

peculiarities confined to a few unenlightened peoples, such as the ancient Germans and Britons, it would be a graceful thing to admit that the schoolmaster was abroad when the so-called myth sprang into being, and there leave the matter. But when they are found common to the traditions of Phœnicia, Egypt, Chaldea, Persia, India, Arabia, Ethiopia, North Africa, Italy, Greece, the Celtic and Germanic peoples and the numerous families of Asia Minor; when they are seen to have been perpetuated from age to age, and retained in spite of advancing knowledge, even to the prejudice of the traditions in which they are found; when the romance of the middle ages, spite of all the changes to which it subjects the old world story, did not discard them nor alter what were well known as geographical absurdities and unheard of relations among nations: it is then wise to ask if no other reason than universal unbounded ignorance in regard to relation and locality on the part of the ancients can be given for their singular agreement in these particulars.

So numerous are the facts, from a consideration of which the intimate connection of all peoples prior to the historic period may be inferred, that I can simply indicate a few of the classes into which they may be divided. Some are philological in character. The study of comparative philology has resulted in an established belief in the common origin of the languages called Indo-European. It has, however, been customary to erect a barrier between the Semitic and the Indo-European languages, and thus to cut off Phœnician, Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, &c., from the last great brotherhood of tongues, while Coptic, Ethiopic, and the languages of the Assyrian inscriptions have been kept in a state of suspense, being assigned now to one family and now to another. It must surely have occurred to those who hold out most strongly for a radical diversity of the Semitic from the Indo-European languages, that the many connections of old Greek, Bœotic especially, with Phœnician,³⁸ and the conclusion often arrived at that the Pelasgian and Phœnician tongues were identical;³⁹ the fact that Coptic lies midway between the Semitic and Indo-European languages, and comes nearest of all to the Celtic branch of the latter;⁴⁰ and the unsatisfactory way in which the difficulty that leaves the cuneiform inscriptions of Chaldea between heaven and earth is removed by calling them Hamitic:—from these considerations—it must surely have

³⁸ Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacrae*, p. 400. Rawlinson in Herod. ii., 49.

³⁹ Russell's Connection, by Wheeler, ii., 99.

⁴⁰ Pococke, *India in Greece*, 208. Rawlinson, Herod. App. Bk. ii., Ch. 1.