

# THE TRUE POSITION OF BRITAIN IN PROPHECY.

A LECTURE BY MR. ROBERTS,

DELIVERED IN

MYDDELTON HALL, ISLINGTON, LONDON,

ON SUNDAY EVENING, APRIL 27th, 1879.

SUBJECT: *“The true position of Britain in relation to Israel’s coming Restoration, and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of David, in the hands of Christ, the Son of David (as well as the Son of God), in ascendancy over all nations for their blessedness and well-being.”*

It is one of the redeeming features of the agitation promoted by Mr. Hine — with whatever object — that it brings into controversy Bible revelation concerning God’s purpose with the House of Israel. That purpose is very much more important than it will appear to the majority of people at first sight. It will be found to involve all that is of possible interest to mankind, whether we consider their national or their individual weal.

That remark assumes what must be assumed upon the present occasion — an assumption, however, which can be established upon the very strongest evidence

— that the Bible is God’s Word. I do believe that with all my heart and soul. If I did not believe it I would not be here, and I believe it in spite of science; I believe it not in ignorance of science, but in full view of all the facts, and the hypotheses founded upon the facts, which would seek to displace that marvellous Book from our confidence as the revelation of God’s mind to man. It is a very tempting theme: I require to put a restraint on myself not to pursue it, and having said that much upon it, must needs now return to the particular subject that is doubtless before the minds of all who are here present.

Mr. Hine has said a great deal about England; it has been my duty during the past week to deny what he has said about it. But there is something to be said about England: she has an indirect and transient part in the programme of God’s work upon earth. It would be a marvel if it were not so, considering the time in which we live, and considering the extraordinary position of the British power in the earth. But we must use our judgment scientifically in the matter. I use that word in its correct sense, not in its conventional sense: I mean that we must apply our minds clearly, accurately, logically, dispassionately to the consideration of the facts and testimonies that bear upon the subject, and not run after a theory which may be attractive because of the particular form it may assume, and then go industriously to work and seek some kind of support for it by fair means or foul.

Now, to make manifest the position which England occupies in the Divine programme of the latter days, it will be needful first to say something about the people concerning whom the whole discussion is conducted; I mean not the people of England: concerning the ancient people, concerning the scattered people, concerning the circumcised people, concerning God’s chosen people, concerning the Hebrew, the Israelitish people, the descendants of the nation whom Moses brought from Egypt, and which nation was afterwards settled in a land of God’s own choosing, and which has been specifically the subject of Divine manipulation in all its national destinies and experiences.

## THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL — MOSES’ WARNING.

We have seen, during the course of the discussion, that their present position is one of down-treading, one of adversity, one of dispersion. Let me illustrate, in the light of what Moses said to them, what their present position is. When he brought them out of Egypt, when he had them assembled in the Wilderness, in the rehearsal, the magnificent rehearsal contained in the Book of Deuteronomy, of all God’s dealings with them, you find him saying (Deut. 11:26): “Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; A BLESSING, *if ye obey* the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and A CURSE, *if ye will not obey* the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.” Now we know which selection, as a matter of fact, the people made between those two alternatives: we know they were disobedient in

their entire history, even immediately after the death of Joshua, who brought them victoriously into the land of Canaan. We read that when Joshua was dead, and all the elders that outlived Joshua, they turned aside to the worship of the idols of the nations. God raised them up adversaries in consequence, and brought them into evil circumstances, upon which they returned unto Him, and He was besought of them, and He raised them up deliverance, and granted them a season of rest — eighty years of national prosperity — when again they declined from His way, and were again brought into adversity — a process repeated many a time with many varying circumstances, all detailed minutely, yet briefly, graphically, without circumlocution, without any adventitiousness of discourse, totally unlike any human narrative: we have it all in these wonderful books, which come to us with the stamp of Christ's endorsement.

Over a thousand years that experience was illustrated in their case, till finally first one half, namely, the half consisting of the ten tribes, and then the other half of the nation were entirely driven from the country, and brought into a position of great affliction, to which Moses made prospective allusion in a beautiful discourse which you will find in the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, from which I will read one extract. Addressing them at the end of their forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, and just prior to their crossing the Jordan and entering the land, he said, at the 22nd verse: "I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan: but ye shall go over and possess that good land. Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which He made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee. For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God. When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image: \* \* \* I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen" — addressing the twelve tribes — "few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell."

As Moses forecast, so it came to pass; and here we are this day, witnesses of the fulfilment of His word, for the Jewish race is a fact — not a political corporation, but a nation notwithstanding — a scattered nation, a nation of one blood, of one faith, of one history, and of one mighty prospect: as we shall see, a prospect to which the large part of the nation still adhere, though in a kind of despairing hope. A day will come when the Lord God of their fathers will remember the covenant He made with them, and will gather them from their dispersion, and bring them again to their land, and use them in that mighty purpose of blessing all mankind, which He declared to Abraham, their progenitor, in the first instance, to be the

very purpose of his call, saying unto him, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed", "and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" (Gen. 12:3).

#### CHRIST FORETELLS THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

To bring this matter quite home to our own day and to our own experience, I call your attention to a prophecy delivered by Christ Himself in connection with the last episode in the national history, which you will find in the 21st chapter of Luke. In the 5th verse we read: "Some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts." No wonder! It was a magnificent structure, built of great blocks of marble, ornamented with spikes of gold. The whole of the description is contained in the works of Josephus, and the works of Josephus have been verified by the things discovered by the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Society. And the disciples called attention to the magnificence of the building, and said, as recorded by another Evangelist, "See what manner of stones and what buildings are here." Jesus said, "As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they asked Him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" He proceeds to answer that question: He proceeds to depict to them the course of events in their own generation immediately succeeding the time of His discourse. He describes a time of great public calamity, great social convulsions, great trouble amongst the people, great distress in the land; and winds up by saying (verse 22): "These be the days of vengeance"; (verse 23): "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people", that is, the people of the Jews, and the land of Judah, in which He was living at the time He spoke these words. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Now please go back:—let us pull ourselves back as by a chain along the waters to that time. It is only 1,800 years ago. People may say "Only!" Well, that is, perhaps, because their minds are cooped up within the four walls of their own particular little life, and engrossed with their own little concerns, which will disappear as entirely from the universe within fifty years as the snow of winter. If they will open their minds and look at facts — look at the great movements of the universe — conceive the endless ages before and behind — realise the progress of events described in the Scriptures, they will not object to this way of putting it, when I say "only 1,800 years ago since Christ was there uttering words" which are fulfilled before us this day.

#### JOSEPHUS' TESTIMONY.

Were they fulfilled? Yes: He says, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh;" "This generation shall not

pass away till all be fulfilled" (verses 20, 32). So that He led them to expect, within their own lifetime, the destruction of their temple, the disruption of the Jewish Commonwealth, and the dispersion of the Jewish nation. And it all happened. The works of Josephus are a sort of literary monument to the fact of Christ's words having been fulfilled. That book is a literary marvel. It is a very voluminous work; it is a very minutely-written work; it is a very clearly and accurately-expressed work, and nobody has the hardihood to suggest that it was not written in the first century, and that it was not written by Josephus — not even Mr. Bradlaugh: he was abound to admit, for I had — shall I say the pleasure? I don't know; I have had the experience, at all events, of meeting him in six nights' discussion; and he does not dare to impugn the authenticity and historical veracity of the works of Josephus. And there we have it, a full account, written by Josephus from the Roman camp, for he was taken prisoner during the early part of the war, and was with Titus throughout the closing part of the campaign, a witness of all that took place, and a participator in the events which terminated in the destruction of the nation. In this position, with these opportunities, he wrote as full an account as the *Times* correspondent would write in our day of all the incidents that transpired from day to day during the accomplishment of these terrible events: till the day that Jerusalem was laid in ashes, and an unprecedented destruction of the Jewish people accomplished; for about a million of them perished in the terrible events that soaked the soil of Judah in blood from north to south, during the terrible, the frenzied resistance of the Jews to the formidable efforts of the Romans. "They shall be led away captive into all nations," said Jesus; "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until*": "UNTIL". Does not that show that Jesus recognised a limit to the desolation? Does it not show that He recognised a change coming by-and-bye in connection with Jerusalem? "*Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*" And the Jews have been scattered from that day to this, and Jerusalem has been down-trodden from that day to this, and the times of the Gentiles, chronologically and prophetically considered, have been current from that day to this, though they are running out in our age, in our generation. "Trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." What then? Well, as to what is to happen then, let me call your attention to a slight forecast of the matter by Moses himself, in the beautiful words to be found in Deuteronomy 30:1-5.

Now just realise that these words were spoken three thousand years ago. There is no doubt about that. But it is necessary to ask people to remember it, and to rouse themselves up, for they seem to be all asleep and dead about these great things; they seem to have been brought into a lethargic and unbelieving state of mind, notwithstanding that the facts of the case stand right up at every man's door, so to speak, challenging his reasonable attention. Josephus, for instance, as a book, is known to everybody of the most ordinary acquaintance with literature. This takes you back into the presence of these facts at one huge stride; for he tells you, writing 1,800 years ago, of Moses' writings having been in existence centuries

and centuries before his time. He had occasion to argue this point indirectly against Apion, an adversary of the Jews, who sought to bring scorn upon them by making out that the Jews and their literature were of very recent and infamous origin. Josephus answers his arguments, and makes manifest the great antiquity of the nation of the Jews and the Mosaic writings. He does this most successfully and trenchantly, quoting Egyptian, Greek and Babylonian authors, whose very existence would in our day have been unknown but for Josephus' quotation of them.

#### MOSES FORETELLS RESTORATION.

Realise, therefore, that we are now reading what was written three thousand years ago. This is a general forecast of God's purpose to restore Israel after the punishment of their sins. "It shall come to pass", says Moses, "when all these things are come upon thee",—still addressing the congregation of the twelve tribes,—"the blessing and the curse," for they first had the blessing and then the curse, "which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee", or shall have driven thee, "and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will *turn thy captivity*, and have compassion upon thee, and will *return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee*. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee; and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers." Why! there is a forecast by Moses three thousand years ago, of restoration as the finality of God's dealings with the House of Israel.

#### THE PROPHETS ON THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

Now let us take something more recent, and something which may be more precise, and in some respects may be considered more satisfactory, because people might feel concerning these general indications by Moses, that perhaps they had their fulfilment in the return of Israel from Babylon, and I say, to shut the door against any idea of that sort, let us look at other descriptions which entirely preclude the possibility of any such suggestion being admitted. Let us take this in Jeremiah 30:10: "Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid." Verse 18: "Thus saith the Lord; Behold, I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling-places; and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall

remain after the manner thereof. And out of them shall proceed thanksgiving and the voice of them that make merry: and I will multiply them, and they shall not be few; I will also glorify them, and they shall not be small. Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before Me, and I will punish all that oppress them. And *their nobles* shall be of themselves, and THEIR GOVERNOR shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto Me: for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto Me?"

Who is that? Now we can settle that in a very quick and straight manner: look first at Micah 5:2: "Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel", — *Ruler in Israel* — "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Who is that? Look at the 2nd chapter of Matthew: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" and it goes on to tell us that Herod, being troubled, convened the chief priests and scribes, and demanded of them where Christ should be born "They said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule My people Israel." Here is proof of the applicability of this prophecy to the Messiah. Who came out of Bethlehem? Jesus of Nazareth: here is the Governor that came out from amongst themselves, and has been caused to approach to the presence — to the ineffable presence of the eternal and self-existing Creator of heaven and earth. And what about his governing of Israel?

Now let us go back to the prophets, and see whether this picture has ever been realised. Jeremiah 33:14, 15: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the House of Israel and to the House of Judah. In those days and at that time will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness IN THE LAND. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely." Or take it as you find it in Jeremiah 23:5-8: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord"; the words are almost the same, but there are certain words that come after, that are an addition: "that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice IN THE EARTH. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt"; because that ancient deliverance will be so entirely eclipsed by the one to be accomplished by the Son of David,— "But, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the House of Israel out of the north country,

and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land."

Now nobody can suggest that that is Babylon: the door is shut against all idea of that sort. It is a futurity with which Christ is associated as a reigning king, and when under Him, Israel and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; it is the thing referred to by Christ in the word *until*: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*"

#### THE APOSTLES ON THE RESTORATION.

Take Peter's allusion to all these glorious predictions. I am sorry there is not time to read more. I have a great many of them. Why! Those who know the Scriptures are well aware that the prophetic Scriptures are brimming with declarations concerning the re-organisation of the Kingdom of Israel under the great Son of David, in whom, as we shall presently see, all families of the earth shall be blessed. Let your minds rest upon the words I am going to read, for Scripture is not a mere jargon of pious phraseology, like the Church Service: it is a clear enunciation of sound ideas, the mind of God expressed under the guidance of the Spirit of God by the servants of God, prophets and apostles, who were totally unlike the religious leaders of the present order of things.

In Acts 3:19, "Repent ye", says Peter, — and, in order to comprehend the full force of his words, recollect where he was speaking: he was speaking in Jerusalem; he was speaking in the court of the temple to a large Jewish crowd, drawn together by the performance of the miracle of causing the lame man to walk with a word: he was addressing the crowd who had clamoured for the destruction of Him whom Pilate nailed to the cross under the superscription, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews"; they were convinced by the manifestation of Divine power through Peter and the other apostles that this Jesus of Nazareth, whom they had put to death, was really their Messiah; and Peter said, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and *He shall send Jesus Christ*, which before was preached unto you: whom *the heaven must receive UNTIL*" — until when? "until *the times of restitution of all things*, WHICH GOD HATH SPOKEN BY THE MOUTH OF ALL HIS HOLY PROPHETS SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN." Verse 24: "*All the prophets* from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, *have likewise foretold of these days.*" The heavens must hold Him until the time spoken of by the prophets. And then shall He come? Yes.

For so it is written over and over again. For instance, in Acts 1:11: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.*" What is He coming for? 2 Tim. 4:1: "Jesus Christ who shall judge the living and the dead at His appearing *and His kingdom.*" Is He coming to reign? Why! you could not make anything else out of those things I have read from the

prophets, if there were no other information at all; but when we come to the specific delineation in the New Testament of the things that are to transpire when He comes, they are all focalised, so to speak, in one declaration: "*The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever*" (Rev. 11:15).

#### THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF CHRIST.

Has He anything to do with the restoration of the Jews? Why! He could not set up His kingdom without that. Why not? Why! What is His kingdom? What kingdom is His kingdom? Is it the kingdom of Great Britain? is it the kingdom of Austro-Hungary? Is it the empire of Russia? Look at the 1st chapter of Luke, verse 32: "He shall be great" — an angel is the speaker: he is speaking to Mary, the mother of Christ, before Christ was born: "He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him *the throne of His father David*: and He shall *reign over the House of Jacob* for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." Look at those glorious words that are made familiar year by year to the mind of the public by the music of Handel: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and *the government shall be upon His shoulder*: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, UPON THE THRONE OF DAVID, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. *The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this*" (Isaiah 9:6, 7).

It will not be done by human agency. "I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down" (Acts 15:16). How can that be done without gathering the people of Israel? Well, but we will not rest content with a mere inference: let us take the express declaration of the prophet that a part of Christ's work is the re-gathering of the House of Israel. In Isaiah 49:5: "And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be His servant, to bring Jacob again to Him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength." That is Christ's present position; Israel is not gathered, but He is glorious in the presence of the Lord God of Israel, whose manifestation He is by conception and by anointing with the Holy Spirit at His baptism in the Jordan. When on earth, His work was an apparent failure. He is tempted to say, as at the 4th verse of this 49th chapter of Isaiah: "I have laboured in vain, I have spent My strength for nought, and in vain; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and My work with My God." His life appeared to be a failure: "He came to His own, and His own received Him not"; but here is a prophetic forecast that although His work in the first instance should be an apparent failure, He Himself personally should be no sufferer: He was to be taken away to the right hand of power; and He says here, "Though Israel be not

gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of Jehovah", and then Jehovah proceeds to say, "It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be My Servant *to raise up the tribes of Jacob*, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will *also* give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth," — showing that an extension of His mission would take place.

He would offer blessing to the Gentiles as well as to Israel. But you see the first and proximate element in His work was the *raising up of the tribes of Israel*: therefore so long as the Jewish nationality is scattered to the winds, as it is at the present day, and the Land of Promise in desolation — yea, so long, I may say, as the earth is ruled by man, Christ's work is not accomplished. It is in process of accomplishment: He laid the finished foundation of it at His first appearing, but its full development is a matter of futurity, as is evident from these few testimonies, and as will become further evident as we proceed.

I would like to read some more statements about the Jews returning, but I think I will not, because of the other things that have to come. Let me just read one more specimen, though I think it is not necessary. It seems to me that I could not read anything more forcible than those I have quoted, but just let me read one which those acquainted with the Scriptures are well aware is but a specimen of a great many. I will read from the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, at the 21st verse: "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." That has never happened; no one can suggest a past fulfilment to this, and unless you are prepared to say the Word of God is a lie, or a delusion, or an imposture, or something of that sort, you are bound to say it will happen in the days that are to come. Look at the 11th chapter of Isaiah: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea"; so it says in the 9th verse. I think everybody will say that is not yet fulfilled. Very well; then this occurs in connection with that, at verse 12: "And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall *assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.*"

#### OBJECTIONS: "UNBELIEVING JEWS."

Just one or two answers to objections here. It may be said, "Well, certainly it appears obvious that a restoration is predicted there, a gathering together of this outcast nation"; but, "We cannot see into it, because these Jews, whether they call them Israel or Jews, they are disobedient; they are unbelieving; they are not in the condition referred to by Moses — as a condition of blessing: for what purpose, or with what fitness or suitability, can they be gathered? With what object? Surely if they are a bad people in dispersion, they would be a worse people in

consolidation." People might argue in that way. Therefore let me read one or two of God's explanations of the reasons He has before His mind when He sets His hand again a second time, as He declares by Isaiah He will, to bring them together from their wide-spread dispersion. Now you cannot find anything more perfectly simple and satisfactory on this point than Ezekiel 36:16:

"NOT FOR YOUR SAKES."

"Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, when the House of Israel dwelt in their own land, they defiled it by their own way and by their doings: \* \* \* 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. And when they entered unto the heathen, whither they went, they profaned My holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land. But *I had pity for mine holy name*, which the House of Israel had profaned among the heathen, whither they went. Therefore say unto the House of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, *I do not this for your sakes*, O House of Israel, but FOR MINE HOLY NAME'S SAKE, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went. *And I will sanctify My great name*, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land." The object of their restoration is the vindication of the honour of God, by the manifestation of His power, that men in all the earth may see and know that He is God and submit to what He will require of them in the law that will go forth from Zion.

#### PURGING OUT THE REBELS.

Are Israel to be restored in a bad state? No. Are they to be gathered in a good state? No. What is the meaning of that — an apparent contradiction? You will find the explanation, if you listen to this from Ezekiel 20:34: "And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of the Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: and I will *purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against Me*: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel." So they are all to be brought, as Moses says, wherever there is one of them anywhere, good, bad, or indifferent; all to be gathered until they undergo a purification, before their entering into the land, as

their fathers did when they came out of Egypt: there is to be an entire purgation, and only a purified residue will enter into the land to take part in that re-organization that is to take place when Moses' words are fulfilled, as quoted from Deuteronomy 18, in Acts 3:22, 23.

"A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; *him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you*: And it shall come to pass that every soul who will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people." That has not been fulfilled yet, but it will be. Christ has not left the earth for ever. He has blessed it already with His presence for a short time, and the glory of that presence, though in weakness, was so great, that faintly — though faintly — it has illuminated the Gentile darkness during all these dreary ages that have since elapsed. But He is coming back to shine with a greater glory. He is to rise as the Sun of Righteousness, before whose presence every form of evil amongst mankind will disappear: because in His hands there will be irresistible power, which no power of armies or strength of ironclads will be able to resist; and infallible wisdom to direct the affairs of the whole family of man throughout the world, through the administration of His tried and proved and then glorified friends, whom He is to bring from the grave and associate with Himself in the magnificent and glorious work of administering human affairs with true delight to all mankind, and with that "Glory to God in the highest" which was proclaimed by the angels as the necessary antecedent of true human blessedness.

#### "THE LATTER DAYS" — ENGLAND'S POSITION.

And now the question is: What has England to do with this? Well, before I ask that, perhaps another question ought to be asked, and briefly answered, and that is: What evidence have we that the ingathering of this despised people, the re-organisation of this broken nationality, is an event near to us? what evidence have we that it is going to happen by-and-bye? I will briefly direct your attention to the evidence. It must be very briefly. Allow me to say that it could be done extensively, because there is a great deal of evidence and argument upon the point, but the time now only admits of a little of it.

First, we have this information, that it is "*in the latter days*" when this great change in the fortunes of the House of Israel is to take place. We have that information in a variety of ways. I will give but two specimens. In Hosea 3:4, 5: "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 shall fear the Lord and His goodness *in the latter days*." Then we have an account of the shape of the final conflict between God and Gentile power that characterises the arrival of the time of restoration, and immediately precedes the full accomplishment of the work. Concerning that, we read in Ezekiel 38:8: "*After many days* thou — thou" — a certain potentate addressed in the 1st and

2nd verses, who, I may say, can be identified with the Emperor of Russia — “After many days thou shalt be visited: *in the latter years* thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword.” How many days? Let me direct you to the answer on that point in the 8th chapter of Daniel — and I would say to every true disciple of Christ that he or she is at home in Daniel, if he or she be a true disciple of Christ. How is that? Because Christ referred to the prophet Daniel as an authority to be respected. He said, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law and *the prophets*: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil”: and He says, “When ye shall see the abomination of desolation *spoken of by Daniel the prophet*” (Matt. 24:15). I make that remark because my experience generally is that as soon as you speak of the prophet Daniel in the presence of religious people, there is a shrug of the shoulder, as if that was something altogether out of the province of reason, and indeed something dangerous to be considered. Let them ask themselves on what ground they entertain that feeling; and if they look at the matter rightly, they will not only find that there is no reason for such a feeling, but they will turn to Daniel with thankful reverence, and find light on the dark part of human history, which, though dark now, has a glorious ending anon.

In Daniel 8:26, we find the angel telling Daniel: “The vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for *it shall be for MANY DAYS.*” How many? Look at the 14th verse: “He said unto me” — in answer to the question, *How long* shall be the vision? — “*unto 2,300 days.*” Has that any meaning? You may say, “Perhaps it has; but how are we to know?” Let me observe, we can know. You may say, “In what way?” There is a straight and short road to the understanding of it. We have a key to this in the case of another prophet, Ezekiel, who was put through certain symbolic operations with reference to the past and coming history of the house of Israel. He was told to lie upon his side a certain number of days to represent the house of Israel in a certain relation, and he is told about that in Ezek. 4:5: “I have laid upon thee *the years* of their iniquity, *according to the number of the days*”; and at verse 6: “I have appointed thee *EACH DAY FOR A YEAR.*” When we come to Daniel we find that the same principle obtains, because there is in Daniel a prophecy concerning the crucifixion of Christ, fixing it to happen in 490 days from the issue of a certain edict of the Persian Emperor; and it was because that period reckoned in years was about to expire in the days of Christ that there was a general expectancy amongst the Jews everywhere that the Messiah would appear; and He did appear at the time, though they did not recognise Him in the particular character in which He presented Himself. Therefore we have a key to the meaning of “days”.

How long is it since that vision began that Daniel saw? If you will examine the vision, you will find it is a symbolical representation of events that began with the uprising of the Empire of Persia. There is no mist about it; there is nothing obscure or fanatical about this. People think these things are inscrutable. Look at the 3rd verse: “Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns.” People laugh at the ram with two horns. Why

do they not laugh at the British lion? Is the British nation the only nation that uses an animal to represent its power? No: Persia used a ram, and Greece used a goat. Accordingly we read in verse 20: “The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia: and the rough goat is the king of Grecia, and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king”. The thing is palpable: we are dealing with facts; we are looking at something substantial. It is no dreamy business. We know how long it is since Persia became a power in the world: it is all the time mentioned in that verse, and more — “2,300 days”; — what then? — “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed”. The expiry of that period introduces us to the era of Jewish restoration.

#### THE RESURRECTION “AT THE END OF THE DAYS.”

I could give a good deal more evidence to show that we are in “the time of the end” — the end of the days. You may say, “How are we to be sure that the time of the end is the end of the days?” Look at Daniel 12:13: “Go thou thy way till *the end* be: for thou (Daniel) shalt rest, and stand in thy lot *at the end of the days.*” Thou, Daniel, shalt rest — does it say, “rest in heaven? thou shalt go to realms above the skies?” No; that is an invention; that is not a Scriptural doctrine. The Scriptural doctrine is in harmony with what science finds. We are mortal: when we are dead we are dead; and if God never brought us to life again, we should never appear in the universe at all again; but, thanks be to God! He has shed light in on human futurity, through Christ. He has given us in Him “the Resurrection and the Life.” He has given to Him the power to bring forth the friends of God at the appointed time; to bring them into relation with a blessed state of things upon earth, to be established by Him at his coming, not up in the clouds. “Go thy way, Daniel; thou shalt rest.” Ah, but you see it says “rest”. Aye, rest; but where? Look at the 2nd verse: “Many of them that sleep (or rest) *in the dust of the earth* shall awake.” “Go thou thy way (Daniel) till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot *at the end of the days.*” It is perfectly plain. People do not understand because they do not study; and they do not study, because, in the first place, they are not interested: they are taken up altogether with this world’s affairs; and, in the second place, because if they are religious, under the guidance of their religious leaders, their hopes and aspirations are all fixed on the day of their death, when they hope to go beyond the stars. They have no interest in the purposes of God on earth. Their false doctrine of natural immortality, borrowed from the Greek pagans, has made void the Word of God which we have in our hands.

#### “THE SHIPS OF TARSHISH.”

A good many other arguments might be employed to show that we are now in the latter days; but I must hurry on. I must now ask: As it is in the latter days that Israel’s regeneration is to be accomplished, what has England to do with it? The answer to that is to be found in this fact, that when the time for restoration

arrives, we find there is a certain power in the earth providentially made use of to co-operate in the work. I will read the passages to which I refer, and then I will ask you to perceive, in the considerations I will suggest, their applicability to the nation of which we form a part. Let us turn to Isaiah 60. In the last verse but one of the previous chapter we read: "The Redeemer shall come to Zion", and I may say that, in the 11th chapter of Romans, Paul quotes that as a prophecy unfulfilled in his day, which shows it cannot apply to the first coming of Christ, and must therefore apply to the second. "The Redeemer shall come." Following upon that there is this most glorious address to the House of Israel (60:1): "Arise, thine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. \* \* \* And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising"; and it goes on to say in the 8th verse: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows? Surely THE ISLES shall wait for me, and *the ships of Tarshish* first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because He hath glorified thee."

In Isaiah 18:1 we read: "Woe" — or, more correctly, "*Ho!* to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia: that sendeth ambassadors by the sea, even in vessels of" — *bulrushes* we have here, but that is palpably a mistake, for vessels of bulrushes sent upon the mighty ocean would not long be vessels of any sort. What should it be? There are Hebraists who agree in saying that it means vessels with moving things, turning things — pointing to a peculiar form of vessels that should be used in the latter days: "Vessels of moving, turning, whirling things, upon the waters, saying, Go, ye swift messengers", — no ships were *swift messengers* until the steam marine of Great Britain came into existence — "to a nation scattered and peeled, to a people terrible from their beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden down, whose land the rivers have spoiled! All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when He lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when He bloweth a trumpet, hear ye." And then he proceeds to describe something that would be very interesting to follow, namely: the judgments that are to descend upon the ripened iniquity of the present generation. But we pass on to the 7th verse: "In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of Hosts of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from their beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose land the rivers have spoiled, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion."

#### THE "YOUNG LIONS" OF TARSHISH.

Now read Ezekiel 38:16, and this is the last one I will quote on this point, and then I will ask you to consider how they bear on the matter: "And thou shalt come up against My people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against My land, that the heathen may know Me, when

I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes". Now observe verse 13: "Sheba, and Dedan, and *the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof*, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?"

Now here are three passages in which in the latter days, a power is represented — first, as shielding the infant colony of Israel in its beginning; and secondly, as taking part in helping a more widespread restoration afterwards; and thirdly, as bringing a present of the scattered people to God. Now the question is: What power is there in our day that can answer to the description? Well, reminding you of the reason we have for believing we are now in the latter days, let us look around, and see. First, take the SHIPS: what power is there whose characteristic description, as a characteristic applicable to herself alone, is, — "*the ships of Tarshish*". Obviously, there is but one: England is the only really maritime power. Of course there are other powers that are called maritime powers, because they have ships; but consider their proportions, — the relative proportions of the navies of the world. All the ships of all the other powers of the world put together scarcely come up to England's. That, therefore, of itself, would cause one to think surely it must be England! That would not be conclusive of itself, but it would establish a presumption.

#### "SHIPS", "SEA", "ISLES."

We must look at the other points. We want something more certain than that. We are not to be content, like Mr. Hine, with a mere possibility, or with a mere perhaps, a casual coincidence and faint resemblance. We want proof; and we can get it. In the next place: this power having ships, is said to "send ambassadors *by the sea*." Does not that imply that it is an island-power? France does not require to send her ambassadors by sea: she sends them by land to Vienna, to Berlin, to Madrid, to St. Petersburg; the only country where she has to use the sea is England, and she has to use English ships to do that. "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows? Surely THE ISLES shall wait for me" (Isaiah 60:8, 9). What are those? Are we not only the power having ships but isles? — the islands of Great Britain? People may say, "Why don't you allow that in Mr. Hine's argument? Does not he quote passages about isles, too?" Yes, he does; but let me read them to you. I will read to you all the passages he quotes about the isles, and you will see that while they have a bearing upon the subject I am talking about, so far from proving that the inhabitants of these "isles" are Israel, they prove that they are not Israel but adjuncts and servants of Israel, who co-operate with Israel in obeying the command of the King of Israel, when he commences His work of breaking the kingdoms of the earth as a potter's vessel.

Isaiah 41:1: "Keep silence before Me, O islands; and let the people renew their strength: let them come near, then let them speak: let us come near together to



judgment." Isaiah 42:4: "The isles shall wait for His law." Aye, well, England will be commanded to keep silence shortly. She makes great brag now before the nations of the earth, but she will be compelled to keep silence before the power of Christ which will be exerted with this result: "THE ISLES SHALL WAIT FOR HIS LAW;" not at once. The English people are too fond of their political privileges to give them up at once; they think they have a natural right to be a law-making people. Universal suffrage is a sacred thing with them: the right of the people by the mere vote of majorities to appoint the men who are to make the laws? What is there really sacred in this? The majority are the ignorant, the evil, the unqualified. Why should they give law to intelligence? However, we will not discuss it. That is the theory of things under the British Constitution — government by majority. There will be a change when Christ reigns. "The law shall go forth of Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Micah 4:2), and it will come forth from the Son of David. The British Parliament will be commanded to surrender allegiance to "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah". The isles shall wait for His law.

Another passage that Mr. Hine quotes is Isaiah 42:10: "Sing unto the Lord a new song, and His praise from the end of the earth, ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles, and the inhabitants thereof." Yes: so they will. They sing "Rule Britannia" now, but they will sing "Glory to God in the Highest, peace on earth, good will among men" by-and-bye. "There were great voices in heaven", says John, "saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." That "a new song" shall be sung in these isles does not prove that Israel has anything to do with the isles, except that they are exiles in them — such of them as are here.

#### THE ISLES TO LISTEN AND OBEY.

Isaiah 49:1: "Listen, O isles, unto me", a command to "the isles" to LISTEN: not a proof that they are Israel, but the opposite, for Israel were in their land when these words were uttered. Jer. 31:10: "Hear the Word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it *in the isles* afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." How does that prove that we are Israel? It is rather a command to do what we are doing to-night, to tell this enlightened nation — for, although it is for the most part in the dark in regard to the purposes of God, it is comparatively enlightened and the command is to declare in these islands that it is God's purpose to gather His scattered people, one of whom is placed at the summit of British power for the purpose of developing a situation favourable to the inauguration of the work that will be commenced shortly; had Mr. Gladstone been in power, we should have had no footing in Egypt as proprietors of the Suez Canal, and no footing in Cyprus as protectors of the land which comprehends the Holy Land in which position the Russian power finds us, as described in Ezekiel, the 38th and 39th chapters.

Next, Isaiah 42:12: "Let them give glory unto the Lord and declare His praise *in the islands.*" We may live to see that accomplished, when God's glory will be declared, instead of the glory of man.

And finally, Isaiah 59:18: "To the islands He will repay recompence". What sort of recompence? Well, I could show, if the time allowed of it, that the recompence we shall receive will not be flattering to us, — will not be pleasing to us, — I will indicate the nature of it by reading a single passage from Isaiah 2:12, which will speak for itself: "For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up, and he shall be brought low." At verse 10: "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud", and at verse 16, "upon *all the ships of Tarshish.*" "Thou breakest *the ships of Tarshish,*" we are told in Psalm 48:7, "with an east wind." He *will* break them: for the Hebrew tense is somewhat indefinite, and flexible enough to apply to futurity where that is involved.

Mr. Hine quotes all these passages where "isles" and "islands" are mentioned, to prove that Israel is an island nation. I think you will have seen with how little reason he uses these passages in that way.

#### ENGLAND AND RUSSIA: ANTAGONISTIC POLICY.

Now, the question is: Are those islands the British Islands? The very form of things would show that it is so. I mean as regards the current political situation. Here are England and Russia planted face to face with each other in Asia Minor, because England has undertaken to protect the Asiatic possessions of the Sultan against Russia, so that — as *The Golos* said last week — "the next time Russia goes to war in these parts, it will not be with Turkey but with Great Britain, whom she encounters in the Asiatic part of the Sultan's dominions." This position of things existing at such a time as this would show that it must be England; the ships would show that it must be England. But there is another element in the case that is decisive, and that is the word "Tarshish". I might have said that the phrase "the islands of the sea" shows it is England, because there is no other nation that is an island nation but ourselves.

#### "TARSHISH."

But the next point is Tarshish. Well, how do we apply this to England? By a process of argument arising out of Ezekiel 27:12. This chapter is an address to ancient Tyre, the capital of Phoenicia, the Britain of ancient days — I mean the power that in the ancient world fulfilled the part of England in conducting the traffic of the sea and the business of the world in general. There is a description here of the various markets that were open to her, and the various countries that

traded with her, and in this passage we read: "Tarshish was thy merchant by reason of the multitude of all kinds of riches; with silver, iron, *tin*, and lead, they traded in thy fairs." Now, tin was derived from but one source in those days. The question is: What source was that? Whence was the tin derived that was supplied to the markets of Phoenicia or Tyre, and thence distributed through the world? That is a matter of historical enquiry, and I may say, without going round about, that classic investigation will show that the British Islands were the source from which Phoenician merchants brought the tin that was sold in the Tyrian market and supplied to all the military nations for the alloy in the manufacture of their military and other implements. There was no other known source of supply at the time. The Greeks tried to find out the secret in vain. Herodotus, I think it is, who speaks of the Phoenician ships being chased and rather suffering themselves to be wrecked than disclose the secret.

The very name *Britain* shows it: for you find that in Welsh the word means *the land of metals*, and that in the Phoenician, which is the source of the Welsh, for there can be no doubt that many of the names of capes, mountains, rivers, and so forth in Cornwall, Wales, etc., are Hebrew in form, because they are Syriac, which was allied to the Hebrew, and they are Syriac, because the Phoenicians from Syria were the first trading settlers in the southern parts of Britain, as the extinct mines in Cornwall bear witness to this day. I was about to say: You find the Phoenicians called these islands Baratanac, which came, in the course of ages, to be pronounced Britainic, and gradually softened down to Britain.

"The merchants of Tarshish and all the young lions thereof" were to antagonise Gog, that is Russia, in the latter days. Are we merchants? Yes, the merchant-power of the world. Do lions answer to our political heraldry? Yes; the young lions rampant are the arms of our royal house; and the great lion, the standard of our political constitution. Mr. Hine has made mistaken use of Hebrew resemblances, in the nomenclature of the country, and of the political heraldry of the nation. These matters identify the isles with Britain.

#### ENGLAND NOT ISRAEL, BUT ISRAEL'S SERVANT.

But there is all the difference in the world between this position and Mr. Hine's theory, that there is between master and servant. England is not Israel, but Israel's servant; she will have to bend her back to the King of Israel. Mr. Hine makes it an objection in his books that if we are not Israel, then we shall have to cringe to the Jews. Just so! But God has made choice of our nation to minister to the Jews in the great and marvellous programme that is to be developed upon the earth when Christ arrives; and this surely is a great honour.

#### SOLOMON A TYPE.

We may see an analogy between the state of things foreshown in the prophets, and what existed in the days of Solomon. The events in the ancient history of

Israel were analogies or foreshadowings of future things, as can be shown in many ways. Solomon, the king of Israel, had in Hiram, the king of Tyre, a maritime ally, who placed his ships at his disposal in the building of the temple and the consolidation of the kingdom of David: and England, the latter-day Tyre, with all her vessels, will be placed at the feet of the King of Israel when he arrives to re-establish David's kingdom as the governing instrument of the earth. But before that comes to pass, we have a sea of blood to wade through, just as was the case in David's reign prior to Hiram's assistance; there is to be a time of trouble such as has never been upon the face of the earth. And the source of the trouble is revealed in this, that when the Lord appears in the earth and begins His work with the House of Israel, the nations of the world resist Him. John saw it in vision (Revelation 19:19): the kings of the earth and their armies gathered to fight against Christ. The result of the war is not doubtful; He overcomes them, and in the breaking of their power inflicts that humiliation described by Isaiah, when the power and pride of man everywhere will be broken, and the lofty looks of man brought low, and the Lord alone exalted.

#### THE "ONE HOPE."

Now, it may be said, "What have we to do with all this?" Well, there is a very forcible answer, if there were time to show it. If we are to have any future life, if we are to have any position in the blessedness which God has prepared for His people, if we are to have a share in the salvation covenanted to Israel — *and there is no other salvation under the heavens* — we must be heirs of the kingdom that Christ is to establish at His coming. And who are the heirs? James 2:5: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?" What is faith? Hebrews 11:1: "Faith is the *substance of things hoped for*, the evidence of things not seen." What things hoped for? Any? — any things hoped for? No, no: Paul says in Ephesians 4:4: There is *one* hope. What hope is that? Speaking of salvation in Colossians 1:5, he says: "The hope which is *laid up for you in heaven*, WHEREOF YE HEARD BEFORE IN THE WORD OF THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL." People say, "Ah! there it is: laid up in *heaven*." Yes, it is laid up there, for Christ is there; but it is coming with Him, and when it comes, it will be immortality of nature and a position of power in the Kingdom of God. The first condition of attaining this is, that we must believe in the Gospel, wherein Paul says, the hope is set forth: that Gospel is the Gospel of the Kingdom of God (Acts 28:31; 19:8; 8:12; Matthew 24:14); and no person who is ignorant of the Kingdom of God that is to be established by Christ at His coming can believe the Gospel.

You may believe in the death of Christ; that is only a part of the Gospel. You will find, if you consult many parts of Scripture, two of which I will give — Acts 8:12; 28:31 — that the Gospel is made up of two things: the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ; and in view

of these things you will understand this little circumstance which Mr. Hine could not explain in answer to my question. Acts 28:17: "And it came to pass" — when Paul arrived in Rome — "that after three days, Paul called the chief of the Jews together"; and he said to them, verse 20, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain." The hope of the Gospel is the hope of Israel: the salvation that God is to reveal in the earth by Christ is a Jewish salvation; for, as He said to the Samaritan woman, "Salvation is of the Jews" (John 4:22). Have we Gentiles no hope, then? O yes. How? We who are afar off may be made nigh. By what process? Paul says that we are branches of the wild olive that may be grafted upon the good stock of Abraham, in the belief and obedience of the truth in baptism. He says: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ", and "If ye be Christ's" — and ye may become Christ's by believing the Gospel, and being baptised: there is no other way of being saved — "then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Rom. 11:17; Gal. 3:27-29).

People may laugh at it, they may think it is childish, they may think it too narrow for their enlightened liberality — people who think themselves wise and honourable in raking in the cinder-heaps of antiquarian barbarism and philology, or in the full-blown pride of the nebulous hypotheses manufactured by scientific speculation which changes form and hue every ten years — I say, such people may laugh at the simplicity of these things, and at the faith that builds on Moses, the prophets, and the apostles; but, as the proverb says, "Let those laugh who win". Where will science be, when the Lion of the Tribe of Judah sends His roars throughout the world? Where will ancient lore be, when everlasting life becomes a fact upon the earth, by the power that God has given to Christ? What is the use of a man's fame, and his titles, and his diplomas, when he is on his dying-bed? Of what use are a man's attainments when he is rotting in the cemetery? It is now, as it was in Paul's day, "God knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain."

The first Cause is greater than the phenomena on the surface: men proudly fill themselves with the phenomena; they ignore the fact that the First Cause has spoken. God demands our simple faith and obedience. But all the world has turned its gaze away: they are all following vanity — some in the shape of fleeting pleasure, some in the honours of false or superficial science, some in the gains of the present world. But Christ is coming; He will shiver the kingdoms of the world to atoms; He will abolish the entire system of human society as now constituted. He will establish new heavens and new earth, politically and socially. When the proud sons of mammon, and the science-stuffed *savants* of this God-neglecting generation, shall sleep their perpetual sleep in the grave appointed for all who wander out of the way of understanding, the Son of David will be alive upon earth with His friends of all ages who have honoured Him with faith in His promises and obedience to His commandments; and it is because that absent but coming Christ has commanded His friends to speak these things in His absence — whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear — that these things are now rehearsed in your hearing.

## APPENDIX.

*(Mr. Hine was offered the opportunity of writing an answer to this additional matter, for publication along with it, but did not accept the offer.)*

TIME at the discussion did not allow of the full presentation of the argument in disproof of Mr. Hine's absurd and mischievous theory. Sufficient was advanced to be effective for that purpose, but some parts of the evidence call for a more complete exhibition, and some points require elucidation, and difficulties occurring to those who listened to the Debate have to be considered according to promise. For this purpose an Appendix is added. To keep it within due bounds we must be as epigrammatic and condensed as possible.

### ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

The essence of the Anglo-Israel argument lies in the distinction it makes between the two political sections into which the Hebrew nation was divided in the days of Rehoboam. For the ten-tribe section it claims all blessedness on the strength of promises that speak of "Israel" (in the teeth of the fact that that section of the nation was incurably idolatrous, and that Mr. Hine was compelled to allow in cross-examination, that the term "Israel" applies equally to the two-tribe section); and to the two-tribe section it allots all, or nearly all the curses uttered by the prophets, whether addressed to Israel or Judah. The whole argument is a fundamental mistake. The whole nation of the twelve tribes was under the law of Moses, which made blessing dependent entirely on obedience to its requirements. This is plain from the book of Deuteronomy in particular. Not even Mr. Hine can dispute it. That the curses connected with the breaking of the law applied equally to all the tribes is evident, (1) from the fact that they were addressed to both; (2) from its actual application to both — (*a*) to the ten tribes at and in their deportation; and (*b*) to the two tribes a considerable time afterwards. The schism in the reign of Rehoboam made no difference in the relation of the ten tribes to the principles on which their national existence was founded in the law of Moses. That schism was itself a punishment for infraction of that law (1 Kings 11:9-13), and the total extinction of the kingdom of the ten tribes three hundred years after is expressly declared to have been for the same reason (2 Kings 17:15-18). The House of Judah remained in the land for several centuries afterwards (with the exception of a disciplinarian banishment of seventy years to

Babylon), because with Judah was found some redeeming features (2 Chron. 11:16; Hosea 11:12), and because God proposed the preservation of the line of David till it should be "established for ever" in the person of His promised Son, Jesus (Luke 1:32), to whom is promised the throne of the kingdom in the fulness of the times of restitution (Dan. 7:15; Acts 1:6; Luke 22:28; Acts 3:20, 21). The two houses, however, both proved reprobate, and were subjected to the punishment long threatened. This is effectively exhibited in the parable of the two women (Ezek. 23), of whom it is said (verse 36): "Son of man, wilt thou judge Aholah (Samaria — the capital of the ten tribes — verse 4) and Aholibah (Jerusalem — the capital of the two tribes — verse 4)? Yea, declare unto them their abominations; that they have committed adultery, and blood is in their hands. \* \* \* They have defiled My sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned My sabbaths. \* \* \* Thus saith the Lord God, I will bring up a company upon them, and *will give them to be REMOVED AND SPOILED*" (verses 36-46). Here both are included in the same retribution, the kingdom of the ten tribes (Samaria) and the kingdom of the two (Jerusalem). That both are meant is evident by express comparison earlier in the chapter. The ten tribes had been "removed and spoiled" when the prophet uttered the words: the two tribes were about to be so. Hence the prophet, addressing Jerusalem, says (verse 32): "Thou shalt drink of THY SISTER'S CUP deep and large: thou shalt be laughed to scorn and had in derision; it containeth much. Thou shalt be filled with drunkenness and sorrow, with the cup of astonishment and desolation, *with the cup of thy sister Samaria*" (verses 32, 33). As both are included in the same retribution — (that threatened under their national constitution in case of the disobedience of which they became guilty) — so both are included in the same restoration when the time for that arrives.

Thus in a similar parable, in another chapter (Ezek. 16:53-58). "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and *the captivity of Samaria and her daughters*, THEN will I bring again the captivity of thy (Jerusalem's — verse 3) captives in the midst of them. \* \* \* WHEN thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate, *and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate*, THEN thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate." There is no room here for that setting apart of the ten tribes "unto honour" which the Anglo-Israel theory contends for. Israel and Judah have sinned simultaneously: they are in punishment simultaneously; and they will return to Divine favour simultaneously — viz., to the land in which alone that favour to them is to be enjoyed. Thus the following prophecies will have their natural fulfilment:—

Jeremiah 3:18.—"In those days the *House of Judah* shall walk *with the House of Israel*, and they shall come TOGETHER out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers."

Isaiah 11:12.—"He shall assemble *the outcasts of Israel*, and gather together *the dispersed of Judah* from the four corners of the earth."

Jeremiah 50:4.—"In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, *the children of Israel* shall come, they and *the children of Judah* TOGETHER, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord their God."

Jeremiah 30:3.—"For, lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of *my people Israel and Judah*, saith the Lord: and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it."

Zechariah 10:6.—"I will strengthen *the House of Judah*, and I will save *the House of Joseph*, and I will bring them again to place them: for I have mercy upon them: and they shall be AS THOUGH I HAD NOT CAST THEM OFF."

Ezekiel 39:25.—"Now (in the latter days, see chapter 38:16) will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon *the whole House of Israel*. \* \* \* They shall know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there."

Ezekiel 37:21, 22.—"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: \* \* \* Neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."

The division into two political "houses" was a mere episode in the national history, brought about in punishment of the sins of Solomon. Anglo-Israelism artificially exalts it into a revolution with profound significance. Without reason it claims the conditional oath of favour to twelve-tribed Israel (Deut. 7:12), as the special inheritance of the separated ten tribes — ignoring the fact that the condition of favour has been breached in the constant disobedience of the whole nation, and shutting its eyes to the obvious conclusion, that if its construction of "the oath" were right, the oath ought to have averted the Assyrian captivity, and the many and sore evils into which the ten tribes were brought both before and after that event.

#### THE BLINDNESS OF ISRAEL.

There is an incessant allusion in Anglo-Israel literature to the exiled ten tribes as "the blind people", by which is meant alleged blindness as to their own identity — ignorance as to who they are; and passages are quoted to show that this blindness, as the supporters of the theory contend, was foretold. Nothing could be more absurd than this part of their argument. Such an argument was of course necessary if the theory was to stand at all, because how otherwise could it account for the fact that the English have no history or tradition that could connect them with the ten tribes of Israel? There are passages that use the terms "blind" and

“blindness”; but when we ask for the meaning of the terms, the Anglo-Israel explanation at once disappears. The meaning is explained in too many ways in the Scriptures themselves to admit of any mistake. Paul said that “blindness in part *is happened* unto Israel” (Rom. 11:25). He could not mean they had forgotten who they were, for Mr. Hine himself admits that the ten tribes at that time, “beyond the Euphrates”, had full knowledge of their identity. (Of course! who ever forgot their identity!) It was not literal blindness of eye that was meant, Anglo-Israelites again being witness. The question is: What sort of blindness? The answer is plain: and the following passages contain it:—

2 Cor. 3:13.—“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 veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament*, which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, *the veil is upon their heart.*”

John 9:39.—“For judgment I am come into this world; that they which *see not* might see, and that they which *see might be made blind.*”

John 12:39.—“Therefore they *could not believe*, because that Esaias said again, *He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart: that they should NOT SEE WITH THEIR EYES.*”

Ezekiel 12:2.—“Son of man, thou dwellest in the midst of a rebellious house, *which have eyes to see and see not.*”

Jeremiah 5:21.—“Hear now this, O foolish people, \* \* \* *which have eyes and see not.*”

Acts 28:25.—“Well spake the Holy Spirit by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, \* \* \* *seeing ye shall see, and not perceive.*”

The blindness in the case was mental obtuseness in relation to spiritual things. The reason of such an infliction is plainly set forth in Isaiah 29:13, 14, as follows: “Forasmuch as this people draw near Me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour Me, but *have removed their heart far from Me*, and their fear towards Me is taught by the precept of men: therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for *the wisdom of their wise men shall perish*, and the understanding of the prudent shall be hid.”

A similar result — the judicial infliction of blindness for the misuse of divinely-offered opportunities of enlightenment — has been manifest in the history of the Gentile Christendom, in accordance with Paul’s prediction: “*Because they received not the love of the truth* that they might be saved. For this cause, *God shall send them strong delusion* that they should believe a lie, that they might all be condemned who believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness” (2 Thess. 2:10-12).

The infliction of moral blindness for such a reason is intelligible, but who can think of Mr. Hine’s version of the matter (*the alleged loss of a people’s recollection of who they are*) without amazement: first at the man’s effrontery, who contends without evidence or reason that this is the meaning of the inflicted blindness; and second, at the gullibility of the people which should make serious confutation of his view a necessity. Mr. Hine’s volubility on the blessings that are to result from Britain’s recognition of her (so-called) identity is something phenomenal. One is to be pardoned for thinking of the lunatic asylum as he listens. According to his own showing, Israel was well aware of their identity 1,800 years ago and had been for centuries prior to that. Was the result of their self-knowledge (assuming they ever lost it) so very beneficent to themselves or others as to make its restoration an object of desire?

#### ISRAEL SAVED AND REDEEMED.

It is another constantly iterated assertion of the Anglo-Israelites, that Israel (said to be “lost”) should, when “identified”, be found “a Christian nation”. When proof is asked for this, the interrogator is referred to Isaiah 45:17; “Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end.” If he ask, in what way this proves the proposition which it is adduced to support, there is no reasonable response. The statement that Israel is to be saved (granting for the sake of argument that it meant what Mr. Hine means by being a Christian nation), points to an indefinite futurity. It fixes no time. It certainly has no application to the time when Israel is not saved but “lost”. It is a repetition of the pledge of final blessedness with which the words of the prophets abound with reference to the house of Israel: and as this blessedness is always found associated with national restoration to Palestine, and Christ’s presence as a governor in their midst, it can have no application to the time of their dispersion and darkness and Christ’s absence. A single passage will settle this point: “I will take you (House of Israel — see verse 22) 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”, etc. (Ezekiel 26:24).

Then we are referred to passages which state that Israel is to be “redeemed”; such as “O Israel, fear not, for I have *redeemed* thee: I have called thee by My name, thou art Mine” (Isaiah 43:1). “Return unto Me, for I have *redeemed* thee” (Isaiah 44:22). “The Lord hath *redeemed* His servant Jacob” (48:20). Stress is laid on the word “redeemed” as proving the point. A redeemed nation and a Christian nation are held to be synonymous. This might do very well for a book written in the style of Sunday School Hymns: as applied to the Bible, it is altogether inappropriate and mistaken. The Bible uses the word redeem in its simple sense, and not in the technical sense of clerical theology. It is applied to Israel under

Moses repeatedly. The Egyptian deliverance is promised in this form: "I will *redeem* you with a stretched-out arm" (Exod. 6:6). The deliverance was celebrated in this language: "Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people which Thou hast *redeemed*" (Exod. 15:13). "The Lord hath *redeemed* you out of the house of bond-men, from the king of Egypt" (Deuteronomy 7:8). There are numerous other instances. According to Mr. Hine's contention, these passages would prove that Israel was "a Christian nation" when they came out of Egypt. He says, "redeem" in the prophecies means "redeemed from Moses". If he is right, the passages quoted would show that they were redeemed from Moses in the act of being put under Moses. His theory is altogether artificial and false. It is based on his own dogmatism: and when people are willing to receive the undemonstrated assertions of an uninspired man as truth, they deserve to be deceived, as thousands are by Mr. Hine. "Redeem" in the prophecies is used in the sense of "deliver", without reference to the particular mode of deliverance adopted in given cases. Deliverance by Moses was redemption in one case; deliverance by Christ will be redemption in the other; but what has this to do with defining the state of Israel while they are in the dispersed and depraved position from which they are to be delivered?

#### THE TRIBE OF BENJAMIN.

Of all the gratuitous and ingenious shifts to which the exigencies of the Anglo-Israel theory drive its supporters, none is more extraordinary or inconsistent with facts than that which makes Benjamin one of the ten tribes left in the House of Judah as "gospel-bearers".

*Benjamin was not one of the ten tribes.* This is proved in a variety of ways. To Jeroboam, the first king of the separated tribes, ten tribes were promised: e.g. "Take thee (Jeroboam) *ten pieces* (of the rent garment), 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." No one believing the Scriptures will say that this promise was not fulfilled; consequently, in the absence of further information, we should be bound to assume that Jeroboam received ten tribes. But there is not an absence of information. The ten tribes given to Jeroboam are all casually mentioned in the course of Israel's history. The enumeration of the references will be found in the course of the Debate. *Benjamin is not among them.* But, more conclusive still, if that be possible, is the statement that Rehoboam, son of Solomon, after the revolt of Jeroboam, "had Judah AND BENJAMIN *on his side*" (2 Chron. 11:12).

Then, on the question of so-called light-bearing, the evidence is entirely against Mr. Hine's hypothesis. The tribe of Benjamin did not distinguish themselves in the kingdom of Judah for the maintenance of Divine light. On the contrary, they are declared at a certain stage to have been without a righteous man among them.

Thus: "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem (one of the cities of Benjamin — Josh. 18:21, 28) and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, *if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment that seeketh the truth*, and I will pardon it; \* \* \* thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return. \* \* \* Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord; shall not My soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" (Jer. 5:1, 3, 5). Mr. Hine, as was evident during the Debate, had overlooked the circumstance that Jerusalem was one of the cities of Benjamin, and that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were "children of Benjamin" (Jer. 6:1). Consequently, his Benjamite light-bearing theory suffers some embarrassment in presence of the prophet's declaration that "they are all grievous revolters, walking with slanders: they are brass and iron; they are all corrupters. Reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them" (Jer. 6:28, 30). He might attempt to evade the force of this by saying the so-called light-bearing was to be performed in the days of Christ, but there is no escape. He is confronted here by Christ's apostrophe to these same Benjamite inhabitants of Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate", etc. (Luke 13:34).

#### A LIGHT FOR THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

Mr. Hine has altogether blundered on this question of "light". He hangs his fancy on this subject on God's declaration by the prophet to Jeroboam, when intimating the coming disruption of the kingdom of David. "Unto his (David's) son will I give one tribe, *that David, My servant, may have A LIGHT *always before Me in Jerusalem**" (1 Kings 11:36). To make this mean "gospel-bearing" is preposterous. It was David that was to have "a light" — not the people; and the political sense of this is settled by the frequent illustrations that occur throughout the Scriptures. Thus, when David had exposed himself to danger in battle, the people dissuaded him from further risks, "That thou quench not *the light* of Israel"; or, as in verse 17, "the lamp of Israel", that is, the political light of the nation. Thus, concerning the reign of Abijam, one of David's successors, who was permitted to reign, though unworthy, we read in 1 Kings 15:4, "Nevertheless, for David's sake, did the Lord his God give him *a lamp in Jerusalem* TO SET UP HIS SON AFTER HIM." Of the same matter, in another relation, we read in Psa. 132:17, "There (in Zion) will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine Anointed. His enemies will I clothe with shame; but *upon himself shall his crown flourish.*"

## WHY ONE TRIBE.

There remains the question why the giving of one tribe to the House of Judah was necessary to preserve the light of the House of David. An obvious explanation is perceived when it is realised that Jerusalem, the seat of the kingdom, where the temple stood and the royal house reigned, was in the tribe of Benjamin, and if this had gone over to Jeroboam, Jeroboam would have taken his seat on the throne of David to the complete extinction of David's house. God's purpose to preserve the House of David required Jerusalem to be exempt from the effects of the revolt, and therefore that Benjamin, in which Jerusalem was situate, should remain with Judah. Standing in Jerusalem, the historian was standing in Benjamin, and could naturally say that none followed the royal city but the tribe of Judah only. From another point of view, contemplating Judah as the House of David, the prophet who foretold the disruption to Jeroboam, could with equal naturalness speak of one tribe being given to David. In this way the whole twelve tribes find appropriate, though not verbally visible, place in the prophet's discourse. Ten were given to Jeroboam; one (Benjamin) given to David (who stood for Judah, the remaining tribe): total, 12.

## THE POSITION OF LEVI.

Levi was not reckoned among the twelve tribes in the national constitution. This was abundantly proved in the Debate. They stood legally obliterated under the circumstances detailed in the following passage: "Thou shalt separate the Levites from among the Children of Israel: and the Levites shall be Mine. \* \* \* For they are wholly given unto Me from among the Children of Israel; instead of such as open every womb, even instead of the first-born of all the Children of Israel have I taken them unto Me. For all the first-born of the Children of Israel are Mine, both men and beast, on the day that I smote every first-born in the land of Egypt I SANCTIFIED THEM FOR MYSELF" (Num. 8:14-17). For further testimony on the point Num. 3:6, 9, 12, 13; 2:33; Exod. 13:2, 11-13; Num. 18:2, 20, may be referred to.

This Divine absorption, so to speak, of a whole tribe, left a blank in the national number of twelve tribes. This was filled up by dividing Joseph into two tribes — Ephraim and Manasseh, his two sons (Josh. 14:4). Thus was Joseph, the excellent and approved of God, specially honoured in the national constitution, and the tribes brought to the required number of twelve. Where, however, the race of Israel, without reference to its political constitution is represented, Levi is restored to his place and Ephraim and Manasseh merged in Joseph, as in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:28), of Moses (Deut. 33:1), the naming of the gates of Jerusalem in the future age (Ezek. 48:31), and, with a slight modification, in the symbolic sealing of the 144,000 "out of all the tribes of Israel" (Rev. 7:4).

When these matters are understood, the Anglo-Israel motion about Benjamin being one of the ten tribes, and Manasseh not having a place among the twelve, will disappear like mist before the sun, and with them the extraordinary exegetical artifices by which its supporters seek to divert the application of the term Israel to the nation of the Jews.

## ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE SEED OF DAVID.

Mr. Hine finds it necessary to say the seed of David did not go to Babylon at the captivity (*Cui Bono*, page 17). The simple confutation of this statement is to be found on the very first page of the New Testament. Matthew, in his first verse, introduces Jesus Christ as "the son of David, the son of Abraham" (chap. 1:1). To prove that He is so, he subjoins the line of descent from Abraham to Christ. Where is that line at the time of the Babylonish captivity? The answer is found in verse 11: "Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon: and AFTER THEY WERE BROUGHT TO BABYLON, Jechonias begat Salathiel, and Salathiel begat Zorobabel", etc. Therefore the seed of David *did* go to Babylon, Mr. Hine's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. Of course, he means the daughters of Zedekiah who were carried to Egypt, about whom he has a liking for some Irish legends which gave him a pretext for flattering Queen Victoria as an alleged descendant of David. But even if the legends were true, it would not help him, for blood descent is counted by the male line, and even if a female were an admissible link, Zedekiah's daughter would be of no use to him, because the "legitimate succession", on which Mr. Hine lays stress, lay with Jechoniah, who went to Babylon with Nebuchadnezzar, and not with Jechoniah's uncle, who was placed on the throne by Nebuchadnezzar to serve Nebuchadnezzar's ends. This is proved by the ignoring of Zedekiah in Matthew's genealogy, and also by the ordinary laws of descent, for while David's line is transmitted on the male side through Jechoniah, it came to an end in Zedekiah's family by the slaughter of all his sons and his own death afterwards (Jer. 52:10, 11). Jer. 22:30, directed against Jechoniah, did not exclude him from the ancestry of Christ. It merely decreed his own and his family's perpetual exclusion from the throne under the established system of things. The decree was carried out, for, though David's seed was preserved in his line, none of his family ever again occupied the throne which he had occupied for a brief space of time, and from which he was deposed by Nebuchadnezzar.

Mr. Hine's assertion that the seed of David was not in Palestine in the days of Christ is overthrown by the foregoing evidence. Christ is the converging and finishing point of David's line. Of Christ Himself, it is many times testified that he is "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3; 2 Timothy 2:8; Acts 13:23; 2:29; Luke 1:32; Matthew 21:15; Revelation 22:16). No better illustration can be given of the pernicious tendency of this Anglo-Israelism than the fact that it

invalidates the position of the Lord Jesus, as the promised seed of David, to occupy his throne as defined in these passages. The House of David was preserved in existence till Christ was born. Thus has been fulfilled the Divine purpose that David should "always have a man to sit on his throne". His throne is for a time in the dust but a son lives who shortly comes to raise it from the dust and "build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen" (Amos 9:11).

And what can we say to Mr. Hine's assertion that the 2nd Psalm does not refer to Christ. (*Cui Bono*, page 16.) It is not easy to treat such a statement with patience in view of the fact that apostolic authority has declared it does (Acts 13:33; 4:24, 28). It is difficult to acquit Mr. Hine of the charge of either gross ignorance of the Scriptures or wilful perversion of facts.

#### THE IDOLATROUS BRITONS AND THE BRITISH TONGUE.

His treatment of other points is similar. Why do the English not circumcise? Why are they not divided into ten tribes? Oh, says Mr. Hine, because Paul who taught them Christianity taught them to abandon circumcision and tribeship when their ancestors were located in Asia Minor (*Identifications*, pages 6 and 9). Then, if Paul taught them Christianity so completely as to cause them to abandon circumcision and tribeship, how came they to be in such a benighted condition when they arrived in Britain, as Danes and Saxons, as Mr. Hine has it, worshipping Wodin, and practising idolatrous rites, having no knowledge of Paul or God or Israel, and requiring to be "converted to Christianity"? To this there is an incoherent answer to the effect that "God Almighty required them to arrive here in an idolatrous state". There is not a particle of evidence in support of the answer. We could not discuss the question gravely were it not for the fact of people believing such outrageous nonsense.

Why do we not speak Hebrew? Oh, because God said to Israel, "With stammering lips and another tongue, will I speak to this people" (Isaiah 28:11). You mean English? Yes. When has God spoken to anybody in English — British, or anybody else? Oh, by the clergy! missionary operations. But clergymen and missionaries are not inspired. They merely retail what they have learnt, whether true or false. That is not God speaking. But we do not require to discuss the question. Paul has settled it and he is a rather better authority than Mr. Hine. Paul quotes the prophecy and applies it (1 Corinthians 14:21) to the miraculous speaking with foreign languages, which was one of the features of the apostolic ministry directed towards Israel (Acts 2:1-12; 1 Cor. 14:22). English had no existence when the prophecy which Mr. Hine prostitutes was fulfilled.

#### MR. HINE ANSWERS HIMSELF.

Inconsistently enough, while professing to account for the supposed total obliteration of the Hebrew tongue among the English by a predicted miracle, he tries to found an argument for our Israelitish identity on alleged Hebrew features in our names and dictionaries, and talks of Hebrew roots and Hebrew peculiarities, Hebrew features in our institutions — such as the Sabbath, the Ritualistic fondness for the Eastward Position, Hebrew phraseology in our Prayer Book, etc. Anything Hebrew he may discover in any of these items he unwittingly accounts for, in trying to fence off an argument for identification with the Samaritans who exhibited Hebrew peculiarities in their ways. He says (*Oxford Wrong*, page 174): "Thus, these Gentile people, now inhabiting the cities that Israel once dwelt in, the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali, were brought up in the Mosaic service of Israel; taught to speak of Abraham as 'our father Abraham', the homely phrases of Israel becoming their household words: just exactly as in the same manner and sense, one of their very descendants in our Lord's time, a purely Gentile woman, the 'woman of Samaria' asked him, 'Art thou greater than our father Jacob', etc. An argument good for the Samaritans is good for the British. Considering that, by means of the Bible, the British have been "brought up" in the admiration of Hebrew names and ways and principles; what marvel if Hebrew traces are discoverable in our family pedigrees and our ecclesiastical phraseology and institutions? Mr. Hine answers himself, if answer were needed.

#### THE NON-JEWISH PHYSIOGNOMY OF THE BRITISH.

Why do we not show the Hebrew physiognomy? Here there was a roar of ironical triumph from Mr. Hine's sympathisers. They thought the interrogator had put his foot in a quagmire. They seemed to say: "Is that all you know? Are you not aware that the Jewish physiognomy is not the standard of Israelitish physiognomy? Do you not know that the Jews had their faces changed because they crucified Christ?" On what is this astounding suggestion founded? On one passage, and one passage only, which Mr. Hine introduces in this way (*Oxford Wrong*, page 159): "Prior to the crucifixion they (the Jews) could have passed anywhere without even being known, except by their Mosaic observances. After the crucifixion their recognition was to be universal, and how was this to be effected? Only by the mark of God being fixed upon them: their physical type was now to be re-cast — to undergo an entire change. \* \* \* Scripture is so explicit upon this point, for speaking alone to Judah, and not to Israel, in a passage where Judah is directly mentioned by name, without any reference to Israel at all, we are told: 'Judah is fallen: because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord to provoke the eyes of His glory, the show of their countenance shall witness against them' (Isaiah 3:8-9). Thus from this time they became a marked people, that they



might be recognised anywhere, and this was to be done by the show of their countenance being the tell-tale, witnessing against themselves, which was a new sign, a new mark that they had not previously borne." The first thing to be remarked upon this extraordinary piece of exegetical dogmatism is that the passage is incorrectly and incompletely quoted, with the effect of declaring a different thing from what the passage declares as it stands in the Bible. Whether this was an effect intended by Mr. Hine or not, we leave others to decide. The passage as quoted is made to threaten a certain "show of countenance" as a future visitation in punishment of sin. The passage as it stands in the Bible does no such thing: as will be seen by its full quotation as follows:—

"Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen; *because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of His glory.* The show of their countenance doth (not "shall") witness against them: and they declare their sin as Sodom, *they hide it not.*"

Mr. Hine, in his quotation of this, mutilates and alters the construction of the opening sentence, and in the second sentence he alters a word. This is a fact self-evident to the reader. On the meaning of the fact we need not comment: the result is to enable him to get an apparent sanction to his preposterous answer to the very palpable objection to his theory, that the British show no trace of Hebrew extraction in their physiognomy, which the Jews do. An apparent sanction only. The meaning of the passage is plain on the face of it. The "show of their countenance" is not introduced as a threatened punishment, but as an actual manifest token of their guilt. The prophet's own periphrasis — which Mr. Hine suppresses — proves it: "They declare their sin as Sodom: *THEY HIDE IT NOT.*" This is the idea of the verse — that transgression, as the cause of the national ruin, was palpable in the very face of the people. A verse or two further on informs us that "the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with *stretched forth necks and WANTON EYES.*" On the same subject, Jeremiah 3:3 declares: "Thou hadst a whore's forehead, *thou refusedst to be ashamed.*"

If the people who roared out their defiant response to the question about Jewish physiognomy had known the facts of the case, they would not have involved themselves in the disgrace of this "wresting of the Scriptures", this "handling of the Word deceitfully", of which both Peter and Paul make mention.

#### "A COMPANY OF NATIONS"

Mr. Hine complained that no notice had been taken of his argument on God's promise to Jacob, that "a nation, and a company of nations, would be of him" (Gen. 35:11). No notice was taken of this, — first, because of the abundance of other matter to be dealt with; and, secondly, because the argument had been answered in the Memorial Hall Lecture published prior to the discussion. There is

really nothing of an Anglo-Israel value in the argument. Before it could be of any value in this direction, it would have to be shown that its fulfilment was to transpire during the time of Israel's exile from their land. This cannot be done. The reverse can be shown, and has been shown in the course of the Debate. Even the context of the promise shows it, for there immediately follow these words: "And *the land* which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land", showing that possession of the land is collateral with the promise of development into "a nation and a company of nations". There is nothing in the promise, in a chronological sense, to fix the time of the promise. We must therefore be guided by the facts of the case elsewhere obtainable. These present themselves in two phases. First, there is the accomplished performance of the promise, when Israel were in their land; and, second, there is the more glorious performance in "the time of restitution spoken of by the prophets", when Jesus will no longer remain away from the earth, but return to occupy the throne of David, and rule all nations in subjection to that throne. As regards the first accomplishment, Israel (that is, Jacob — for Israel was Jacob's added name) grew into "a nation, and a company of nations", that is, a nation which was a company of nations, a nation divinely organised in twelve sub-nationalities or tribes, having each a princely head, in subjection to the authority of God emanating from the oracular mercy seat in the Mosaic tabernacle.

The idea is better expressed by the translation adopted by some Hebraists — "a nation, *even* a company of nations." This translates the Hebrew particle *wav* in an expletive instead of a conjunctive sense. That this rendering is admissible is shown by its adoption in other instances in the common version, such as 1 Sam. 28:3; "All Israel buried Samuel in Ramah, *even (wav)* in his own city"; and Mal. 3:1; "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, *even (wav)* the messenger of the covenant." Doubtless the particle is most commonly used in a conjunctive sense, but these illustrations show that an expletive sense must be allowed where the sense requires it. Otherwise we should make Israel bury Samuel in two places at once, *i.e.*, "in Ramah *and* in his own city". In the case of "a nation *and* a company of nations", it is a question of what the facts are. We must not subordinate the facts to an assumed sense of a variable Hebrew particle: the facts must determine the sense. The facts are obvious. Jacob became a nation, *even* a company of nations.

Suppose, however, for the sake of argument, we were compelled to take it with the sense contended for by Anglo-Israelism: "a nation *and* a company of nations", that is, nations besides the nation, the Anglo-Israelite view, that it means England and her colonies, would not be proved. It would still have to be proved first that the present time is the time contemplated in the prophecy. This cannot be done, as has been already made apparent, for now is the time of dispersion and down-treading, as evidenced by the state of the land which is the basis of the whole matter. We should therefore have to seek in Israel's prophetic

futurity a state of things answering to the terms. And in this there would be no difficulty: for what do we find? That in that day "Many nations shall be joined unto the Lord" (Zech. 2:11); when "The Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: the strangers shall be *joined with them*, and they shall cleave to the House of Jacob" (Isaiah 14:1); that "Many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord" (Zech. 8:22). "All the nations shall be gathered \* \* \* to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart" (Jer. 3:17).

Here is a prospect fully answering to the most ample construction that could be put upon "a nation and a company of nations." All the nations of the world united in one political family with the House of Israel, in subjection to the throne of David, would surely be quite as good a counterpart to the Anglo-Israelite view of the prophecy in question as the more limited and vastly less interesting picture of Britain and her colonies. If it be insisted on that the company of nations must be lineal descendants of Jacob, and not political subordinates, it has to be pointed out that the Anglo-Israelites make no difficulty on this point in their application of the prophecy to the British colonies. The large numbers of French in Canada, Germans and Irish in the United States (Manasseh, according to Mr. Hine!), the Dutch and Danes in other colonies, are made no difficulty in the way of claiming these countries, which have but a weak English element in the population, as the "company of nations". If it is no difficulty in the one case, it can be none in the other; for all nations under Christ will be ruled by Israelites, natural and adopted, His own immortal friends of all ages; and there will be a large element of Jewish population in honourable circulation among them in the altered circumstances that will then have come to Zion (Isaiah 61:9; Zeph. 3:19, 20).

#### THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S PUNISHMENT.

Among the many self-stultifications of the Hine theory, the most glaring instance, perhaps, is furnished by its selection of A.D. 1840 as the terminal point of Israel's "seven times" of punishment for their sin. (See *Oxford Wrong*, page 151.) If Israel's punishment lasted till then, how can England be Israel, seeing that the punishment, as defined in the very Scripture from which the "seven times" measurement is taken (Lev. 21:21) was to consist of dispersion among the heathen (verse 33), weakness and faintness of condition (36), with no power to stand before their enemies (37)? To meet this, we have an extraordinary declaration, completely nullifying the idea of Israel's punishment lasting till A.D. 1840, or any other time, that Israel in Britain (!) is not liable to punishment (*Cui Bono*, page 9); that no amount of national abomination can cancel the oath of blessing! Here the badness of Anglo-Israelism appears. If no amount of abomination can alienate Britain from Divine favour, what effect is the idea likely to produce on the English

people? The idea is as monstrous as it is untrue, even supposing the utterly unsupported identity of the English with Israel. If the idea were correct, the expatriation of the ten tribes ought never to have taken place. Punishment ought never to have taken place at any time. The "oath" of Mr. Hine's argument ought to have averted all calamities for their sins. God has not changed. He cannot change. His principles of action towards His responsible creatures are always the same. The very oath of favour was conditional on obedience (Deut. 4:29-31). Jehovah's own declaration to Jeremiah is destructive of Mr. Hine's "no-amount-of-abomination" gloss, viz., "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build, and to plant it; *if it do evil in My sight, that it obey not My voice, I WILL REPENT OF THE GOOD WHEREWITH I SAID I WOULD BENEFIT THEM*" (Jer. 18:9). The true relation of Israel to the blessings that might have been theirs are pathetically set forth in the following quotations, which of themselves completely overthrow Mr. Hine's demoralising "no-amount-of-abomination" theory: "Oh that thou hadst hearkened to My commandments! THEN had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea: thy seed also *had been* as the sand, and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof" (Isaiah 48:18). "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight" (Deut. 32:29, 30). "Oh that My people had hearkened unto Me, and Israel had walked in My ways! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned My hand against their adversaries" (Psa. 81:13, 14).

#### "THE ISLES".

Mr. Hine's argument on this subject will be found answered in the Lecture on the "True Position of Britain". There is just one feature of the case not developed in that Lecture. If Israel is found "a Christian nation in the isles" when Christ comes, how are we to understand statements which show that the inhabitants of the isles are at that time to receive severe treatment that they may be brought to the knowledge of God; .e.g., "I will send a fire on Magog, and on THEM THAT DWELL CARELESSLY IN THE ISLES; and they shall know that I am the Lord" (Ezek. 39:6). The context shows this to apply to the latter days and the appearing of Christ. Again, "I will send those that escape of them to the nations \* \* \* to the isles afar off, that have not heard My fame, neither have seen My glory" (Isaiah 66:19). Verse 15 of the chapter shows it to refer to the appearing of Christ. The isles in the case include Britain unquestionably; but they are isles inhabited not by a Divine and obedient Israel, but by a proud and careless race who require to be enlightened on the first principles of the Oracles of God.

## ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND ROMANS 11.

No amount or intensity of animadversion would be too severe for Mr. Hine's treatment of the eleventh chapter of Romans and its context. He borrows the name of his magazine from Rom. 11:15. The verse reads: "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*?" The last four words constitute the name in question. He claims the verse for the ten tribes, and dilates wondrously on the strength of it, on the effects that are to flow from his so-called identification, which he understands Paul to mean by "the receiving of them." With his foolish interpretation of a statement of Paul's, no fault might particularly be found; but what are we to say to his deliberate evasion of the results involved in his own interpretation? If the "them" of verse 15, are the ten tribes, so are the "them" of verse 11 — for Paul has introduced no new "them" between. We ask Mr. Hine, therefore, how the fall of the ten tribes in Paul's time brought salvation to the Gentiles, when, according to him, the ten tribes did not fall, but received the gospel and began their career of blessing? and what Paul means by saying in verse 7 that the same "Israel had not obtained what he sought for", and in chap. 9:31, that the same Israel had not attained to righteousness but had stumbled at Christ? To this Mr. Hine replies that in these cases Paul means the Jews. Why? Mr. Hine has no reason to give — merely his *ipse dixit*, and that against manifest reason in the case, as any reader may satisfy himself by reading the chapter. No doubt Paul means the Jews, but in that case he means the Jews in verse 15 as well, where he is speaking of the same people, and where Mr. Hine claims, not only without evidence — but against the evidence, he is speaking of the ten tribes. Such a treatment of Scripture reminds us of the statement Mr. Hine made in the course of the Debate about Josephus, that he believed in him only in so far as he suited his purpose! It is a kind of interpretation that is unworthy of serious refutation. We would not condescend to notice it, were it not for the numbers who are being misled by him to their hurt.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In fulfilment of the promise made at the close of the Debate, a few pages are added for the consideration of objections and difficulties brought forward by individual correspondents. Most of them will be found already dealt with in the Appendix. Where this is the case, it will not be necessary to do more than refer to the answer already written.

First comes the letter of Mr. H.S. Icke, as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—At the close of the Debate, in Exeter Hall, you kindly promised to answer questions on the Anglo-Israel controversy in an appendix to the report of the discussion about to be published. For the sake of distinction I refer to the ten-tribed kingdom as "Ephraim-Israel", and the two-tribed kingdom as "Judah-Israel". A reply to the following queries would much oblige.

Yours truly, H.S. ICKE.

[Then follow the queries, which, for the sake of clearness, we shall set forth one by one with the answers,]

1.—Do you think the promises given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of their seed becoming "a great nation", "as the dust of the earth", as "a nation and a company of nations", as "possessing the gate of his enemies", have been fulfilled in the past history of the Hebrew race in the Land of Palestine, which was only about the size of Wales?

ANSWER:—There was doubtless a fulfilment of these promises in the history of Israel, under Moses, and the succeeding judges and kings. Thus, Moses said to them, on the eve of their entering into the land, under Joshua: "The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Deuteronomy 1:10). "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with three-score and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Deuteronomy 10:22). "What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day"? (Deuteronomy 4:8). The conclusion is further evident from the precise statement made concerning the subjugation of the land by Joshua, and its division for inheritance among the tribes: "The Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. *There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the House of Israel*" (Joshua 21:43).

But there is a coming fulfilment on a larger scale, as we learn from the prophets

and apostles. This coming fulfilment will result in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. See remarks in Appendix on "The Company of Nations", page 138.

2.—*Do you not think that the present position England occupies in the world, as Great Britain, with her numerous colonies, literally "a company of nations", possessing "the gates of her enemies" (defensive positions constantly spoken of in the secular press as "gates", "gateways", "keys") in all parts of the world, as already to be numbered by tens of millions, and increasing in a greater ratio than any other race — would be a grander exemplification of the fulfilment of these God-given promises, than any that have yet been realised in the past history of the recognised Hebrew race?*

ANSWER:—It cannot be that the position of England is the position assigned to Israel in the futurity of unfulfilled prophecy; for this simple reason, that both Israel and the nations associated with her in that unfulfilled prophecy are exhibited as subject to the direct authority of God, ministered by a Son of David reigning in Jerusalem (Jer. 3:17; 23:5; Isaiah 24:23; Isaiah 9:6, 7; Micah 4:1-8); with the result of all nations abandoning war and living together in a condition of enlightenment and love, and a resultant state of blessedness and peace (Isaiah 2:1-4; 11:1-8; 25:6-9; 32:1; and many other places).

England is a purely human government and the state of things among her populations makes the hearts of good men groan. As for the "gates", while the secular press may speak of defensive positions in this way, we are not to conclude that these are what the Bible means when it speaks of gates. We must not govern the Bible by modern idioms, but subject our modern speech and notions to Bible usage. The "priest" of the Bible is not the cowed creature of modern ecclesiasticism. The "gates" of Scripture are not what men may choose to call gates now. It is a metaphor derived from the fact that the gate in ancient cities was the place of authority and power. To possess the gate of your enemies was to possess, not a defensive position in their territories, but to possess the territories themselves. Any reasonable man may satisfy himself of the truth of these statements by a comparison of the following passages: Deut. 16:18; Obadiah 13; Isaiah 14:31; 24:12; Psa. 69:12; 107:16; 118:20; Micah 1:9; Prov. 14:19; 24:7; 31:23; Jer. 39:3; Dan. 2:49. For the seed of Israel to possess the gate of their enemies, is for Israel to have dominion over all nations under Christ, as expressed in Isaiah 60:12. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (This is after Christ has come: see preceding chapter, verse 20, and same chapter — 60, verse 1). Or as it is expressed in Micah 5:8; "The remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep \* \* \* *Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries*, and all thine enemies shall be cut off". (This is when Christ reigns: see verse 2, applied in the New Testament to Christ, Matt. 2:5.) For further remarks, in answer to this question, see Preface.

3.—*Have the blessings pronounced upon Joseph, Ephraim, and Manasseh, by Jacob and Moses, been fulfilled? If so, when and how?*

ANSWER:—They have partly been fulfilled in the accomplished history of Israel, but will receive a more striking and complete fulfilment when the kingdom is restored to Israel under Christ and the apostles (Luke 22:28, 29). Joseph (who is represented by his sons Ephraim and Manasseh) held prominent and honourable place in the national constitution and history under the first covenant, and will do the same under the second. The proof is contained in the matter furnished in the answer to questions 1 and 2, and in sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Appendix, and in several parts of the Debate.

4.—*Was the separation of Ephraim-Israel from Judah-Israel a Divine arrangement?*

ANSWER:—Yes, as a punishment for Solomon's sins (1 Kings 11:31-33).

5.—*From the time of the disruption, have the two houses had a separate history, and are they still dis-united?*

ANSWER:—They have had a separate history since the time of the disruption, and they are still dis-united, except in so far as small parts are interfused in the dispersion, after the illustration of 2 Chron. 11:16; Luke 2:36; Acts 1; Acts 2:5, 9-11. In the bulk they are still dis-united.

6.—*Does the term Ephraim in Isaiah 7:8, and many other places that might be mentioned, refer to the tribe singly or to the ten-tribed kingdom, of which Ephraim was the head?*

ANSWER:—It refers to the ten-tribed kingdom.

7.—*Can you explain why the promises of temporal power, prosperity, and greatness, are so much spoken of in connection with Ephraim, when, in this advanced period of the world's history, the only recognised seed of Israel are the Jews — "few in number" — scattered throughout the world without a country and a house of their own?*

ANSWER:—Here it would have been well to have tried to give illustrations. It is not the fact that the promises of temporal power, etc., are spoken of in connection with Ephraim to the exclusion of Judah. They are both always associated in these promises. For proof, we refer to section 1 in the Appendix, "Judah and Israel", and to the Debate generally.

8.—*Because the judgments denounced by Moses were addressed to the twelve tribes united, does it necessarily follow that both houses must now be under the curses in their divided state?*

ANSWER:—Unquestionably; because their division (itself a punishment as already proved) did not alter the relation of either part to the national constitution in which they stood under Moses.

9.—*Was Ephraim-Israel involved in the guilt of crucifying the Lord, and in the curse invoked, "His blood be on us and on our children?"*

ANSWER:—No: but that was only one item in a long course of disobedience, spread over centuries. The judgment that came was not in punishment of the Lord's rejection as a single act, but in retribution for the iniquity of which that was the last filling drop of the cup. So Christ says: "Fill ye up then *the measure of your fathers*, \* \* \* that upon you may come *all the righteous blood shed upon the earth*. \* \* \* ALL THESE THINGS shall come upon this generation" (Matthew 23:32, 35, 36). See also the parable recorded Matthew 21:33-41. Ephraim's cup was full much earlier than Judah's; for the history of the ten tribes was an unmixed history of idolatry and wickedness: therefore their punishment came seven centuries sooner; and they remain in dispersion till He come whose duty it is to "raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel" (Isaiah 49:6).

10.—*You admit that the Jews to this hour reject the Messiah: but can you prove that the Gospel never reached Ephraim-Israel, over whom Jehovah yearned with such pathetic tenderness, and that they never accepted?*

ANSWER:—The Gospel was certainly preached by the apostles to all Israel, who were in their days commonly known as Jews throughout the world. The proof is contained in the Discussion and Appendix. It exists furthermore in such a statement as that of Paul, that the Gospel "was (in his day) preached to *every creature which is under heaven*" (Col. 1:23); also in the information that Israel was present at Pentecost from the countries where the ten tribes were. (See Acts 2:5, 9, 22.) Speaking expressly of Israel (Rom. 10) Paul says, "Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world" (verse 18). There is not only this evidence that the Gospel was preached to Israel, but there is evidence that they rejected it. The book of Acts is full of it, and much could be quoted. Let Paul's simple statement suffice: "As concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes" (Rom. 11:28). "Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; *because of unbelief, THEY WERE BROKEN OFF*, and thou standest by faith" (verses 19, 20). "Through *their fall* salvation is come unto the Gentiles" (verse 11). Mr. Hine claims that the ten tribes are spoken of in verse 15. Consequently, these statements made concerning those who are spoken of in verse 15, proves that the Gospel was preached to the ten tribes and rejected by them.

11.—*If they accepted it, can you tell me why they should not come under blessings?*

ANSWER:—Answered in reply to the last. But even if they had accepted, blessings would not have followed. Acceptance of the Gospel does not ensure present blessedness, except in a prospective sense: "He lifted up His eyes on *His disciples*, and said \* \* \* Blessed are ye that *hunger now*: for ye shall be filled" (Luke 6:20, 21). "We must *through much tribulation* enter into the Kingdom of

God" (Acts 14:22; 1 Pet. 1:6, 7; 4:13, and many other places). The blessedness offered in the Gospel is not national and present, but individual and future.

12.—*Was Jesus sent to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel"? Is He exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins? Was He "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law?"*

ANSWER:—Yes.

13.—*If so, can you explain how it is that our Saviour's special mission for nearly 2,000 years has been an utter failure (I speak reverently) inasmuch as the only recognised seed of Israel — the Jews — reject Him to this day?*

ANSWER:—That it was to be for a time an apparent "utter failure" is prophetically recognised. In a beautiful prophecy concerning "Him whom may despiseth, Him whom the nation abhorreth" (Isaiah 49:7); who of course is no other than the Man of Sorrows, having the name Israel as well as other names; He is represented as saying, "I have laboured in vain: I have spent My strength for nought and in vain" (verse 4). It is recorded in the New Testament that "He came to His own and His own received Him not" (John 1:11). In His own parable of the vineyard, He represents the keepers of it saying among themselves as He approached, "This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and seize on *his inheritance*. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him" (Matt. 21:38). The cause of the failure is defined by Paul (Acts 28:27), in quoting from Isaiah, "The heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed." The providential object accomplished in Israel's rejection of the offered mercy is described by him in the words he immediately adds: "Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto THE GENTILES, and that *they will hear it*." The matter is further clearly presented in what he says to the Romans (11:11, 15): "Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather, *through their fall* salvation is come unto the Gentiles. \* \* \* *If the casting away of them* be THE RECONCILING OF THE WORLD, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

But the failure is only temporary. Christ returns anon. The heavens hold Him only "till the time of restitution" (Acts 3:19, 20); and then His whole work shall have its glorious issue in the bringing back of Jew and Gentile to God, to walk in ways of wisdom, righteousness, prosperity, and peace. "And so all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11:26); and the "Gentiles shall come from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit" (Jeremiah 16:19; 3:17).

14.—*Can you tell me what nation was referred to in Matthew 21:43; "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof?"*

ANSWER: Christ settles it in Luke 12:32: "Fear not, little flock (His disciples), for it is your Father's good pleasure to give YOU the kingdom." They are to reign

with Christ in the kingdom of Israel, and bring forth the fruit in glory to God and blessing to men (Matthew 19:27; Luke 22:28). Thus the kingdom taken from the Scribes and Pharisees will be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. The people of Christ are styled a nation — an holy nation (1 Peter 2:9) and “the righteous nation *which keepeth* THE TRUTH” (Isaiah 26:2). The brethren of Christ are to be “kings and priests unto God, and to reign with Him on the earth” (Revelation 1:6; 5:1). The basis of this reigning is the kingdom restored to Israel, which they are to possess and administer (Acts 1:6; Luke 1:32; 22:28; Daniel 7:15-27).

15.—*Can you tell me where is the place — the safe retreat — appointed by God for His people Israel, as mentioned by Nathan in 2 Samuel 7:10: “Moreover, I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more”?*

ANSWER:—The answer is contained in Ezekiel: “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; and I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the HIGH MOUNTAINS OF ISRAEL shall their fold be \* \* \* They shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid (Ezekiel 34:13, 14, 28).

16.—*Has Judah-Israel, so far as you know, been located in their “place” up to A.D. 1879?*

ANSWER:—The work of locating them has begun.

17.—*Is England “set on high above all the nations of the earth”? is she the “chief of nations”? — “the head and not the tail”? — “above and not beneath”? Has she been blessed in her commerce, in her agriculture, in her fecundity? Have her enemies been smitten before her? Has any invasion been successful since the Norman Conquest? Were the Normans not “of the same primitive race as the Anglo-Saxons”? and since the fusion of these similar races, has not the English nation been consolidated? Do we “lend unto many nations and not borrow”? Do we “reign over many nations” and no nation reign over us? Are not the Anglo-Saxons and the Jews the only people who can in any way be said, in a national sense, to keep a “seventh day” — the former the “Christian sabbath”, as it is usually called; the latter, the Jewish? Has England been “in the midst of many nations as a lion, tearing in pieces, etc.” — a great conquering power? Has she been, and is she now, “in the midst of many nations as a dew from the Lord” — a power of blessing — “declaring God’s glory among the Gentiles” (nations)? Is England a great maritime power, her “seed being in many waters”? Is she not a great mining power, possessing in a marked degree “the chief things of the ancient mountains”, and “the precious things of the lasting hills”? Does England “give glory to God, and declare His praise in the islands? To a speaker in Palestine, having the Mediterranean Sea on the west, would not “the isles afar off” be a fit*

*designation for the British Isles? Was drunkenness a sin of “Ephraim-Israel” denounced by the prophets of old? Is drunkenness our “national sin”?*

ANSWER:—In reply to this series of questions we can only say, that whatever might be the position of England in the various aspects indicated, it could be no proof of her identity with the lost ten tribes in the absence of the vital marks of identity, and in the presence of the various Scriptural facts, and necessities, and prophecies indicated in the course of the Debate. Her position undoubtedly is a great one in preparation for the part she has to play in the transition from the present to the future age, a part exhibited in the Lecture to be found at the end of the report of the Debate, commencing on page 106: but it is not the position required for Israel by the prophecies referred to in the questions. England is not the head. The world has no head at present. Europe is an agglomeration of powers on a footing of equality. When a difficult international question has to be settled, the powers have to meet, and discuss, and submit to mutual compromises. None of them dare take the position of head. Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome have all been head in their day — masters of the world, without a rival. If political supremacy is to identify a power with the promised headship of Israel, there was far more reason for fixing the identity on these powers than on England, which has to accommodate herself diplomatically to the interests and exigencies of the co-ordinate powers of the world. As to the success of her commerce, trade, and agriculture, other nations in past times have had their turn.

Venice, Holland, Portugal, and even France, have one after the other been England’s superior in ages past. British prosperity in these fields of human activity is a comparatively recent affair. It is very important in its place, but it does not prove British identity with Israel any more than a similar position in past times proved other nations to be Israel.

As for unsuccessful invasion, the history of England has been a history of revolution and blood from the beginning. The Romans held the country in subjection for four centuries. On their retirement the Picts and Scots overran the country, and brought the native Britons into great distress. The Britons sent for the Saxons to protect them. The Saxons came and proved worse to the Britons than the Picts and Scots. The Britons were brought into subjection to the Saxons, and grievously oppressed for a time. Arthur, a prince of the Britons, rose against the Saxons, defeated them in several battles, overthrew their power, drove them out of the principal parts of the country and secured forty years’ tranquility. Other German bands arrived at different times, and renewed the war against the Britons. The war lasted with intervals, for 135 years. Finally, the Saxons prevailed, and the Britons who were not exterminated retired to Cornwall and the Welsh mountains, and many fled to France where they founded Brittany. When the Britons were subdued, jealousies and dissensions arose among the Saxon chiefs, resulting in perpetual war among themselves. Taking advantage of this, the Normans and Danes invaded Britain in the ninth century; they were at first defeated by the

Saxons under Egbert at Henges Down, but the Danes returned with fury, and though often repulsed and sometimes thoroughly defeated, they made a supreme effort. After a long struggle, lasting many disastrous years, the Danes, reinforced by new swarms from the Continent, got the upper hand and brought the Saxons into subjection. This subjection lasted a considerable time; finally, Prince Alfred broke the Danish yoke, and in one or two succeeding reigns there were cruel massacres of the Danes all through England. These brought retaliation from the Danes on the Continent. In A.D. 1003, Sweyn, king of Denmark, took vengeance on the English for the slaughter of his countrymen. England was overthrown, and Canute, the king of Denmark's son, became England's master. About 40 years afterwards, England shook off the Danish yoke, and the Saxon monarchy was becoming established, when a new enemy in the shape of a rabble of Papal adventurers, under the leadership of William, the Duke of Normandy, landed on the shores of England, and overthrew English power at Hastings, establishing the dynasty of William the Conqueror. This was far on in the eleventh century. Since then, though there has been no new inroad of Continental strangers, the history of English politics has been a history of continual intrigue and bloodshed and revolution. To call such a history, the history of a divinely-guided nation, etc. — Ephraim under blessedness, — is to divert language from its rational use and make it an instrument of delusion.

As to the Sabbath, that is borrowed from the state ecclesiasticism established by Constantine, which prevailed in Romanised England for centuries. As to England being a dew from the Lord, declaring God's glory among the Gentiles, the case appears in a different light when the truth is known. England requires bedewing herself. She herself is the victim of Bible-nullifying tradition, and the subject of the predicted darkness which should cover the earth before the rising of the great light of Israel — the coming of Christ, to lighten all the earth with His glory. Doubtless she is included in "the isles afar off", but with a very different result from that contemplated in the questions, as will be apparent from the Lecture on "The True Position of Britain", and the article on "The Isles". The question about drunkenness does not call for serious notice.

18.—*Is there nothing singular in the fact that our royal standard should be the lion and the unicorn — emblems of Israel and Ephraim or Joseph?*

ANSWER:—The lion was Judah's standard, not Ephraim's (Gen. 49:9). If, therefore, there is any Hebrew significance in British heraldry, it would establish our Jewish and not our Ephraimitish extraction — a conclusion very unacceptable to Anglo-Israelism. As to the unicorn, it was not used as the standard of any of the tribes. There were only four standards — symbolically incorporated in the cherubim as the symbol of the Divine encampment — the lion, the ox, the eagle, and the man, corresponding to the four camps into which the congregation of Israel was divided in their journey to the land of promise (see Num. 2). The unicorn was not one of the standards. The unicorn, or one-horned beast —

(perhaps the rhinoceros) — is introduced in the blessing of Moses as a metaphor merely, and not as a heraldic symbol: "His (Joseph's) glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns *like the horns of unicorns*." It is a figurative expression of strength. If a heraldic symbol is to be extracted from it, then we ought to have rain in the heraldry as well, because it is said of Israel's king that he shall be "like rain upon the mown grass". Mr. Hine, or somebody else, has blundered in this matter. It is one of many ingenious misapplications by which Anglo-Israelism is sought to be established.

19.—*Is there nothing singular in Ephraim being compared to "a bullock" and our sobriquet being John Bull?*

ANSWER:—If our standard had been a bull, it would at least have been a curious coincidence, because the standard of the camp of Ephraim was an ox; but our standard being the same as Judah's, a *sobriquet* due probably to the beef-eating propensities of the English race, is surely not worth serious consideration.

20.—*The first-born usually claims the inheritance: is not the birthright said to be Joseph's, and does not God call Ephraim his first-born?*

ANSWER:—The birthright was given to Joseph's sons, because of the misbehaviour of Reuben, the real first-born (1 Chron. 5:1); but this did not confer more than precedence of rank and genealogy, as evident from the fact that all Israel — (the twelve tribes in Egypt) — are styled Jehovah's "first-born" (Exod. 4:22, 23), and that all of them shared equally in the inheritance. Ephraim's precedence as the first-born is shown in the leading part played by that tribe in all the history of Israel.

21.—*Can you point to any other nation under heaven possessing, in so marked a manner as England, Israel's promised blessings, and doing Israel's appointed work?*

ANSWER: No nation under heaven, at the present time, exhibits the one or exemplifies the other. Israel's promised blessing and Israel's appointed work cannot be realised in the absence of Israel's appointed leader, the Son of David, the Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, under whom both will become the greatest realities of the age, in a way not to be mistaken. "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together."

22.—*Has the prophecy concerning Ephraim, in Zechariah 10, been fulfilled in any measure in "far countries" and "among the people", or is it altogether to be fulfilled in the future?*

ANSWER: The prophecy is a prophecy of the restoration of both the Houses of Israel, as manifest from verse 6: "I will strengthen THE HOUSE OF JUDAH, and I will save THE HOUSE OF JOSEPH, and I will *bring them again to place them*; for I have mercy on them: and *they shall be as though I had not cast them off*." Even Anglo-Israelites will allow that this is future. In view of this evident futurity of the

whole, it is unsafe to depend upon a present application of any part of the prophecy, however plausible. There will, of course, be operations preliminary to the execution of the work of restoration, but nothing of the character to justify the theory that Ephraim is to be found at that time a great and prosperous nation in any part of the world.

These are all Mr. Icke's questions. he adds, "If you can answer these satisfactorily, in a non-Anglo-Israel sense, I shall be prepared to give up my Anglo-Israelism". His questions cover nearly the whole ground, and obviate the necessity of saying anything in answer to other correspondents.

---

---