

# ISRAEL IN BRITAIN.

THE COLLECTED PAPERS ON THE

## ETHNIC AND PHILOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

BY

C \* \* \* M \* \* \*

PREFACED BY A RESUME OF THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

By PHILO-ISRAEL.

---

"THIS MY SON WAS LOST AND IS FOUND."

---

*SECOND THOUSAND. PRICE FOURPENCE.*

LONDON:

W. H. GUEST, 29 AND 54 PATERNOSTER ROW.

MANCHESTER, JOHN HEYWOOD; LIVERPOOL, WILLIAM GILLING;

EDINBURGH, J. MENZIES & Co.;

GLASGOW, JAMES M'GEACHY; BRISTOL, E. T. CHILLCOT.

---

1876.

GLASGOW: PRINTED BY HAY NISBET, GEORGE STREET.



## INTRODUCTORY.

---

CAN the future of human affairs be foretold from the past? That is, can the movement of the events of history be generalised with such precision as to enable us to foresee the course of their future development? Such seems now to be accepted as the problem to be solved by what is technically known as the Philosophy of History. But the Philosophy of History which shall solve this problem has yet to be constructed; and, judging by the contention, contradiction, and confusion among the experts, and their slow progress towards a definite result of any kind, it will evidently be a very long time indeed before we arrive even at the beginning of a solution. Especially if the problem be attacked without taking into account the factor of Divine Government.

The notion of the Philosophy of History propounded by Schlegel was "to point out historically, in reference to the whole human race, the progress of the restoration in man of the lost image of God." The present professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's, with the advantages of later and more extended materials, and himself qualified by severe logical habit and method, maintains in his recent work that "the ultimate and greatest triumph of Historical Philosophy will really be neither more nor less than the full proof of Providence."

In the meantime, some enthusiasts—but apparently not particularly hare-brained, judging by their manner and method—have set forth a proposition which, if demonstrated, is a master-key to unlock the whole secret of history for the last twenty centuries at least; casts brilliant and unexpected light on many a dark and unintelligible page; gives a clue by which to connect in a clear sequence many apparently disjointed and sporadic events, which have been turning-points in the life of nations; and (which is of the most interest to practical men) withdraws the veil from the now immediate future, and indicates with singular definiteness our imperial relation to the pending crisis in the East.

This proposition is—that the British people are the House of Israel, the descendants and heirs of those Ten Tribes (altogether distinct from the Jews) who disappeared from history about the Christian Aera on the western verge of Asia, came into Europe with the huge Scythic migration, slowly

travelled still westward by different routes under different names, Danann, Saxons, Normans, and finally re-united here in these "Isles of the Sea," to send forth their legions after a while and girdle the world with "great circles" of empire.

So now,—Are these the children of the Promise? Are these the Kings of the East, whose way (to India) by the Euphrates was foreseen in the Apocalypse of the Seer? Whose by right is the territory from the Black Sea to the Gulf of Akaba, from the Dardanelles to the borders of Persia? And when the prophetic period of 1260 years from the Héjra shall, in A.D. 1882 \* be completed, when the dominion of the Grand Turk shall have vanished like an ill dream, and the blood-stained foot of the Infidel be no longer a blight, a curse, and a profanation on the Holy Places, who by right shall possess them? Who shall hold Constantinople and the Bosphorus? Shall Russia or any other power stand in the very gate of our direct highway to our Eastern Possessions? What fairer capital, what more central and accessible from the extremities of our empire, than Jerusalem Delivered? Of what account will Egypt be to us, except as an allied power on our flank, when we are masters of the quicker road to India and Australia by the valley of the Euphrates?

To these questions the tens of thousands throughout Britain and the Colonies, who have already accepted the above proposition, have a ready answer.

The author of the following addresses, delivered at different times, directed to the ethnic and philological difficulties which lie on the threshold of the question, has been urged to publish them at this crisis in a collected form. But as the proposition, on which they serve only as a commentary, has for its final basis the obvious interpretation, by the light of actual events, of the whole burden of the song of the ancient prophets, he has sought the co-operation of a well-known writer to furnish a succinct outline of the argument from the Divine Word.

C. M.

---

\* By Muhammudan reckoning the present year is 1293 from the Héjra, but their year is the *lunar year* of only 354 days.

A RESUME  
OF THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT PROVING THE  
IDENTITY OF THE BRITISH RACE  
WITH THE  
LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL.  
By PHILO-ISRAEL.

---

THE SCRIPTURAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

It is essential that there should be a distinct understanding regarding this preliminary point, which meets us at the very threshold of the subject. All Jews are Israelites, *but not all Israelites are Jews*. Let us examine this proposition.

About 3800 years ago God chose one man to raise up a People for Himself. He chose "Abraham alone" (Isaiah li. 2), then Isaac, then Jacob, and lastly the Twelve Patriarchs. From them He formed a Nation—the Twelve Tribes of ISRAEL, whom He named "His Servants, His Chosen, His Elect, His Inheritance," and the like (Exod. xxxii. 13; Isa. lxiii. 17, xli. 8, 9, xliv. 1, 2, 21; Exod. xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 26, 27, 29, xxxii. 36-43).

This People were one United Nation for 516 years, from Moses to the death of Solomon (B.C. 975). During that period there was silently growing up a divergence between two unequal portions of the race—between the Ten Tribes on the one hand, and the House of Judah on the other. It reached a crisis at the death of Saul, when, for seven and a half years there were two separate Kings ruling in Israel (2 Sam. v. 5), then again at the rebellion of Absalom (2 Sam. xvii.). But it passed into open revolt and rupture, on a question of taxation, when Solomon died (1 Kings xii. 4-19).

The headstrong men of Ephraim held that they were burdened by excessive imposts. King Rehoboam answered their petition for redress roughly. The result was insurrection, and the cry "To your tents, O Israel! Now, see to thine own House, David!" The standard of Israel was raised in rebellion in Samaria.

Jeroboam, the Son of Nebat, was placed on the throne of Israel, the Ten Tribes (including Manasseh); while Rehoboam,

the rightful sovereign, ruled in Jerusalem over the JEWS—henceforth properly so-called—consisting of Judah and Levi of the House of “Judah,” and Benjamin,\* belonging to the House or Kingdom of “Israel” (1 Kings xii. 21).

From that day to the present the two Houses (Israel and Judah) have continued disunited — have never again amalgamated.

They remained in the Land in separation for more than two centuries. They warred with each other, conducted separate treaties of peace with foreign nations, and existed under distinct dynasties, laws, customs, religions—practising different rites.

The subsequent history of the Jews is sufficiently well known, and need not be detailed here. The Babylonish Captivity of the Tribes of Judah, Levi, and Benjamin, in B.C. 606—588, their return to their Land after seventy years’ banishment, the crucifixion of Our Blessed LORD by the two first, and their subsequent destruction as a nation, and dispersion (A.D. 70), are familiar matters of history. We meet them now in all parts of the world, and know them everywhere, as JEWS.

Let us turn to the Ten Tribes, whose Kingdom was Samaria (Micah i. 5). They began badly. Their King, Jeroboam, led them into idolatry. They were ruled for 235 years (from B.C. 975 to B.C. 740) by nineteen kings, each of whom was worse than his predecessor. When at last the Divine forbearance was exhausted by the national apostasy and idolatry, they were, for the most part, carried away captive into Assyria and Media, from B.C. 740 to 678, some (probably the whole Tribe of Dan) having escaped by sea before the final catastrophe took place (2 Kings xv. 29, xvii. 6, 23; Isaiah vii. 8).

#### WHAT BECAME OF THE DEPORTED TRIBES ?

Did they return with the Three Tribes—Judah, Levi, and Benjamin—when they were restored from Babylon to Jerusalem in B.C. 535 ?

They did not, for the following, among many other reasons:—

1. The Prophets and historians, Ezra and Nehemiah, are silent as to the presence among the returning Jews of any Tribe of “All Israel” save Benjamin.

\* The “Kingdom of Israel” (or the Ten Tribes) was composed of the following:—1. Reuben; 2, Simeon; 3, Dan; 4, Naphtali; 5, Gad; 6, Asher; 7, Issachar; 8, Zebulun; 9, Joseph or Ephraim; 10, Benjamin.

At the Rebellion, B.C. 975, the Tribe of Benjamin was, for a special purpose, transferred temporarily to the House of Judah (1 Kings xi. 13, 31, 36, xii. 21; Ezra i. 5; Neh. xii. 34).

But in its place the Tribe of Manasseh—not being one of the Twelve, but constituted a Great People (Gen. xlviii. 19)—went into captivity with the Nine. With Judah and Levi, Benjamin made a third, there being thus really Thirteen Tribes in all (not Twelve), and Eleven “Lost.”

2. The Scripture tells us that when the return of Israel takes place, there will be friendship and political union between them and Judah (Ezek. xxxvii. 17, 19; Jer. l. 4; Hosea i. 11). But when the Jews returned from Babylon the House of Israel was in open rebellion against Judah; as Ezra, writing after the Return, informs us in 1 Kings xii. 19.

3. Israel is to return to Palestine with Judah, when "The Lord shall set his hand AGAIN the SECOND\* TIME to recover the Remnant of His People;" and they shall return under *one* King (Isa. xi. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 22; Hosea i. 11). But on the return of the Jews from Babylon they had NO King. There can be no THIRD return for the Ten Tribes, because God declares that when He brings "AGAIN their Captivity" they shall no more be "pulled up out of their land" (Amos ix. 15). But Judah was "pulled up" in A.D. 70.

4. Israel's return is to be accompanied by wonderful portents, such as the "utter destruction of the Tongue of the Red Sea" (or Gulf of Suez), and the "drying up of the Seven Streams of the River" (Nile), so that "men may go over dryshod" (Isa. xi. 15, 16), physical changes which have not yet occurred.

5. Daniel, in ch. ix. 7, speaks of the Ten Tribes as being (B.C. 538) "afar off" from Babylon.

6. St. Peter and St. James in their Epistles speak of the Ten Tribes as "scattered and dispersed" in their day (1 Peter i. 1; James i. 1).

7. The testimony of Josephus (Ant. ch. v.) relating to A.D. 60 to 80, and of St. Jerome in the fourth century, is to the same effect, and proves that the Ten Tribes did *not* return, as some allege, with the Three from Babylon.

We inquire, therefore,

#### WHERE ARE THE TEN TRIBES NOW?

Are they mingled among the Gentile Nations? Have they thus disappeared never to be found? That cannot be! GOD made with the Twelve Tribes an Everlasting Covenant (Gen. xvii. 7), which utterly forbids that supposition (Judges ii. 1; 1 Chron. xvii. 22). What then? Israel, the Ten Tribes, are "Lost" (Jer. l. 6, 17; Ezek. xxxiv; Hosea ix. 17). "Lost" in the sense of being—

1. Banished from their land and home for 26 centuries.
2. Their name of "Israel" removed (Isa. lxxv. 1, 15; Hosea i. 9).

---

\* Israel, the Twelve Tribes, were brought by the Divine guidance into their land the FIRST time when they came out of Egypt under Moses and Joshua. They return "again" the "Second time" no more to be "pulled up" out of their inheritance.

3. Their Language (Hebrew) supplanted by another (Isa. xxviii. 11).

4. Their Religion changed, and the People "divorced" from the Mosaic Law (Jer. iii. 8; Isa. l. 1; Hosea ii. 2).

But though thus lost and disguised, they cannot be, as we have said, "lost" for ever. That is impossible. For God has solemnly promised that He will Himself make known this Lost Nation to the world, and remove those disguises under which He has concealed them for great and mighty purposes (Rom. xi. 1; 1 Sam. xii. 22; Jer. xxxi. 37).

Passages such as the following also proclaim this purpose:— Jer. xxiii. 6; Isa. xi. 12; Amos ix. 14, 15; Jer. iii. 18, l. 4; xxxi. 31; Ezek. xxxvii. 16-28; Hosea i. 10, 11; Rom. xi. 25, 26, &c.

*But what clues are given whereby to find this Lost People now?* They are many, and most simple in their application. We ask the reader's attentive consideration of them.

God Himself declared that His People, the Tribes of Israel, should become "A NATION AND A COMPANY OF NATIONS"—"as the sand by the sea shore, innumerable; as the dust of the earth and as the stars of Heaven for MULTITUDE" (Gen. xxii. 17; xxxii. 12; xxxv. 11; Num. xxiii. 10; Rom. ix. 27).

The Colonial Empire of Great Britain constitutes a "Company of Nations." They are in Federal Union with the Central Power, but are partly independent in their political organisation.

They are as follows:—

1. The Dominion of Canada.
2. The Six States of Australia.
3. Tasmania.
4. New Zealand.
5. The South African States.
6. The West African Settlements.
7. The Fiji Islands.
8. British India with its Sixteen Distinct Nations.

The United States of America are of "Great Britain," though now independent.

We know the Jews do not answer to these predictions, for they are under a parallel series of condemnatory prophecies, one of which (fulfilled in them) dooms them to be FEW (Jer. xv. 7).

But of all the Nations of the Earth the British *alone* responds to the description given. She doubles her population every 56 years, that of her Colonial Possessions every 25. We recognise this fact, patent to our senses, as one of a very large number of most remarkable Identifications of the Lost People, all pointing to the self-same Race, now extant, which Our God expressly gives us for our guidance.

God's Word, further, has set certain signs or marks on the Ten Tribes of Israel, when hidden, and declares they shall be found—as

1. A Single Nation (Jer. xxxi. 36; Isa. li. 4; lxv. 1; Matt. xxi. 43).

2. A Strong Nation (Micah iv. 7; v. 8).

3. A Northern Power, occupying the Islands of the Sea, or West (Isa. xi. 11; xxiv. 15; xli. 1; xlii. 4-10; xlix. 1; Jer. iii. 12-18; xxiii. 8; xxxi. 8-10).

4. Possessing the GATE of his Enemies (Gen. xxii. 17; xxiv. 60), as Great Britain does now in Heligoland; the Channel Islands; Gibraltar; Malta; the West, South, and East African Settlements; Perim; Aden; the Straits Settlements; Hong Kong; the Falkland Islands; the three Great Gates of British India, through which the whole Peninsula was secured—Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras; Peshawur; Rangoon; Sydney; New Zealand; the SUEZ Canal (probably also, in a few years, CONSTANTINOPLE); and others, the like of which no other Nation has, or ever has had, in possession.

5. A Nation never conquered by Gentile Races (Isa. xvii. 13, 14; xli. 12-16; Micah v. 8, 9); which is true of Great Britain, but not of any other great Power whatever.

6. A Nation whose "Home" Ports or "GATES" are "open continually," "not shut day nor night," for the purposes of a gigantic commerce (Isa. lx. 5-11); which has been realised by Great Britain for a thousand years, but not by any other Nation of the world.

7. The Chief of Nations (Isa. xli. 8, 9; Jer. xxxi. 7)); a description quite accurate of Great Britain, supreme at Sea, and able, if she choose, to be the leading Power on land, as in times gone by.

8. Possessing a magnificent Heathen Empire (Ps. ii. 8; xviii. 43; cv. 43, 44; cxi. 6); which is true of our Country, and of no other.

9. Having for Colonies, immense in size, in all zones, the "Desolate Heritages" of the Earth (Isa. liv. 1-3; lviii. 12; xlix. 8-10; lxi. 4); which is true of Great Britain, but not of any other Power.

10. Mistress of the Seas (Gen. xxii. 17; Isa. xlii. 10-12; lx. 5-11; Ps. lxxxix. 25, P.B. vers.).

11. Scattered everywhere among the Heathen (Ezek. xxxvii. 21).

12. Yet owning the Ends, the sides, the "uttermost parts" of the Earth (Deut. xxxiii. 17; Ps. ii. 8; xcvi. 3).

13. With possessions forming a Great Girdle round the Gentile Nations (Deut. xxxii. 8, 9).

14. Immensely wealthy (Deut. xxviii. 1-14; Isa. lx. 16).

15. Lending to many nations, but never borrowing from them (Deut. xxviii. 12; xv. 6)—all characteristics of the British People, and of no other.

16. Adhering always to their ancient Israelitish, just, scientifically-accurate, heaven-given system of weights and measures\* (Levit. xix. 36); a fact true of Great Britain, but not true even of Germany, which has adopted the atheistic, metrical system, the apocalyptic "mark of the Beast" (Rev. xiii. 17).

17. As a rule, paternal to the Aborigines of their Colonies, but finding them nevertheless, to their dismay, "dying out" before them (Jer. xxx. 10, 11; xlv. 27, 28).

18. Living under a Monarchy (Num. xxiii. 21; 2 Sam. vii. 13-16),

19. "The Christian Nation"—redeemed from the Mosaic Law (Gen. xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14; Isa. xliii. 1-21; xlv. 17-19; xlviii. 20; lxvi. 19; lx. 16; Hosea i. 10; Micah v. 7; Psa. lxxvii.).

20. The chief Missionary Power of the Earth,—carrying the Gospel, to the Jew first, and then, everywhere, to the Gentiles (Micah v. 7; Gen. xxii. 18; Isa. xxvii. 6; lii. 10; Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47, 48; Acts ii. 38, 39).

21. A Sabbath-keeping race, nationally and by law (Ex. xxxi. 13-17; Levit. xxvi. 2; Deut. iv. 13; v. 14; Ezek. xx. 12); passages which describe Great Britain, the United States, and the Jews—all of whom keep holy one day in seven—but are not true of the Continental nations.

22. Full of Good Works and fruits of Righteousness (Is. xxvii. 6; Matt. xxi. 43).

23. Called by Isaac's name—Saxons (Rom. ix. 7).

24. But prone to Idolatry, and ever lapsing into it (Hos. viii. 11).

25. Addicted, as regards very many of the people, to all sorts of wickedness and abominations, hateful to God (Ezek. xxxvii. 23).

26. Having a "Part" of the Nation afflicted with *πωρωσις*, or Hardness of Heart, or blindness (Rom. xi. 25).

27. Nationally addicted to the vice of Drunkenness (Isaiah xxviii.).

28. Blind as to their Origin (Hosea ii. 6).

29. Ever declaring here, in Britain, they are not God's People Israel (Hosea i. 10).

30. Yet continually acknowledging here, in Britain, they *are* God's People Israel, in the Services of the Established Church, Sunday by Sunday, and notably on Sunday, the 20th June, when the following Prayer is prescribed and used:—"Let there

\* See "Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid," by the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland.



never be one wanting in her" (the Queen's) "house to succeed her in the Government of this United Kingdom, that our Posterity may see her children's children, and Peace UPON ISRAEL. So we, that ARE THY PEOPLE, and Sheep of Thy Pasture, shall give Thee thanks," &c.

31. In Public Worship praying towards the East, towards the Land, the City, and the House, chosen of the Lord God, as Israel is directed to do in Solomon's Prayer (1 Kings viii. 44, 48).

32. During a part of their past history living for Centuries without a King, but governed by Chiefs, as during the Heptarchy and prior thereto (Hosea iii. 4).

33. A People separated from all others by God Himself, and in covenant relation with Him for EVER (2 Samuel vii. 24; Deut. xxvi. 18, 19).

34. And lastly. Kind to strangers, making Britain an asylum for the Foreign Refugee (in a manner not followed anywhere else), treating him here, and here only, as "One Born among them" (Lev. xix. 33, 34).

These and many others are the Marks and Signs which God has given us in His Word, by which we may know, and recognise His Lost People. We look around now—now that we have reached the eve of the Sabbath of the world—now that there is absolutely no time left, as all good men are agreed, for the rising up of New Nations, or new Companies of Nationalities—and what do we find? Not one of the nations on the globe—Christian, Mahommedan, Heathen, or Jewish—responds to ALL these Identifications, with ONE exception, and that one is—GREAT BRITAIN.

She, and she alone, responds to them EVERY ONE. She, and she alone, lacks *not one!* *This is the ground on which we take our stand, and on which we challenge discussion.*

What are we to say to all this? Are we to reject these fulfilments, now before our eyes, as "mere analogies," "coincidences," and "remarkable similarities," and think no more of them? Or, are we to accept the evidence they afford, as reasonable men? Surely reason, common sense, analogy, and reverence for God's word, all compel us to admit that the evidence—abundant as it is, truthful as it must be, convincing as it surely will be deemed—suffices to show, *primâ facie*, at any rate, that the Lost People are Identified and Found; also that God's word is true, as regards them in every—even in the very least—particular?

In conclusion, we ask (what we think ought always to be put forward and answered in connection with this subject), Whither does all this tend? *Cui Bono?* Why seek for Lost Israel? and what good will it do if the British Nation *be* found to be the

Lost House of Israel—first, to themselves; secondly, to the World at large?

To this we reply, "Much, every way." For, speaking generally, by searching for the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel, we are most distinctly doing God's work, and acting according to His clearly-revealed will. He declares, speaking of the two Houses of Israel and Judah, "I will rejoice over them, and do them good, and I will plant them in this Land, assuredly with my whole heart and with my whole soul" (Jer. xxxii. 41). Hence Israel must first be found and identified. When found, God's word declares that Israel and Judah *together* will be Blessed in themselves, and bring down Blessings from on high, to the whole world. He says—"And it shall be to Me a Name of Joy—a praise and an honour before all the Nations of the Earth which shall hear all the good that I do unto them" (Jer. xxxiii. 9). Let us not undervalue what God Himself, the God of ISRAEL, declares is for His Glory, and what He says, He will carry out "with His whole Heart, and with His whole Soul!"

Coming to particulars, the Blessings to accrue to Great Britain by her Identification as Israel, will be beyond all expression. For, 1. She will experience the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit on the Nation at large (Joel ii. 28). 2. She will become, in truth, a Righteous Nation (Is. lx. 21). 3. The Nation will be satisfied with God's goodness (Jer. xxxi. 14). 4. The People will All know Him, from the least to the greatest (Jer. xxxi. 34, speaking of Israel). 5. They will be triumphantly acknowledged by the Lord, before all the world, and "He will make them a Name and a Praise among all People of the Earth" (Zeph. iii. 20).

Then, as to the Jews, their benefit will be great and glorious, indeed. They will be gathered in the West—(Is. xliii. 5)—and return to their Land, in union with the British—with them, the subjects of One Monarch (Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22; Hos. i. 11).

They will be grafted in again into their own Olive Tree—Israel (Rom. xi. 23); for "God is able to graft them in again." Once in their Land, they will be cleansed from their iniquity; on them, in God's good time, will be poured out of the Spirit "of grace and of supplication; they shall look on Him whom they pierced, and shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son" (Zech. xii. 10).

To the Gentile world the Blessing will be beyond all calculation. The "casting out" of the Ten Tribes is "Riches" to them now; the stumble of Lost Israel is "Salvation" to them at present. But when the British are Identified and "received," when Israel is "brought back," it will be to the Gentile world as "Life from the Dead" (Rom. xi. 15). Then, "Strong Nations" and "Many People" will "COME" to the Lord—will "come to"

the Light, and to the Brightness of Israel's "Rising" (Is. lx. 3; Zech. viii. 22). "And the Earth" (so glorious is the prospect) "shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea (Hab. ii. 14).

And lastly, the Discovery of Israel will vindicate the truth of God's Word—THE BIBLE;—cast out the evil spirit of Infidelity, and make God's faithfulness so clear, that All nations shall admit it, and submit to His Holy Will.

We ask our readers, as reasonable men and women, above all as believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, in the Goodness and Faithfulness of our Covenant-keeping God, whether the prospects held out to Our Nation in the views we entertain, are not most glorious in themselves, most honouring to our Gracious Redeemer, and most clearly revealed to us as the Divine Will in the Scriptures, which we all hold to be, most justly, our Infallible Guide in Life? If so, then we press upon all as their bounden duty, the obligation to embrace these truths, and to propagate them as God's revealed word and will, by every lawful means in their power, looking for His Blessing, who over and over again, declares, that the two Houses of the Hebrews, Israel and Judah, are "His People," "His Inheritance," "His Servants," "His Chosen ones," "His Elect," for EVER, while He is, in a peculiar sense, "THEIR GOD." (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; xxxii. 38-40).

PHILO-ISRAEL.

### A PARALLEL AND CONTRAST.

WHEN *Tyndale* freed th' imprisoned Word,  
Hid in a language dead,  
Men wept for joy at tidings heard  
In living language read.

Three hundred years have passed.—*This* age,  
Of Force and Matter learns.  
Another *Tyndall* treads life's stage,—  
The joy to ashes turns.

He treads with scorn upon the Book.  
Mill-like his working brain  
To ATOMS grinds our human Hope,  
And earns—applause and fame.

Y. A. B.

# THE COLLECTED PAPERS, BY C \* \* \* M \* \* \*

## A LECTURE ON THE ETHNIC AND PHILOLOGIC RELATIONS OF THE BRITISH RACE.

14th November, 1874.

While some are earnestly following the elucidations of this question, others, less or more evenly balanced in the intellectual capacities of criticism, less or more highly endowed with the faculty of insight, are more or less placidly or more or less impatiently amused.

Why not? One need not measure the seriousness of people's minds by the natural or artificial length of their faces, nor restrain the exercise of charity when people smile instead of being solemn. St. Paul was a man of the world—a Pharisee, and therefore, we may assume, a patrician by birth—and a man of scholastic culture. In theory and practice he “became all things to all men.” We may very well elect to follow St. Paul. In polemic business one has often to announce startling propositions, at which people may be expected to be amused very much—at first; and the fact may be accepted as a necessary condition of the argument, due to the admitted frailty of human nature.

But more. It seems to be the most natural thing in the world for people to be very much amused when they, for the first time may be, hear announced with gravity by a knot of enthusiasts—or even mere dilettanti, as they may be deemed—this startling proposition—

That the direct sequel and sequence of an event which happened 2600 years ago in Western Asia is now being evolved on this westernmost verge of Europe; that a nation who were then transported into slavery, whose movements dropped gradually out of history during 700 years, who for 1800 years since have been absolutely and completely lost sight of, except in the flickering light of tradition, are now re-discovered, identified, proven to be—yourselves, ourselves. That *we* are the reconnecting link by which is to be made good again, before all men, that chain of historical evolution which was apparently snapped in sunder long ages ago; and that by the light of the glowing sparks which fly out in the forging of this link, the world is to see that the Everlasting Word is true, and no lie: that another cyclical crisis is at hand in the affairs of the world; and that our religion is based on practical, tangible facts, and not on assumptions, as some do vainly teach.

It may well be, in the enthusiastic advocacy of a proposition such as this, and which promises so much, that many arguments

and supposed corroborations may come to be adduced, which are hardly consonant with a sufficient sobriety of reflection, which are too speculative, or rest on analogies too remote, or are wanting in logical relevance. It cannot be otherwise while human frailty is all-pervading.

Christianity itself has suffered, and suffers, more from the errors and misapprehensions of its advocates and professors than from any inherent defect in its theory—if any might be, for the sake of argument, admitted.

Any proposition whatever is to be judged on its proper merits, leaving absolutely aside the fallibility of its advocates.

For those who accept the Sacred Scriptures as a true, direct revelation of the Divine Thought, the argument from prophecy is a perfectly sufficient ground on which to argue the proposition it is now our business to consider. There are, however, those who deny altogether, or are at least unprepared to admit, the validity of prophecy—who question altogether the certainty that the Holy Scripture is a Divine Revelation. For these, some of the arguments advanced are very much open to question on various grounds, however edifying for those with whom the matter is already a foregone conclusion.

It may be desirable to refer to some which were set forth at a recent conference :—

1. There was the statement of the fact (sufficiently well known) that there is a large correspondence between etymons in the Welsh language and in the Sanscrit. But as it was not at the same time expressed that the Brachmans are, by the hypothesis, a *Shemitic* race, it was naturally observed that the fact seemed rather to prove that the Welsh are Hindus, or that the Hindus are Welshmen, than that *we* are the Lost Tribes. Besides, this correspondence of etymons is common to all primitive languages in direct proportion to their antiquity.

2. Another point which arose incidentally was the affirmation that the Maltese form of cross—that, namely, in which four triangles meet in a point—is the true proper Christian symbol; and that the so-called Latin Cross—having a long and a short arm—is the pre-Christian and Pagan symbol, in which statement three things seem to be overlooked.

- (a) That the *Greek* Cross, with two equal arms, is a combination of the two forms, and unites the symbolic ideas which are the origin of both.

- (b) That all three—and, indeed, all other forms—are equally pre-Christian, so far as mere chronological order of time is concerned; are primeval; are expressive of various senses of the same original esoteric idea (a subject too abstruse for incidental treatment), and are all indications of the looking forward of the ancient world to the fulfilment of the promise, that the

seed of the woman should make atonement for the *sin* of the woman and the man.

(c) That the form of the cross—on which first the brazen serpent and then the Son of man was lifted up—was, by the consentaneous testimony of all tradition, that which came to be the symbol of the Western Church, and called the Latin Cross.

3. There was, finally, the statement—not new however—that *Ashtaroth* was the Queen Semiramis, and that *Tamuz* was her son! How could this be? it was asked, seeing that *Ashtaroth*, or *Astarte*, was only another form (Babylonian and Syrian) of the Egyptian *Isis*, and the later Venus of the Grecians and the Latins; and was worshipped by the nations as Queen of Heaven, her hair divided by the horned crescent, and crowned with the Pleiades, centuries before Semiramis was born to be Queen of Babylon. Seeing, further, that *Amuz*, or *Tamuz*, was no other than the Syrian and Phœnician form of the Lord *Osiris*, the *Adonis* (*Adonai*, Lord) of the later Greeks, and the husband of *Isis*, or *Astarte*. Moreover, as the Prophet *Ezekiel* reproved the women for “weeping for *Tamuz*”—just as the Egyptian women wept for *Osiris*—if *Tamuz* was merely the son of an alien queen, what was *Tamuz* to them, or they to *Tamuz*, that they should weep for him?

These misapprehensions of the meaning of the archaic mythologies are made, however, in excellent good company, for even Sir Isaac Newton imagined that the goddess *Ceres* was a benevolent woman of Sicily, who, crossing to Attica in search of her daughter, taught the Greeks the cultivation of corn. And not long ago one who enjoys the repute of erudition, but who seems to have cultivated the science of mythology with less success than might be desired, announced that *Osiris* was a *man* who devoted a philanthropic life to the instruction of the Egyptians, and that *Horus* was another *man* who came after him, and that they were apotheosised for their pains!

These delusions are rapidly passing away in the light of more intelligent interpretation; and we now know that these supposititious personages were, in fact, the exoteric expression (for the instruction of neophytes and the common people) of hierarchic esoteric conceptions of the One Supreme God, but which, naturally and necessarily, degenerated into those base idolatries from which it was sought to separate that chosen people to whom it was said—

שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד

Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is *One* Lord!

Can we not indicate an *à posteriori* argument on which to base some proof of the proposition that the British race, and their congeners, are descended of the ancient Hebrew People?

—for the benefit of those who are unprepared to accept the *à priori* argument from prophecy. Such an argument may be founded on two sets of considerations :—

1. *Historical and Traditional.* These are abundant, and extraordinarily cumulative. But as they are treated more or less exhaustively in published writings easily accessible, we may leave them for the present.

2. *Ethnic and Philological.* Of these the fringe only seems to have been hitherto touched. Yet they appear to afford very striking corroborations of our position.

There has been lately a Congress of Orientalists, where, as usual, and natural to expect, mixed with a vast amount of good and substantial, and immensely useful work, was a certain quantity of loose, and (not to speak it profanely) ill-considered vagaries. For example, we were told by a great *savant*, whose fame in his special department is deservedly European, but who, elsewhere, since, has described himself—some would say, with an exquisite irony of accuracy—"a dabbler in old bones"—we were told that the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh dated from before the Flood. The one thing wanting to perfect the singular chronological table on which this was set forth seemed to be, to set down the Flood itself as having occurred *before the Creation*. That would effectually dispose of all difficulties in the premises, by leaving no difficulties to be disposed of.

However, it happens that we do know absolutely the age of this Pyramid, and a great deal more of vital consequence, which, however it may be ridiculed, has never yet been seriously attempted to be disproved.

But there was one remarkably salient circumstance throughout the proceedings of the Congress, which struck some of us who attended them assiduously. This was the perfect matter of course with which it was taken as settled, that the British race and the Hindu race are of close kindred ; and both of the one Aryan family with the Teutonic and Latin races.

Now, it seemed on reflection that this which is taken as an established fact is, after all, based on pure assumption—on this assumption, namely :—

That *Philological* relations are coincident with *Ethnic* relations, and, therefore, that affinities of *Language* are (within uncertain anthropological limits), a final and absolute test and criterion of the affinities of *Race*.

But granting that such a coincidence is a general law, which, for the most part, governs the relations in question, where is the proof that it is rigidly and universally operative, that it is not subject to exceptions so wide as to require the nicest discrimination and the closest analysis, to separate the tangled warp and woof of abnormal crossings of the *ethnic* lines by the lines of



language? There is no proof. No proof has ever, that I know, been attempted.

On the contrary, there are instances, not a few, and continually accumulating, of such exceptions. There are, for example, *two*, notorious and familiar.

1. That of the nomad race we call Gypsies, and known in Southern Europe as Gitanos, Ciganos, Zingari, &c., perhaps of Turanian origin. While preserving in a singular degree the purity of their race, their language—the Romanic—especially in this country, is dying out. In Scotland they speak choice broad Scots. But if, on that account, one ignorant of their ethnic relation were to assume that they were of Scots blood, his conclusion would be absurd. The affinity of language in this case has not the remotest relation to affinity of race.

2. There is the instance of the universally scattered Jews, admittedly Hebrew and Shemitic, *pur sang de pur sang*. But they nowhere speak the Hebrew tongue; and nobody would argue the absurdity that, because the Jews, for example, on the European Continent, speak Aryan tongues from the time of teething to the day of their death, therefore, they are of Aryan blood.

But, if this be so in the notable case of the Jews (that is to say the descendants of the tribes of Judah and Levi), why may it not be so in the case of *another* great people, of whom it is affirmed that precisely the same causes have operated to change *their* language; that, in fact, both cases are one and the same case; and that twenty-six centuries ago they were decreed to come into the same category, in the sentence—"With *another* tongue will He speak to this people."

It may be objected that in both the instances cited, the ethnic tongue has nevertheless survived—in the one case as an alternative vernacular, in the other as a written record. But the English tongue contains so large an infusion of words which, while they correspond closely with Hebrew equivalents (making due allowance for the modification of dialectic form and idiomatic value, which would naturally occur during ages of time), are not recognisable, or only very remotely, in languages which are classed as cognate and Aryan, that the matter has attracted the attention of students any time this hundred years; and a small library of books has been written on the subject.

Let us take a few examples haphazard, not chosen as test-words, so much as general illustrations:—

*Bag*—בֶּקֶבֶק *Bak-balk*, a bottle, that is a leathern *bag*. From בָּק *bak*, to be empty; or hollow.

*To balk*—To disappoint, or lead one to expect something, and send him off with nothing—בָּלַק *balk*, to lay waste.

*Wicked*—בָּגַד *Bāḡād*, to deal deceitfully, treacherously.



*To crush*—גֶרֶשׁ *Gěresh*, to grind, as corn between millstones.

There are hundreds of such words, for which it is exceedingly difficult to find any approach to equivalents in what are assumed to be cognate languages, as for example the German.

There is, however, a consideration of fundamental consequence, to be borne in mind in any comparison or correlation of analogous words in different languages, namely this—that every step in philological research tends more and more to establish the *essential unity* of all languages, by virtue of common descent from *one original*. The neglect of this consideration induces one of two alternative errors:—

1. To suppose, when there is a close resemblance between certain words in one language and some in another, that the one set is derived from the other, or the converse. When the truth may be, that the likeness is only due to common descent from a stock to which, in the particular cases, they have preserved a close adherence. For instance, because many words in Kymric, Gaelic, or Erse, are nearly the same as in Sanscrit, or Zend, it by no means follows that Kymric and the rest are derived from the others, or these from them; but only that both categories have a common origin.

2. The alternative error is common with professed philologists, who are too often loose in their generalisations, and do not display that carefully rigid method of analysis which is proper in so weighty a matter. This is—the too hasty conclusion that, because there is a remote resemblance, or dialectic, or idiomatic analogy between many words in one and many in another language, the two are of the *same family*—Aryan, it may be, or Khamitic, or Shemitic. So that it often happens that a language is classed under one family, when it properly belongs to another. Forgetting that the element of *age* is an essential function of the analysis; so that the *older* a language is as to its radical elements, the less widely will these depart from those of another which belongs to another family.

Incidentally, this may explain the apparent anomaly of such a language as the Phœnician, which, while it is closely allied to the Chaldaic and Hebrew, seems, on various grounds, to be ethnically a *Khamitic* tongue. But the time which elapsed from the period of their common departure from the One First Tongue to their becoming fixed, was not sufficient for the development of wide differences.

The true tests, however, of close affinity in language, are *Grammatical structure* and *Idiomatic texture*. It may be sufficient for our present purpose of merely indicating, rather than developing, an argument, to direct attention to a comparison, in these respects, between our own and that Germanic tongue which we are told was its progenetrix.

Knowing a handful of languages in particular, and something of language in general, I confess it becomes for me increasingly difficult to understand how these two languages have come to be accepted—except from mere educational habit—as belonging to the same ethnic category. It would be difficult to cite any two which are more dissimilar in Grammar and Idiom, as for example in these characteristics of the German :—

1. The position of the verb in the sentence, and its inverted form.
2. The formation of the verb, particularly of *scyn*, to be.
3. The apparently arbitrary distribution of gender.
4. The declension of the noun by terminal inflexion.
5. The declension of the adjective as a noun.
6. The declension, by inflexion, of the demonstrative pronoun and definite article.
7. In idiom, the circumlocution often necessary to express the simplest proposition.

It is only necessary to illustrate the first point. A good example occurs in the sentence from Luther's version of the S. S. *John* i. 13.

*Welche nicht von dem Geblüt, noch von dem Willen des Fleisches, noch von dem Willen eines Mannes, sondern von Gott geboren sind.*

"Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

The characteristics just indicated are, for the most part, typical of the older Aryan tongues; and for the later languages classed at present in that family, as Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, there will be few who are not familiar with their radical difference from our own in idiomatic texture.

But, for the most part, these are not typical characteristics of the Shemitic languages, as the Chaldee and Hebrew; and the general aspect of the English language, to my mind, is that of a Shemitic tongue which had been for a long period in contact with Aryan tongues, and suffered a large transfusion of verbal roots and dialectic forms, whilst it had preserved with tenacity the primitive basis of its grammatic and idiomatic structure. Thus Tyndal in 1530, the first translator of the Hebrew Scriptures into English, says—"Ye propertyes of ye Hebrue tongue agreeth a thousand tymes more with ye Englishe than with ye Latyne."

It does, indeed, seem to have undergone precisely such changes as might be *à priori* anticipated would occur, if we supposed the Hebrew tongue to have been subjected to the domination of Aryan tongues during a period of twenty-five centuries, in the course of the slow westward migration of a Hebrew-speaking people, from the Shemitic centre across the Aryan territories of Western Asia and Europe.

It will not do to reply that our language has been de-Aryanised,

so far as regards the characteristics indicated, since its severance from the Germanic stock; because the changes have been hardly more than dialectic. There has been a large adoption of foreign words, the pronunciation has been refined, and the orthography fixed; but the structural basis has survived almost intact. The English of the time of the Conquest differed surprisingly little from the vernacular "brode Scots" of the present day, and is easily readable by a Scotsman, who instinctively sees through its quaint spelling the indications of those Doric euphonies which are his delight.

Take for instance these lines of the eleventh century, before the Norman French had imparted to our language the tone of patrician elegance:—

*Tha the masse wes isungen,  
Of chirceken heo thrungen.  
The king mid his folke  
To his mete verde,  
And muckle his dugethe.  
Drem wes on hirede.  
Tha quene, an othre halve,  
Hire hereberewe isohte;  
Heo hafde of wif-monne  
Wunder ane moni en.*

When the mass was sung.  
From church they thronged.  
The King 'mid his folk  
To his meat fared,  
And many of his chiefs.  
Joy was on the hired (folk).  
The Queen, on the other hand,  
Her harbour ysought;  
Who had of wife-men (women)  
Wonderful many a one.

It is at once evident that where the verb is transposed, it is done incidentally for the sake of the metre, just as in modern poetry; and as a departure from the natural structure indicated by the verb in the other cases. In all other points, the English is nearly the vernacular English of to-day.

It is worth while to remark on the word *muckle*, that while it has no Teutonic equivalent (that I can find), there is the Hebrew word מְקַלֵּל *m'kel*, which has precisely the same idiomatic value as in these verses, viz., that of a *gathering together* (from קָהַל to gather). Hence the later vernacular uses—*many, much, great*.

There is another element which is of value in determining ethnic differentiation in language, namely—the *phonetic*. This has been almost entirely neglected by philologists, for the reason, no doubt, that the phonetic values in ancient languages, which are the chief basis of research, are exceedingly difficult to recover.

We may remember how, on a memorable occasion, this test was used to establish a distinction of family descent (Judges xii. 6): "They said unto them, Say now, *Shibboleth*; and they said, *Sibboleth*; for they could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took them and slew them."

Whoever has lived much among the so-called Latin races, must have been impressed by the marked ethnic difference between the *Castilian* Spaniard and the Portuguese, on the one hand, and the Italian and French on the other—differences of a

very salient order. These are paralleled by analogous salient differences between the Castilian and the other languages on either side. The index of these differences is found in remarkable phonetic conditions, which, so far as regards the physiology of speech, are fundamental. The softness of Italian, due to predominance of vowel-sound, is proverbial. The precision and *finesse* of French are familiar. In Portuguese the predominance of soft sibilance is remarkable. But in pure Castilian the combination of precision, rotundity, dignity, and rhythmic cadence, is unmatched in any language of Europe. This phonetic force is due, in some measure, to *two* sounds which the other Latin peoples have a physiological incapacity to produce, except by trained effort. These are the *soft guttural*, and the sound of our TH, or the Greek  $\theta$ .

For example, this sentence, in which the j is guttural—

*Jamas viajo el jueres.*

and this, where the c and z are like *th* in *thin*—

*Parece una moza rolliza zahareña.*

But no Italian, Portuguese, or Frenchman can pronounce such words without repeated trial and great effort.

Surely these contrasts in the habit and capacity of the vocal organs indicate a true physiological, and therefore ethnic, distinction.

Now, in English there are two sounds which are common and characteristic—the *theta* sound of *th*, and the *ut* sound of *u* and *o*, as in *gun*, *money*. The former is so difficult for German-speaking people, for instance, that many who otherwise speak English perfectly can only overcome it by great effort. The *ut* sound is exceedingly rare in German and its immediate congeners, and, indeed, may be said to be a provincialism when it does occur (as in *die Sonne*.)

But in Hebrew and Arabic, and other Shemitic tongues, the *theta* sound is as common and characteristic as in English. The *ut* sound is characteristic also in Shemitic languages, as Hebrew and Arabic. It is expressed in the Masoretic vowel Kibbutz, as in קִבּוּלָה *gūlgoolēth*, a skull; שָׁלַם *shalām*, rewarded.

In this connection it is curious to note also that in Greek and Latin there is no trace of this sound, so far as the phonetic values are recoverable. But in the Sanscrit and derived dialects the predominance of this—one may almost say, Shemitic sound—is very striking; striking because their etymons and grammatic structure are of Aryan type. As an example of the sound, there is the cry of the Brachmans—*Ram ge nām Sūtti hai*. "In the name of Ram this is Sutti."

It is not, however, intended to be argued by these references that such varieties of phonetic idiosyncrasy are by any means,

of themselves, determinative of a radical ethnic differentiation, but only that they have a determinative value, when considered along with typical features of etymology and grammatic and idiomatic structure. Because there is an undoubted frequent interlacing or crossing of the lines of typical characteristics throughout the whole of the great ethnic divisions, Yaphetic, Shemitic, and Khamitic (in which last I do not hesitate to include most of what is called *Turanian*) due partly to their common origin, partly to the mixture of the streams of ethnic migration.

With reference to the true ethnic relation of Sanscrit and the Brachmans, it seems necessary to lodge a caution against premature assumptions. The question is at present absolutely unexplored. Although their mythologic conceptions and traditions (estimated by the older Shâstras, and before the corruption of comparatively modern Hinduism) do very distinctly point to a Shemitic origin, and although their very *name* is Shemitic, it has yet to be clearly determined—Whence they came? Did the Brachmans bring with them across the western spurs of the Himâlayas to the plains of Delhi this Sanscrit speech? Or did they find an Aryan people already there established? And did they adopt their Aryan speech, as the Norman conquerors here were compelled to submit themselves to the “Saxon” speech of the majority?

In conclusion, appeal may be permitted to what may not inaptly be termed *ethnic instinct*.

The tendency of culture, and of the refinements of courtesy, is to bring to a uniform type the higher circles of society of all civilised peoples, and to round off the asperities of special ethnic characteristics. But those who have had occasion to live much abroad, and to mix with the ordinary average people of the Aryan nations, more or less equally advanced with us in what is called “civilisation,” will agree that it is difficult, often impossible, to overcome the instinctive feeling of a fundamental separation between them and ourselves in habit and tone of thought, in the capacity to apprehend those concrete notions of freedom, and of the nature of social and domestic relations which, somehow, seem to be inherent in the blood of our race; and render us indifferent or contemptuous towards those theories of Right and Equality which, elsewhere, never pass beyond the region of abstraction.

Whatever may be the value of the suggestions I have ventured to submit—although it may be admitted that the identity of the British family of nations with the Lost House of Israel is not capable of absolute demonstration, outside the proof of Scripture, until a further development of pending events shall leave no room for doubt—nevertheless this much is certain, That in the solution of the matter is involved the veracity of Holy Writ

as a direct revelation of the Divine Will and Intention; or whether it be only such another outflow of ethnic spirit as the Vedas, Shâstras, Zend-Avesta, and Eddas.

But no professor of comparative mythology has yet produced from these a *body of fulfilled prophecy* such as is historically demonstrable from Holy Writ; or has explained away the palpable standing protest against Unbelief, in the dispersion over the face of the whole earth of the Jews, and their abiding, absolute separation from the nations among whom they live, with whom they mix in every act and operation of daily life—excepting that of marriage.

The truth is, that the rejection of Revelation suits the tone of the times. Frivolity is supreme; and to get through life with the least possible trouble is the sum of ambition. Ignorance of those fundamental principles of life, which have been admitted and taught from primeval times by wise men of all countries and races, results from the almost entire absence among us of true culture and serious thought. So that, nowadays, people are only too glad to be able to hang their opinions on the teachings of popular professors—for the most part specialists, who are hopelessly out of their depth outside the boundary of their particular department—who catch the tickled ears of the multitude by specious, but absolutely undemonstrated, speculations; or revive, with audacious pretence of novelty, propositions which are at least as old as the earliest Greek philosophy, and which have been refuted or exploded time out of mind. C. M.

#### FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON THE ETHNIC AND PHILOLOGIC REVELATIONS OF THE BRITISH RACE.

28th January, 1875.

We are told that the notion of the Identity of the British Race with the Lost Hebrew Tribes is in opposition to the investigations of "Science," and therefore absurd. The works of Bopp, Grimm, and so forth, are cited as quite decisive of the question. The very names of these authorities, endowed with a certain uncouth majesty, must infallibly awe into submission the advocates of a foolish theory, presumably unlearned and devoid of scholarly culture and attainments, however well-meaning.

But the fundamental question arises—What is *Science*? The vernacular use of the phrase is large and loose, but seems by common consent to imply the sum of accumulated human experiences and reasonings; and universal solvent of the riddles of the Kosmos, unerring touchstone of Truth, unfailing talisman against Evil. How the one term of the definition is to be recon-

ciled with the other—that is to say, How these vast ends of infinite import are conceivably to be achieved by a means so imperfect, limited, petty? is another question; for the answer to which we shall, no doubt, have to go on waiting still some centuries longer.

In the meantime it may not be without service to eliminate from what we may venture to call the vernacular abuse of the term its true meaning; and so perhaps be enabled to distinguish between Science and that which is falsely so-called.

By common usage of the phrase everything is Science; not only Facts which *are known*, which are irrefragable, perdurable, but also Fancies, the theories, speculations, hypothetical inferences which are spun out of and round about the Facts. There is for practical purposes, however, a sufficiently defined boundary between the two territories. When theory becomes solidified by accumulated evidences it passes into the region of Fact, to be no longer disputable. But if we strip "Modern Science," with a merciless and cynic hand, first of its meretricious gauds and dazzling pretences, next, one by one of its outer garments of glittering speculation and brilliant conjecture, and then of its nether wrappings of soberer texture, in which the warp of ascertained data is weft with the looser thread of hypothesis, it will be a long evening's toilet before we get at the bone and muscle of the body of Fact. Doubtless that must be a bold, not to say heroic, courage which shall dare at this time of day to challenge the majesty of Science, and question the canons and decrees of its infallible dogma. Great was Ishtar. Great was Diana. But a greater than Ishtar and Diana is here, and more greatly to be feared.

Nevertheless the followers of this new goddess profess iconoclasm as the highest duty, and the Ark of Covenant itself is not too sacred to be ripped open by profane hands from end to end. So it is too much that they shall claim immunity from the attacks of a scepticism directed against their own creed. They question; fool us to the top of our bent with their questioning. Shall we not also question?

To minds trained in the severe, rigorous, logical method of the past generation, a method now replaced by a so-called "scientific use of the Imagination," the mutually destructive contradiction of whole categories of propositions is apparent, through the course of the speculations which are at present dignified by the title of Science. A careful analytical dissection of some of the most fashionable doctrines of the day (those of Human Development and the indefinite prehistoric Duration of Man, for example) divests them of the claim to be accepted as *Facts known* and irrefragable, shows them to be built up mainly on assumptions, and reduces their foundation of ascertained fact to a thin and



meagre substratum, altogether inadequate to support so ponderous and momentous a structure. This being so, and if the term Science be properly limited to that which is *proven and known*, these doctrines may be found to fall under the category of "Science falsely so-called."

Indeed a book, substantial in several senses, might be written on the assumptions of modern Science. They abound at every turn; and nowhere so plentifully as in the new-fledged Sciences of Ethnology, and Comparative Philology and Mythology. Yet while these bantlings are hardly able to walk upright, we are asked to accept their crude utterances as final and conclusive Words of Wisdom. As a matter of fact they are so accepted. The rapid rate at which we live, and the pervading frivolity of society, have induced an access of acute "priggishness." Young men scramble through the pages of the last great book, bow to the authority of a great name, assured that so learned a personage, so great a "scholar," cannot possibly be in error, and go forth to flaunt their attainments in the faces of the unilluminated.

It seems to be entirely forgotten that the deliverances of men who devote themselves to special investigation, are precisely those which in the nature of things need to be examined with most critical caution. A laborious student who has gathered in the course of years a mass of materials on a given subject, when he proceeds to systematise them, is liable to bias in one direction or another from various causes—idiosyncrasy, or congenital mental or moral *twist*, prepossession; but most of all that narrowness and oneness of vision and sympathy which are inseparable from working in a groove, and the neglect of general culture.

After these observations on methods of criticism particularly affecting our position, it may be useful to summarise briefly the categories of materials on which the argument for the Hebrew origin of the British Folk claims to be founded; with the view to direct attention to branches of the inquiry which have not up to the present been satisfactorily examined, and to urge those who have the disposition and means to apply themselves to research in those branches.

For the exhaustive treatment of the general question, five distinct lines of argument indicate themselves.

*First, The Prophetic.* This has been, and continues to be skilfully handled by various writers, and with such effect that, to those who accept the Scripture as a Divine Revelation, the conclusions appear to be inevitable and decisive.

*Second, The Historical,* which is the complement of the first, and properly includes the data of Tradition and Archæology. The remarkable feature of the various books bearing on the question, of which the number is considerable, is the coincidence



of their conclusions, while proceeding from entirely independent premises and variant points of view.

*Third, The Metrological*, which connects our national system of weights and measures, the basis of our practical and scientific life, through the testimony of the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh, with that Hebrew system whose fundamental principle was—"A perfect and just measure shalt thou have." Here we come into most violent conflict with the high priests of the new Diana. Naturally, because here we undermine the bases of the loftiest pinnacles of their temple, and brand their most specious doctrines as a clever delusion. So if we maintain that the Great Pyramid differs in any essential particular from its neighbours, no doubt we must be subjects of a not undangerous lunacy.

It happens, however, that Egyptologists are for the most part merely philologists and grammarians. This consideration may serve to moderate amazement at their ignorance of the *unique* structural character of the Pyramid, and their invincible mental incapacity to comprehend the technical relations of dimension which it involves. All this to the contrary notwithstanding, these relations are completely demonstrated by the labours of the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland and others who have followed up his work. The system of weights and measures of the Great Pyramid is shown to be not only coincident on the one hand with that of the Hebrews, but also on the other with that in force in this country until modified by recent legislation; a system which is the only true scientific basis of righteous dealing between man and man, between nation and nation. It is in this respect in pre-eminent contrast to the empirical and unscientific chaos of metrologic values which distract modern civilisation, and are a Babel not less confounded than that of human speech itself.

*Fourth, The Ethnological.* The admission cannot be withheld that this department is more prolific of conjecture than of serious logical demonstration. In the general interests of science, apart from the prepossessions of any theory whatever, it would be fortunate if some investigator, competent by his proclivities and the special bent of his studies, would devote himself to the examination of the intricate questions involved, which have never yet been attacked by systematic exhaustive method. It is perfectly clear that if we be of Yaphetic (Aryan) descent, there is at once an end of our Shemitic-Hebrew origin—prophecy, history, and all else notwithstanding. Our opponents do at least manifest their intelligence in directing attack on ground which is ill-defended. But they seem to forget that their own position is so far from being assured, that it is at least as difficult for them to demonstrate our Yaphetic, as for us to prove our Shemitic descent, on grounds of ethnology pure and simple.

It was in the full conviction of the crucial consequence of this department of the general argument (with particular reference to those who reject all considerations of prophecy) that I ventured some months ago to indicate the outline of a refutation of the commonly-received notion that we are of Aryan stock. I drew attention to the fact that this notion is founded mainly on the assumption that "affinities of language are the test of affinities of race," and adduced familiar instances to show that the assumption is not true in fact, and inadmissible.

My position has since been more than corroborated by a professed philologist of a certain eminence, whose admissions are of the greater value from his having some time ago pronounced our Hebrew origin to be beneath discussion. At a late meeting of the Anthropological Institute, the Rev. A. H. Sayce declared that, "As a philologist, he maintained that Language cannot be held to be a test of Race. It is a test *only of social contact*."

The consequences of this proposition are manifest. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that English is a purely Aryan tongue, we are now entitled to ask—What then are the proofs of our Aryan descent?

I may add to what I have previously advanced this further suggestion, viz., that the conception of the ethnologic type of the Hebrews is based on that presented by the Jews of modern times. But there are strong grounds for surmising that the physiognomy by which we recognise the Jews, is not that which characterised them before their dispersion; and that it is to a great extent the result of the social and physical degradation into which they were flung after the destruction of Jerusalem, in which for ages they continued, and from which they have only recently emerged.

*Fifth, The Philological.*—One may repeat here, with little modification, the remarks made on the Ethnic question. Is the English language so distinctly and certainly Aryan as we are taught? Is it demonstrably, from its grammar and vocabulary, of the same category with the family of which Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and German are the leading types? Or is it so classed only by force of habit and prepossession, on the assumption that Language follows Race; on the further assumption that the Saxon and Norman influx was Aryan, because coming from the midst of Aryans; and by the disregard, as of no account, of the patent distinction between these two families and their surrounding neighbours, during the whole course of history, in Law, Custom, and Tone?

On the hypothesis, however, of the Hebrew origin of the British, it could hardly be credible that a nation which, by the hypothesis, has never at any time lost the compactness of tribal

cohesion, could have had the *foundations* of its mother-tongue absolutely displaced by an alien tongue (whether on the one side Teutonic, or on the other Gallic), so as to be no longer traceable.

On a former occasion I pointed out how these foundations may be traced; how the Aryan position is open to logical attack, and at least not impregnable. In a brief address it was not possible to do more than make a tentative reconnaissance of the salient points. Nor can more now be done than to offer such suggestions as may induce those who have the disposition to examine the subject for themselves. I expressed the opinion, in which I am supported by competent Hebraists, "that the general aspect of the English language is that of a Shemitic tongue, which had been for a long period in contact with Aryan tongues, and suffered a large transfusion of verbal roots and dialectic forms, whilst it had preserved with tenacity the primitive basis of its grammatic and idiomatic structure."

It is no answer to this—it is, indeed, a total misapprehension of the tenor of the proposition—to refer to the German dictionary as a witness of Teutonic and English correspondences. Nor is this at all the method by which to determine fundamental affinities of language. As already said, and as universally conceded, the final test of affinity is in Grammatical Structure and Idiomatic Texture, on which the mere vocabulary in itself throws little light.

On the other hand, how is the mass of words to be accounted for which are certainly not Teutonic, nor even truly Aryan, but which *are* palpably Shemitic? Granting the proposition already quoted (which, however, is not admissible, without limitation), that Language is a "test only of social contact," when and where was the *Shemitic* contact by which the transfusion of this mass of vernacular words was effected? How, finally, are we to reconcile the assumption of Germanic origin of English with the daily experiences of learners of German? Not excepting Greek, it is precisely the most difficult for English students. The number of words recognisable without the dictionary are, after all, extraordinarily few. The involved complications of inflectional categories not only bewilder these supposititious children of the Teuton, but are a confessed burden to the Teuton himself. Nor are they a difficulty on the threshold merely, but intensified as the student advances to the standard literature. To him surely, unused to the subtleties of Philologianism, it must seem to be a rebellion against common sense, to affirm structural affinity between this eminently typical Aryan language and his own almost grammarless mother-tongue.

We shall be told that the affinity is not direct, but mediate through forms of what is generically known as Low German; and we shall be referred to the authoritative treatises in which

the gradations of relation are traced with consummate ingenuity. But, indeed, nothing short of consummate genius would be of service, where the conclusions of the argument are already cut and dried, and the problem is to find premises to fit them. What is to be the definition of an Aryan tongue? If the definition is to be founded on the canon that affinities are finally determinable by grammatic structure, then to say that those languages shall be classed as Aryan which conform to the type of the Sanscrit, is perfectly intelligible. But it is absurd to include in such a definition the Platt-Deutsch, for example, of Holstein, in parts of which High German is not "understood of the common people," by reason mainly of the very complexity of its grammatical construction. What are we to conclude but that the whole terminology of this *science* is imperfect, provisional, based on immature and unsifted conjecture?

If Low German dialects be a detrition of High German, it becomes necessary to inquire by what (in that case) anomalous force High German itself, existing still full-blown side by side with them, has been preserved intact, and the rigid complexity of its grammar rather intensified than slackened? It does not seem to have entered the minds of the theorists that these dialects, everywhere spoken by the *inferior classes*, or in remote districts, may be a Germanized survival of Khamitic (Turanian) tongues, of that earlier westward migration which seems to have preceded the advance of the Yaphetic and Shemitic hordes. This would explain the likeness (still remote enough) between English and Low German dialects, as the distance between the Shemitic and Khamitic types is far less than between both these and the Yaphetic, or Aryan.

In former observations I drew attention to the contrast, in the structural position of the verb, between German and English, and illustrated the point by a sentence from Luther's version of the S. S. (John i. 13). Some who are not familiar with the language have inquired whether this characteristic has not been changed by modern usage? Not in the least. The fashion is indeed quite the other way. The passage was quoted as likely to be familiar, and because it is a fair sample of the colloquial language of the present day. In reading, one naturally expects to find the verb of the subject somewhere on the next page. So that with Prince Bismarck, as he said the other day of his further contest with Vaticanism:—*Diessmal muss Mann tiefer in die Sack griesen*.

Going back to the language spoken in Britain, from the seventh to the tenth century, when direct Germanic influence had ceased, we do find—as in the Saxon Gospels—a dialectic inversion of the verb, similar, indeed, to what is not uncommon in Shemitic languages; but it is not of that marked idiomatic

Aryan type in which the verb is relegated to a dim perspective at the end of subject and predicate. There is also some variation in this respect in the different dialects spoken between Northumbria and Wessex, and it is of great moment to remember, for further examination of the whole subject, that the most "classical" of these dialects was little better than an uncouth patois. A fixed language simply did not exist until centuries after the Conquest.

It is not without interest to observe, with reference to those phonetic determinative characteristics to which your attention has been directed, that in these earliest dialects the *θ* sound was in full force, both in its hard and soft form, represented by two corresponding characters. The guttural, hard and soft (as in the Scottish pronunciation of *loch* and *might*), survived certainly to the time of Chaucer, and no doubt later, as it still survives North of the Tyne. Its use receded before the influence of the courtly Norman, which has fined down the vigorous definition of the harder consonants to the more effeminate "polite English" of modern society.

C. M.

---

#### ADDRESS AT THE ANGLO-ISRAEL CONFERENCE.

26th May, 1875.

The more we consider this subject from different points of view, the greater must appear the magnitude of the issues involved. They are, indeed, momentous. If it be irrefragably true that the lost House of Israel is resuscitated in this British people, so vast a change is presented to the mind's eye in the aspect of history, of ethnic relations, of the position of the militant Church, and of the Divine method of accomplishing the predictions of the ancient prophets, that we must needs feel as those on whom the ends of the world have come; as if the burning bush of Sinai had suddenly blazed up again in the very midst of us; as if we were now ourselves in the actual terrible presence of the Most High.

But if, on the other hand, all this be a delusion, a fanciful and unsubstantial conceit, how fearful is the responsibility of those who are busy in promulgating it!—how gross and unqualified the dishonour done to the sacred word of Scripture!

There is no doubt that it is from this point of view that the matter presents itself to many devout minds, well instructed in Holy Writ. One such, a man of rare attainments and experience, has lately denounced it as "a highly pernicious theory." And, no doubt, if it be not *true*, "pernicious" is the lightest epithet which could be applied to it.

It seems, therefore, to be of the utmost consequence to review, from time to time, the nature and logical value of the whole

argument by which the matter claims to be demonstrated; to reconsider, step by step, the whole series of premises and conclusions; to ascertain once again what is clearly and unanswerably proven, and what is merely adventitious assumption.

If this process be followed without bias, and with the single aim to ascertain the truth, with a stern disregard of consequences to cherished prepossessions, there is little doubt that much will have to be rejected as imaginative, fantastic, worthless.

The proposition that the lost Tribes of Israel have risen like the phoenix from the ashes and ruin of the ancient empires, in the tangible and robust form of the British folk, is so startling, stirs the imagination with such force, and is so much in harmony with the universal presentiment, that the time is big with portents,—that calm judgment is apt to be overset. We are exposed, on the one hand, to the vagaries of ill-regulated, undisciplined minds, stirred by every wind of doctrine, and moved by the fervour of fancied religious enthusiasm to catch up every new thing as a special revelation. On the other hand, the epidemic of dilettante interpretation infects the leisurely and unemployed, who rush in with crude theories where angels must needs fold their pinions and tread softly. Last of all is the insidious tendency, on all hands, to attempt the premature completion and rounding-up of what is admittedly in a stage of rudimentary incompleteness; whence come assumptions of “identities” where none exist, and the extension of recognisable identities into regions where they are totally inapplicable.

However satisfied we may be with the method of interpretation of prophecy which identifies our race with the old Hebrews, it is vain to deny that we encounter immense difficulties in the regions of history, ethnology, and philology. And it is particularly in these branches that the subject seems doomed to be discredited, in the judgment of the well-informed, by rhapsodies which not only set at defiance the very elements of what is *known* of ethnic relations, not only are devoid of logical consistency, but are repugnant to common sense. Any approach towards hurting unnecessarily the susceptibilities of earnest and well-intentioned propagandists of what they persuade themselves is truth, should no doubt be avoided; but there are occasions when it becomes a supreme duty to protest against the overflow of a zeal without knowledge, whose sole achievement is to involve in ridicule not only a question of the greatest and most sacred order, but to intensify that contempt for Holy Writ which is already sufficiently dominant amongst the daily-widening ranks of the sceptical, the cynical, and the profane.

When I refer to the technical difficulties of the question, however, I do not mean that we come so much into conflict with *ascertained facts*, or firmly and irrevocably established inductions

of science, as that what we have to contend against is a science falsely so-called; a science which is forced out of the mid-channel of logical induction by the trend of the current of modern thought; a science which is based on immature assumptions, crude and undigested data; a science which, therefore, is inchoate, halting, self-contradictory;—and if science be definable as *that which is conclusively known*, then it is no science, but a pretence, a charlatanism, an intellectual gymnastic.

Into this the technical difficulties resolve themselves—that there is yet no such thing as a well-defined science of ethnics, not yet a body of well-established facts, by which the way may be made clear to test or corroborate what we hold to be the true interpretation of prophecy, by a reference to a clearly ascertained order of ethnic migrations.

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, within only the last few months, such science as there was of ethnic relations has been revolutionised, and the very basis on which it was built abandoned by common consent as untenable. That basis was the assumption, the fallacy of which I exposed some time ago, that “affinities of language are a final test—within uncertain limits—of the affinities of race.” On a late occasion I quoted the declaration of a professed philologist of eminence that “language cannot be held to be a test of race, but only of social contact.” Now, not content with that declaration, made incidentally in the course of a discussion on the Basque language, he read a formal paper on the subject before the Anthropological Institute (which must be carefully distinguished from the Anthropological Society) on the 11th of May, of which the following is a brief summary:—“The Rev. A. H. Sayce, M.A., held that the fallacy of considering language a sure and certain test of race was one to which few modern philologists would commit themselves. There was no assertion which could be more readily confronted, more clearly demonstrated to be false. Society implied language, race did not; hence, while it might be asserted that language is the test of social contact, it might be asserted with equal precision that it is not a test of race. Language could tell us nothing of race. It did not even raise a presumption that the speakers of the same language were all of the same origin. It was only necessary to look at the great States of Europe, with their *mingled* races and *common* dialects, to discover that language showed only that they had all come under the same social influences. Race in philology, and race in physiology, mean very different things.”

The only complaint to be made of these statements is that they go too far, and are too sweeping. We are under great obligation to the author for his expositions of the Assyrian language, in which he is *facile princeps*; but while acknowledging his



skill as a Shemitic scholar, his laborious assiduity, and his remarkable cleverness, we may yet venture to question his capacity for philosophic grasp of abstract principles, or for profound generalisation. Fortunately, we have at hand what appears to be a much more accurate presentment of the matter, from one who is distinguished by intellectual power of the highest order. On the 22nd May, Sir H. S. Maine lectured before the University of Cambridge on the characteristics of the native polity of India ; and, in reference to the influence exercised on Western thought by the study of Sanskrit, he said—"The new theory of language has produced a new theory of race. The assumption, however, that affinities between the tongues spoken by a number of communities are *conclusive* evidence of their common lineage, is one which no scholar will accept without *considerable qualification*. But this assumption has been widely made, and in quarters and among classes where the discoveries out of which it grew, are very imperfectly appreciated and understood."

But what is the practical effect of these declarations ? Why, this : that even if we spoke pure German, instead of a language which is *radically* in its structure as unlike German as we ourselves are radically unlike the Germans, it would by no means necessarily follow that we were of the same Aryan race as they apparently for the most part are. The practical effect is, to demolish at a stroke the hypothetical structure of ethnic relations which has been built, like a house of cards, on the affinities of language. The practical effect is, that the labours and writings of those giants in comparative philology—Bopp, Grimm, and the rest,—who were brought in to grind us to powder by an ingenious young gentleman, who described himself with charming unsophistication as a "Teutonic Christian"—are almost entirely, if not quite, beside the question.

We are, therefore, now in this position: that as affinities of language are no longer acknowledged to be *decisive* evidence of affinities of race, we are entitled to ask those who condemn the proposition of our Shemitic origin out of hand as contrary to the first principles of science,—What *are* those first principles of science to which the proposition is contrary ? What are the grounds on which you venture to treat the proposition with scorn, as unworthy of serious discussion ? There are some who will fall back with sublime confidence on ethnologic analogies, and discourse eloquently on sizes of skull, humerus, and femur. We may reply, that to rest the argument on such a ground is too absurd, and decline to consider *that* as worthy of serious discussion; simply because we have no "standard of reference."

But it is necessary to exercise the greatest caution lest we carry an argument beyond its legitimate conclusions. It is necessary to have very clearly in the mind, that although affini-



ties of language are of *themselves* insufficient to determine affinities of race, they do, nevertheless, yield to careful research a clue of immense value to guide us through the mazes of ethnic origin. And for this reason: that any given language is the complete and perfect index and expression of the mental and moral tone, the culture, the polity, the traditions and history, and the psychological idiosyncrasy, of the tribe or race who speak that language.

Hence, in the case where the mother-tongue of a people has been transmuted or displaced to a greater or less extent by another, their new language will retain, in its essential structure and the *tournure* of its idiom, the special characteristics of their mother-tongue—other things being equal—in direct proportion to the survival in the people of independent mental and moral force. A people wanting in native vigour, lacking initiative *verve*, supple and impressionable, will be so dominated by a superior race with whom they come in contact, that they will become so far assimilated in *habit of thought* to the stronger, that nearly all trace of their original speech may be lost by a parallel assimilation. But where a people of potent congenital genius, strenuous courage, and invincible independence, are brought into contact with a race of even equal capacity, and perhaps superior culture, and also immensely outweighing them in numbers, the natural effect would be, that the language of that people would necessarily suffer an extensive transmutation in its *vocabulary*, whilst the changes in its grammatic structure would be superficial and transient. So that, when released from contact with the other race, their strong ethnic idiosyncrasy would reassert itself, and re-vindicate its independence by a continual divergence from the types to whose influence they had been temporarily subjected.

This, indeed, appears to be what has actually occurred with the Anglo-Normans on the one hand, and the Anglo-Saxons on the other. So that we are as much *French* as we are *German*; and not one whit either one or the other.

C. M.

---

## POSTSCRIPT.

In this question of the Identification of the Lost Tribes, there are two different views propounded.

The first in time is that which finds the Tribes in the so-called Teutonic nations generally. This was the crude and rudimentary result of the earlier investigations of the subject many years ago. It was the result which arose—one may say necessarily—in the very nature of the case. Because the conception of a radical ethnic difference between the British Family, whose august homogeneity was consummated at the Norman Conquest, and the Germanic Nation, with the apprehension of the logical consequences of that conception,

had not yet arisen. Because the ideas of ethnic affinity which subsisted at the time of the inception of these investigations were founded on assumptions whose accuracy is now exploded, and which are now—as I have elsewhere shown—declared by the highest scientific authorities themselves to be inadmissible. Not only is it too late, at this time of day, to argue as if affinity of language involved a common ethnic origin, but the very affinity itself in the abstract of our own with typical Teutonic language is broadly questioned and controverted.

Nevertheless it was on the ground of such false assumptions that the theory of Identification was first based; could only be based, until further advance in ethnic and philological research on the one hand, and on the other of the clearer definition and application which that research confirms in a stricter interpretation of the prophetic writings, rendered it possible to eliminate inaccurate premises. So long as the question was thus tied to conditions and assumptions which strained intellectual acceptance by a defiance of the logical instinct of probabilities, it was confined—and this view is still confined—to a comparatively narrow circle.

The later advanced view has grown out of the former, rejects its errors, and displaces it. This perfected argument finds in the prophetic writings the clear identification of the British race and Empire as the heritors of the Ten Tribes; finds that while the Sacred Promises in all their marvellous scope have been in the past, and continue to be palpably accomplished in the accumulating events and circumstances of our national life, those promises have never been, and are nowhere being, as a plain matter of fact, fulfilled in the case of any other nation or race whatever. The British empire is such a "Company," or congregation of nations, "possessing the Gate of its enemies," as not only never has before existed, but nowhere now elsewhere exists. But as the Tribes were to be scattered among, and again gathered from the nations, we shall find detached stray remnants in many lands. Some of these are recognised on the lines of original migration westward across Europe, in parts of Saxony, Denmark, Normandy; and again eastward in remote corners of Asia, whither detachments from the main body had early wandered.

As in the earlier interpretation which assumed a necessary community between our own and the Germanic nation, there is the absolute failure of any application in their case of those prophetic descriptions which in our case, none can dispute so long as words have meaning,—it is the later and more strictly defined interpretation which makes the question vital and personal to each one of us. It is this, not the other, whose mere enunciation falls on the mind like sudden sunlight through a rent cloud; which at once commends itself to searchers in prophecy as the final self-evident solution of the impenetrable difficulties by which they had been beset. Not the other, but this, which has laid hold on the minds of tens of thousands throughout the length and breadth of the empire, strengthened the faith of the faltering, shaken the scepticism of the unbelieving.

Finally, let those who accept the Scripture as the Revelation of the Divine Mind, who believe that it is the summary presentment of the Divine method in the guidance of the affairs of the world, from the beginning to the consummation of all things, and that its development of the Law of Providence is the only true Philosophy of History, let them ask themselves if it be conceivable that precisely the greatest thing in all history, this British Empire, with its absolutely unique conditions and surroundings, should have been left altogether out of account in the Sacred Record? If not, then let them point out how, or where else it is to be identified, than as set forth in the succinct argument which precedes these commentaries on the general question.

*2nd January, 1876.*

C. M.