

enter more deeply into the doctrines of Anglo-Israelism. Now, my lord, ladies, and gentlemen: I think all here may be depended upon to agree that the Bible which we have in our hands is the Handbook from which man may learn of his fall from a higher state, and God's plan of salvation to rescue him from the consequences of that fall. The whole foundation and essence of that plan of salvation is the free grace of God. God's free grace chose Abraham, and made his seed the backbone of that plan of redemption; and, for this service, which He ordained to be performed, and which Abraham by grace formally accepted, God gave to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, certain promises, magnificent, and unconditional, which we are told, in the same Word of God, the law which was 400 years after could not disannul. Punishment there might be, but not to the extent of obliterating or diminishing the promises. This is the base which I would lay down, and which should be repeated, and repeated, until it is accepted as an axiom, that no interpretation of prophecy can be correct which is discordant with the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. There are many persons, fond of their Bibles, who are deeply interested in prophecy. There is a kind of charm about prophecy, and they are anxious to interpret it, and to see more, by the Spirit of God, into those things; but it is no use attempting to deal with the prophecies until the promises are mastered. Books have been written by scores upon the prophecies by men mighty in the Scriptures, but scarcely three of them agree, because they have not mastered the promises. To jump in to the prophecies without having mastered the promises is like putting to sea without a rudder. A friend a few days ago said to me, "I agree very much with the Anglo-Israel theory, but, at times, I come across a passage which seems to upset it all." I replied, "When you meet with such a passage do not compare it with the Anglo-Israel theory, but with the promises, and you will find that it is not the fault of the Anglo-Israel theory, but of your interpretation." (Hear, hear.) Having laid down this base I would now indicate the first step; and that is, to show the two divisions of the promises. In the 27th chapter of Genesis, Esau, complaining of Jacob to Isaac his father, said, "He took away my birthright, and behold now he hath taken away my blessing." There were two distinct things then given. In Genesis xlix. we find that Jacob in blessing his sons gives a very regal portion to Judah, but for Joseph he burst forth into the grandest language, invoking for him every conceivable blessing; and not only that, but he followed a course with Joseph which he did not follow with any other of his sons. He blessed Joseph's two sons, his own grandsons, repeating for them the vast promises that he had

given to Joseph, though giving the preference to the younger, and declaring that they should be reckoned as his own sons. Then again, we find Moses taking up the same cue in the 33rd chapter of Deuteronomy; while breathing only one word of a sort of mournful prayer for Judah, he burst forth for Joseph, as if with all the language he could command, through five long verses, bestowing down blessings upon his head until length and high seems exhausted. Thence, through various periods of their history, we find the interest in Israel and Judah often noticed as distinct, and at length, in the 1st Chronicles and 5th chapter, we find the two divisions of the promises distinctly asserted, thus: "Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler, but the birthright was Joseph's." This doctrine we find continued through the prophecies. The prophecies of Ezekiel in chapters xi. and xxxvii. clearly prove to us that the nation is divided has never yet been re-united. I, therefore, lay down these two points as the first; fixed in approaching the subject of Anglo-Israelism—viz., that no interpretation of prophecy can be correct which is discordant with the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and that the two divisions for Israel and Judah must be recognised. There are some who say to us, that in thinking so much of the blood of Abraham we are ignoring the blood of Christ. There is no truth in this charge. The blood of Abraham indeed gives high privileges and powers, but it carries with it also very grave and high responsibilities, responsibilities for ourselves, and responsibilities towards the rest of mankind; but without the blood of Christ the only brings greater condemnation. Better to be of the household of Rahab than an Achan of Judah, Zimri, a Dathan, or Abimelech, princes of the congregation, of the best blood of Israel, who were cut off in their sins. But, my lord, to whatever much is given of the same much is required. There are in this nation those who would deprive us of our Sabbaths. There are those who deny the Lord that bought them. There are others who are unmindful of the Rock of their salvation; but, if England be true to her God, she will be delivered from all her troubles. But, my lord, I trust that in the next year many more associations will be reported as brought into existence, and that there may be more principles of Israel who will come forward as boldly as the lordship has done, and take their part with the ministers of religion in carrying this forward, as in the old days of good King Jehoshaphat, when the princes, together with the Levites, went out to instruct the people (applause), and that we may say with Israel in the wilderness, with reference to the progress of Anglo-Israelism: "Spring up, O well; sing ye unto it! The people digged the well, the nobles of the people