—Mr. Roberts told us that he acknowledged there is existing at the present time a division between the ten tribes and the two; will he tell us what tribes are comprised in the house of Judah?—The house of Judah, when it existed in the land as a nation, I presume Mr. Hine understands, consisted of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi.

15.—Does Mr. Roberts suppose that it comprises any other tribe but these three?—I should not.

16.—Does Mr. Roberts believe in these days the tribe of Benjamin to be connected with the house of Judah?—I do.

17.—Would Mr. Roberts suppose that Jeremiah 6:1 has been complied with? I will read it: "O ye children of Benjamin, gather yourselves to flee out of the midst of Jerusalem". Would Mr. Roberts suppose that that Scripture has yet to be complied with?—It was a command given, which, like a great many other commands was disobeyed.

18.—Can Mr. Roberts supply us with any proofs that this command has been disobeyed?—Yes, I can.

19.—In what way can Mr. Roberts bring forth proofs?—By calling attention first to the date of this prophecy, which was a few years before the Babylonian captivity, and reminding Mr. Hine of the fact that when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem the inhabitants of Jerusalem had not fled, but were in it; and the inhabitants of Jerusalem were the children of Benjamin, *i.e.*, a part of them, because Jerusalem was a city of Benjamin (Josh. 18:21, 28). Of course, there were many of the children of Benjamin spread about the country, the bulk of Benjamin being outside Jerusalem.

20.—At what time Mr. Roberts?—At the time I speak of, just before the Babylonish captivity.

21.—Before the Babylonish captivity, or after the Babylonish captivity?—Before the Babylonish captivity. After the captivity a few of the poor of the land were left, but the inhabitants of Jerusalem were taken in the bulk to Babylon. If they had obeyed the command of the prophet, they would not have been taken captive, for it was a command to the inhabitants of Jerusalem to get out of it and go over to the forces of the king of Babylon, with a promise that if they complied they would be exempted from death (Jer. 38:2). Jeremiah attempted to go and was stopped by one of the sentinels of the gate (Jer. 37:12, 13). Perhaps Mr. Hine recollects that?

22.—He does not recollect that Jeremiah wanted to go to Babylon.—No, but to get out of Jerusalem.

23.—Did the tribe of Benjamin, or any portion of them, go to Babylon?—Yes, a portion.

24.—Mr. Roberts has told us that the tribe of Benjamin now is allied to the Jewish people; hence, if the tribe of Benjamin is allied at the present time to the House of Judah, how many tribes would be left of the House of Israel?—When?

25.—Now?—The number that were taken away.

26.—How many would that be?—Ten.

27.—Then there would be ten tribes connected with the House of Israel, and there would be three tribes connected with the House of Judah?—Yes, that is correct, understanding that Levi was separated for the priesthood.

28.—Then there would be thirteen tribes connected with the twelve-tribe people of Israel?—Yes, because one was split into two.

29.—My dear friends, you really do not believe that, do you? Would Mr. Roberts suppose that this one tribe, cut into two parts, would consist of, or make, two tribes?—Yes, that was settled by the power dividing them. I have the proof.

30.—Did this one tribe, divided into two parts, go forth two distinct tribes?—I do not quite understand that question, Mr. Hine.

31.—What tribe was divided into two parts?—The tribe of Joseph.

32.—Can Mr. Roberts supply, or tell us, what Scriptural proofs he has that the tribe of Joseph was separated into two parts?—Yes, I can.

33.—Will he do so?—I will. It is in the 14th chapter of Joshua, where there is an account of the distribution of the land to the tribes after the conquest of the country. It says, verse 4,—“For the children of Joseph were TWO TRIBES, Manasseh and Ephraim: therefore, they gave no part unto the Levites in the land save cities to dwell in, with their suburbs for their cattle and for their substance.” I have more proofs than this, if Mr. Hine wishes.

34.—Would it be the tribe of Joseph or Manasseh that would have been divided?—The tribe of Joseph was divided, *i.e.*, Joseph's two sons were taken as the heads of two tribes.

35.—Then the tribe of Joseph was divided into two parts; and was the tribe of Manasseh divided also into a second tribe?—It was not divided into two tribes, but into two halves, and they were called the half-tribes of Manasseh, simply because they received their inheritance in two separate sections of the country.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

36.—In the course of your opening remarks you quoted the command by Christ to His twelve disciples, "Go ye to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Do you understand the House of Israel in that command to mean Israel's ten tribes?—Most certainly.

37.—Not Jews?—Decidedly not. I do not believe, nor ever had faith in a converted Jew.

38.—Then will you explain to me the fact stated in Acts 11:19, which I will read:—"Now they which were scattered abroad, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, *preaching the Word to NONE BUT UNTO THE JEWS ONLY?*"—Yes, I quite believe that our Lord did exercise a certain prerogative in trying to persuade the Jewish people to believe in Himself, and I also believe that the Apostle Paul tried the conversion of the Jews, but in each case there was a signal failure.

39.—Do you mean to say the disciples did not obey the command Christ gave them?—No, I believe the tribe of Benjamin, that one special tribe allied to the House of Judah, obeyed the command.

40.—Why did they preach to the Jews *only*?—Oh, as far as the apostles were concerned, in certain instances, they might have preached to the Jews, but their great mission was with the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

41.—But here is the word “only”, which restricts their preaching to one particular class of people, to whom you say they were not sent?—Yes, I grant that, because in a certain time, in a certain day, they fulfilled a certain mission, and then they gave themselves to this one work which they have fulfilled.

42.—Do you mean they changed the nature of their work, and did one sort of work at one time and another sort at another time, without fresh instructions?—Quite so; because even the Apostle Paul, whose great mission was to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, tried to convert the Jews, and having failed he turned his back on them, and said, “Instead of talking to you, lo I turn to the Gentiles”.

43.—Why did these disciples who preached to the Jews only, not preach to the House of Israel?—I should be very sorry to say they did not.

44.—It says they preached to the Jews only.—At that time.

45.—How do you know?—How do you know to the contrary?

46.—By reading this statement, that they went everywhere preaching to none but the Jews?—At that time.

47.—Yes, when going forth to execute the Lord’s commission they preached to none but the Jews only. Why did they not preach to Israel according to your conception of Israel?—Perfectly right. Mr. Roberts is referring to a special time; that is, the time before redemption had come. It would have been folly on the part of the disciples to have gone forth on their grand mission of proclaiming redemption to the lost ten tribes until after the death of our Lord, because until that death had taken place no redemption could have been proclaimed.

48.—Are you not aware that the fact I have referred to—this preaching to none but the Jews only—was a fact that transpired after the death of Christ, and not before?—Then we come to the fact that after our Saviour had died, that is after He had redeemed Israel, even His own disciples had to proclaim the gospel, because they were to be a light unto the Gentiles, as well as proclaiming the gospel for the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

49.—To whom had these apostles to proclaim the gospel?—Their grand object, that is their chief mission, was with the lost sheep of the House of Israel; but their second mission was to the brethren of the House of Judah; and the third mission they took up was with the Gentiles, as Christ Himself came to Paul when at Damascus, they declaring they would not receive Paul’s testimony concerning Him. The Jews would not receive it. Hence you have the three distinct missions taken up by the apostles—the main one being to the lost sheep of the House of Israel; the second one being to the brethren of the House of Judah; and the third one being to the Gentiles whom they found in the highways, the byways, and so forth.

50.—My question is: Why did they in this case limit their operations to the Jews only?—Well, I suppose a man of method would apply a given time for given work.

51.—Can you tell me when the mission with the House of Israel, according to your conception, began?—Immediately after redemption.

52.—Then my question is: As this was “immediately after redemption,” according to your use of those words, why did they preach the word “to none but the Jews only”?—It did not at all follow immediately after redemption. The Apostle Paul was forbidden to pursue his fruitless mission on behalf of the Jews.

53.—It is not the mission of Paul I am discussing.—It matters not whether it is the mission of Paul or the mission of all the apostles.

54.—I return to the question: Why did these original disciples after redemption limit their work to the Jews only?—I do not know why they did it at that particular time, and Mr. Roberts does not know.

55.—Yes, I do; but it is not for me now to say. (Laughter and applause.)—Well, Mr. Roberts may know.

56.—You state that the British race, in these days, was to be found in the districts of Cappadocia and Bithynia and other places; the lost ten tribes, I think you say, were not lost then, but existed in these districts?—I am quite sure in the days of Christ the ten tribes were not lost, but known, and some of these were in the districts mentioned by Mr. Roberts.

57.—Bithynia is one of them?—Yes.

58.—Then I wish you to explain the statement in Acts 16:7,—“They assayed to go into Bithynia; but the Spirit *suffered them not*”—Well, I really do not know, and honestly you cannot show the connection of such a question with the identity question.

59.—There is this connection. You say the great work of the apostles was to preach to the lost ten tribes who, you say, were in Bithynia and other parts; and here they were expressly forbidden to go to Bithynia?—That does not follow. As far as their mission went, they would certainly know where they should go, because they would be inspired by Divine power.

60.—You say it is a mistake to speak of the apostles as Jews?—Yes, I quite believe, as far as the apostles were concerned, they were not Jews because no Jew, by the Word of God, can rightly become converted.

61.—You think it is a great mistake, that is your phrase — “A great mistake to speak of them as Jews”?—Yes, because they belonged, as Dr. Farrar declares in his *Life of Christ*, to that one tribe provided by God whom He separated for a certain work — that is the tribe of Benjamin, separated to be gospel-bearers. They belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, and God’s command was not disobeyed, because they have fulfilled their mission.

62.—I think you said that Peter was recognised not to be a Jew by his tongue?—Yes, I think that is a very clear identification, as far as Peter is concerned. His speech betraying him showed that he did not belong to the Jewish body.

63.—Then I wish to ask you how you explain this address, delivered by the Apostle Paul to Peter at Antioch, as related in Gal. 2:14: “I (Paul) said unto Peter before them all, If thou, BEING A JEW livest after the manner of Gentiles and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews. WE WHO ARE JEWS BY NATURE, etc”?”—There is no difficulty, as I see, in that, because Paul, who belonged to the tribe of Benjamin, and Peter, who was not of the Jewish sects but of the tribe of Benjamin; yet being connected with the tribe for a thousand years—connected with the House of Judah, by which you get the Jewish term “the Jews”, Paul and Peter had every right to declare that they were Jews.

64.—Did Paul make a mistake in saying Peter was a Jew, then?—No. Paul never made a mistake when he himself declared he was a Jew, and yet Paul declared he was an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin.

65.—Then, why do you say it is a great mistake for us to speak of the apostles as Jews?—We only say, as far as the apostles are concerned, that they had the right to term themselves Jews, because they were connected for so long a time with the Jewish House.

66.—Then it is not a mistake to speak of them as Jews?—As far as the tribe of Benjamin is concerned it would not be a mistake; but it would be more correct to declare they were Jews belonging to that house; but that would not apply to the tribe of Joseph, Gad, Reuben, or any other of the tribes.

[HERE TIME WAS CALLED. It being optional with Mr. Hine to question Mr. Roberts for fifteen minutes, or make a speech for that time, he chose to make a speech.]

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH.

Mr. HINE:—Well, my dear friends, I declare—taking the Word of God to state that the Children of Israel should exist, a separated and severed people from all the other nations of the earth, made an everlasting covenant throughout their generation, confirmed by oath, which God Almighty could never break—we see the seed of Israel existing, severed from the other people. Then we see twelve tribes belonging to the same house. God Almighty comes forth and declares to these tribes; the whole of the twelve-tribe people of Israel, only existing as God’s chosen people, He declares certain promises, and conditional promises, quoted by Mr. Roberts, and mark you, very unfairly, and I beg of you to take Mr. Roberts’ statements in reference to the promise God Almighty has given to His people, as

simply recorded in Deuteronomy, with great suspicion. There is a very great deal in that; hence, if you take my words you will not find I am quoting from the promise given in Deuteronomy, but from a prophecy given at a far later date than that is recorded, and which was issued conditionally to the whole of the twelve tribes; hence we say this promise found recorded in Deuteronomy did not touch the great standard promise God Almighty gave to future times. You will find that the promise recorded in Genesis was a great promise given unconditionally; given to Abraham as an everlasting covenant throughout all generations. When the people came into the land as twelve tribes united, then God gave to them certain promises, and conditional; but the great promises that God gave to Abraham long before were unconditional. Thus we say, that after God broke the bands of Israel and Judah, He separated the family into two parts; and to the Apostle Paul, that grand man who acknowledged the division of Israel from Judah, the same command came forth to speak. If God Almighty could separate the family, and show favour to the one and the cold shoulder to the other, then God Almighty can be partial. When the Apostle Paul goes forth, with righteous indignation he says: “Who art thou that repliest against God? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump (the twelve tribes) to make one vessel unto honour, and the other unto dishonour.” God need not have the two promises to divide it into two parts, so as to bring this about. Hence we see the division, and take Almighty God’s Word, that He has divided the House of Israel into two parts, and until the return shall take place, which is yet in the future, God Almighty requires the division still in existence, so that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall come together. Hence we see, taking the fact in Deuteronomy, the curses and blessings are pronounced for the whole of the twelve tribes.

After that event, God Almighty comes forth to divide the family into two parts, forming one vessel for honour, and the other to dishonour: the House of Israel for honour; and the Jews for dishonour as they now stand before us. Over the House of Judah the curse is pronounced in the same chapter Mr. Roberts has referred to — a chapter of curses. Judah, consisting of two tribes — the tribe of Joseph, and the tribe of Levi — this very night is under the curse; whereas the ten-tribe people, consisting of the House of Israel, are under the blessing pronounced in that chapter. Seeing the division of Israel from Judah existing this day, we can observe God’s everlasting covenant that He has made, and that must stand, and surely stand, when God declares that the people — the people that He hath redeemed, the people He hath taken away from Moses; declaring that this people, the ten-tribe people — “This people that I formed for Myself, they shall show forth My praise”. Paul, Peter, the apostles, go forth to the lost tribes; the people not actually lost, but yet known, because: Josephus declares that in his time the ten tribes were known — they were beyond the Euphrates in large numbers. Hence the mission was given to these exiled sheep, these lost sheep, in the sense of proclaiming redemption. How could Paul, supposing he was allied to the Jews, honestly declare: “You were once under the law, but now you are become dead to

the law"? Why, there is no discretion in the matter. God requires that the Jews this very night be under Moses, and being under him, they form one of God's witnessing people, the people of God's commands, waiting until their return shall take place, when they shall come forth and build their new temple. They are now recognising all the paraphernalia of the Mosaic economy: their sin-offerings, their burnt-offerings, and their peace-offerings.

Judah was told by God Almighty, in the last seven chapters of Ezekiel that if they did not comply with His instructions, they would be a wicked people, because they were told to go forth. But as far as the Apostles Paul and Peter were concerned, they were with the lost sheep, the people God Almighty declared He had redeemed—that is, taken away from Moses—the people God declared should be the people who should show forth His praise, becoming a people in Christ; hence this people were to be a redeemed people, a Christian people. The Apostle Paul glories that he is an Israelite, of the tribe of Benjamin, of the seed of Abraham, of the very seed which God Almighty declared should still exist, separated and severed from all the other nations of the earth. And so we find the Apostle Paul going to this people and saying: "You were once under the law, under Moses; but now you are delivered from the law, and become a Christian people. Once under the law, you have now become dead to the law; it was only to bring you to Christ". If I could twist these words as applied to any of the Gentile people, I should say your great Apostle declared that the Gentile people were under Moses; but have you ever had a Gentile nation under Moses? The only people who were under the law; the only people upon earth who have had the Mosaic Law to bring them to Christ, were the people Israel, whom Christ came to redeem. "I am not sent", says my Lord, "but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Why was it He did not go forth to the Jews though He tried to persuade some of them to believe, but afterwards they fell away? The Apostle declares, as far as Judah was concerned, that they should simply be a stumbling-block. The prophets declare, that seeing he should not perceive, and hearing he should not understand; and that they would stumble at our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Christ came forth and declared: "Your house shall be left desolate, as without Me, until the time when ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" — the second coming of our Lord, when that House shall receive our Saviour. Hence, they believe in the prophecy; and honestly, as honest men still remain under Moses, still being in God's hand a witness for Him. So we come to the matter that Paul came forth, and Christ declares: "I must send thee unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel". The people once under the law, he delivered from it — the people once under it became dead to it, the people once under the law, which was only a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ.

Hence, upon the testimony of your Saviour, His mission was for the people — the ten-tribe people — who must have been once under the law; and no Gentile

nation has ever been under it, or become dead to it. So we come to this separated nation, this seed which Almighty God covenanted to keep separate; we come to this people that Christ came to redeem; and you never could find that people after the division had taken place; and since redemption did come, you never could find the people apart from Christ. They must be the people in whom "I will be glorified" — "This people have I formed for Myself". They shall take up the missionary work. Their light shall be in Christ, and as Christians they shall go forth throughout all the nations of the earth, and shall become a light unto the Gentiles; the very seed, being God's own seed, to be the means of blessing to all the other nations of the earth. Hence we see — as far as the accounts of the apostles are concerned, which our brother Roberts has referred to — we have shown as far as Peter and Paul were concerned, that they belonged to Benjamin, because they belonged to that House, which for two thousand years or more was allied to the House of Judah, and had every privilege and right to call themselves of the stock of Judah — Jews of the House of Judah; but also they were Israelites. And then, the tribe of Benjamin separated from the ten tribes? Why? Why are you going to leave Jeroboam with nine tribes? Why take one away? Why, that Christ might have light-bearers in the city who should bless His name. It was natural one tribe should be taken away from Jeroboam — the tribe of Benjamin, and separated from the ten tribes, and should be allied to the two tribes which should become three tribes, in order that when the time should come — the time of redemption — when our Lord should appear to take Israel away from Moses, He might have a set tribe whose special duty should be to proclaim the gospel, light-bearers, heralds to His own people and the Gentile peoples round about. Hence, thank God, and we devoutly thank Him for that arrangement; this tribe taken away, and allied to these two tribes, and at the time of Christ the Scripture was complied with: "Gather yourselves together ye Children of Benjamin, to flee out from the midst of Jerusalem".

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

67.—Do I understand you to say, Mr. Hine, that Jeroboam did not receive ten tribes of Israel?—I am quite sure Jeroboam did receive ten tribes, because he received the tribe of Manasseh, which was destined to become afterwards separated.

68.—If Jeroboam received ten tribes, how come you to call Benjamin one of the ten?—I am quite sure, as far as the tribe of Manasseh was concerned, it never has been one of the ten-tribe people, but was destined to be a separate thirteenth tribe established from the twelve.

69.—If Manasseh was not one of the ten tribes, why do you say that Jeroboam received ten tribes?—Simply because Jeroboam had the tribe of Manasseh before it became separated from the other tribes.

70.—Before it became separated from what tribe?—Before it became separated from all the tribes.

71.—Was Manasseh one of the ten tribes that God promised to give to Jeroboam?—Manasseh was never a tribe promised to belong to the House of Israel.

72.—Then, did Jeroboam receive the ten tribes or not?—He received the nine tribes belonging to the House of Israel, and Manasseh, which was not required then to be separated.

73.—From whom?—From the other nine tribes.

74.—Where do you read of Manasseh being separated from the other nine?—Both as a matter of prophecy and history. God required Manasseh (in Genesis) to become a people separated from Ephraim.

75.—Is that an inference or a fact—which?—It becomes a part of the fact. Hence God required that there should be two distinct peoples from the same sect: that Manasseh should be a great people, but that Ephraim should become a greater people. God Almighty did prophesy, and it became a fact in history. God required Manasseh to be a separate people from the ten-tribe people of Israel.

76.—Give me a passage which shows that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—I think you have it at the time when God Almighty declared, through His servant, that Manasseh should be a people, and Ephraim should become a greater people than he.

77.—My question is: Is there a passage in the Bible which says that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—Most certainly.

78.—Where?—In this very chapter of Genesis.

79.—Give me the verse?—Will some one be good enough to give it?
A Voice: the 48th.

80.—What verse do you rely on?—I rely on the Word of God, who declared that Ephraim should be greater than Manasseh.

81.—Tell me the chapter?—The 48th chapter.

82.—But the verse?—The 19th.

83.—This you produce in proof of the proposition that Manasseh was to be separated from the ten tribes?—A voice: The 20th.

84.—I will read the 19th and 20th verses, which are referred to as proof of the alleged fact: “And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also (Manasseh) shall become a people, and he shall also be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations”. What has that to do with the ten tribes given to Jeroboam?—You have

two distinct nations going forth. Ephraim is the embodiment of the ten-tribe people; hence, when God says: “Woe unto the drunkards of Ephraim”, he is not alluding to the two-tribe people of Judah but to the ten-tribe people of Israel.

85.—If Manasseh was a tribe, afterwards to become a great people, did not Jeroboam receive ten tribes and not nine?—We have granted that Ephraim —

86.—Say yes or no. I showed you an example of brevity in answering you. I ask yes or no, did Jeroboam receive the ten tribes?—Yes.

87.—Then why do you say he only received nine, and that Benjamin, which formed part of the Kingdom of Judah, was one tribe separated from the ten, leaving only nine?—Anyone could see that Benjamin was a tribe separated from the others.

88.—Was Josephus right or wrong in saying that ten tribes existed in his day?—He was wrong, and I have no faith in Josephus except so far as he answers my purpose. (Sensation.)

89.—Do you think that Josephus, a public man of the Jewish nation, was not a better judge than you of the historical facts of his own race?—He made many blunders.

90.—Why then do you quote his testimony that the ten tribes existed in his day?—It is a grand fact.

91.—If so, was he right or wrong in recognising ten tribes as given to Jeroboam?—Wrong, because Dan and Simeon were not there; and he tells you there were only two tribes subject to the Romans. He was wrong there were three.

92.—Levi was not a tribe, having inheritance with the others?—Levi has always been a tribe.

93.—Well, I will leave that. You say the British race, in the days of the apostles, were contending earnestly for circumcision?—I never said so; I should be very sorry to say such a thing.

94.—You say so in your published works (*Forty-seven Identifications*, 131st thousand, page 8). (Mr. Hine laughs.)

95.—Then you withdraw that remark?—I never made the remark. I could not be such a fool. (Laughter.)

96.—Do you not say that the ancestors of the British nation were in the northern districts of Asia Minor and Southern Thrace in the days of the apostles?—Some of them.

97.—Were then they contending for circumcision?—I do not think Paul was.

98.—I did not say Paul. I said those to whom Paul went to preach?—I do not think the people Paul wrote to and went to preach to: I do not think Paul at all contended for circumcision, and he is the chief of the apostles, and his word ought to be taken first.

99.—I am not speaking of Paul: I am speaking of the Jewish or Israelitish people to whom Paul went to preach?—Our friend says he does not refer to Paul, and yet he is referring to him. Paul did find them contending for circumcision, because they were under the Mosaic law; and that commanded the rite of circumcision.

100.—And those, you say, were the ancestors of the British people?—And those were the ancestors, to my own knowledge, of the British people.

101.—Why have the British people abandoned circumcision?—Because Christ came to redeem Israel, and circumcision is a rite belonging to Moses, so that that was taken away, and you never could find the ten tribes with it again. It would be opposed to Scriptural knowledge to suppose that you could find the ten-tribe people with the rite of circumcision.

102.—What right have the British people to consider themselves as a nation of God, even of the descendants of Abraham, if they do not practise circumcision?—Oh, if Christ came to redeem the ten-tribe people of Israel — that is to take them away from Moses—you never could reasonably suppose they would have the rite of circumcision. We have answered the question twice or three times.

103.—You will have to answer it again, for I have to read something which bears directly on the matter?—Read it please.

104.—I will. In Genesis 17:10, these words were addressed to Abraham, the alleged progenitor of the British race, on account of our connection with whom you claim for them that they occupy a privileged position: "This is My covenant, which ye shall keep between Me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations * * * and *My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant*. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is *not circumcised*, THAT SOUL SHALL BE CUT OFF FROM HIS PEOPLE; *he hath broken My covenant*." I ask, as a fact, do not the Jews circumcise to-day?—And why?

105.—Answer the question first?—Because the Jews to this day are under Moses, and not under redemption.

106.—Circumcision is not under Moses; what I have read is under Abraham?—Circumcision was always commanded under the law of Moses. (Cries of "Question".)

107.—My question is: Do not the Jews circumcise?—And that they will do until He comes.

108.—And do not the English abstain from it?—They never were required to observe it after the time of their redemption.

109.—Is redemption a national or an individual thing?—Redemption is decidedly national, and has no connection whatever with salvation.

110.—If so, what is the meaning of the song of the redeemed,—“Thou hast redeemed us to God * * * out of *every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation*”? (Rev. 5:9).—That refers to the future. We had far better wait until that time shall arise.

111.—Are there two redemptions then?—There is only one redemption to Israel—that is the being taken away or redeemed from the Mosaic law.

112.—Are there two redemptions in Christ?—Only one redemption to Israel.

113.—You change the terms of my question. Are there one or two redemptions in relation to Christ?—There are two redemptions, because the ten-tribe people — the House of Israel — are already redeemed from Moses; and the time has yet to come when the two-tribe people — the House of Judah — shall become redeemed; and that time only shall come, and never can come; until they see Him come whom they have pierced. When that time shall come, then they shall be redeemed. Hence, as far as the term redemption is concerned, there must be two. One has already taken place, as far as Israel is concerned; the other has yet to take place, as far as the House of Judah is concerned.

MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.

Mr. HINE:—My dear friends,—I do not want you to be disturbed in your minds. I would call upon God that, as far as the matter of this discussion is concerned, we may be calm, and catch from God Almighty the holy feeling, because we are only, after all, dealing with those things that must be for the good, the weal, and the welfare of your nation. Hence, when we say you are identical with Israel, we shall try to bring forth our proofs to-morrow night; for we have very wisely, as I think, studied not to bring forth any one of our identities, leaving these for the future, but have only wanted to impress on your minds that God Almighty required His own people separate throughout all time, until the time shall come when the earth shall be taken away, and when eternity shall break upon us. We say naturally then, seeing God requires that we shall be a separate people, that we can identify ourselves with the nation God required to be lost, to be redeemed, to give the light to the Gentiles; and He Himself declares that He comes forth to be not only the light to the Gentiles, but to be the glory of this people — the glory of your people. Hence you have these two promises of our Lord and Saviour, saying He Himself recognised the literal distinction of the ten-tribe people as existing this very day, because He comes forth to be not only the light unto the Gentiles, but He Himself becomes the glory of His people Israel. And by virtue of the fact that you are the only nation under heaven of whom Christ becomes the glory, for you cannot stretch your hands across the people who are worshipping stocks and stones, but you come to your own people that God Almighty came to redeem; you can see His own mark, that you are this very people — still kept separate, and still meant by Him to be used in the great mission work of the world.

In a very few years from now, when missionary glory and light shall shine forth, shall many people, by virtue of your being identical with Israel — and never until then, be joined to the Lord. Hence we want you to go away this evening under the impression that God must keep His word, when He requires His people Israel to be a separate people; and by virtue of your being identical with that people, after your return you shall have missionary glory, and give God the glory of your returning; you shall shine with a sublime glory, and know there are many nations joined to the Lord. Why, the fact of your being identical with the people of Israel gives you the motive power by which you shall grow. I am glad, indeed, dear friends to know that we have spent so pleasant an evening, without any very severe bruises; and we hope it shall be as kindly a meeting that we shall hold to-morrow night. I do not know whether there is any vote of thanks, but as far as I am concerned, I am thankful to his Lordship for the very kind way in which he has been pulling my coat-tails and controlling my actions. (Applause.)

MR. ROBERTS' LAST SPEECH.

Mr. ROBERTS:—I exceedingly regret, dear friends, that the time at our disposal for the discussion of this subject is so limited as to compel the omission of material matters that ought to be canvassed and considered in the discussion of this question.

Mr. HINE:—Why did you not say twelve o'clock?

Mr. ROBERTS: I said twelve nights, and that was better; but Mr. Hine declined twelve nights, and we are obliged to be content with three. I am sorry, because I feel greatly embarrassed by the abundance of matter which it is impossible to bring into such circumscribed limits. However, I must be content to make the best of the circumstances. The circumstances of the case require me to submit argument to you, and not to indulge in assertion. I was engaged in argument at the time when, perhaps to the audience, the more interesting part of the proceedings commenced. I was then saying that the ten tribes who were constituted a separate kingdom under Jeroboam, were 300 years afterwards driven out of the land to circumstances of evil, to circumstances of dispersion, weakness, and obscurity; to circumstances incompatible with the conception that in our day, in our country, they are to be found in the powerful nation of Britain. I will now ask your attention to one or two brief statements, showing the circumstances into which they were to depart when deported from the land, and direct attention particularly to the prophet Hosea, because, beyond all cavil, he particularly deals with the ten tribes.

I call your attention to such a passage as this: Hosea 1:4:—"I will cause to cease the kingdom of the House of Israel;" then the sixth verse: "I will *no more have mercy upon the House of Israel*". The ninth verse says: "*Ye are not My people*", and chap. 2:11, says: "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths"; cause to cease "her sabbaths"! concerning which

Mr. Hine says the ten tribes of Israel must be found with the sabbath. Further, God says by Hosea: "The Children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice", etc. (3:4). Further, "Because thou (Israel) hast rejected knowledge, I also will reject thee" (4:6). "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone" (4:17). "Israel and Ephraim shall fall in their iniquity" (5:5). "They shall go with their flocks and herds to seek the Lord, *but they shall not find Him*, FOR HE HATH WITHDRAWN HIMSELF FROM THEM" (5:6). "Ephraim shall be *desolate* in the day of rebuke" (5:9). "I will be unto Ephraim *as a moth*" (5:12). "I will be unto Ephraim *as a lion* * * * I will tear and go away, and none shall rescue" (5:14). "When they shall go, I will spread My net upon them' *I will bring them down to the fowls of the heaven*: I will chastise them as their congregation hath heard" (7:12). "*Israel is swallowed up*: now shall they be *among the Gentiles as a vessel wherein is no pleasure*" (8:8). "As for Ephraim, *their glory shall fly away like a bird from the birth*, and from the womb, and from the conception" (9:11). "Ephraim, as I saw Tyrus, is planted in a pleasant place: but *Ephraim shall bring forth his children to the murderer*" (9:13). "MY GOD WILL CAST THEM AWAY, because they did not hearken unto Him: and they SHALL BE WANDERERS AMONG THE NATIONS" (9:17). "I will meet them *as a bear that is bereaved of her whelps*, and will rend the caul of their heart, and there will I devour them like a lion: the wild beast shall tear them" (13:8). "*Though he be fruitful among his brethren*, an east wind shall come, the wind of the Lord shall come up from the wilderness, AND HIS SPRING SHALL BECOME DRY, AND HIS FOUNTAIN SHALL BE DRIED UP: he shall spoil the treasure of all pleasant vessels" (13:15).

These passages of prophecy are sufficient of themselves to show that the ten tribes were to depart to dispersion, vagrancy and curse, and to continue in that state until the latter days. There is another point of much importance to consider. There is a land which constitutes the basis of God's whole proceedings towards His people Israel, and apart from which, they are never considered except in banishment. It is not the land of England, it is not what Mr. Hine speaks of as "the isles" on which we may have something to say to-morrow evening. It is another country altogether than Britain, a land with which you are all acquainted, a land which has been made memorable, if by nothing else, by the appearance and sufferings of Jesus Christ, whose appearance upon the earth already as the great light of the House of David, has produced a great effect, but which will produce a still greater effect when the prophecy of Amos is fulfilled; that "in that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen:" when he, the son of David, shall set it up in truth and righteousness, and execute judgment and righteousness in the land as the prophets declare. What land is this? The land appears at the very beginning of Divine dealings with the earth, it is visible all down the course of those dealings, and it shines in glory at the end, "when the land that was desolate shall become like the Garden of Eden" (Ezek. 36:35). Abraham was called into it as a stranger, and it was said to him: "The land wherein thou art a stranger, to thee will I give it". Speaking to Moses, the Lord says: "The land shall not be sold for ever, for the *land is Mine*; for ye are strangers and sojourners with Me". I am informed that my time has expired, and I must submit to the rules of the debate, and reserve further remarks till to-morrow night.

SECOND NIGHT

MR. HINE: My Lord, and ye Children of Israel,—As far as this night's work is concerned, I have got an idea that I am going to put my foot in it. We will recall what we passed over last night. We showed you by the Word of God that by His covenant, the people of Israel were to be kept distinct and separated from all the other nations of the earth. If the people of Israel comprised twelve tribes then, if God Almighty kept His promise, these twelve tribes now exist upon the earth, separated from all others. We showed you that in after time God divided those twelve tribes into two parts, forming one for honour and the other for dishonour. We gave to you the suggestion founded upon the Word of God, that if the second-time return had taken place — if the second-time return has already been accomplished, then it would be vain, completely vain on our part to look after the tribes of Israel; because if they be returned, then they would not be lost. We showed you by the Word of God that if the tribes had returned, and God had not fulfilled His promises by a score or so, that then by the score or so God Almighty would have broken the promises that He had made; that if the return had taken place, there was to be no more pulling up from the land; and if the return had taken place there was to be no more sighing and sorrowing; and if the return had taken place, there was to be another *dividing* of the waters; and we told you, as we have positive knowledge from the Scriptures, that there are a score or more such promises made by God Almighty of circumstances and events that should take place when that return has been effected. Hence to say the return has already been accomplished, these circumstances having come to pass, then we should reflect upon the sure Word of our God, which declares that it is impossible that the return should take place without being surrounded by these events; and we say not only reflect upon the Word of God Almighty, but upon His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, who declared that every jot and tittle of the prophecies should be fulfilled. Hence we come to the conclusion given to us by God Almighty, and of which we are quite positive, that the return has not yet taken place. Hence it is yet to take place. Hence the people of Israel, the ten-tribed people, the ten-tribe section of the same house are yet a lost people, and to-night we come to give some suggestions from the word of God how we may find that people — find the ten-tribed people that God decreed should be told off for honour,—the people that we reminded you last night were to be redeemed from Moses.

You will remember that we divided the tribes into two parts, the House of Israel ten tribes, and the House of Judah two tribes; that God wills, as far as the people of Judah are concerned, that they shall yet remain under Moses; when the return shall take place, then, it will be a second struggle to re-establish the Mosaic rites, and to serve God Almighty under Moses, because they are not redeemed. Hence any doubt being conveyed to your mind that God Almighty would never save a

soul apart from a belief in Christ, is not founded upon the Word of God. It is directly contrary to the Word of God, because he declares in Ezekiel 34, the last verse, that He will accept the people of Judah under Moses, under sacrifice, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, and the rest. Hence we say God has declared that He will accept that people under Moses; but our Lord comes saying, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel"; hence these ten-tribed people must be redeemed from Moses, taken away from the Mosaic rites, and they must now exist upon the earth a people in Christ,—a Christian nation apart from the rites of Moses,—apart from the rite of circumcision, and certainly apart from the institution of genealogy, because these redeemed people were to be the people to show forth God's praises,—a people in whom God Almighty would be glorified,—that they should go forth to all nations of the earth, a blessing—the means of blessing to all other people. And we think we showed you, or wanted to show you, that, as far as Judah is concerned, she is not a proselytising people. If you wanted to enter under the Mosaic law, the Jews would not receive you. If you expressed your belief that you would like to become a Jew, they would look upon you with suspicion and turn the cold shoulder to you; and rightly, because God only wants that sort, the two-tribed sort, to be separated for Him under Moses. Hence the ten-tribed people must be the only people on the earth up to the present time that could rightly be called a Christian nation, and that is one of our identities. We never could find the ten-tribed people unless we find them under Christ, redeemed from Moses, with the veil torn away from their gaze when they shall believe in Christ—to be the special people to show forth His praises, to take up the missionary work and go forth in missionary labour to all the nations of the earth.

We are glad to find all the tribes in our own Christian nation. We may say, in passing, that we do not identify the people of Israel with the English. We know that you have a little thing formed in London lately called the Anglo-Israel Association, which means the identifying the Anglo-Saxons, simply the English branch, with the lost tribes. The very title of that Association is a delusion; because to identify Israel, the people of Israel, you must take in the whole stock. You must take in the Welsh people, and the Scottish people, and part of the Irish people. Hence in founding any institution, instead of using the delusive term of Anglo-Israel, it must be the British-Israel Association, because that takes in the whole British-speaking people, the whole British race, and that will include the whole of these ten tribes without any one of them being missing. Hence God Almighty required of the ten-tribed people that so long as the sun and moon shall endure, the ordinances of day and night being in continuance—that so long shall this ten-tribed people be a nation before Him. God Almighty required of the two-tribed people that they should simply be nothing more than a dispersed people without inheritance throughout all nations of the earth. Then we may give forth, and rightly give forth, this idea, that as the two-tribed people of the House of Judah are literally — this very night they do literally — replying to the prophecies,

any minister of religion, any minister coming forth to stand in his pulpit, and giving it forth before his people that the people of Judah only existed as a spiritual people, would receive the lie cast in his teeth, and the Jew himself would stand forth as a people, as a representative of the people literally and not spiritually, replying to His prophecy.

Hence we say, as to the House of Judah comprising only two tribes literally and not spiritually — aye, and spiritual Israel — it is a delusion, we dare not say of the devil, but comes from darkness — and as soon as affirmed the very intelligence of our own nation, the majority of the people who are not now found connected with your Christian Associations, because we have put before them that horrid delusion that Israel could never exist except as a spiritual seed — the intelligence of the people gives the cold shoulder to your ministers, including the clergy of the Church of England and all the different sections of the Dissenters — the 365 in number know why. These people have suffered — just by putting forth that spiritual notion, — they have suffered the birth-right of your people to slip through their fingers. That is the result after 2,000 years' preaching, — and we will guarantee that if we had another 2,000 years before us, and we still clung to this deception, this delusion of a spiritual Israel, the intelligence of this country would yet again slip through their fingers, and instead of having those 365 miserable and horrible divisions in the so-called Christian church, we should have, in the course of ages, thousands upon thousands. And as we say the people of Judah literally and not spiritually comply with that prophecy, it follows by logic — that comes to the heart of every man possessed of intelligence — that so it must be with the ten tribes, part of the same family, the family destined ultimately to re-unite, because God tells you why it is that the two sticks are to come together, and if that house literally complies with the prophecy, then the ten-tribed people should also literally and not spiritually comply with their prophecies.

Then we say, if you insist in your folly, and we always declare it to be a folly, and we have the authority of God's Word for so declaring it, and we shall ever declare before the British people that to insist upon Israel being a spiritual seed — if you insist upon that, then we are armed with a right by God Almighty, who has given to all His children the gift of reason — no man is entitled to become a lunatic, no man is entitled to become an imbecile man — God has given that gift of reason, unless there is something wrong within his cranium — so that we say, if you insist upon Israel, the ten-tribed people, being a simply spiritual seed, we have a right to insist that you shall also mean the spiritual seed of Judah. And there is no man here — if there is, I would be very glad to meet him — and you have no minister in London, if we might be personal, naming such persons as Dr. Stoughton and Dr. Vaughan, naming those you esteem eminent in the ministry, you have no men in your midst in this City of London, this great metropolis of the world, who would dare to meet me and insist, on a public platform, that the seed of Judah, the House of Judah, comprising the tribe of Levi, exist only in these

days as a spiritual seed. No man has the pluck to come forth before me on a London platform to insist upon such an absurdity, because he knows full well that he would be floored before the intelligence of the people of this country. Hence if it becomes impossible to spiritualise away the seed of Judah, so it seems impossible to spiritualise away the people of Israel. Hence when the time of return, yet further God Almighty declares that the children of Israel and Judah, the two people shall come together, and as we say, before the public, for men to talk, for Bible students to talk about the rubbish, the nonsense, of the return of the Jews — why that is a lop-sided idea of Scripture. It is utterly impossible for Judah, by the Word of God, to return alone, because God declares by His own teaching, and by His own decree, that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall come together — not one without the other, but both together.

Hence, in looking after Israel, we say, in fixing upon the British people, not the English people only, — but in fixing upon the British people as being identical with the ten-tribed people of Israel, just as Judah complies, and literally complies, with their prophecy, so should this ten-tribed people comply to all of their prophecies. You never could find the people of Israel unless you find them fulfilling literally, entirely complying with and corresponding to the prophecies that God Almighty gave to that people. Hence Mr. Roberts gave us a splendid Identity Lecture. He came to us referring to the prophecies recorded in the Book of Hosea; he came to us referring to a prophet who lived at a time — please mark this — Hosea, a prophet who lived at a time when neither Israel nor Judah had ever been subject to captivity, when both people were in their lands, when both people in separate kingdoms existed as nations before God Almighty, and before the people of Israel sinned against God Almighty, and He was angry with them. Hence, launching out before them prophecy touching their future, He declared that He would not utterly take them away — that they should be entirely removed from their land — and we know that that was the fact because after they had been entirely removed from their land, then the people who were imported into the region of Samaria in the land of Israel, found lions multiplied, and they wanted to know why these devouring beasts should come and make ravages upon them; and they said, "It is because we are not following the customs, the religion of the God of this land"; and they sent to the king of Samaria and they besought of him that he would send back some few of the men who should teach the people imported into that land the customs of the religion of the people of Israel.

And you have it recorded in your Scriptures that only, only one man was returned, showing that the prophecy of Hosea which God declared through him that He would utterly and entirely take the people away was literally fulfilled. Then God Almighty alluding to the time of their captivity, comes forth to declare, "Now you shall be for many days without a king — this people, — you shall be taken into captivity, and during the time of that captivity the yoke of a Gentile power shall be around your neck; you shall be without a king, and you shall abide many days without a king". A good minister in this City of London — Dr.

McAuslane, has taught a certain disciple of his church that we never could be identical with the people of Israel, unless we were existing without a king. We say, what teaching from God Almighty! It does not come from Hosea, because it is against Scripture entirely. That Scripture declares simply that after Israel were exiled, when brought into their captivity then for a time, during the time that the yoke was upon their neck, for a time they should be many days without a king; and that perhaps was literally fulfilled when the people were in exile, in captivity, under the yoke of the Assyrians.

Then we say you shall be in no manner of doubt as to the whereabouts of the people of Israel; because, as Mr. Roberts quoted from the Scriptures last night, after the time that they had been for many days without a king, they were to become wanderers. There was to be a time of wandering, a time when they should leave their land, and a time that should be an interval before the time that they should settle in their distant possessions, and God declares that their ultimate possession upon the face of the earth should be isles. Mr. Roberts referred last night, and perhaps chided me with having brought forth that idea — yet we stoutly declare and maintain that God does require, did require, of His own people, the ten-tribed people that in the time of their exile outside their country, they should occupy isles, and the very position of these isles is mentioned: they were to be isles afar off. Hence when the time of gathering shall come, when the time of their identity shall come, the proclamation goes forth to the isles afar off, saying “He that scattered Israel shall gather him,” and we have a Scripture where God commands the people of Israel during their exiled state, and when living in the isles, that they were to glorify the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the west — “isles afar off,” and “isles in the west.” Are we quite sure that that is the right rendering of that Scripture — showing, as you have it in your translation, the word “sea” — but that very word sea is interpreted in the Bible thirty times elsewhere “west.” Hence interpreting it to mean that they shall glorify God in the west, they shall arrive in these isles—like the Zulus, a barbarous people, a people of idolatry. In the times before they entered these islands, they were to lose their paths, have their way hedged in, be forgetful of their ancestry, and not to remember their name.

They were to be called by another name, not the name of Israel; they were to be called by another name, and falling into idolatry, they must have arrived in these islands according to the Word of God and the teaching of Scripture, in a barbarous condition, because it was not until the moment they arrived in these islands in this idolatrous state that God states He would once more speak comfortably to them. Hence we say of your people, it is a grand thing to know that the ancient ancestors of these islands were an idolatrous people; because God required the people of Israel to arrive in these islands in an idolatrous state, and you have complied with that. Then God Almighty required the people to renew their strength. They had settled in these islands, they had broken the yoke of the Assyrians from off their necks; then arriving in these islands they were to renew their strength and increase as a people, because they were the multitudinous seed;

Hosea declaring by the very same pen, they were called by another name, alluding to the time when they were in the islands. “Yet the number of the Children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered.” As far as Judah is concerned, you have it, not recorded in Deuteronomy, but recorded in Jeremiah, that God would bereave them of children, which is the only corresponding prophecy that they should be few in number.

As far as the people of Israel were concerned, they were to renew their strength—increase in number, and increase in their strength. “Listen, O isles, unto them”—God Almighty speaking of them in prophecy, when they were in the islands they were to cry out, “The place is too strait, too narrow.” Why? Why should those islands be too strait, too narrow? By reason of the inhabitants, the multitudinous seed of the people increasing as the sand of the sea for multitude; and they cry before God Almighty, “Give place to me that I may dwell.” Then you have the Word of God coming forth to declare in response to that prayer—God Almighty addressing them, not as a spiritual seed, but as a literal seed only, “I will give thee to establish the earth, and cause thee to inherit the desolate heritages.” So that these people arriving in these islands, finding these islands too small, too strait for them increasing as a people, God Almighty opened up spaces to them to inherit—the desolate heritages. And by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, God Almighty has given to you your colonies, by which God has fulfilled that grand promise to Abraham whereby He declared you should become a nation and a company of nations. Hence by the having of your colonies, you have complied with that prophecy.

MR. ROBERTS:—My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,—If I do not follow Mr. Hine so exactly as he would like, and perhaps as you would like, it is because he does not supply me with matters with which I can deal in a critical way. He indulges in a perpetual stream of assertion. He says God Almighty says this of His people, and that of His people; but he does not prove that He does so. If he attempted to prove that what he says is true, then it would be in my power, or at all events would give me the opportunity to show that it is not true. In some cases it is easily in my power to do so. Such, for instance, as where he alleged that the contrast between Israel and Judah is to be found in this: that while God declares that Judah should be a dispersed people, He says, concerning Israel, that Israel would be a nation for ever. I turn to the passage of Scripture in which there is a statement to that effect, and you yourselves will be witnesses by my simple reading of it, that the declaration that they should be a nation for ever, applies not to the ten-tribed section only, but to the House of Judah as well—that is, to the two nations that God had chosen—to which the words referred to apply.

In Jeremiah 33:24: “Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying. The TWO FAMILIES which the Lord hath chosen, He hath even cast them off? thus they have despised My people, that they should be NO MORE A NATION before them.” Then He proceeds to say: “If My covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast

away the seed of Jacob, and David My servant," and so forth. So that the decree of perpetual nationality applies to the two families and not to one only. If Mr. Hine would put it in my power similarly to test his other assertions, I should be able, I know, to show in detail that the same misrepresentation characterises all his allegations. I may call attention to one little point as illustrative of the very uncertain nature of his position. He impugned the title of a certain association formed in London on the ground it was not sufficient to identify the Anglo-Saxon stock with Israel; that we must take into account the Welsh, and the other elements that have gone to form the British population. Now, Mr. Hine, it strikes me, must have changed his mind on that point, for in his *Twenty-seven Identifications*, 26th thousand, on page 16, I find him saying—illustrative of the pushing characteristic of so-called British Israel, "In our country we have the Welsh, descended from the ancient Britons, pushed into a corner of the country once their own, and subject to OUR RULE:" while in *Forty-seven Identifications*, 131st thousand, page 27, he says: "The Welsh people * * * cannot be the descendants of the ancient Britons by the fact that they are not dying out," He says in another place, the ancient Britons were not Israel. If they were not Israel, and the Welsh are descended from them, by what process of argument does he identify the Welsh as a portion of the Israelitish nationality?

The fact is, there is a great deal that is inconsistent, and much that is altogether fictitious and unfounded in the theory, and in the facts and arguments by which it is attempted to be established. The distinction between Judah and Israel is one of these fictions. There is a distinction, but it cannot be drawn so sharply as Mr. Hine's theory does. It is unnatural and unscriptural to do so. The distinction was political and natural, and has none of the recondite significance claimed for it by Mr. Hine. Its origin was as simple and natural as anything could be in this world. Let me recall your attention briefly to the circumstances. They are so elementary in their nature that even school-children must be supposed to be acquainted with them. In the first place, let us consider the term "Israel," which plays so large a part in this controversy. How comes it to be applied as a national designation at all? Simply because that it was the name of Jacob, divinely bestowed upon him at an advanced point in his life. We read of that in Genesis 32:28, also in Genesis 35:10. There you find the intimation that his name was no more to be called Jacob, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel." The reason for the change is given, but we need not trouble ourselves with it now. The twelve tribes—the multiplication of Jacob's twelve sons, were literally Jacobites, but by reason of the change of Jacob's name to Israel they were Israelites, and they are continually described as Israelites in the account of their deliverance from the bondage in Egypt. The whole nation was Israelite, as consisting of the descendants of the twelve sons of Israel. There was no change when formed into a monarchy in the Holy Land; they were Israel, all the twelve tribes, the whole of them, every one of them, without the least exception or distinction.

How came they afterwards, or any part of them, to be called Jews? The answer to this requires a moment's attention to a political episode that arose in the history

of the nation, resulting in the separation of ten of the tribes from subjection to the House of David. This separation was not for blessing but for curse every way; for it was as a punishment that it happened, as a punishment for the sins of Solomon, and it was not for the blessedness of the ten tribes that they were separated. Their position was in no way altered by the separation; they were still subject to the law of Moses, and their future lot depended entirely upon their submission to that law, or otherwise; as I illustrated in the argument last night, and as shown by the destiny that finally befell them. As to the name Israel, by which they came to be known, there is no difficulty. They were Israel before, and as constituting the bulk of the nation they were Israel still, and retained the original name of the nation. It did not follow that the two tribes left behind were not Israel. They were not de-Israelitised by the separation, yet they had to be described by another name, for it would have been inconvenient, as a matter of ordinary communication, to have described the one as Israel, and the other as Israel also. When we have to distinguish between two things we have to employ distinctive terms, even if the two things are sections of the same thing. How then was the smaller section of the house of Israel to be distinguished? Obviously by the name of the tribe that took the leading part in it. That tribe was the royal tribe—it furnished the dynasty of the whole house, and that was the tribe of Judah; and therefore it was described as the Kingdom of Judah, not to signify that it was not Israel but to signify that it was a distinct political section of the original and complete race of Israel.

Now follow the history, and you will find the origin of the term Jew, and the reason why that term came ultimately to be applied to the whole twelve tribes. The ten-tribed section of the House of Israel soon disappeared from the scene. After a career of three hundred years it ceased to have political existence. The kingdom was overthrown, and the ten tribes became a rabble of wanderers,—exiled, dispersed and despised. But the Kingdom of Judah was left upon the scene to represent the original race of Israel. This Kingdom of Judah was a monument, a political monument of Israel, visible to the eyes of the world. The race of Israel, visible to the eyes of the world. The race of Israel was politically visible in no other form. The people composing the Kingdom of Judah came to be called Ju's from Judah, finally spelt Jews from this; by a very natural process, the whole race of Israel came to be known by the same term. The Jews, or people of Judah, were the only visible portion of Israel; in a political sense visible, that is, to the nations of the Gentiles. Not knowing anything of the ten tribes except that they were part and parcel of this race forming the Jewish kingdom, they called them all Jews, and the term "Jews" came, in course of time, to be applied to the whole race of Israel. The process was slow but natural. The name filtrated through all the Gentile nations, and came to be the designation of the entire race of Abraham. (Cries of "No, no.") I will prove it. (Cries of "No, no," and applause.) Well, listen to the proof. I will not ask you to accept it on my assertion but I do ask you to bow to proof.

I first call Josephus as a witness, concerning whom Mr. Hine made a singular

remark last night, that he believed him only in so far as he could make him serve his purpose—a remark, I think, that will not commend itself to the audience as one characteristic of wisdom or candour. (A voice: Josephus is no authority). No authority! Why, listen to this: here is a bishop's opinion of him (Bishop Porteus), and I will say it is the opinion that every competent man will form if he will make himself intimately familiar with Josephus' book. (A voice: "The Bible.") I will give you the Bible presently. There is a time for everything. The time now is a time for Josephus, or rather for Bishop Porteus' opinion of him. "The fidelity, the veracity, and the probity of Josephus are universally allowed; and Scaliger in particular declares that not only in the affairs of the Jews, but even of foreign nations, *he deserves more credit than all the Greek and Roman writers put together*. Certain at least it is, that he had the most essential qualification for an historian—a *perfect and accurate knowledge of all the transactions which he relates*; that he had no prejudices to mislead him in the representation of them; and that, above all, he meant no favour to the Christian cause." Now, Josephus lived 1,800 years ago, and he certainly is in a position to tell us how the case stood with regard to the designation by which the universal race of Israel was known. I will read you one or two brief extracts from his writings on that point. In the first place, what is the name of his book? The *Antiquities of the Jews*; not the *Antiquities of Israel*, though he might have said that: for the whole twelve tribes were Israelites, and sons of Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel. Perhaps you will say he means the *Antiquities of the Kingdom of Judah*. Not at all. To what does that narrative extend? Does it begin with the revolt under Rehoboam? Does it begin with the formation of the Kingdom of Judah? According to the name of the book, on Mr. Hine's theory, it ought to do so. Instead of that it goes back to the very beginning of the national history. It presents to you Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It gives you the history of Moses. It takes you through all the time of the Judges and the Kings. In fact, it presents to you the history of the race of Israel in its completeness. Hence, in Josephus' estimation, the term "Jew" was applicable to the whole race. (Cries of "No, no.") I am not resting on this argument. I merely tell you it would be a legitimate argument; but I do more than that, I show you that that argument is borne out by Josephus' employment of the term "Jew" throughout his history.

In his *Discourse against Apion* (Book I., section I) he begins with these remarks: "I suppose that by my books of the *Antiquities of the Jews*, most excellent Epaphroditus, I have made it evident to those who peruse them, that *our Jewish nation* is of VERY GREAT ANTIQUITY, and had a distinct subsistence of its own originally; and also I have therein declared how WE came to inhabit this country wherein we now live." "We," the Jews. In *The Wars of the Jews* (book 5., ch. 9, sec. 4), he says: "When was it that God, who is the Creator of *the Jewish people*, did not avenge them when they had been injured?" Then he refers to the King of Egypt, and says he "bestowed both silver and gold on the Hebrews, as on a people beloved of God." The "Jewish people" and the "Hebrews," you see, he uses as interchangeable terms. "Take notice," says he—this is in a speech that he

made to the Jews from the outside of the walls of Jerusalem (*Wars of the Jews*, 6, ch. 2, 1): "That I, who make this exhortation to thee, am one of *thine own nation*; I, who AM A JEW, do make this promise to thee." He was making this speech to John, of Gischala. This Gischala was in Galilee, and therefore John, as a native of Gischala, according to Mr. Hine's theory, was of the tribe of Benjamin, and therefore not a Jew; but you see, in Josephus' estimation, John was a Jew, and himself, Josephus, too—both belonging to one nation.

This term "Jew" not only diffused itself in general use throughout the earth as the name of the descendants of Jacob, but came actually to be historically employed as descriptive of them in times before the separation of the ten tribes had taken place, and before the term "Jew" came into existence. Thus, in speaking of Samuel's days, Josephus describes them as Jews in this extract: "*The Jews* were caught in distressed circumstances, as neither having their weapons with them, nor being assembled there in order to fight" (*Antiquities*, 6, ch. 2, 2). "When Samuel had heard this, he called *the Jews* early in the morning, and confessed to them that he was to ordain them a king" (*Antiquities*, 6, ch. 3, sec. 5). It was to the twelve tribes he made that communication, and here he styles the twelve tribes "the Jews." Nay, David he styles "the King of the Jews;" for referring to David, he says: "The King of the Jews never permitted himself to do anything without prophecy and the command of God" (*Antiquities* 7, ch. 4, 1). So, that according to Josephus, David was King of the Jews, which must be strange in the eyes of Mr. Hine.

Then Josephus uses the name Jew as applicable to Israel in their very beginning, viz., when they came out of Egypt. Thus he remarks: "Manetho says that *the Jews* departed out of Egypt in the reign of Tethmosis, 393 years before Danaus fled to Argos. * * * Solomon himself built that temple 612 years after *the Jews* came out of Egypt" (*Apion*, II., sec. 2). So, that according to Josephus, the term "Jew" was not only general throughout the world, but can be taken historically backwards and applied to them before the division took place, and before ever the term "Jew" had a technical existence. Then we find him saying: "Our first leaders and ancestors were derived from them (the Chaldeans), and they do make mention of *us Jews* in their records, on account of the kindred there is between us. * * * Some of the Greek writers—he says,—have made mention of *us Jews* also" (*Apion*, I., sec. 13). *That this phrase "us Jews" comprehends the ten tribes,—that Josephus claimed those ten tribes as part of this Jewish race, this Hebrew nation, is evident from the Preface to his War*, sections 2 and 3, in which, giving an account of the extraordinary resistance of the Jewish nation to the Roman arms, he says: "The Jews hoped that all of THEIR NATION, *which were beyond Euphrates*, would have raised an insurrection together with them." He also adds: "Those of *our nation*, BEYOND EUPHRATES, with the Adiabeni, by my means, knew accurately both when the war began, what miseries it brought upon us, and after what manner it ended." Then, as showing that by this people beyond the Euphrates, whom he claims as part of the Jewish nation, he means the ten tribes,

I quote the following from Book 11 of *The Antiquities*, ch. 5, section 2: "Esdras sent a copy of it,"—that is, a copy of the letter he had received from the king,—“to all those of *his own nation that were in Media*, and when *these Jews* had understood what piety the king had towards God”—these Jews that were in Media!—that is, where the ten tribes were—“and what kindness he had for Esdras, they were all greatly pleased; nay, many of them took their effects with them, and came to Babylon, as very desirous of going down to Jerusalem; but then the entire *body of the people of Israel* (‘Jews’ and ‘Israel’ used interchangeably) remained in that country; wherefore, there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while THE TEN TRIBES *are beyond Euphrates till now*, and are an immense multitude and not to be estimated by numbers.”

Now, all this constitutes proof I promised; that in the knowledge of Josephus, all the tribes of Israel in his day were currently, politically, and conventionally known as Jews. But, I will come to an argument which will be more congenial perhaps to those who called for the Bible. Here it is, and if there is any difference between the two arguments, this, perhaps is the more conclusive of the two. In the first place, when Paul speaks of the human race in its great divisions, in its general classes, he always contrasts Jew and Gentile, and never introduces Israel as a separate element from Jew. Here are my proofs. Romans 3:9; “We have before proved *both Jews and Gentiles*, that they are all under sin.” Romans 10:12; “There is no difference between *the Jew and the Greek*.” Romans 9:23, 24; “Vessels of mercy which He had before prepared unto glory, even us whom He hath called, *not of the Jews but also of the Gentiles*.” Romans 2:9, 10; “Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of *the Jew first and also of the Gentile*; but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to *the Jew first, and also to the Gentile*.” Romans 3:29; “Is He the God of *the Jews only*? Is He not *also of the Gentiles*.”

And now I give you New Testament illustrations of the fact that the term “Israel” is interchangeable with the term “Jew,” for the simple reason which I explained early in my remarks, that the Jewish section of the House of Israel were no less Israel than the ten-tribed section, but were merely designated the House of Judah or Jews for convenience of discourse. The land of the Jews, you will find in Matthew 2:20, is described as “the land of *Israel*.” In Matthew 8:10, Jesus, speaking of the smallness of the faith He had found among the Jews, says: “I have not found so great faith, no, not *in Israel*.” Speaking of the Jews having been helped by the birth of Christ, Mary says, Luke 1:54; “He hath holpen His servant *Israel*.” *Zacharias, who was a priest, and therefore a Jew, even according to Mr. Hine’s theory—there is no escape about Benjamites in that case—says, in Luke 1:68; “That the Lord God of Israel hath visited and redeemed His people.*” Many of the Jews turned at the preaching of John, and the angel who appeared to Zacharias, predicting that fact, says (Luke 1:16); “Many of the children of *Israel* shall he turn to the Lord their God.” Paul, addressing the Jews, in Acts 13:17,

says: “The God of *this people of Israel*.” That he was addressing the Jews there can be no doubt, as you may see by looking at verses 42 and 45, where we are told that the Jews opposed themselves and blasphemed, and threw dust into the air, etc., which I think last night Mr. Hine said was the particular attitude of the Jews, causing him to look with hopelessness on all missionary operations towards them. Again, the Jews speaking one to another in the temple cloisters, urging one another to apprehend Paul, said: “Men of Israel, help” (Acts 21:28); and they apprehended Paul, and they were Jews, by Mr. Hine’s own admission—Jews and “men of Israel.” In Acts 22:3, Paul says: “I am a Jew;” and in Romans 11:1: “I also am an Israelite,” an interchangeable description. Jesus, several times in the course of the narrative of His life, is described as “King of the *Jews*”; and He is also described (Mark 15:32; John 1:49) as King of Israel, King of the Jews, and King of Israel; no contradiction, because they are both the same thing; they are all Jews, and they are all Israel. Speaking as a Jew, in Acts 26:7, Paul says: “*Our TWELVE TRIBES*, instantly serving God day and night,” have this great hope to come concerning the promise made to the fathers. And when he arrived in Rome as a prisoner, he sent for “the chief of *the Jews*,” and said, “I have sent for you to see you: because, that for *the hope of Israel*, I am bound with this chain” (Acts 28:20). All this is conclusive.

The next point is, that you will find there is the same interchangeableness of terms in spiritual use. Mr. Hine will please not suspect me, as I suppose he will not, of intending by that remark to lend the least countenance to any such theory of spiritual Israelitiship as he condemned in his closing remarks. There is a spiritual Israelitiship.

TIME CALLED

Oh! I have a statement to make here. This evening, before the commencement of the proceedings, Mr. Hine asked me to excuse him putting questions to myself. The next quarter-of-an-hour belongs to him to put questions to me. Now, if he likes, as my argument is unexhausted, I will occupy the quarter-of-an-hour for him by continuing my remarks; but if he is prepared to put questions, I will sit down.

MR. HINE:—Honestly, I am far more gratified than any of our friends now before me, at hearing the remarks of Mr. Roberts, and though, when I said to him, as I did: “Will you let me make a speech—instead of being a barrister before you, putting you on trial as it were, by asking you questions”—he said “No;” yet I will gladly hear Mr. Roberts continue his address for my next quarter-of-an-hour. (Applause.)

MR. ROBERTS OCCUPIES MR. HINE’S QUESTION TIME

MR. ROBERTS (resuming his address): I was remarking that there is such a thing as spiritual Israelitiship. I may define it very briefly. It is a matter that might be

spoken of at length with profit, but this is not the time. I will therefore say that spiritual Israeliteship consists of the adoption of Gentiles into that abiding commonwealth of Israel, which consists of all of Israel's generations who are like Abraham in faith and obedience. These are to be manifested in the earth together at the appearing of Christ to raise them from the dead and establish the promised inheritance. Gentiles are adopted among them in the sense and manner referred to by Paul, in the 2nd chapter of Ephesians, where he says: "Ye"—Gentiles of Ephesus, who have believed the Gospel—"are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." At one time, before the Gospel came to you, you were strangers from the covenants of the promise and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; but now, he says you are no longer in that position, but in Christ (for as many as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ); you are adopted into the family of Abraham, and are therefore Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. (See Eph. 2:11-13, 19-22; Gal. 3:27-29.)

For that spiritual Israeliteship I should certainly contend with all the strenuousness which it is possible for any human being to throw into any cause whatever; but that is a totally different thing from a theory that fritters away the promises made to the nation of Israel by attempts to substitute the church or any other body for the people that God brought out of Egypt; who, though not all of them true Israel, contain the true element. With that nation God has not yet done. Their preservation amongst the populations of the world is proof that He is true to His promise that He would preserve them, and He has preserved them for a great purpose that He has for them in the time to come.

But not to digress, there is such a thing as a spiritual Israel, and I found an argument on the Jew question on the fact that in that relationship also, the terms Israel and Jew are used interchangeably—as expressing one and the same thing spiritually, as I have shown they are now one and the same politically and socially. In Romans 2:29: "He is a Jew, that is *one inwardly*." I wonder what Mr. Hine would make of that with his understanding of the word Jew. Again, in Rev. 2:9, and 3:9, Jesus speaks of those "who say *they are* JEWS and are not, but do lie." The interchangeable term Israel, in spiritual use, is found, in Galatians 6:16, where we read: "Peace be on them, and mercy, and upon *the Israel of God*," a benediction directed to a Gentile community, and therefore constituting an instance of what I say, that the term Israel, like the term Jew, is spiritually applied in an interchangeable way, the same as in its use with the natural seed of Abraham.

Now, in what way does Mr. Hine attempt to evade the force of this really irresistible argument? By what means does he attempt to dispose of this really irrefragable evidence? By a most extraordinary theory about the tribe of Benjamin: to which I shall now have to direct your attention in a critical manner for the purpose of showing its utterly unfounded character. He says that Benjamin, which was united with Judah in forming the kingdom of Judah, was in

reality one of the ten tribes, and so technically "Israel" in the midst of Judah, and that all the statements as to Israel, some of which I have quoted, apply only to the Benjamites in the House of Judah, and not to the members of the tribe of Judah at all. At first, people are staggered with this manoeuvre. Let us examine it, and we shall find it nothing more than an audacious invention, utterly inconsistent with the facts of the case.

To show this, it will be necessary for me to call your attention to the constitution of the kingdom of Israel under Moses in their twelve tribes, with regard to one of two peculiarities of which, judging from his remarks last night, Mr. Hine, with all respect, did not seem to have become enlightened. There were twelve sons of Jacob, and in the ordinary course, these twelve sons would have constituted the basis of the twelve tribes, of which, in the Divine purpose, it was intended to constitute the kingdom of Israel. But the ordinary course was not observed: an incident transpired in Egypt in the life of Jacob which was a providential preparation for a certain national necessity afterwards experienced under Moses in the Wilderness. I refer now to what you read in Genesis 48:5. Joseph, you will recollect, had been sold into slavery in Egypt, and separated from his family for many years. Jacob and Joseph's brethren had afterwards gone down to Egypt and were comfortably settled under Joseph. Joseph introduces his two sons to Jacob before Jacob's death, and Jacob says concerning them, "Now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, who were born unto thee in the land of Egypt before I came unto thee into Egypt, *are mine*; as Reuben, my first-born, and Simeon, *they shall be mine*. And thy issue which thou begetteth after them, shall be thine." And he says afterwards (verse 16), "Let *my name be named on them*." So that Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph, were adopted as sons of Jacob. We never read of Joseph having any other children. We read of "the children of Joseph" in the various enumerations which afterwards took place, but it is always explained that by these are meant the children of Manasseh and Ephraim, these two constituting the heads of two tribes. Joseph's two sons were to be peoples, both of them, and upon that an argument is founded by Mr. Hine which I will not follow in its details: I will merely direct your attention to the very obvious meaning of the promise. In the ordinary course of family development, these two boys would have had their individuality merged in the tribe of Joseph: Joseph would have been the head, and Manasseh and Ephraim would never have been heard of; but an exception to the whole family arrangement of the House of Jacob was made in this case. These two boys were separated, and placed upon an equality with Reuben and Simeon and Judah and the other sons of Jacob, and were thus to be two separate peoples instead of amalgamations with Joseph's family.

By this arrangement Joseph himself was placed upon an equal patriarchal rank with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The meaning of this separation of Joseph's two sons became apparent afterwards. The kingdom of Israel was to be a kingdom consisting of twelve divisions springing from the sons of Jacob—twelve peoples in

one,—a bundle of nations in one—a company of nations, which by Mr. Hine is gratuitously made to apply to the colonies of Great Britain. But the family of Levi was wanted for the priesthood and its service. This would reduce the number of tribes to eleven, where twelve were wanted. How was this to be obviated? The separation of Joseph's sons—Ephraim and Manasseh, as the heads of two tribes, answers the question. In the days of Moses, we find him leading the immense multitude into their tribeships, and we are not left to speculate as to who the twelve tribes are. I will call your attention to the very abundant and distinct information and illustration we have upon that subject.

In the first place we have the numbering of the congregation of Israel, both at the beginning of the forty years' wandering in the Wilderness, and at the end. The numbering was done in tribes, and we have the tribes enumerated. They are enumerated several times. There is no room for mistake. They are—Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Reuben, Simeon, Gad, Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, Dan, Asher, Naphtali. *Joseph* is not there (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear), but his two sons are (Mr. Hine: No, no). What? EPHRAIM and MANASSEH, are they not the two sons of Joseph? *Levi* is not there. Why not? Look at the 3rd chapter of Numbers, verse 6, and you will see the reason, to which I have already alluded: "Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the priest, that they may minister unto Me." Verse 9: "And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron, and unto his sons: *they are wholly given unto him out of the Children of Israel,*" and accordingly in chapter 2, verse 33: "The Levites were NOT NUMBERED AMONGST THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL," for they were separated entirely to the Levitical services, and when the time came to divide the land for inheritance to the tribes, it was divided to *the twelve enumerated tribes*, but the Levites had no inheritance, but had cities distributed to them out of all the portions of the tribes, that they might perform the services of their priesthood.

Therefore we have to deal with a divinely illustrated constitution of the nation of Israel in the twelve tribes. I may, perhaps, afterwards have to show you more particularly who they are, and that Benjamin was not one of the ten separated from the kingdom of Judah. Meanwhile, let me call your attention to the frequency with which we have the twelve-tribe feature of the constitution brought out.

We have first the arrangement for numbering them; it was not done by Moses alone: he had assistants; and you will find their names in the 1st chapter of Numbers, and they are introduced as "*a man of every tribe*"—twelve men. There is no man for Joseph among them, except the representatives of the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim, and there is no one to represent the tribe of Levi. There is one man for each of the twelve tribes I have already enumerated.

Then again you have the twelve tribes organised in camps. You will find that the tabernacle was pitched in the middle; and there were three tribes on the north, three tribes on the south, three tribes on the east, and three tribes on the west. Their names are given: their names are all here. You will find the particulars in the

2nd chapter of Numbers. I have already read them; I need not occupy time in repeating them.

The time came when the tabernacle being finished had to be reared up and sanctified, and the princes of the tribes of Israel came with an offering to dedicate the altar and the tabernacle; a prince for each tribe—and who were they that offered? Their names are given. Here they are (Numbers 7): (1) For the tribe of *Judah*, Nahshon; (2) for the tribe of *Issachar*, Nethaneel; (3) for the tribe of *Zebulun*, Eliab; (4) for the tribe of *Reubeun*, Elizur; (5) for the tribe of *Simeon*, Shelumiel; (6) for the tribe of *Gad*, Eliasaph; (7) for the tribe of *Ephraim*, Elishama; (8) for the tribe of *Manasseh*, Gamaliel; (9) for the tribe of *Benjamin*, Abidan; (10) for the tribe of *Dan*, Ahiezer; (11) for the tribe of *Asher*, Pagiel; and (12) for the tribe of *Naphtali*, Ahira. *Levi* is not there. *Joseph* is not there, but his sons, MANASSEH and EPHRAIM are there. Therefore, Manasseh and Ephraim are elements in the twelve tribes of Israel as divinely constituted.

Then came the time when spies had to be sent to see the country. How many were sent? Twelve men. Who were they? A man of each tribe; their names are given. You will find them in the 13th chapter of Numbers. They are the same tribes as those already enumerated. This matter is illustrated perpetually.

They were numbered a second time at the end of the forty years; there were again twelve men to help; there were again twelve tribes numbered; the twelve tribes are the same.

And so the thing goes onward and downward until we come at last—for here I must make a jump, inasmuch as time does not admit of our tracing the matter right through, as I had prepared myself to do—we come to *the future time of the restored kingdom of Israel*, under a monarchy it is true—but not under a British monarchy—but under a monarchy appointed by God in the son of David, who was crucified on Calvary with His title written over Him "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews." I say, when that time comes, you have again a division of the land, and the allotment of its inheritance to the twelve tribes. And what tribes are they? You will find the enumeration in Ezekiel, the 48th chapter, from the 1st verse. The tribes mentioned are: Dan, Asher, Naphtali, *Manasseh*, *Ephraim*, Reuben, Judah, Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun, and Gad: the same twelve that were organised into a nationality when Moses brought them out of Egypt, the twelve that are perpetually referred to in the whole of the Scriptures as "our twelve tribes." The tribe of Levi is again placed around the sanctuary, as under the Mosaic arrangement; but this time instead of being scattered up and down the land of Israel, they have habitation in the holy portion of the land, set up apart in the middle of the country for the Divine encampment.

All this may be very dry, but it has a vital bearing on the argument of Mr. Hine on the subject of Benjamin and the "Israelites," spoken of in the New Testament. To see this, let us go to the days of Rehoboam, when the division of the kingdom took place. How many and what tribes did Jeroboam get? Let us patiently follow this—that we may see the position of Benjamin and the extraordinarily ingenious

shift by which Mr. Hine endeavours to evade the whole of the New Testament and other scriptural evidence, as showing that Israelite and Jew are alike. In I Kings, 11th chapter, verse 29, this incident is recorded: "When Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite found him in the way; and he had clad himself with a new garment; and they two were alone in the field: and Ahijah caught the new garment that was on him, and rent it in twelve pieces: and he said to Jeroboam, *Take thee TEN PIECES*: for thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, *and will give TEN TRIBES to thee*, but he shall have one tribe — (he, the king of Israel, belonging to and representing the tribe of Judah, shall have one in addition to himself, one of the twelve — Benjamin, making two — Judah and Benjamin); he shall have one tribe, for this reason: "For David's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake, the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel". If Benjamin had not been given to Judah, David's royal house in Jerusalem would have been extinguished; for Jerusalem was in the portion of Benjamin. Ten tribes were given to Jeroboam; one to the House of David, of Judah, constituting with Judah the kingdom of Judah. Hence, we always find Judah and Benjamin associated in the subsequent history of the kingdom of Judah. Now what tribes were these ten that were handed over to Jeroboam? We have not the list set out particularly in one place, but we get at them in this way: in the history of the ten tribes you find incidentally mentioned, here and there, all the tribes that went to constitute the kingdom of Israel.

TIME CALLED.

It was now Mr. Roberts' part, according to the programme, to question Mr. Hine for a quarter-of-an-hour.

MR. HINE:—I have been exceedingly courteous to Mr. Roberts in allowing him to speak, instead of my questioning him; and now may I ask of Mr. Roberts to be equally generous with me, and relieve me from being under the burden of his questioning, and give me a speech for the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN (after a pause): How is it to be?

MR. ROBERTS:—I abide by the programme.*

MR. HINE:—Oh! Mr. Roberts abides by the programme! Go on, Mr. Roberts.

*Mr. Hine claims generosity for his omission to question Mr. Roberts, and suggest discourtesy in Mr. Roberts adhering to the programme. This is the wrong way to put it. Mr. Hine requested to be relieved from the necessity of putting questions to Mr. Roberts. Mr. Roberts complied, on condition of being allowed to occupy the time. If generosity is in the question at all, it was on that side that granted Mr. Hine's request. Because Mr. Hine chose to surrender a quarter of an hour, which he felt it inconvenient to occupy, that was no reason why Mr. Roberts should allow Mr. Hine to evade the most important test in the debate.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE

114.—Why did Paul call the chief of the Jews together when he arrived in Rome?—I don't know. I do not believe he did call the chief of the Jews together.

115.—You do not believe he did?—No.

116.—Then what do you understand this to mean: "It came to pass that after three days"—upon his arrival in Rome—"Paul called the chief of the Jews together" (Acts 28:17)?—I believe that Paul went after the people called to be saints in the midst of Rome.

117.—Why did he call the chief of the Jews together?—I believe that Paul was after his own brethren.

118.—Why did he call the chief of the Jews together?—I don't know.

119.—Will you accept Paul's explanation?—Oh! I shall be glad.

120.—"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" (Acts 28:20). My question is: What had the Jews to do with the hope of Israel, according to your theory?—I can see a very good reason why Paul called the chief of the Jews together, because they were really a dominant power over the people of Israel divided and separated from the Jews.

121.—What had they to do with the hope of Israel?—Oh, the Jews and the ten-tribed people together have to do—as one nation, together with the Jews, have yet to do, with the hope of Israel.

122.—Then do you believe that the Jews are part of Israel?—Answer: Mr. Hine has never denied that; I may say Mr. Hine would never be such a fool.

123.—Then why did you say to-night that God told off Israel to honour, but the Jews to dispersion and shame?—Because God requires the ten tribes to come again into contact with the two, and the two sticks to form no more two nations or two kingdoms at all.

124.—If the two tribes are part and parcel of Israel, how can you keep them out of the promises to Israel?—Because God has told off one house for honour, and the other house for dishonour.

125.—Where is the evidence of that?—Because God declared: "Behold My servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold, My servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, My servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold, My servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. 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."

126.—Do you call idolaters servants of God?—Well, God required the people of Israel to be in idolatry, and yet to be the people He had covenanted with. (A Voice: "Proof.")

127.—Where has God required His servants to be idolaters?—God required Israel to be in idolatry at the time they arrived in the isles, because He would strip them as in the Wilderness.

128.—Where does He say they would arrive in the isles?—You have in Scripture: “Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken ye people from far: He that scattered Israel will gather him.”

129.—(*Turning to the Bible, and reading.*)—Is this the verse that you rely upon as proving that idolatrous Israel were to arrive in the isles: “Listen O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people from far; The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name. And He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me” (Isaiah 49:1, 2). Who is speaking there?—Oh, He is speaking of Israel in the isles.

130.—I ask, who is speaking?—God Almighty.

131.—(*Continues reading.*)—“And said unto me, Thou art My servant O Israel” (verse 3). Does God Almighty say that God said to Him, “Thou art My servant?”—Yes, God says that Israel should be His servant. Israel could never be a servant to any other people.

132.—The speaker says, “God hath said unto ME, thou art My servant, and you say the speaker is God?—Yes, I do; because if God inspires a man to put forth certain statements, it is not the man that speaks, but it is God Almighty.

133.—Then my question is, How can God Almighty say to God Almighty. “Thou art My servant, O Israel?”—I do not believe that God ever addresses Himself.

134.—Then who is addressed here?—God Almighty is addressing His servant.

135.—And who is the servant?—Israel.

136.—And Israel says, “Listen unto me, O isles?”—No, God Almighty says.

137.—Say plainly, Mr. Hine: Is God Almighty or Israel the speaker:—God Almighty is always the speaker in Scripture.

138.—You do not mean that?—Yes, I do.

139.—Consider: How can this be God Almighty speaking: “God hath said unto ME?”—All Scripture is Divine.

140.—Yes, I believe all Scripture is divinely written; but all Scripture is not about God?—I believe God Almighty is the speaker.

141.—Well, who is He addressing here?—Israel. “Thou art My servant, O Israel.”

142.—But it is Israel reporting what has been said by God to him?—No, God Almighty addresses His people Israel in the isles.

143.—Then, whether it be God, or whether it be Israel, it is a summons to the isles to listen, is it not?—No, it is not: it is a summons to the people in the isles.

144.—Precisely: and if Israel be the speaker, how can Israel be the people in the isles?—I declare that Israel is not the speaker, but God Almighty.

145.—I have read the first three verses, “Listen, O isles. unto ME; and hearken, YE PEOPLE, from far; the Lord hath called me.” Do you still say that the Lord is the speaker?—Yes, I do.

146.—Then do you say that God says to Himself, “The Lord hath called me?”—I am quite sure that if I instructed Mr. Roberts to give you a message from me, it is not Mr. Roberts who speaks, but my own spirit.

147.—You have referred me to this passage as proving that God says that Israel was to arrive in an idolatrous state in the British Islands?—No. I have not said that; I should be very foolish if I did.

148.—Well, I will leave the point. The audience will judge of your position in the matter, Mr. Hine. I pass on to another point, You say that it was God’s purpose that Israel should be lost?—Aye, yes, and your Saviour says so: “I am not sent but unto *the lost sheep* of the House of Israel.”

149.—What do you understand by the term “lost” in that connection?—Oh, I believe the people were then in exile.

150.—Then, by “lost,” you mean in exile?—Yes, I do.

151.—Now, will you stick to that? (Laughter.)—Yes, I do, I mean to stick to that.

152.—Then what do you mean by saying in your publication that the ten tribes were not literally lost in the days of the apostles?—They were not lost to name in the days of the apostles; and Josephus, your great authority, whom you seem to take before the statement of God Almighty, says so.

153.—But you said that by “lost” you meant in exile. Seeing they were in exile, why do you say they were not lost, if by lost you mean in exile?—They were not lost to name.

154.—I find in your *Forty-seven Identifications*, p. 8, you say that: “The ten tribes were exiled, but not literally lost in the days of the apostles. This is evident from the fact that when they (the apostles) were sent after them they found them in the region already indicated, with their synagogues abounding everywhere. * * * We read of them earnestly contending for circumcision.” (This is what you denied last night, having said)?—No, I did not.

155.—After noticing other circumstances, you go on to say: “These facts preclude the idea that Israel was literally lost, either to themselves or to others in Paul’s time.” Now, were they lost or were they not lost then?—There I give, writing years ago, in a pamphlet, the statements of which have never been brought before this meeting. Years ago, I have said that the people in Paul’s time were not lost.

156.—You have altered your mind upon that point?—No, I have not.

157.—Then you still say they were not lost?—I am sure they were not lost, in the sense of our term “lost”.

158.—They were either lost or not lost, and I wish you to say plainly?—Yes, they were in exile.

159.—The term is “lost?”—It is the equivalent to being in exile.

- 160.—Is that the only sense in which you use the term?—That is the only sense.
- 161.—You say that Jesus came to seek the lost sheep of Israel?—Yes.
- 162.—How could He come to seek lost sheep that were not lost?—He knew where to find them then.
- 163.—But you say everybody else knew where to find them?—Yes, Paul knew where to find them. Hence he wrote to the people in Rome — not Romans — but to the strangers scattered in Rome called to be saints.
- 164.—Do you mean that in writing to the strangers in Rome, he wrote to the natural descendants of Abraham?—Yes, I do, the very people separated from all other people by the copyright term of “saints,” people separated to be called by that name.
- 165.—What did he mean then, in writing to those people, saying: “I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office” (Romans 11:13); “I would not that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened unto Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in (verse 25).” How came he to write to Israel after the flesh in those terms?—Quite right and proper, because he is seeing the future, whereby blindness in part should happen to Israel.
- 166.—To whom was he writing?—To Israel.
- 167.—Why did he say to them he was the Apostle of the Gentiles?—By styling himself the Apostle of the Gentiles, he did not say that his great mission was not after the lost sheep of the House of Israel.
- 168.—Then what did he mean by saying: “As concerning the Gospel *they* are enemies for *your* sakes, but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers’ sakes (Romans 11:28). Of whom is he speaking then?—Of the Jews.
- 169.—Not of Israel?—Not of Israel.
- 170.—Then if that be so?—I am quite sure it is so.
- 171.—Then if it is the Jews, let it be the Jews, and now listen to this: Well, if you say it is the Jews—
- 172.—I am asking you: now do you stick to that?—Yes.
- 173.—That it is the Jews?—Yes.
- 174.—And not Israel?—And not Israel.
- 175.—“For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but *life from the dead*,” which you apply in your *Magazine* to Israel?—Yes; and that passage does not apply to the Jews at all.
- 176.—Is not Paul speaking of one Israel throughout the whole of that chapter?—No, certainly not: he is speaking of one vessel unto honour, and another vessel unto dishonour. Hence if one is for honour, and another is not, he is not speaking at all times of the same people.
- 177.—What “vessel” is he speaking of in this chapter?—If he is speaking of the

- vessel to honour, I am quite sure he is speaking of the ten-tribed people of Israel?
- 178.—Why are you quite sure?—Because God appointed them to it.
- 179.—But why are you sure that Paul is speaking of them?—I am sure he is speaking of Israel.
- 180.—But you said a moment ago, he was speaking of the Jews?—Last night I said he was writing to a people not under the law, but redeemed from the law.
- 181.—The letter is addressed “To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints.”—Yes, called to be saints.
- 182.—Who are they?—The people of Israel, and never a Gentile among them.
- 183.—Let us go to the history of the case and see. In Acts 28:24, when Paul spoke in Rome to the people of Israel, we are told that “some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not. And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive;” verse 28: “Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is SENT UNTO THE GENTILES, and that they will hear it. And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves. And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and RECEIVED ALL THAT CAME IN UNTO HIM, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.” Is it not evident from this that the Gentiles in Rome (those of them who would listen) were called to be saints by the hand of Paul?—I am right down glad that the people Paul was speaking to—that is, the Jewish people—did not receive his testimony, because if they had they would have belied the prophets. Hence he told them if they did not hear God, the Gentiles would.
- 184.—Did the Gentiles hear?—Many of the Gentiles were converted and received in my judgment the out-pouring of the Spirit at the time of Pentecost, but never a Jew.
- 185.—I am at Rome—not in Jerusalem—in this chapter. Did not the Jews in Rome believe the Gospel that Paul preached?—In Christ’s time, and Paul’s time, many of the Jews believed the Gospel, but afterwards they fell away. I am quite sure that in Paul’s time, in Rome, many of the Gentiles received the Gospel, and there is no reason why they should not have done.
- 186.—And were they called to be saints—No, they were not.
- 187.—What, the believing Gentiles not called to be saints?—No, they never were.

TIME CALLED.

MR. HINE:—Now, Mr. Roberts, whose turn?

MR. ROBERTS:—It is your turn to make a speech, or question me.

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH

MR. HINE:—Then I choose to make a speech. I have listened to Mr. Roberts, who has been trying to found an argument conveying to you the impression that Josephus is quite as trustworthy as the Word of God—an argument trying to give forth the impression that we have as much right to receive what Josephus tells us as we should have in reading a chapter from the Bible. And I declare that Josephus was wrong, and totally wrong in very many of his records of history; for a man who declares that only two tribes were subject to the Romans was under a delusion, because we know there were three tribes—Judah, Levi, and Benjamin. Josephus tells you only two. Josephus tells you that ten tribes were beyond the Euphrates—a great host that could not be numbered, and yet your own history—mark you—your British history declares positively that the tribe of Dan settled in the north of Ireland 720 years B.C. Mr. Roberts will have plenty of time, and I defy him to come forth and tear that page out of the history of your own nation from the book.

Then we say, departing from many of the ideas which have been given to us, which I really have not been able to follow—it may be my own fault; it may be on account of the method that Mr. Roberts has employed—we still claim and still adhere to the idea that we are that people of Israel, and never could receive Mr. Roberts' statement that Israel and Judah do not exist as separated peoples, but are interchangeable terms; because when God Almighty declares that the one people should eat and the other should hunger; that the one people should drink and the other be thirsty; that the one people should rejoice and the other be ashamed; that the one people should sing for joy of heart, and the other should cry for sorrow of heart and howl for vexation of spirit—when God Almighty comes forth to declare that backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah, then we are bound to acknowledge that there must be an utter distinction between the House of Israel and the House of Judah. If we could not see that, then we are perfectly justified in stating before you, that my dear friend, whose name is Robert Roberts, and Robert Roberts is the same man—where would be the sense in saying that backsliding Roberts had justified himself more than treacherous Roberts?

Then insisting upon the distinction—because the return is yet to take place; because God Almighty declares that the children of Israel and the children of Judah shall come together; and when our Saviour says that He will save the tents of Judah before He saves the tents of Israel, we declare before you that there must be a distinction between Israel and Judah. Hence God Almighty declares of that people—the people we are in quest of—that they were in exile long after they were cast out of their land; and we all know, as we proved last night, that they have never returned. Hence God Almighty declared of that people when in exile, when lost: “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; the remnant of Jacob shall be amongst the Gentiles as a lion amongst the beasts of the forest, as a young lion amongst the flocks of sheep, who if he go through—if he declare war—

shall both tread down and tear in pieces, and none shall deliver.” Hence, upon the fact that you are identical with the people of Israel—do you want a proof that when your nation—the representative of that people—the people terrible from their beginning, and hitherto, and remaining this night, a strong nation, and required by God to glorify Him—why we have a proof in the very news that you have received this day, where our brave Colonel Pearson has been relieved by the British forces, and where the Zulus have had their lesson which God Almighty required, by which you will find that our weapons have prevailed, and that the weapons of the Zulus have not prevailed; and by the same law, by the same fact, you are identical with the people of Israel.

We declare to you that you shall rectify your frontier in Afghanistan, and by virtue of your being identical with that people, there is no power that shall come in between the power of Britain and the people of Afghanistan to prevent our obtaining possession of all that God Almighty requires us to have. Hence we say by virtue of being identical with Israel, corresponding to those prophecies, we have prevailed over the Zulus, we have prevailed over the Afghans, and we have in time gone by—thank God for it—because it becomes a seal to the many testimonies that His Word is true, in that by our fives we have chased hundreds, and by our hundreds we have put ten thousands to flight, and that our enemies have fallen before us by the sword. So we say that you have always done that, and have simply done it by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel. Again, following out our declaration that we belong to the ten-tribed people, God gives to you this promise, because you possess—literally possess—the promises that are recorded in Deuteronomy, that “thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow.” So you are the only nation—that promise is only given to the people of Israel—you are the only nation required by God Almighty to be so prosperous, to get such abounding wealth, whilst, by the covenant that God made with your forefathers. He gave you the power to get wealth, and by the accumulation of this wealth you have lent nearly 900,000,000 pounds of money to foreign needy states outside your nation; but you never have required to borrow of them. We say that prophecy was only given by God Almighty to the people of Israel, and He never required any other nation on the earth to comply with that promise but Israel. Hence, when you find a people literally complying with the promise, you become justified in declaring that you have found the people of Israel, and by virtue of the British nation being the only people upon earth lending and not borrowing, again we declare that you are warranted in saying you are identified with Israel.

I am sorry that Mr. Roberts—in trying to impose upon your credulity when he was narrating particulars from the last chapter of Ezekiel—that he did omit the tribe of Levi. I am quite sure that that imposture was attempted to be committed before me at Huddersfield, and that is why on some platform—I could not help it—I called the Huddersfield people, only alluding to the Christadelphians—no, it was at Birmingham—alluding to the people there—“miserable wretches.” Not that we attempted to give any offence: but there are thirteen tribes mentioned in

that last chapter of Ezekiel, and the tribe of Levi is included in the number; and as showing that the time of the return has not yet taken place. Work out the details of the last chapter of Ezekiel, and you shall find the whole of the allotments—distributions of the land are differently arranged to that which was in existence in the time that Israel had possession of their land. And then, as knowing, and fully well knowing that the tribe of Levi, a grand tribe, a tribe that shall never be ignored, a tribe that has existed from the beginning as a tribe, and one of the twelve—as knowing that that tribe is still in existence, when you come to the time when the sealing shall take place, there shall be 12,000 sealed out of that tribe that shall swell up the number to 144,000; and I will declare before you, that of the 144,000 sealed, there shall not be a single, a solitary Gentile among that number, because there shall only exist 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes—bringing the total of the 144,000 without a single Gentile being included. Hence the tribe of Levi must still exist as a tribe, because the time of sealing is yet to take place and when that time shall dawn upon us—that blessed time—then Levi shall come forth as a tribe; therefore he is not lost this day.

Then we say, as far as the tribe of Manasseh is concerned, you are well aware that God Almighty said of Manasseh, you shall be a people; and that He said of Ephraim—he was only then the embodiment of the ten-tribed people—the ten tribes focussed into a nation, a nation that was to appear before God Almighty—God Almighty declared of Ephraim that he should be a great people, a greater nation than the people of Manasseh; and we say by that God required two distinct people to come forth from the same blood—the same stock; and you never could be identical with that people—the people of Israel, unless you literally applied to that prophecy. There must have been a time when the islands became too small to hold them when they should lose the people who had separated themselves away from the people of Israel—the people of Manasseh—and thank God the intelligent of the people of America are taking up this identical question by thousands, and they are speaking through Dr. Wyld and through very many of their clergy; and they can clearly see that the American people represent none other than the one tribe of Manasseh, who afterwards should become separated from Israel by their Act of Independence.

Hence in the whole of America we can see a people coming from our blood, and who has now become independent of us, because we can see the promise that was given to the fathers, that of two sons they should become two peoples, and that the people of Israel should ever remain greater than the people of Manasseh, the British people being identical with the nation of Israel—they should ever remain, by the Word of God, greater than the people of America. Hence, knowing that we have little time to spare, we would give you the idea that if you will only understand God to mean what He says, and take His promises as meaning literally the carrying out of prophecy, then you would never commit the blunder that Mr. Gladstone did commit, who, not seeing from Scripture that America would represent Manasseh, has declared that it is possible that that nation in a few years from now shall outstrip us in industry, enterprise, and greatness.

And we say by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, and by God's own Word that Israel shall ever be greater than Manasseh—they must ever be a people—a great people; but Israel, your own nation—the British nation—shall by the Word of God ever be greater than they; and that becomes a very grand thing to know that God has His hand upon the destinies of nations, and by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, you know that you shall maintain your ground, and you shall ever go forth to rule the other nations, and to insist upon God's laws, to insist upon the light of the Gospel being carried to these different nations round about the earth, because God requires you to come forth, being redeemed from Moses, to become light-bearers, and the means of blessing to all the other nations of the earth. Hence, taking up your missionary work in conjunction with Manasseh, from our same seed, from our same stock, we are the light to the Gentiles, and we do go forth before all the Gentile nations of the earth, proclaiming the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; but when the return shall take place, then, God be thanked, you shall have many nations joined to the Lord.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

188.—Mr. Hine, you have used the word "*imposture*," and employed the term "*credulity*," to define the process of my argument as relating to the division of the land to the house of Israel under the Messiah. I cannot suppose that you seriously meant that I have been guilty of imposture?—Hear, hear, Mr. Roberts, I do not.

189.—Then to what did you allude?—I hardly know.

190.—I think I can tell you. You said that Levi was to have a portion in the land as well as the other tribes. I am sure your impression upon that point is sincere, because the name of Levi is mentioned in connection with the distribution, but you certainly are mistaken in saying that Levi is to have a portion. I will read what I referred to in my speech, and what probably you had in your mind, and you will see. It is Ezekiel 45:1; 'Moreover, when ye shall divide by lot the land for an inheritance,'—I may say that this was written after the Babylonish captivity, and will therefore obviously, in the judgement of everyone, refer to futurity (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear)—'ye shall offer an oblation unto the Lord, an holy portion of the land: the length shall be the length of 25,000 reeds.' The reed, I may say, was about 10 feet in length, and the measurement of 25,000 would give about 50 miles; and we read in chapter 48:20; 'All the oblation shall be 25,000 by 25,000: ye shall offer the holy oblation foursquare, with the possession of the city'—a tract of country about 50 miles square. In this the Levites were to have habitation, but it was not allotted to any tribe. It was to be absolutely separated to Divine uses. This holy oblation of the land, separated to the Lord, corresponded to the typical sanctuary in the wilderness, which stood in the centre of the encamped congregation, and round which the Levites were pitched. So, we have this, in Ezekiel 45:4. 'The holy portion of the land shall be for the priests, the ministers of the sanctuary, which shall come near to minister unto the Lord; and it shall be a place for their houses, and an holy place for the sanctuary. And the 25,000 of

length, and the 10,000 of breadth, shall also the Levites, the ministers of the house, have for themselves, for a possession for twenty chambers," and so forth. The Levites were not to have one of the twelve portions but a place in the Lord's portion. Therefore you withdraw the term "*imposture*" in relation to my argument based upon the distribution of the land under the Messiah?—I simply declare before you that the Levites shall have possession when the time of the return to Palestine shall take place, and I find it in Ezekiel 48:22, where we are told: "Moreover from the possession of the Levites."

191.—Is that not within the land-oblation offered to the Lord?—It matters very little, because in your oblation you have the extent of two distinct districts; that is, it is like two distinct territories allotted to the other tribes put into one.

192.—But is not the land to be divided in twelve portions among the twelve tribes whose names I read, and whose names are all in the chapter; and is it not the fact that not one of those twelve is given to the Levites? That is the question.—No: the land is divided literally into thirteen divisions, the Levites possessing one, and—mark!—Manasseh possessing another.

193.—Well, I have read the evidence, and will not press that point further. The audience will judge. I ask Mr. Hine another question. Mr. Hine said, not a single Gentile would be heir with Israel of the promises made to them. I want to know how he reconciles that view with what Paul says in Ephesians 3:6: "That the Gentiles should be *fellow-heirs*, and OF THE SAME BODY, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel?"—I should consider myself an impostor if I came forth with the history of the British nation, and made circumstances and events that happened in the time of William the Conqueror to appear in the reign of Queen Victoria. Hence we declare that we never have said, as far as the Gentiles are concerned, that they will have no share in the hope of Israel. We simply say, that not a single Gentile should be among the 144,000.

194.—And who are the 144,000?—Mr. Roberts surely does not want to ask that.

195.—"The 144,000" is a phrase occurring in a symbolical book, and you have used it in argument, and I wish to know what your idea is as to the meaning of it?—Answer: Mr. Hine is quite sure that it will be a literal sealing, and that the 144,000 shall comprise 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes of Israel.

196.—Do you mean that each of those 144,000 are to be literally stamped on their foreheads?—Answer: Mr. Hine would be rather foolish to suppose such a thing.

197.—You said you considered the sealing was literal, and you will find they were sealed in the foreheads with the name of the Father.—You are quite wrong, Mr. Roberts, it does not say sealed in the forehead. The beast, the Antichrist, he shall seal his men, the subjects of his rule, in their forehead: there is no doubt about that.

198.—Here is the statement, that they have their "Father's name *written in their foreheads*" (Revelation 14:1).—But that is not the sealing of the 144,000. As far as the sealing of the 144,000 is concerned, you have no reference to the sealing in the forehead.

199.—Let us see, what I have read is unquestionably about the 144,000: Lo, a lamb stood on the Mount Sion, and with Him *an hundred and forty and four thousand* having His Father's name written in their foreheads." But, you say this was not their sealing. Well, let us see. It is earlier in the book (A voice: Chapter 7, verse 3). "Till we have sealed the servants of our God *in their foreheads*." My question is: Were they to be literally stamped upon their foreheads, because you said the sealing was literal?—Well, my reply to that is, that being in the future, and not being a prophet, I really do not know, but I do not think that it would be a literal stamping.

200.—Well, that will answer the purpose of my question, Mr. Hine. I will pass on to something else. You said that at the time of the separation of the ten tribes from Judah, Benjamin, one of the ten as you make them, was to be left in the midst of Judah as a spiritual illuminator. Do I understand you correctly or not?—Benjamin was to be allied with the two tribes of Judah as light-bearers, because the two tribes could not serve that purpose.

201.—What do you mean by light-bearers?—Gospel-bearers in the city that our Lord should choose.

202.—I ask on what passage of Scripture you rely for that meaning?—Well, I believe it is recorded in the *Kings*, and I believe it is recorded in *Chronicles*.

203.—Let us turn to the record, I Kings 15:4?—And I am quite sure of Benjamin, that it is one of the tribes of Israel; that is, not one of the tribes of Judah.

204.—The passage is this: "Nevertheless for David's sake did the Lord his God give him *a lamp* in Jerusalem, to set up his son after him, and to establish Jerusalem." I wish to ask if that term "*lamp*" is the phrase upon which you rely, which is also paraphrased in the corresponding narrative by the term "*light*." Is that the passage upon which you rely?—Yes.

205.—Then I ask whether that meaning applies in Psalm 132: 17, where it is said of Christ, or David if you will—for the argument will be the same in either case, but I believe it to be Christ: David first, and then his son. "There will I make the horn of David to bud; I have ordained A LAMP for Mine Anointed," my Christ. Where is the spiritual illuminator that has been appointed for Christ?—I do not believe at all that the Almighty here is setting forth Christ as that horn, but that David literally will come back as his seed.

206.—Does David require a spiritual illuminator outside himself?—David does require, that is, our queen, from David, does require the light of the gospel redeemed from Moses under Christ.

207.—You said you believed David himself would come back; and my question refers not to Queen Victoria, but to David?—I do believe that David will yet re-appear, but I don't believe that David will take the throne, because it is David's seed that is to have the possession, the custody of the sceptre, until he comes whose right it is to reign.

208.—“Until HE comes,”—how can that apply to a woman?—David’s seed can apply to a woman: otherwise, it would be a very poor Christ for Mr. Roberts.

209.—Is not Christ the son promised to David to sit upon his throne?—Yes, when the time shall come for him to reign: hence, when Mr. Roberts was trying to give you the impression when the inscription was written, “King of the Jews,” you all know that it was written in derision: that is, the people then knew he was not their king.

210.—Was not David king of the twelve tribes?—For a part of his time he was.

211.—Do you say Josephus made a mistake when he called him the king of the Jews?—Yes, I do.

212.—Do you think that Christ will rule over the twelve tribes?—I am quite sure that he will.

213.—Is he not the promised king?—Of course.

214.—If the kingdom of David is to be no more until he comes whose right it is, and he whose right it is is yet away, how do you say that the throne of David exists now?—You must have the throne of David existing as long as the ordinances of heaven and earth exist. Hence with David’s seed God made a perpetual covenant, and until our saviour shall come, whose right it is to reign, the sceptre must ever be with Judah, David being of Judah.

215.—If that be a right construction of the prophecy, how are we to understand the other prophecy that says: “At that time I will *build again* the tabernacle of David that IS FALLEN?”—Yes, we quite believe that David’s throne did fall at the time of the captivity to Babylon, and for some time after that.

216.—How then about your construction of the covenant, that it should last for ever?—Then it was taken up by the decree of God Almighty, who required simply a lapse, an interval, the same as we have had in this country in reference to Oliver Cromwell, but the sceptre must be with the seed of David, and it must be in perpetual covenant.

MR. HINE’S LAST SPEECH

MR. HINE:—Well, my dear friends, I do not want that we should go home under the impression that we are playing the fool with each other. I would go home intensely unhappy if I thought I was trifling with the Word of God; but by seeing these proofs of our being Israel—I can see three hundred distinct proofs that we are Israel—why we simply bring forth three hundred new powers—new gifts—which we impart to you; and until Mr. Roberts shall see our identity in the separation of Israel from Judah he never shall, I am sure he shall not as a Christian minister, possess the power that he could possess, if he saw in these three hundred jots and tittles, in these three hundred plain evidences as to the truth of God’s Word, see these three hundred proofs coming forth to substantiate the Word of God; why he and you shall possess a new power to go forth to the infidel,

and win him for God. I will simply ask you to go forth with this thought upon your minds: the Almighty has permitted me to go almost throughout the length and breadth of this land, and when we have shown the people how God has fulfilled, literally fulfilled, His prophecy; why! over and over again, in hundreds and hundreds of instances, we have won back the very men that the clergy had allowed to slip through their fingers. We have shown them that what God had said should be accomplished has been accomplished, and when they have seen the rational view of Scripture apart from the spiritualising notion, then they have been constrained to accept the Bible as the Word of God. Hence we want you to go home this night in the calm of the Holy Spirit, go home without bias, go home with the desire to be taught only by the Spirit of God Almighty, and when we shall meet tomorrow, which we hope shall be the most refreshing meeting of the three, we are quite sure that after our three nights’ labour, you will not regret that you have come forth to help us to show forth the mysteries of the Word of God.

MR. ROBERTS’ LAST SPEECH.

MR. ROBERTS:—If there were three hundred marks of identity to prove that the British nation is the ancient House of Israel, I would not be here to stand up against it. Nay, I will say that a single identification would shut my mouth. There is not a single identification. What is an identification? It is one’s ownness, so to speak, a something that belongs to yourself, that cannot belong to anybody else. You do not identify a man by what he has in common with all. All men have eyes, all men have arms, all men have many things in common; and how absurd the individual would appear in the estimation of the authorities of Scotland Yard, who, when a man was wanted, should being a man with marks claimed as “identification” which were common to all. Suppose he was able to make out a list of “three hundred marks,” and said: “The man you want has brown hair, and this man has brown hair; the man you want has finger-nails, and this man has finger-nails; the man you want wears trousers, and this man wears trousers;” and so on. In this way, I would undertake to draw out a list of three hundred identifications of any man, not one of which would be a true identification, and which in the estimation of the police authorities would be simply an insult to their understanding. And I am quite sure if you take Mr. Hine’s three hundred identifications, one by one, and examine them critically, you will find that they will all dissolve in your hands, like so much winter’s snow.

When I was stopped in my opening address, I was arguing about the point made by Mr. Hine concerning Benjamin. I cannot hope to finish it now, in the short space of time at my disposal, but I will remind you of what I was saying, that although the names of the ten tribes given over to the jurisdiction of Jeroboam, the servant of Solomon, are not given in a formal manner, yet you do have the whole of the ten tribes mentioned incidentally in the history — the dark, and bloody, and idolatrous history, — of the ten tribes, from the day that Jeroboam

took the throne till the day that Shalmaneser led a weary rabble of captives into the countries beyond the Euphrates; and if you go over that narrative, as I have done, you will be able to pick them out.

You will find Issachar, in 1 Kings 15:27; Zebulun, in 2 Chron. 30:10; Reuben, in 1 Chron. 5:26; Simeon, in 2 Chron. 15:9; Gad, in 1 Chron. 5:26; Ephraim, in 2 Chron. 15:9; 30:10; Manasseh, in 1 Chron. 5:26; 2 Chron. 15:9; 30:10; Dan, in 1 Kings 12:29; 2 Kings 10:29; Asher, in 2 Chron. 30:11; and Naphtali, in 2 Chron. 16:4; 34:6.

There you have the ten tribes that God promised to give to Jeroboam, and in the list you do not find Benjamin, and therefore Mr. Hine's contention that Benjamin was one of the ten, and was left behind in Judah as a spiritual illuminator for the Jews, is a simple invention. He founds it on the statement that in sending away the ten tribes from the throne of David, God would leave one tribe to David "for a light". He assumes that the "one tribe" referred to (1 Kings 11:36) was one of the two, whereas it is one of the twelve (Benjamin) given to Judah, as represented by the House of David — the two and the ten making the twelve. This is shown by a sensible reading of the narrative, and conclusively established by the history of the case. The reason for leaving this one tribe of Benjamin to David was that David might have "a light". There was force in this reason, for Jerusalem, the royal city, was in the inheritance of Benjamin (Josh. 18:21, 28), and if Benjamin had been given to Jeroboam, the political light of the House of David would have been extinguished. Mr. Hine understands "light", as thus metaphorically used, to mean spiritual illumination — "gospel-bearing", to use his phrase.

My questions to him showed the absurdity of this. It is still more conclusively shown by other passages where it is used — (2 Sam. 21:15, also verse 17) — and by Josephus' paraphrase of the promise of "light" as "the promise made to David FOR HIS SUCCESSION" (*Antiquities*, Book 8, chap. 7, sec.7). Consequently the whole body of evidence that I adduced from the New Testament, going to show that those to whom Christ and the apostles preached, even if Benjamites exclusively, were Jews, synonymously described as Israelites, remains absolutely untouched. The notion that they were Benjamites exclusively is absolutely gratuitous. There is not a tittle of evidence in support of the idea; but even if it were so, it would not alter the argument, for Benjamites are uniformly styled Jews in both Old and New Testaments. For instance, Judah and Benjamin, by Mr. Hine's own admission, returned together from the captivity in Babylon. Now, what do we find? That they are called "Jews" indiscriminately throughout the whole of the account in Ezra and Nehemiah, of their return from that captivity. (Mr. Hine: No, no.)

Well, I will prove it: first, as to their captivity, in Jeremiah 52:28, we read that Nebuchadnezzar carried away 3,023 *Jews*. Then as to their return, Ezra 4:12: "Be it known unto the king" — say the friends of the Persian king, writing from Syria to Babylon — "That *the Jews who came up from thee to us* are come unto

Jerusalem, building the rebellious and the bad city." In Nehem. 5:17, Nehemiah says: "There were at my table an hundred and fifty *of the Jews* and rulers, beside those that came unto us from among the heathen". In Nehem. 13:23: "In those days also saw I *Jews* that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in *the Jews' language*". Esther 2:5: "There was a certain *Jew* whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, A BENJAMITE". Here we have the particular tribe mentioned as a tribe to which a particular *Jew* belongs, and yet Mr. Hine says that when we read Israel in the New Testament, we are to understand Benjamites, and when we read Jew in the New Testament, we are to understand Judah, although here is a Benjamite who is called a Jew. (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear.) Well, if Mr. Hine can endorse that, it strikes me that his argument about Benjamin must altogether go to the wall.

THIRD NIGHT.

MR. HINE:— My Lord, Mr. Roberts, and ye Children of Israel, — And I am very glad to make a distinction between Mr. Roberts and yourselves, because he claims to be a Gentile. Hence, it would not be right for me to class him amongst the Children of Israel. We remind you of the basis laid down on the first night, that God Almighty covenanted with the people of Israel that they should be a separate people from all the Gentile nations of the earth throughout time; that is, throughout the everlasting period, and “everlasting” does not refer to eternity. We remind you that the Children of Israel comprised twelve tribes; that they exist to-day if God Almighty has kept His covenant — they exist to this day a separate people from the Gentile nations. Afterwards their circumstances were changed, and the one family, the twelve tribes, were divided into two parts, comprising the House of Israel, the ten tribes, and the House of Judah, two tribes; and we tried to place great emphasis upon the fact that, unless you could distinguish the difference between the ten tribes and the two tribes, you could not beget any right conceptions of the bulk of Scripture.

There was the difficulty about the ten-tribed people: because if at any time they have returned they would not be lost, because they could only return in conjunction with the two-tribed people of Judah. Judah could not return alone, and for people to talk about the return of the Jews and ignore the existence of Israel is simply to take a one-sided and very unfair view of Scripture. We showed you many reasons why it became utterly impossible that the return had taken place. When the return does take place the distinction must still exist, because God declares that the Children of Israel and the Children of Judah shall go together, as proving that the return, that is the second-time return, has not yet taken place. When that return has taken place, God declares that they shall no more sing about their deliverance from Egypt; then they shall sing a new song; they shall no more say, the Lord liveth that brought up the Children of Israel from Egypt, but the Lord liveth which brought and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of the north country. If the return had already taken place, the Jews would be bound to forget the song of their deliverance from Egypt, and be singing this new song in connection with Israel, a deliverance from the north country. As a proof that the return has not taken place, the Jews have never yet sung that new song; but are still singing the old song of their deliverance from Egypt, which they rehearse piously and acceptably before God Almighty every day in their houses.

Then as the return has not taken place it conclusively follows that the distinction between Israel and Judah still exists. Then we say if the distinction exists between Israel and Judah with their altered circumstances — and you will remember that Mr. Roberts last night was talking very largely also of the past history of the people of Israel, touching periods before their division, and positively attempting

to apply those times to their altered times, the times when the division had been effected. If I were to take upon myself to write the history of good Queen Elizabeth, and I were to take a part from the reign of William the Conqueror and a part from the reign of your most glorious Queen Victoria, and if I were to apply these passages from the different histories to the time of Queen Elizabeth, I should simply be trying to impose upon you — simply be trying to delude you. Hence we say it would not be right to take Israel when they were in existence as one family of twelve tribes, to take all their circumstances as being applicable to the time when the division had taken place, when God Almighty declared that He had broken the bands between Israel and Judah, because from that time one house — as we have already told you — and very important to see — was told off for honour and the other for dishonour.

Mr. Roberts was trying to make a very great point, which I thought very, very little of. You know the whole drift of his argument has been to make out that there is no distinction between Israel and Judah in these times, that the terms Israel and Judah are interchangeable, synonymous with each other. Hence we say, as showing that that distinction must still exist — hence Mr. Roberts is wrong — your Saviour, speaking of the Children of Israel, declared that unto them it was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God: and then turning to the people of Judah — the Jews — He declared that unto them it was not given. Your Saviour declared to the Jews, your house shall be left desolate — that is, without Christ — until the time when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Your prophets have decreed and declared that the Lord hath — the thing is already done — that He hath redeemed Israel. The two tribes remain under Moses, the ten tribes are redeemed from Moses and drafted into their higher life — the life in Christ.

Then when we were trying, or Mr. Roberts was trying, to give you the impression, so far as the disciples were concerned, and so far as some of the apostles were concerned, that they were Israelites and Jews, laying special emphasis upon the fact that Paul himself declares that he is a Jew, that Peter himself is spoken of as a Jew, that Paul himself declares that he is an Israelite, and that Paul himself declares that he was a Gentile — a Roman; we say we do not see very much in that, because as far as that one tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, was concerned, from the time of the separation of Rehoboam from Jeroboam, Benjamin was allied to Rehoboam, that is the kingdom of Judah, and that one tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, existed for thousands of years connected with the House of Judah, the kingdom of the Jews. Hence, being in connection with that house for so long a time, Paul had every right — he was not telling a falsehood — he had every right to avow himself that he was a Jew; and yet, belonging to that particular tribe, the tribe of Benjamin, he had every right to declare also that he was an Israelite. And then again — because at that time — in Paul's time — that tribe and Judah were connected or under the Roman yoke — then again,

belonging to the Roman nation, being subject to that power, he had every right to declare himself as belonging to a Gentile nation. Hence, when he speaks of himself as a Jew of Judah, as an Israelite of Israel, and as a Gentile of a Roman — a Gentile power, he tells you why he did it. He did it that he might be common to all men, so that he might be enabled to gain some. It was his law of expediency. Hence, as far as the disciples, whom we believe to belong to the tribe of Benjamin, that tribe which had been so long allied to the kingdom of Judah — as far as they were concerned, they had every right to avow that they were Jews, and they had every right to avow that they were Israelites, there being exceptions to all rules.

Then we say there was very little in the point which Mr. Roberts wanted to make a great deal of. We come to this, that though Judah is still under Moses, and though the prophets declared that they should “stumble at that stumbling-stone” — why, if they had not stumbled at that stone, then what the prophets declared would have been wrong: then when your Saviour declares, that every jot and tittle of prophecy should be accomplished, if that jot or tittle of prophecy had not been accomplished your Saviour becomes untrustworthy; and although your Saviour, in order to comply with prophecy, saw it needful that the Gospel should first be offered to the Jews, He saw that it was equally needful, though offering the Gospel to them, that they should reject it, and though some in His time and some in Paul’s time did receive the Gospel, you are plainly told that afterwards they fell away, and your Saviour, and the Great Apostle, when he found out that fact, he gave them the reason of their falling away, and said, because it is written. Written what? Why, the prophets had written that “Seeing ye shall not perceive, and hearing ye shall not understand.” So that you come to the fact that you have had, even in your New Testament times, when the Apostle Paul himself declares of the twelve-tribed people of Israel that they were broken into two fragments: that one house was formed for honour, whilst the other house was formed for dishonour.

Then if you will take the chapters from the 40th of Ezekiel and downward, where God Almighty, speaking of Judah, declares that they are to go back to their land, and that they are to build a second temple, not in Jerusalem as in times gone by; because, if we work out that last chapter of Ezekiel, we shall find that Judah’s and Levi’s portion is not in Jerusalem, but positively in Samaria. Hence, when the second temple shall be built, it shall not be upon the old site in Jerusalem, but it shall be in Samaria, and a far more magnificent temple than has ever yet been seen. And God instructs them that when they go back and build that temple they shall take oxen, and they shall take rams, and they shall take kids, that there shall be shedding of blood, and He declares positively that upon the 8th day, and so forward, the priests shall take of your offerings, your burnt-offerings, your peace-offerings, your sin-offerings: they shall take them, and what? God Almighty declares that He will accept them under that paraphernalia, that is the economy of the Mosaic, because He says in the very last verse of the 43rd chapter of Ezekiel, “And I will accept you, saith the Lord God.” So that when we come to a

Christadelphian idea — which is one of their ideas, and I am ashamed to own it for them — that there is no salvation for any man, however moral his life may be, apart from the Gospel given to the people of Israel, we simply state that, if you will take the 43rd chapter of Ezekiel and the last verse, God Almighty declares that in a time yet to come He will accept the Jews under the Mosaic rites. He will accept them: by which they will obtain salvation. We say that so long as that chapter remains in the Bible, we have Scripture teaching that as far as the Jew is concerned he will obtain salvation and acceptance with God Almighty under Moses, and apart from the Gospel dispensation. Hence, any Christadelphian creed declaring that no man can obtain salvation apart from the Gospel is contrary, decidedly contrary, to the Word of God.

Hence we are happy to know that God requires two witnessing people, and that then at the time of the return He will have a Judah under Moses, and He will have His second witness, and His overwhelming witness — Israel under Christ. And when the Lord shall beget to Himself these two witnessing people, the witnessing for our Lord shall go forth out of all the world, after that return has taken place, when you are promised by the Almighty that then, but never before, many nations shall be joined to the Lord. Then we say, still insisting — because we have the warranty of Scripture — that the distinction of Israel from Judah still exists, we come to Mr. Roberts’ “breeches”. We are in search after the people of Israel, and we are looking for Mr. Roberts’ “finger-nails”, and you know that he told us last night that all people had finger-nails, that all people had noses, and that many people had breeches: but it so happens, as far as the breeches are concerned belonging to my people of Israel, they are of a different pattern, of different construction entirely, to the breeches that shall be worn, or are now worn, by your people of Judah. Hence it is a very grand thing to know that different people wear breeches, and have finger-nails, and have eyes, and have noses; but it so happens that my people of Israel have some part of their dress, and some part of their personality which other people have not. There is nothing very peculiar in that, because I have been told by a good lady, that as far as regards the Zulus, whom we have by the will of God and by His own instructions taught a lesson by giving them a thrashing, that though we wear breeches they do not. (Applause and hisses.)

I can hear the hiss of a serpent. I am quite sure that a man who would come forth with the hiss of a serpent could never belong to the Kingdom of God. Then we say, as far as our own people are concerned, their dress, their peculiarities, their manners, and so forth, that you shall not find any other nation upon the earth with the circumstances that God Almighty willed and that He should surround the people of Israel with, you shall not find any other nation upon earth with most of these standard purposes. True, quite true it is, that there may be some things that God Almighty has decreed should be in the midst of the people of Israel, but there are hosts of things that He has decreed shall not be found with

any other people upon the earth, things that should be peculiar things, that should only belong to the Children of Israel. Hence, not only shall they have their "breeches", and their "finger-nails", and their "teeth", their "eyes", and their "noses", but they shall have other things which the other peoples of the earth cannot touch and never possessed. Hence we say of the people of Israel, God required them to come out a nation before Him, and Scripture never could be fulfilled — Christ's word could never be taken as trustworthy — unless the people of Israel, the kingdom of Israel, now existed upon this very earth with David's sceptre in full sway over that kingdom at the present time, because He required it to exist a nation, a nationality before Him for ever — that is, so long as you have the sun, and so long as you have the moon; and as you have had the sun and moon this day, so it follows that the kingdom of Israel must be a nation before God this very night.

Not only so, but Israel was to become a nation and a company of nations. This is a pair of breeches that no other nation upon the earth is wearing: this is a pair of breeches that the people of Britain only are wearing. Hence, when they went forth into their isles, as we reminded you last night, then they were to come forth finding those isles too small, too strait, by reason of the inhabitants; and what blasphemy would it be to suppose that the Christadelphian Church could ever be too small, or too narrow, or too strait, to hold those people who wanted to belong to the Kingdom of God! But as far as the islands were concerned, they were, if the prophecy was to be sure, to become too strait and too narrow by reason of the inhabitants — the multitudinous increase.

And then God promised them their colonies, and you have it in the song of Moses, that the colonial possessions should be situated in certain spots, that the positions of these possessions should be surrounding all the other nations of the earth. They were to be the measuring line, the cord of the Lord, His own people, His own inheritance. The people of Israel were to be the Almighty's measuring line; their possessions were to surround, to belt, to circle all the other nations of the earth; and it would be utterly impossible for two nations to occupy that position. Hence God, describing Israel after they were in exile, applies the descriptions to them as occupying the sides of the earth, the coasts of the earth, the uttermost parts of the earth; and your nation, the British nation, and your nation only, are wearing this pair of "breeches". Then we say, God requires that not only in that way should they come forth to be a people surrounding all the Gentile nations, which would make them comply with the promise — O the sacred promise! — that God Almighty gave to Abraham. Could I conceive for a moment that God could make that promise and break it? Why, if I could conceive that God could break the promise that He covenanted with Abraham, then, however much I loved Mr. Roberts, who is a minister of religion, and who does preach in his pulpit, and who does preach, in his way, the Gospel of Christ; why, when he was unfurling before me the blessed Gospel, I would say, my dear Mr. Roberts, I think you are placing a misjudged confidence in the Word, because if God

Almighty could break those covenants, He could also break all the promises you are alluding to, and that means everlasting. Hence, when God promised to Abraham that his seed should be a nation and a company of nations, I am looking to the fulfilment of that word; and when I see the word, fulfilled, then I say God promised, and here it is complied with, and in your nation; the breeches only fitting your people, because not found with any other nation upon earth — you are alone the people who have become the nation and the company of nations.

Hence, we give to Australia her parliament, we give to New Zealand her parliament, we give to Canada her parliament, we give to the Cape her parliament, and we give to our separate colonies their different legislative assemblies, and we allow them to legislate for their own internal affairs. But still it is a nation and a company of nations, for there are constitutional laws that shall bind us all; and, although we allow them the privilege of having their separate parliaments for their own affairs, they shall not put a single finger upon one of those constitutional laws unless they apply for the consent of the imperial parliament of the nation — they belonging to the company of nations. Hence, in that way, having your legislative assemblies in all your colonial possessions tied to this country, we stand this very night — God be blessed — we stand this very night, the literal fulfilment of His word — we stand this very night a sure evidence that His word is sure, because we are the only nation upon the earth existing this night a nation and a company of nations. Then we say, we should be very sorry to imbibe Mr. Roberts' idea, because many men are impressed erroneously, and I think Mr. Roberts is so impressed.

MR. ROBERTS:— My Lord, Mr. Hine, Ladies and Gentlemen,—For the third time, Mr. Hine has spoken for half-an-hour without giving me anything with which I can properly deal as a matter of argument. We have had a very great deal of assertion, and if Mr. Hine were in the position which I heard him claim in the Memorial Hall meeting — if he had a mission from God to declare the truth upon this question, then his assertions would be entirely satisfactory, and I should not be here to dispute them. But he does not take that position to-night, nor on the two other evenings we have been together. He comes forward professing to be amenable to the facts and testimonies transpiring in connection with the history of Israel in the past — in records, sacred and profane, and appealing to that as the standard of argument. I am, therefore, in a position to follow satisfactorily what there may be in the nature of argument, but feel myself at a loss how to deal with merely a string of assertions in which he says that God says this of Israel and that of Israel, quoting detached sentences without concatenation or consistency, without referring to the parts of Scripture from which he quotes them, and without showing that the testimonies from which they are quoted really apply to the matters concerning which he is alleging there is certain meaning. I must, therefore, take a course independent of his, and recall your attention to those

simple historical facts which apparently he has failed altogether to comprehend, with regard to their bearings upon this question.

He makes a great deal of the division of the nation of Israel into two parts. On the first and second nights, I submitted not my assertions, but evidence, to show that that political division was a mere episode in the national history, without altering the relation either of the ten tribes or of the two tribes to the principles of the constitution to which they stood related, namely, the Mosaic law, which covenanted blessings on condition of obedience, and imprecated curses in the contrary case. In spite of the occurrence of the judicial division for a temporary purpose, I must emphasize the fact of the unity of the nation in its essential constitution, and in its relation to futurity. The fact that the division was to be temporary is shown by Mr. Hine himself, in recognising the prophecy of Ezekiel in the 37th chapter, verse 22, where it is said, "they shall be *no more two nations*, neither shall they be divided into *two kingdoms* any more at all." Apart, therefore, from the temporary division — (a laugh).

Well, perhaps the friends who give way to their impulses in a little smile at that, do not comprehend the idea of temporary, and do not apparently see that a nation cut into two halves for certain special reasons, may still retain identical relations to the political constitution upon which they stand: they think the ten tribes were separated for blessing — "told off for honour", as Mr. Hine phrases. I will prove that, as with regard to the two tribes after them, so with regard to the ten tribes of Israel before them, their dispersion distinctly took place under the law of Moses, and that they suffered the curses that were imprecated in that law, and because of their disobedience of that law. I have proved this point before, but I have not quoted this express statement in the 9th chapter of Daniel. Daniel, in the course of his prayer to God for the recovery of the two tribes from their Babylonish captivity, thus alludes to what had come upon all the twelve tribes. He says at verse 7:—

"O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto Thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto *all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither Thou hast drive them*, BECAUSE OF THEIR TRESPASS that they have trespassed against Thee"; and then, at the 11th verse: "Yea, *all Israel have transgressed Thy law*, even by departing, that they might not obey Thy voice; *therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath THAT IS WRITTEN IN THE LAW OF MOSES*, the servant of God, *because we have sinned against Him.*"

Now, in further, and emphatic, and unmistakeable illustration of the unity — the everlasting unity of the nation whom God chose for Himself, and whom He has not cast away as a matter of final use, but has merely driven into disgrace, as they are at this day, in punishment for their past national sins, against the time of their recovery, to which I shall have to call attention this evening — I say, in illustration of that unity, let me rehearse one or two very simple facts which must

be known to those who are Bible students — concerning whom I should like to think that they were numerous, but concerning whom my experience leads me to know that they are very few in number. There are many people who are ready to borrow notions at second-hand, from pamphlets in which mutilated Scripture is quoted entirely apart from its connections. But where are the men who are quietly, and industriously, and patiently, and intelligently, and from day to day reading God's Word as it ought to be read, and as it is commanded to be read in the book itself? There are a few here and there, and I must say they are to be found most largely in connection with that company of people whom Mr. Hine has sought to introduce as objects of contempt, although I admit that his remarks were not very harsh.

Concerning the typical investiture of the high priest — that is to say, the robe which Moses was instructed to get made — we have on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod a precious stone on each shoulder, and in these stones (six names on each) were to be engraved the names of *the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 28:9, 10). The breastplate in front of the ephod was to have four rows of precious stones, and in each precious stone the name of one of *the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 28:17-21). When Moses came down from Mount Sinai, and before his second ascent, he erected twelve pillars *according to the twelve tribes of Israel* (Exodus 24:4). When the question of the selection of the tribe for the priesthood was in dispute, he was instructed to deposit *twelve rods* in the sanctuary, that God might openly signify his mind in the matter by causing one of them to bud. When the twelve tribes passed over Jordan in their mission to occupy the land of Canaan, Joshua was instructed to take from the bed of the river twelve stones representing *the twelve tribes of Israel*, and to set them on the bank as a perpetual memorial of the fact of their passage. Then Elijah, after the division of the one nation of Israel into two political sections, in the mission he was instructed to carry out towards the ten tribes, having summoned them to Mount Carmel, he took *twelve stones* and built an altar *according to the twelve tribes*, as you may find in 1 Kings 18:31. Then Ezra, the leader of the Jews in their return from their captivity in Babylon — the leader confessedly of only two tribes, or three if the Levites are counted — did not recognise any separation of the ten tribes as a matter of fundamental constitution, but he took twelve he-goats for a sin-offering, *according to the twelve tribes of Israel*, as you may find in Ezra 6:17; 8:35. Then you finally have in the Apocalypse the symbol of the Jewish commonwealth in its final glorification — I mean the Israelitish, although I do not withdraw the word Jewish, for I proved its applicability last night. You have the four beasts that were employed as the symbols of the four camps into which the congregation of Israel was divided in their twelve tribes in the Wilderness (Rev. 4:7). Therefore you have the national unity, as a principle, running all through the Scriptures. It is represented in the typical arrangements of the Mosaic economy; it is represented in the emblematic acts performed by Elijah and Ezra, when they were divided into two sections; and it is expressly recognised in the finality of the national fortunes in that future

division of the land, to which I called attention last night, and to which I may have again to refer.

And now we are asked to recognise in the British people the descendants of these expatriated ten tribes. Upon what grounds are we asked to go in the face of the broad facts to which I have called your attention? One of the grounds is, the allegation that our ancestors came from the very part of the world to which these ten tribes were deported and at the time when the deportation took place. Mr. Hine repeats this several times in his publications. What is his authority for this statement? Mr. Sharon Turner. This is the historian upon whom he relies particularly in his published works. Well, what is Mr. Sharon Turner's testimony upon this point? I will submit it to you, and you will be able to see how as entirely unfounded this argument is, as those arguments attempted to be founded on Scripture. Mr. Sharon Turner says in his work (*History of the Anglo-Saxons*, 6th Ed., vol. 1, p. 100) concerning the Saxons, from whom we are derived — "The Saxons were a German or Teutonic — that is a Gothic or Scythian tribe — and of the various Scythian nations which have been recorded, the Sakai, or Sacae, are the people from whom the descent of the Saxons may be inferred, with the least violation of probability. Sakai-Suna, or Sons of the Sakai, abbreviated into Saksun, which is the same sound as Saxon. The Sakai, who in Latin are called Sacae, were an important branch of the Scythian nation". From this, it is evident that Mr. Turner is not exactly sure about our derivation. he thinks that "with the least violation of probability" it "may be inferred" that the Saxons came from the Sakai-Suna, a tribe of the Scythians. But supposing he were sure; what then?

Who are the Scythians? (A voice: The Israelites.) Let Mr. Sharon Turner answer the question, because he is the authority who is put forward. The answer that he gives is this. After pointing out that the ancient inhabitants of Europe were Kimmerians, or Kelts, of which the Welsh, Irish, etc, are the descendants — (by the way, Mr. Hine told us last night that the Welsh were one of the ten tribes! However, I let that pass) — he says (*History A.S.*, Vol. 1, page 93): "Herodotus, beside the Minor Scythia, which he places in Europe, mentions all the Eastern or Asiatic Scythia beyond the Caspian and Ixartes. These new comers pressed on the Kimmerians, or Kelts, their predecessors. These nations retired towards the western and southern extremities of Europe, pressed still by the Scythian invaders. This new wave of population gradually spread over the mountains, and into the vast forests and marshes of Europe until, under the name of Germans — an appellation which Tacitus calls a 'recent name' — they had not only reached the Rhine, but also crossed into France. Here Caesar found one great body descended from them, firmly settled, about B.C.54."

Then let us ask Mr. Sharon Turner, when did these Scythians first appear in Europe? His answer is (page 95): "The first appearance of the Scythian tribes in Europe may be placed, according to Strabo and Homer, *in the 8th*, or according to Herodotus, *in the 7th century, BEFORE CHRIST*". *In Europe!* Now, mind you, what did Mr. Hine say last night? Why, that the ten tribes (who were taken into

Asia in the eighth century before Christ) had, in their alleged westward march, reached Asia Minor in the days of the Apostles. (A voice: Yes.) Very well. Does not that prove, even on his version of history, that the Scythians who had, even by his own witness, reached France B.C.50, had nothing to do with the ten tribes? (A voice: No.) I am afraid our friend is not particularly sharp in his perceptions — (laughter) — for if the tribes did not make their appearance in Europe until the first century of the Christian era, how can they be the Scythians who made their first appearance in the 7th century before Christ? (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Who are the Scythians? I ask again; and in answer to that question, Mr. Sharon Turner can give us no information, for he is ignorant, and all ordinary historians are necessarily ignorant on a question going so far back into the beginning of things among the European nations. They are all ignorant except this one (holding up Josephus), who derives his information from this (holding up the Bible). I will give you the weakest first — Josephus — (laughter).

Do you know why Josephus was, that you laugh at it? Do you not know that he was the most prominent and eminent and learned Jew of the first century, the companion of Roman Emperors, the champion of Jewish antiquity against all the writers of Greece and Rome, the author of works which were read by the Roman Emperors, and sent forth to the world with the seal of their authority? (Applause.)

You are not aware of the nature of the authority you are laughing at. Let me read you his information as to the extraction of the Scythian nation — "Magog (one of the sons of Japheth) founded those that from him were called Magogites, but who are *by the Greeks called SCYTHIANS*." Here Josephus tells us that the Scythians are descendants of *Japheth*; the ten tribes were the descendants of *Shem*. Therefore, *how can one be the other*? The information we get in the Scriptures you will find in the 10th chapter of Genesis, where, mentioning these very men whom Josephus describes it says, "The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan"; "and the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah"; and then, in the 5th verse, "*By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations*". Therefore, the Bible and Josephus concur in telling us that the original inhabitants of Europe were descended from Japheth, whereas the ten tribes were descended from Shem. Therefore that is a complete disproof (if there were no other) of the claim of Israelitish descent for the British people.

But let us look at things a little more closely. If we are descendants of the ten tribes, why do we not know ourselves? How is it that we require a man to come forth in the 19th century to tell us who we are? Where is there a case under the whole heaven of a people losing a knowledge of who they are? Why, even in the benighted countries of Africa you will not find a tribe without some tradition of their origin and identity. Why do we not speak the Israelitish tongue? Why have we not the Israelitish physiognomy? Why are we not known as Israel? (A voice: Because we were to be lost.) Aye, so Mr. Hine asserts: and if you are content to

take his assertion as proof, then I will stop the argument. What does he give you as proof? I will go over all his passages, and you will see they are no proof at all.

We have first the passage in Hosea 1:9. Let us read all his proofs in their entirety and integrity one by one. Concerning unquestionably the ten deported, though not then deported, tribes of Israel, we read in Hosea 1:9: "Call his name Lo-ammi: for ye are *not My people*, and I will not be your God." Does that prove that they were not to know themselves? Does that mean that they were to forget their nationality? Does that mean that they were to stop speaking Hebrew? Does it not simply declare that whereas they had been God's people up to that time, that He would no longer regard them in that light, because of their disobedience.

The next passage is Hosea 2:17 — "I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and *they shall no more be remembered by their name.*" Who shall be no more remembered by their name? (A voice: Israel.) That verse does not say Israel. "I will take away *the names of Baalim*" which had been incessantly in their mouths for centuries in connection with the worship established by Jeroboam; and "they" shall no more be remembered — the names shall be no more remembered. This gentleman says it means that Israel were to be no more remembered by their name. Have some regard to the grammar of the case. "They" is a plural pronoun referring to some antecedent. There are two antecedents in the verse, "her" and the "names of Baalim". It cannot be "her" that is antecedent to "them"; for a pronoun — as you know — must agree with its antecedent in number. It must be the names of Baalim that were to be no more remembered by their name. But let us suppose for a moment that Mr. Hine's reading of the verse is the right one. When was it to be that the names in question were to be no more remembered? Look at verse 15: "I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope". I presume Mr. Hine knows where the valley of Achor is? It is on the confines of the land of Israel. "I will give her [at that time] the valley of Achor" (which at one time was a cause of stumbling, when Achan stole the accursed thing) "for a door of hope, and *she shall sing there as in the days of her youth*, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt; and it shall be AT THAT DAY that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shall call me no more Baali." For it was as Baali that God was known in Israel, as you will recollect. Jeroboam set up one calf at Dan, and the other at Bethel, and said, "Behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." For "I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name" — in that day. Now, if it means that Israel was no longer to be remembered as Israel, then it would prove that Mr. Hine is wrong in applying the prophecy to the present state of things, because the time has not yet come for that prophecy to be fulfilled, for the time has not yet come for Israel to have the valley of Achor for a door of hope. Suppose we are Israel, and that this prophecy is rightly interpreted as foretelling a suppression of our national designation, then we ought not to be known as British now. We ought to be

known as Israel, because the time has not yet come for us to be "no more remembered by our name", for the time is the time of restoration, as the context shows. Mr. Hine has, so to speak, begun the "Identity" too soon, and, therefore, disproves his own argument. Besides, look here, if Mr. Hine's interpretation is right, and this passage means that at any time we are *no more to be remembered* by the name of Israel, how comes it that when Israel is restored, they are restored under the name of Israel, for they are settled in the land according to "the *tribes of Israel*" (see Ezekiel 48:29). The names are all given in Ezekiel, and Mr. Hine will not deny that in that day they will be known as Israel. Therefore, if his construction of the passage be right, the name of Israel should never more be revived. Why does he call us "Children of Israel"? Why is he not content with "the new name" as he understands it — the English? Why is he trying to establish the proof of our identity as Israel? Why is he trying to get people to acknowledge that we are Israel, if we are no more to be remembered by that name?

I hope Mr. Hine will not mistake my loudness of voice for anger. My perhaps cross manner, does not indicate cross feelings. It is the mere mechanical result of a naturally weak voice having to be exerted in order to make myself heard in a great hall like this. (Applause.) I appear to be angry when I am nothing of the sort. My words will not read cross, if they sound so. We have another passage brought forward by Mr. Hine as a proof that we were to lose our name. In all its surroundings it really is a disproof of the idea altogether.

It is Isaiah 65:15: "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.*" Well, who is it that is to be slain? See verse 11: "Ye 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", that is to say, idolatrous connections: "therefore will I number you to the sword." Those to be numbered to the sword were those who forgot God's holy mountain. Who did this? Was it not the ten tribes? (A voice: No, no!) What! did not the woman of Samaria say to Christ, "Ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship: but we worship in Samaria", or something to that effect? (John 4). They forgot the mountain of God; they did not come up to Zion in which Jehovah had placed his name; they forsook the Lord; they turned aside to idolatry, and here is the result: "The Lord God shall slay *thee*" — the ten tribes — "and call His servants" — who are they? Observe in the same chapter, verse 9: "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.*" Therefore, if this passage has any such application as Mr. Hine contends for, it means that He would dispense with the ten tribes altogether, and that He would call somebody else by another name — somebody else who were "His servants" — who did not forsake the appointed mountain of the Lord, but were obedient; and that other name is introduced unto us in its full doctrinal manifestation in the New Testament — the name of Christ,

which was established in Judah when the idolatrous ten tribes had for centuries been banished and slain.

TIME CALLED.

Mr. HINE: Will Mr. Roberts, in my judgment, be gentlemanly, and as courteous as I was last night, and allow me to make a speech for a quarter-of-an-hour, instead of questioning him?

Mr. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Hine. I have no objection to excuse you putting questions to me, but it must be on condition that you will allow me to occupy the time so surrendered.

MR. HINE QUESTIONS MR. ROBERTS.

217.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts that this statement that has been placed in my hands in the early part of the lecture is right. A friend has written a note to me to this effect: "Mr. Roberts is not even touching the Identity". Do you think that is true? — No; I was smiting it; that is touching it.

218.—Do you believe a question put in some form to embody this paragraph, Mr. Roberts, would be right? I do not know who it is, but somebody says: "Dr. Rugg, please call Mr. Roberts to order, because he is not discussing Mr. Hine's theory." — No, that would be wrong.

219.—Do you believe that you have been discussing the prophecy about the nation, and the company of nations? — I have been referring to the subject in relation to which you quote that.

220.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that you have answered me in reference to the isles to-night? — I could not do everything in half-an-hour; I did as much as I could.

221.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that in referring to the past history of the people of Israel, when they were twelve tribes united, you were touching the Identity? — Yes.

222.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that you have not this evening introduced very many points that are not connected with the Identity? — No.

223.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that baby sprinkling, and baby salvation are unscriptural? — If you think that has to do with the Identity I will answer it.

224.—No, I do not, and just because most of Mr. Roberts' opening remarks were not connected with the Identity. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that heathen, idiots, pagans, and very young children will never see the light of the resurrection? — If you think that has to do with the Identity I will answer it.

225.—No, I do not, because I do not believe your remarks referred to the Identity. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that salvation is impossible without a belief

in the Gospel, however moral a man's life may be? — As you happened to introduce that subject in your opening speech, I may consider myself at liberty to answer that by saying that I do believe so, on the authority of the New Testament.

226.—I hardly understood Mr. Roberts; I shall have to put that question again. Do you believe that salvation is impossible without a belief of the Gospel, however moral a man's life may be? — I do.

227.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that if God Almighty willed that Judah should still remain under Moses, and declares that He will accept him under Moses, that he will be accepted? — "If?" Do you put it in that way?

228.—No, I do not. — Then I must ask you to repeat the question, if you do not put it hypothetically.

229.—Do you believe that the Jews will be accepted by God Almighty under the Mosaic economy? — The Mosaic economy has been set aside. (Applause.)

230.—I have not much opinion of the Bible intelligence of the people who applaud that. — Then I will give you a passage that says it.

231.—No; I don't want it, Mr. Roberts, I don't want it. Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that the Temple referred to, to be built by the reed in Ezekiel, has been built? — No.

232.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that in that Temple the Mosaical rites will be re-established? — Not as Mosaical rites.

233.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that there will be the shedding of blood? — Yes.

234.—The blood of animals, I mean? — I mean that.

235.—Do you believe that the blood of the bull will be required? — Yes, then.

236.—Do you believe that the blood of the kid will be required? — I believe all that you read in Ezekiel, and everywhere else in the Bible.

237.—Do you believe that a people that shall require the killing of a bull, and the killing of a ram, and the killing of a kid, and their blood being shed for them, that that people will have any requirement for the sprinkling again of the blood of Christ? — The shedding of blood under the law of Moses was a pointing forward, and the shedding of blood in the Kingdom of Christ will be a pointing backward to the one great sacrifice He accomplished.

238.—Do you believe that, as far as the shedding of blood for Christ's people is concerned, that His own blood was sufficient? — That is sufficient, whatever it may be, which God at any time, in any connection, appoints and requires.

239.—Then you believe that there are exceptional circumstances? — Unquestionably, there are.

240.—Then, who are the people, Mr. Roberts, that shall require the shedding of the blood of the bull, the goat, and the ram? — All people on earth during Messiah's reign. I mean all those who are subjects, I don't mean the rulers; — I don't mean those who reign with Christ — the saints.

241.—Do you believe that Christ has died for all? — I do.

242.—Do you recognise any distinction as now existing between Israel and Judah? — None, nationally; neither of them are corporate political entities at present: they are both scattered peoples.

243.—Do you believe the lost ten-tribed people are recognised? — What do you mean?

244.—Do you believe that the ten-tribed people are now in connection with the two? — Again I must ask what you mean by "connection"?

245.—Do you believe that the Jews whom we see and know, comprise the Twelve Tribes? — They do not comprise them in the bulk; there may be some scattered individuals of the ten tribes amongst them.

246.—Do you believe that the Jews have any recognised members of the Ten Tribes among them, as distinct from the members of the two? — They have no recognised members even of the two as a matter of distinct genealogy, still less of the Ten.

247.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that the Cohens, the Goldsmids, and the Rothschilds have their genealogies preserved, and many other people connected with the Two Tribes of Judah? — I should not be surprised at any Rabbinical tradition, whatever.

248.—I have almost done, Mr. Roberts. Well, then, Mr. Roberts, do you believe that the people whom God Almighty required to tremble at the shaking of an aspen leaf, and to serve their enemies in all countries, and to have no inheritance — no territorial possession — but in their persons — can be the same people as the people required by God Almighty to be a nation? — The same people, certainly, in the down-trodden stage of their history.

249.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that the people that God Almighty requires to be recognised by the show of their countenance, can be the same people that God Almighty requires not to be recognised on account of their paths being hedged in and their ways being lost? — Show me a statement of Scripture which says that God requires the House of Judah to be recognised by the show of their countenance?

250.—That is a question. — Yes, but I must not answer in the dark.

251.—Yes, yes. I only put the question, because, of course, I could show the proof? — I will give you the answer when you give me the passage. I decline to answer the question unless you give me the passage, because I deny the assumption involved in the question.

252.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that, without making a statement — which you rebuked me for doing several times, do you believe that the people of Israel referred to by God Almighty to be known under another name, should be recognised by the name "Israel"? — I must confess I do not understand that question.

253.—When God Almighty declares that Israel in after days should be called by another name, do you mean that He meant their old name? — My answer is, that He never has said such a thing. He says that His servants shall be called by another name: not those who had given themselves over to idolatry.

254.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that Judah ever gave herself to idolatry? — Originally — before the Babylonish captivity, certainly; but not after.

255.—Do you believe, Mr. Roberts, that Israel ever gave herself to idolatry? — Do you mean the Ten Tribes?

256.—Yes. — Yes, I do.

257.—Do you believe that they gave themselves more than once over to idolatry? — They were given over to idolatry all the time, and therefore there could not be twice.

258.—Do you believe, really, Mr. Roberts, that the ten-tribed people were given to idolatry always? — Yes, from the very first moment of their national existence, until they were taken away by Shalmaneser.

259.—Do you believe that when the Almighty declared that He would speak to the people of Israel in another tongue, that He meant the Hebrew? — No, I think He meant other languages.

260.—Would you acknowledge that Israel would have to forget her own language for this to be fulfilled? — I should not admit that.

261.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that we have many thousand words in the Saxon which come from the Hebrew? — No: I do not believe it.

262.—Would you be surprised to know, Mr. Roberts, that Canon Lyson, of Gloucester Cathedral, has given you five thousand in his work called *Our British Ancestors*? — Yes, I should be surprised.

263.—Do you believe it to be a fact, Mr. Roberts? — Do I believe what to be a fact?

264.—That we have many thousands of words derived from the Hebrew?—No, I do not.

265.—Are you able to come forth with proofs that we have not, Mr. Roberts? — Well, if I thought the matter worthy of the effort, and were to set myself to work, I think I could.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTIONS MR. HINE.

266.—You said, Mr. Hine, that God had told off Israel to honour and Judah to dishonour; will you please point me to the passage of Scripture upon which you rely for that statement? — Well, my dear Mr. Roberts, honestly I could not — that is to say, I could not give you chapter and verse: I can quote the passage.

267.—Will you quote it then? — Hence, God Almighty says: “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? * * * Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?”

268.—Well, who would say he had not; but, how does that prove that God set apart Israel to honour, and Judah to dishonour? — Because we take Scripture in connection with the context.

269.—Will you allow me to give you the context, then? — No.

270.—The ninth chapter of Romans? — No, I shall not take it.

271.—I will give it? — Put it in the form of a question.

272.—Romans 9:17, 18: “For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh. Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show My power in thee, and that My name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth”! That was the case with Pharaoh, whose heart was hardened. “Thou wilt say, then, unto me, Why doth He yet find fault? For who hath resisted His will? *Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*” (Romans 9:19, 20, 21). Is not the contrast between Pharaoh and certain persons who are described as vessels of mercy, and not between Judah and Israel. Yes, or no? — No, Mr. Roberts.

273.—Can you show me that it applies to Judah and Israel by the context? — Yes, by the context.

274.—Point me, please, to the part of the context upon which you rely as proving that that refers to Judah and Israel? — The context is by referring to prophecy.

275.—Prophecy is not the context of that statement; the context of that statement lies in that chapter, and my question is: Where is there any evidence in that chapter that that statement applies to Israel and Judah? — That chapter refers to the literal and the positive transactions of the people of Israel, the people unto whom the promises and the covenants and the oaths were given.

276.—Can you point me to the proof of that? — In the same Book.

277.—What part of it? — The Romans.

278.—What part of Romans? — I should advise Mr. Roberts not to waste so much time by requiring chapter and verse, which any Bible students may find out when they go home.

279.—But I am testing your statements, as to what the Bible says (Hear, hear.) I ask you to show me from any part of Romans 9, that when Paul speaks of one vessel to honour and another to dishonour, he means Israel and Judah. (Mr. Hine hesitates.) Then, I will take it for granted that you are unable to prove your assertion concerning that verse, and will pass on. In John 4:22, Christ says to the Woman of Samaria, in conversation with her: “Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship, for Salvation is of *the Jews*.” I wish to ask you how you understand that statement with your theory? — I do not understand it to be at all connected with the Identity of the people of Israel, because I do not recognise the Woman of Samaria as being an Israelite at all.

280.—My question is: What did Jesus mean by saying, “Salvation is of the Jews?” — I cannot understand that, really, as being connected with the Identity of Israel. In my judgment Salvation comes from Christ, who came from the Jews, that is, from Judah.

281.—You understand Christ to have been a Jew? — Certainly.

282.—Then, if He meant himself only, why did He not say: “Salvation is of the Jew” (singular number)? — No, if Christ comes from Judah He comes from the Jews.

283.—Then you do not understand that Salvation appertains to the Jews, but only to Christ? — I believe the Jews will be saved.

284.—But Christ here says that Salvation has its origin in their midst as contrasted with Samaritans? — For Israel.

285.—What! not for the Jews? — No, not in His time.

286.—Is God, not the God of the Jews? — Well, He belongs to the Jews. He is one of the Trinity, I believe that.

287.—You said last night that the phrase, “King of the Jews”, was a phrase used in derision? — Yes, and I should be very glad for you to prove it otherwise, because you could not.

288.—Do you think the wise men used the term in derision when they came and said: “Where is He that is born King of the Jews?” — I am not sure about that point, it not being connected with the Identity.

289.—You think that Christ is not King of the Jews? — I believe that Christ shall be King of the Jews, but is not yet King of Israel.

290.—He will be King of the Jews, will he? — I am quite sure that Christ will be king, both of Israel and Judah, when the two “sticks” are united, not before.

291.—You do not agree, then, with a writer in your own *Magazine* who says: “Can we wish to identify a title with the Redeemer that would only remind us of His humiliation and suffering, surrounded with contempt and scorn? No, the Messiah never was king of the Jews, and will not be in the future?” — Well, I should not agree with him. I do not agree with all the good people who try to support me in my *Magazine*.

292.—In Romans 9:2, 3, Paul says: “I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart; for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites.” Who do you think he was referring to there? — The Jews.

293.—The Jews “who are Israelites”! Then how do you understand the next verse: “To whom pertaineth the adoption, and *the glory*, and *the covenants*, and the giving of the law, and the service of God *and the promises*?” — Yes, I believe that even that will refer, in a time yet to come, to Israel and to Judah.

294.—Do you admit then that the promises belong to the Jews? — Oh! I quite believe that.

295.—If so, why do you think they are not fulfilled now? — Because God doth not require them to be fulfilled until the receiving of Israel shall take place.

296.—But you have contended that the promises to Israel are now fulfilled? — Well, suppose I have.

297.—How then do you understand this in the same chapter: “What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, *hath not attained to the law of righteousness* (Romans 9:30, 31). What does he mean by “Israel” there? — Oh, I think the Jews.

298.—Why not Israel? — Well, because he was speaking to the people of the Jews in that region.

299.—How do you know that, seeing the term “Israel” is used? — I think so.

300.—You are not sure?—I am almost sure.

301.—Then, if we may understand he means the Jews, when he speaks of Israel; how are you to discriminate between the Jews and Israel in your sense of that distinction, in other parts of Scripture? — Because I never allow Scripture to contradict Scripture.

302.—But I think you do: we shall see. Listen to this — you say he is speaking to the Jews: “I say then, hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin (Romans 11:1). — Ah, that one tribe!

303.—Very well, do you say that means the Jews, or the Israelites of the ten tribes? — The ten tribes certainly, I am quite sure of that. I will not give up that point, Mr. Roberts.

304.—If so, mark this: “Israel *hath not obtained that which he seeketh for*; but the election hath obtained it, and **THE REST WERE BLINDED**” (Romans 11:7)? — Yes, I quite believe that. I wish you would put it, then, in the form of a question, Mr. Roberts.

305.—You did not wait for my question. My question is: Is that the Jews, or Israel of the ten tribes? — I believe the ten tribes, Mr. Roberts.

306.—Why do you make it The Two Tribes in the first place, and the Ten Tribes in the second? — Because the ten tribes were blinded: blindness has happened to them.

307.—What do you mean by blindness? — “Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in” (Romans 11:25).

308.—What do you understand by the word “Blindness” as used in that connection? — I believe that it means that the people of Britain, declaring in the Liturgy of their Church — the sublimest Liturgy under Heaven — that they are the people of Israel at the very time they are supposing themselves to be a Gentile people.

309.—Then by “Blindness”, you mean blindness to their own identity, is that the meaning? — “Doubtless Thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not” (Isaiah 63:16). That is, though they forget the rock that begat them.

310.—Answer the question: Do you understand the blindness referred to, to mean that they were blind to their own individual identity? — I believe so, and by context with prophecy.

311.—Had the ten tribes lost their identity then? — No, I am quite sure they had not.

312.—But Paul says the blindness “hath happened” unto Israel: if the blindness means loss of identity which you say is the meaning; how do you explain that the blindness was a fact in Paul’s day, and yet they still retained their Identity? — I believe they were to become a lost people; a people blind as to their Identity, and that that is the meaning of the blindness.

313.—Then how do you regard Paul’s definition of the matter in 2 Corinthians 3:13: “Moses put a vail over his face, that the Children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: *But their minds were blinded*: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament: **WHICH VAIL IS DONE AWAY IN CHRIST**. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart.” There Paul decides that your meaning is not his? — No, he does not.

314.—He says, “the veil is on their heart”? — No, he does not.

315.—Well, Mr. Hine, the audience will decide.—Oh, they cannot; it is utterly impossible for them to decide, Mr. Roberts.

MR. HINE ELECTS TO MAKE A SPEECH.

Mr. HINE: Hence, we say we are going to take up the “breeches”. I won’t depart from those breeches. I shall always keep them as an heir-loom, and hang them on a peg; we have our noses, and eyes, and breeches, and so forth. I declare that as far as breeches are concerned to the people of Israel — the ten-tribed people — that they shall ever be found, and never could be found without, standing based upon the Ten Commandments; and if I thought, with Mr. Roberts, that I was a Gentile, I could then believe that I had not the Ten Commandments, because, if the Gentiles, who have not the Commandments — the law, do by nature, by instinct, the things that are in the law, then they become a law unto themselves. Just as Judah shall be saved under Moses, so shall heathen Gentiles, idolatrous Gentiles — though Mr. Roberts has declared bold-facedly before you and against the Word of God, The Word of God declares that even these very Gentiles, who have not the law, though they may do some things that are in the law, yet they shall become a law unto themselves. God will not condemn them, though Mr. Roberts, in the narrow groove of his mind, might be willing to do so.

But, as far as the Ten Commandments are concerned, God gave them to the people of Israel for a sign. They were to abide between God and the people of Israel for an everlasting sign, and only that people were to have these Commandments. And, if you wanted one conclusive evidence that you are identical with the ten-tribed people of Israel, it would be this: that, existing as a nation, you are the only nation upon the earth whose very judicature — whose law, is based upon the moral law of the Ten Commandments. I will swear and declare that Mr. Roberts is not able to prove, before you, that any Gentile nation, outside of the British people, have the Ten Commandments at all. Hence, we say that God would not be so — aye, let us speak reverently when we mention His name — but surely He would not commit Himself to a folly if He put a sign upon His people, the sign of the Commandments; He would never put the same sign upon all the other nations of the earth: because, if I, as a farmer, would have a flock of sheep, and I put a mark of red ochre on their backs, and I herded my sheep with other flocks; if the people who possessed the other flocks marked them with the same sign as mine, you would see that my mark, my sign, becomes obliterated. Hence, God wills that His own people shall bear a very peculiar mark, and that mark shall be the mark of the Ten Commandments, which we have to teach diligently to our children — and I am a back-bone Church-man, and thank God for it; but if I had been inclined to follow in the wake of the Dissenters, I should have torn down the Ten Commandments from the door-posts, from the walls of the sanctuary. I, belonging to the people whom God Almighty had

instructed and commanded, should have them written on the walls and door-posts — if we had been Dissenters we should have torn these down.

The Ten Commandments, then, are a mark of the people of Israel, and you shall never identify that people unless you find her in a national capacity — that is, the Established Church of her nation; and you never shall find, by the Word of God — let any man say No, he does not understand the Scripture; you never shall find the people of Israel, and identify them, unless they have a State Church, which is identical with the will of God Almighty as existing with the people of Israel in these days, until the time of the receiving of their identity shall come to pass. Hence we say, by the voice of the nation, by our own voice going forth through our National Church, thank God for it; and, by virtue of her identity, the Liberation Society can never take the Church from the State, because, until the identity, you must have Israelites’ carcasses — that is, the carcasses of their kings — buried in their high places, your St. Paul’s Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, and so forth — because Judah has never done that; only Israel in her exile could do that. Hence we say, as far as the Ten Commandments are concerned, through the State Church, the Established Church, the voice of the people, the nation, they rehearse to God Almighty, they pass the sign, just as the Freemasons pass the sign by which they are recognised when they meet. So God’s people, by coming forth with His mark, rehearsing His sign every Sunday throughout the year — we pass the sign, the sign reminding God Almighty what are the covenants that He made to our forefathers; and by virtue of the passing of that sign, which Dissenters have ignored, to their shame — by virtue of the nation passing that sign, your nation — the British nation, is that very nation, coming forth by the will of God, the head and not the tail, the highest privileged nation on the face of the earth. We have passed the sign, put God in remembrance of His covenant with our forefathers, and by virtue of passing that sign, which Israel only could do, we have come out, as we stand this night, the most highly privileged nation upon the face of the earth.

We will give you another pair of “breeches”: you never shall find any other nation upon the earth wearing a pair of breeches upon which is inscribed the Eastern aspect. Thank God! though I am not a Ritualist and abominate the Ritualists in my heart, yet I do venerate and esteem the Eastern position of our Church by law established. Hence, I see for once, before you, in these three nights; for once, going back to the early history of Israel when under Solomon, and when united, and when basking under the sunshine of the favour of God Almighty — poor king Solomon! he saw that people happy, contented; he saw God’s blessing upon them, and yet in his wisdom he saw that they would sin, and therefore he comes forth and pleads with God and says, “If they sin against Thee, and Thou take them away from their land, wilt Thou, when they are in their land of captivity, wilt Thou, if they confess their sin, and pray unto Thee with their face toward their land” — if they pray unto Thee with their face toward the land — a contract, a covenant which God accepted — if they do this at their very first

entrance into your National Church, if we come forth and confess our sins — the very first thing in your National Church you have is confession of sins, and with their faces turned toward the East — and why the East? Because you are the people of Israel. Hence you are the only nation — the French and the Germans and the Russians do not — you are the only nation — (A voice: How about the Turks?) — you are the only nation upon the earth who, in your national worship before God Almighty, confess your sins and pray with your faces toward your land. What land? Why the land which the Lord your God gave to your forefathers. Hence, that pair of breeches shall never be found on any other people on earth; but your nation, being the only nation upon the earth, by the law of your land — and not throughout the factions of your Dissenting people, but by the law of your land, the national voice comes forth. Hence we say, that your nation is the only nation that comes forth to respect the Eastern position, because Solomon prayed to God, and God complied, and He said, “I have heard your prayer and I will abide by it all; I will make the contract with you”. Hence, when the people go forth, and in their land of exile they shall pray, whether it be near to or far off — and prophecy declared it should be in the isles afar off — hence, in those isles they were bound to turn to the Eastern aspect, and you are the only nation under heaven that really observes it in your National Church, for which God be thanked! — your Eastern position.

MR. ROBERTS QUESTION MR. HINE.

316.—Mr. Hine, you say that wherever the nation of Israel is found it must be found with the Ten Commandments? — Thank God for it.

317.—Do you consider the British nation a Christian nation? — The only Christian nation upon the earth.

318.—As such, do you consider it subject to the teaching of the Apostle Paul? — The only nation upon the earth subject to his teaching.

319.—That being the case, I ask you to consider this statement, upon which I will put a question when I have read it: “Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if *the ministration of death*, WRITTEN AND ENGRAVEN IN STONES, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? * * * If that WHICH IS DONE AWAY was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious” (2 Cor. 3:5-11). My first question is: Was anything else written and engraven in stones but the Ten Commandments? — My answer is, Mr. Roberts,—

320.—Yes, or no? — The thing done away with was not the Ten Commandments, but the —

321.—My question is: Was anything else written and engraven in stones but the Ten Commandments; yes, or no? — Yes.

322.—What besides? — Well, I believe there was an inscription on Jacob’s stone.

323.—Do you think that Paul was referring to the inscription on Jacob’s stone there? — No, I do not.

324.—What do you think he was referring to? — I think he was referring to the abolishing of the Mosaic law to Israel.

325.—I am not speaking of abolition, but of writing. What does he mean by that which was written and engraven in stones, which he says was done away? — I believe he is referring to what was written on the stony hearts of the people.

326.—What was written on the stony hearts of the people? — Disobedience of God Almighty.

327.—“If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was *glorious*.” Do you say that disobedience written in the stony hearts of the people is glorious? — Mr. Hine pauses.

328.—My plain question is: Is not Paul there referring to the Ten Commandments? — No, I think not. I may be wrong, but I think he is referring to the Mosaic law, which was then abolished.

329.—Was the Mosaic law written and engraven upon stones? — Not upon your sealing-wax that you introduced last night.

330.—Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — I take that as a figure.

331.—Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — Keep your temper, Mr. Roberts.

332.— I am keeping my temper admirably: I am only emphasizing my question: Yes, or no. Were not the Ten Commandments written and engraven in stones? — Well, of course I should be a fool to say No.

333.—Then the Ten Commandments being those which were engraven in stones, what about Paul’s statement that they were done away with? — Well, I say it was not in the literal sense.

334.—You are aware that one of those Commandments is, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy” — the seventh day. Do we observe the seventh day? — We observe the Sabbath day.

335.—Do we observe the seventh day? — I would be very sorry if we did.

336.—Does not the law of Moses command the observance of the seventh day? — We are redeemed from that law.

337.—If we are redeemed from it, how must we be found under it? — We are not found under it. Your seventh day was renewed in the Mosaic economy; but as far as the keeping of the Sabbath is concerned, we have to go back to the Garden of Eden. I have seen the calculations by which according to the moons, and so forth, we have gone back to the original Mosaic Sabbath.

338.—But it was the Ten Commandments you spoke of: you don't think that that law which was written and engraven on stones was done away? — No, certainly not: the Mosaic law, which was given 430 years after, had no power to annul.

339.—The Mosaic law was not 430 years after the Commandments, which were part of it. "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious; * * * WHICH GLORY WAS TO BE DONE AWAY." How do you explain that statement? — Well, I have given you my answer.

340.—Well, I will not pursue the matter further. I think Mr. Hine's position is sufficiently obvious. You say, Mr. Hine, that Israel must be found a nation to-day; what do you mean by a nation? — A people with a land, and not dispersed.

341.—Were Israel a nation when captive in Media? — God never required them to be.

342.—Yes or no? — He required them to be many days without a king — a wandering people.

343.—Yes or no: for whatever reason, were they a nation when they were captives in Media? — No, not at that time. Why! they had to break the yoke of the Assyrians off their neck.

344.—Why must they be a nation now, then? — Because God afterwards decreed it.

345.—"Afterwards"? — After their captivity, when they were positively in exile.

346.—You refer to the words of Jeremiah, spoken after the deportation of the ten tribes. When was the decree to come into force according to your understanding of the matter? — O, it came into force when the ten tribes became collected, because the nation could only comprise the ten tribes.

347.—You do not tell me when? — When the time should come.

348.—Are you sure the time has come yet? — Quite sure.

349.—That we shall see. Does not that pledge concerning the nation, and the continuance of the nation, refer to both families? — Certainly not: I am positive you are wrong.

350.—I will read the statement of Jeremiah (33:24): "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, *The two families* which the Lord hath chosen, He

hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised My people," *two families*, "that they", *two families*, "should be NO MORE A NATION before them. Thus saith the Lord; If My covenant be not with day and night", and then He proceeds to guarantee their stability.— You are skipping over some verses, as you did last night.

351.—No: I am reading the very next verse.—With a paragraph between.

352.—There is no paragraph between. I will hand you the book if you like. (*Offers the book to Mr. Hine: Mr. Hine declines to look.*) Now the question is, if Israel could be a nation, although in dispersion, in the centuries lying between their deportation by Shalmaneser and the time of Christ, why are they not to be considered a nation now, if proved to be in dispersion? — Utterly impossible for a people dispersed in all nations, serving their enemies in all countries, to be a nation.

353.—Were they not to be without a king until the latter days: yes or no? — They have been so, thank God for it.

354.—When are the latter days? — It is not "the latter days" in the passage.

355.—Yes it is.—That day was immediately after their dispersion.

356.—I will read the statement (Hosea 3:4): "The Children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice. * * * Afterward shall the Children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness *in the latter days.*" My question is, when are the latter days? — Don't put it, Mr. Roberts.

357.—I will.—You had better not.

358.—When are the latter days? — After they had been many days without a king; you have it there: abide by the Word of God.

359.—When did the latter days begin? — Afterwards.

360.—And when did the "afterwards" begin? — You don't know, but I think I do.

361.—Exactly, and that is why I am asking; when did the latter days begin? — Not until after they had arrived in their islands in an idolatrous state, as our people did, and then received Christianity, and those were the days that they were to seek the Lord, as we did.

362.—Do you mean the latter days began in the fifth century? — O, there are many days described in Scripture as the latter days, and in two verses they do not refer to the same days.

363.—My question refers to the latter days that we are now speaking of, never minding any others — supposing there are any, which I deny. Did they begin in the fifth century? — They were days afterwards.

364.—Did they begin in the sixth? — When we first embraced Christianity.

365.—Do you date the latter days, then, from the year in which England embraced Christianity? — No: from the time of James I.; and not until then did the ten tribes become really united, when we sought the Lord our God; and in our Bible it is dedicated to our late king James I., to whom all glory be given.

366.—Then you begin the latter days with the reign of James I.? — Yes, I am inclined to do so: those latter days and the latter days afterwards.

367.—If that be so, explain to me how, in the 38th of Ezekiel? — O, now we are coming to another latter day, after the return.

368.—“In the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword.” — We are not there yet.

369.—Wait a moment: “And is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste: but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely all of them.” * * * “And thou shalt come up against My people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; *it shall be* IN THE LATTER DAYS” (Ezekiel 38:8, 16). Has Israel been restored to their land? — I thank God, not yet.

370.—Why not, if the latter days begin in the reign of James I.? — If the latter days began, supposing I am right — and only supposing — if they began in the reign of James I.—no man can prove they did not; but supposing they did, then we say these latter days cannot end until He comes whose right it is to reign, the second coming of our Lord.

371.—You say that Israel was always to be a favoured people. — Thank God.

372.—On what authority? — O, because He declared, “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper” (Isaiah 544:17), “thou shalt be far from terror, for it shall not come near thee” (verse 14), which, if it referred to the Christadelphian church, or any church on earth, should be false.

373.—If the Danes overthrew the Saxons in England in the sixth century, in a long and bloody war, and oppressed them for a long time till the days of Alfred, how can the Saxons be the people against whom no weapon formed was to prosper? (Applause.) I am only very sorry you should applaud, because really it shows you are not conversant with the subject. We simply say that the last tribe that arrived in these islands must be the tribe of Benjamin, because it was in Jerusalem in the days of Christ. He was to be the favoured of the Lord, and her very emblem, her heraldry, is described in Scripture — the lion and the unicorn. Hence, the Normans who came here with the heraldry of the wolf, were the tribe of Benjamin: so the Norman Conquest, so-called, was only the adding of the last tribe, to complete our nation of the ten tribes. Then we had the whole of the ten tribes in these isles afar off and from that time you never have been defeated.

MR. HINE'S LAST SPEECH.

Mr. HINE: Then we tell you, dear friends, that you are the people of Israel. You are the people of Israel because you comply with all the prophecies that God declared and willed should come forth from the people of Israel, and the people of Israel only. Hence, the figure that Mr. Roberts gave you last night amounted to pepper and dust in your eyes, with regard to the “eyes”, and the “noses”, and the “finger-nails”, and the “breeches”; because we have given you proofs, and we could give you hundreds of proofs, that there are certain things, that is certain breeches, that only the people of Israel are to wear, and that no other people are to bedeck their bodies with. Hence we say, by virtue of our complying with those prophecies — the prophecies given to the Children of Israel — for, as we proved last night, the people of Judah were to be few in number; whereas the people of Israel were to be as the sand of the sea-shore for multitude.

In a hundred years from now — a Frenchman comes forth to give you this computation — the French people shall be 69 millions strong; the German people shall be 130 millions strong; but your nation shall be 860 millions strong in a hundred years from now; that is, if you increase according to your present ratio. Being Israel you shall, because God Almighty declares to Israel they shall, increase as they have increased: your ratio shall be kept up. Hence Judah are only to be few in number. Hence we come to the time, by virtue of being Israel, and complying with these prophecies — aye! showing the glorious distinction of Israel from Judah when God Almighty — aye, let us be reverent before Him, and let us not trifle with the deep things of God. If I have stated anything in error I ask God to forgive me, and I ask forgiveness even of my brother, Mr. Roberts. I will be faithful to God, and only to Him. But when the time shall come, after your receiving your identity, the bringing forth of the blind people, when that time shall come — what? Then the Lord shall stretch forth His hand a second time — what to do? He shall stretch forth His hand the second time to recover the outcasts of Israel, and the dispersed of Judah, and when this second-time return shall take place, then God Almighty declares that He will smite the seven streams of Egypt, and He will cause them — Israel and Judah — to go over dryshod; because it shall be like as it was to Israel in the days that they came up out of Egypt.

Hence, being identical with Israel, you only wearing the “breeches” that God intended, according to Mr. Roberts’ vulgar figure — but only taking up that vulgar notion — you only wearing those “breeches”, God Almighty requires you — what to do? When the time of the return shall come, which cannot be until after the receiving, that is the identity of your nation with Israel — what? Why! then you shall have another colony, and when my Lord Beaconsfield — God honour the man (applause and hisses) — the man who knows far better than the hissing of a serpent, the man who knows whose ancestry belongs to you, and who has called you many a time the historical people, the ancient people, the

traditional people, simply because he knew that your nation was connected with the people of Israel — when he went to Berlin, and when the infamous people were twitting him, and, supposing themselves wise in their own conceits, said: “What hath he done?” — why, he came to give you Cyprus, a Bible-land, and God be thanked for the gift, and why? Because you are the people of Israel, and in these latter days, which good Dr. Keith describes as “the time of the end begun”, Daniel’s “time of the end”, and I quite believe it; because in Daniel’s time of the end God requires you to return, that is to acquire another colony; what colony? Palestine, How? According as to the position of Israel in days gone by? Never: because God promised to Abraham, when the time of the return shall take place, when the perpetual possession of the land shall be, that they shall have it from the stream of Egypt to the great river — the river Euphrates. Hence it means, by virtue of your identity, when the nation shall become nationally convinced.

And there are many other things, though Mr. Roberts may laugh at them: we have Jeremiah’s vessel, with his title-deeds defined, which I assure you, and positively affirm before you, shall be found at Tara, in Ireland. Hence we say, when the ark of the covenant comes forth, when the very tables that Mr. Roberts referred to, though you will not — like geese — receive the letter now, when we unearth Tara, which shall be unearthed between this and 1882, then we shall give you the title-deeds; and that is why the Rothschilds cannot buy the Land of Palestine; because we possess the title-deeds, and it is only Israel in Christ that can claim that land, their inheritance through Christ. So we say, by virtue of your being identical with the people of Israel, we are going to give you another country, nay, we are going to take you back to your own land — your mother land. And are you going to return, all of you? Once more showing you the difference, when we get our title-deeds and the ark of the covenant — because God Almighty declares that He will go before you, and a great company shall return, when that holy time shall come — what? Then we shall get the land from the stream of Egypt to the great river — the river Euphrates; not a new possession, but simply a re-inhabitation of your land. And when God shall come forth, He shall come forth and substantiate His own word, by which we shall gain our missionary success in many nations, being joined to the Lord; because that dividing of the water shall be so sublime, shall so eclipse the deliverance from Egypt, that we shall forget that deliverance.

When this second-time return shall take place in conjunction with Israel and Judah, not one without the other, then we shall return a great company; but how? One of a city, and two of a family. The British people, it is impossible for you to return entire: you will only return according to the “consumption decreed” by the Almighty, determined aforetime by Him, one of a city, two of a family. But as far as Judah is concerned, not one of them shall be left behind, and they have to offer, to be accepted by God Almighty their sacrifices, by the shedding of the blood of the bull, the goat, the kid, and so forth, they have to go back and offer their sacrifices; which they could never do in England. Hence as far as they are concerned, not one of them shall be left behind, but as far as your nation is concerned, being identical with this people of Israel, and being a nation and a

company of nations, you shall only return according to the decree, aforetime determined by God Almighty — one of a city and two of a family — a great company shall return, and after you have returned you shall not give up one of your possessions; because Obadiah distinctly declares that Israel shall possess their possessions — that is, continue to possess all the possessions that you now hold. Hence we thank God that by wearing these “breeches” you have before you the grand glory of being the people of God Almighty, to go forth and occupy your inheritance.

And why? for your own glory? that you stupid people may become glorified before God Almighty? Nothing of the kind: it is “that I, even I, may be glorified.” Hence, if you are honest, and your soul goes forth with the wish that you could glorify Jehovah, add to His praise, we say you never could glorify Him until the time of the return takes place, when many people and strong nations shall go to Jerusalem to seek the Lord and to praise His name. So we leave you with this, only this one word. You being the people of Israel, you are not a Christian people unless you want that holiday time to come when Jerusalem shall be made a praise in the earth, and Jerusalem never can be made a praise in the earth until Israel and Judah have returned. Hence you are commanded by God Almighty to seek the return of Israel and Judah, because you are to give Him no rest — it is not your option, it is not your will or fancy: it is your command from God Almighty — give Him no rest, be importunate, earnestly plead before Him, give Him no rest until He establish Jerusalem a praise in the earth, which only your identity can do.

MR. ROBERTS’ LAST SPEECH.

Mr. ROBERTS:—I exceedingly regret, dear friends, that the limits of this discussion do not allow of the full canvass of all the matters that stand related to the issue raised by Mr. Hine. I can only console myself with this thought, that as this discussion is being reported, and will be published, I shall have the opportunity, in an appendix, of treating separately the matters that have not been brought under review on this side of the platform during the course of the discussion; and I would also like to say in this connection that if any lady or gentleman has any point or passage, or difficulty, or argument, as bearing in favour of Mr. Hine’s contention, and against the position which I have sought to maintain, if they will communicate it to me, I will separately treat their communication in the appendix which will be added to the published discussion. I say that, because I am aware of several who are desirous only to know the truth, and who have before their minds certain matters which have not been considered, and, in order to give them the opportunity I refer to, it is needful to be so personal as to tell them my address, which they may now take down — the Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham. Any communication to the effect I have described, sent to that address, will be registered in the appendix to the discussion, and the particular difficulty raised considered and treated.

Having said that much, I must now endeavour to make the very best use of the ten minutes or so that remain at my disposal. I think I cannot make a better use of them than by calling attention to one or two palpable features in the predictions concerning the futurity of Israel which, of their own force, are sufficient to entirely upset Mr. Hine's theory. The first point I refer to is this, that in the predictions of Israel's coming restoration, the lands from which they are to be restored are uniformly described as the land of their enemies, and if that be the case, obviously the English cannot be the ten tribes, because we are not in the land of our enemies, but in our own land. Let me read one or two illustrations of what I assert, for I never feel content to leave anything in an unestablished or doubtful form; I like to give my authority, because, of course, I know nothing of this matter except what is testified in profane and sacred records, and I am quite sure that Mr. Hine is in the same position, except perhaps — begging his pardon for the remark — that he does not quite know all that is contained in these authorities, judging from the things he has said in the course of his argument.

In Leviticus 26:44, referring to that futurity, we read, "And yet for all that, when they be *in the land of their enemies*, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them." You will find the reason of the declaration in the 32nd of Deuteronomy, the memorial song which was to embody God's protest during all the centuries against Israel's wickedness. You will find in the 26th verse of that chapter this declaration: "I said, I would scatter them into corners, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men, *were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high and the Lord hath not done all this.*" In Ezekiel 39:27: "When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of *their enemies' lands*, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations; then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen." In Jeremiah 5:19: "It shall come to pass, when ye shall say, Wherefore doeth the Lord our God all these things unto us? then shalt thou answer them, Like as ye have forsaken Me, and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers *in a land that is not yours.*" In Jeremiah 30:10: "Fear thou not, O My servant Jacob, saith the Lord, neither be dismayed, O Israel, for lo, I will save them from afar, and thy seed from *the land of their captivity.*"

Then I call your attention to a class of testimonies which declare that Israel is in captivity when the crisis of restoration arrives, viz., Ezekiel 34:11-16: "I will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out My sheep, and will deliver them *out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.* And I will bring them *out from the people*, and gather them *from the countries*, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I

will feed them in a good pasture, *and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be*: there shall they lie in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel. I will feed My flock, and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord God. I will seek *that which was lost*, and bring again *that which was driven away*, and will bind up *that which was broken*, and will strengthen that which was sick." Are we broken? Are we sick? Are we driven away? Is it not Mr. Hine's argument that we are a consolidated and powerful nation? In Ezekiel 36:8-28; I will not read all, but a specimen or two: "I will multiply men" — this is an address to the mountains of Israel, the Land of Palestine, as you may see by the 8th verse: "Ye, O mountains of Israel, ye shall shoot forth your branches, and yield your fruit to my people of Israel; for they are *at hand to come*. For behold, I am for you, and I will turn unto you, and ye shall be tilled and sown: and I will multiply men upon you, all the House of Israel, even all of it: * * * and they shall increase and bring fruit: and I will *settle you after your old estates*, and WILL DO BETTER UNTO YOU THAN AT YOUR BEGINNINGS" — a prophecy which Mr. Hine quotes as illustrating British history. (Mr. Hine: No, he never does.)

He does in his published works: whereas you see it applies to what God is to do for Israel when Israel are brought again to their land; (verse 17): "When the house of Israel dwelt in their own land, they defiled it by their own way and by their doings: * * * wherefore I poured my fury upon them for the blood that they had shed upon the land, and for their idols wherewith they had polluted it; and I *scattered them among the heathen*, and they were *dispersed through the countries*: according to their way and according to their doings I judged them; (verse 24): "I will take you from among the heathen, and *gather you out of all countries*, and will *bring you into your own land*. THEN will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh", when He takes them back to their land — a prophecy which Mr. Hine applies to the state of things subsisting in the British nation—

MR. HINE:—I do not: I declare I do not; I defy Mr. Roberts to show that.

MR. ROBERTS:—I could show it from Mr. Hine's published works: but of course he is at liberty to disclaim so absurd an application.

Then, in Ezekiel 37:11: "Son of Man, these bones (symbolic bones the prophet had seen in vision), are the whole house of Israel", and that it includes the two families you will see by the subsequent part of the prophecy, where the prophet is told to take two sticks, and to unite them together, "and they shall become one in thine hand" (verse 17), and the prophet is directed that when he is asked the meaning he is to say this, (verse 21): "Say unto them, 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."

I have a great deal besides that I could read. This description of testimony — this kind of prophecy, of itself, would be entirely sufficient, in true process of logic, to destroy a theory that seeks to identify the lost ten tribes of Israel with one of the greatest and most powerful nations of the world, situated in the British islands at the present time.

I could say much more, but I forbear. I have not been able to go into all the little points and quibbles by which Mr. Hine seeks to evade the evidence that destroys his most extraordinary theory. I must be content to say that it is a theory that is most mischievous in its tendencies. It appears to me that there is no more egregious piece of theological quackery to be found under the sun at the present time than a theory which would divert the purposes of God from His own scattered and down-trodden nation, and associate them with one of the proudest and most God-disregarding nations of the earth. (Cries of "Time".)

I have the permission of the chair to occupy just one or two minutes over the time in concluding. I merely wish to say that if I did not entertain those opinions which I think I am justified in expressing because I entertain them, I would not stand upon this platform in the capacity in which I have appeared before you for the last three nights. England has a position in the prophetic scheme; she has a mission in the latter days; she has a place in those operations by which God will bring together His scattered nation in the latter days; but she is herself a thoroughly Gentile nation, destined only to play a subordinate part in the work of God with scattered Israel.

If you will come to Myddelton Hall, Islington, on Sunday evening next, at seven o'clock, I will then take the pleasure of availing myself of the opportunity of submitting to you something on this subject — not my opinions, not my assertions, but the Scriptural evidence, which goes to show that we are close upon the crisis of Israel's deliverance, and that England is verging towards the position in which she will exercise the latter-day mission which God has given her. (A voice: Time, time.)

Well, as I do not wish to inflict my words upon the patience of any gentleman, I will conclude by simply saying that the mischievousness of this theory, as it appears to me, consists of two things — one, the lesser of the two, and that one I will mention first — is that, first, it gives to England an unnatural and unscriptural complacency in regard to the position she occupies in the world in relation to God; and the second and most serious, as has been illustrated in Mr. Hine's remarks, is that it entirely diverts the attention of those who receive his theory from the only way of salvation which Christ proclaimed to men.

A GENTLEMAN ON THE PLATFORM: Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask Mr. Roberts. He is having this discussion reported, and will, of course, correct all the reporter's errors in his speeches: will he give Mr. Hine the opportunity of doing the same thing?

Mr. ROBERTS: In answer to that, I have simply to say that Mr. Hine has been offered the opportunity of revising his speeches, but he declines to avail himself of it, saying he has confidence in Mr. Roberts' friends, and that he will be too busy to go over his speeches. (Mr. Hine: Hear, hear.) If, however, Mr. Hine would like to go over the manuscript, the offer is still open to him. (Applause.)

After a vote of thanks to Mr. Hine and Mr. Roberts, and also to the Chairman, the meeting broke up.