

as beforetime." In the eleventh verse God says, "And when thy days be fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels and I will establish his kingdom. . . . and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men, but my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it away from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever."

We have here guaranteed the perpetuity of David's throne, and with the perpetuity of the throne as a necessary consequence the continued existence of Israel as a distinct nationality down to the end of time. Some objectors, however, say, God did not mean all He says here, that He meant something different from what the words imply. Perhaps so. We have not so learned regarding Him. We have a higher opinion of the faithfulness and truthfulness of God. "He is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that He should repent." He never flatters, never mocks, never deceives. "Hath He said and shall He not do it, hath He spoken and shall it not come to pass."

Passing on in the history of Israel, we come to the magnificent reign of Solomon—the golden age of Hebrew history. How devoutly fixed has been our attention while we read the story of his prosperity, the magnificent public works which he carried on, his wisdom, his failings and backslidings in the latter part of his reign. With what mournful feelings we pass from the consideration of the magnificent reign of Solomon to the history of the revolted tribes under Jeroboam, and the separation of the Hebrew Nation into two distinct nationalities, recognised as such by God Himself as the "two families whom the Lord hath chosen."

For political reasons Jeroboam instituted the worship of two golden calves, as the national religion for Ten Tribed Israel, one of which he placed in Dan the northern extremity of his kingdom, and the other in Bethel, the southern extremity. His reason for this was, "If this people go up to do sacrifice in the House of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again to their lord, unto Rehoboam King of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam, King of Judah." This national apostasy went on from bad to worse through the reigns of the kings who succeeded Jeroboam, until at last God could no longer bear with it, and in the reign of Hoshea the last of their kings in Palestine they were carried away captive by Shalmaneser to Assyria, and placed in Halah and Habor by the river of Gozan and in the cities of the Medes. From this captivity

according to the testimony of all history they have never yet returned.

It is at this point that our subject properly commences. And here we must impress upon our readers, the marked distinction that is always made all through the sacred record between the two houses or kingdoms of Israel and Judah. It is the mixing up of the two that causes all the difficulty and confusion that obtains in dealing with this most important question. After the disruption the two kingdoms had different destinies and different careers. This distinction should be clearly kept in view, as it lies at the root of the whole theory of the Identity. The Jews or Kingdom of Judah as a nationality have never been lost. Their history is traceable under that name down all through the centuries to the present time. It is otherwise with the Ten Tribed Kingdom of Israel. They were sifted among the nations, yet in such a way that not the least grain could fall to the ground. One writing lately under the *nom de plume* of *"Malachi"* and others, affirm that they are either lost entirely or that they returned with the Jews after the Babylon captivity. That they are not lost, we have the authority of Paul. That a few families or individuals did return with Judah from Babylon, may be, but Josephus, no mean authority, says distinctly in regard to the bulk of the people, that in his time they were beyond the Euphrates, and were an immense multitude that could not be estimated by number.

Sharon Turner and a number of able historians proceeding purely on ethnic and secular principles, assert that the birthplace of the great Anglo-Saxon Nation was Media, precisely that very place whither some twenty-six centuries ago, was deported a vast, vigorous and indomitable people. The grave of Ten Tribed Israel was in fact the birthplace of the most resolute, energetic and invincible of modern nations, the Anglo-Saxon.

"The Anglo-Israel Theory is, no doubt, comparatively new. It comes wholly unheralded by the charm of high ecclesiastical endorsement. But can its mere novelty make it antecedently incredible? We know from history that most theological schools hate what are called innovations. Loose a new theory upon the public, and immediately many keen scents sniff heresy in the wind." As it was nineteen centuries ago, in the days of our Blessed Lord, so is it to-day. "The Scribes and Pharisees rejected Him, but the common people heard Him gladly." The bold brawler with traditional conclusions is too frequently crushed and stifled by the fatal conservatism of the wrongheaded and self-sufficient many. This conservatism is an evil principle when, as it generally does, it fetters men's minds and thoughts, thus repressing all independent thinking and producing mental death instead of life and activity."