

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

ANGLO-ISRAEL.—NO. VII.

Philo-Israel's Historical, Ethnic and Philological arguments in proof of British identity with the lost ten tribes of Israel are here concluded.

TYNDALE'S TESTIMONY.

33. Lastly, the testimony of Tyndale, the first translator of the Hebrew Bible must not be overlooked, as a proof of the philological affinity between the Hebrew and the English tongues. He declared in the quaint language of his day, "Ye Greke tongue agreeth more with ye Englyshe than with ye Latyne; and ye properties of ye Hebrew tongue agree a thousand tymes more with ye Englyshe, than with ye Latyne." Why this should be, unless the Hebrew and the English languages were closely allied in idiomatic structure and grammatical texture, let the reader reflect. Tyndale did not know. We do!

THE TRIBE OF DAN.

34. Our task now approaches its conclusion. It only needs that we note the fact, that the Gothic or Teutonic races, in their wanderings, holding in their midst portions of the tribes of Israel then passing under those Gentile tribal designations, yet left behind them on the road "topographical and etymological evidences that a Hebrew people had passed that way from Asia, westward. They left in the rivers on the route, the Hebrew termination *Dan* a memento of their beloved Jordan." For in southern and central Europe, we have the names of the *Don*, the *Danube*, the *Dan-iever*, and the *Dan-iever*. Then we have the *Edun* (the Po), the *Rhodan* (the modern Rhone). *Denmark* (Dan-mörk), the "limit or border of Dan," and the *Tuatha de Danann* or "tribe of Dan," who partially colonized Ireland some centuries before the birth of Christ.

THE IRISH CELTS.

35. Finally we must notice, though this part of the subject cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty, that a very early influx of Israelite immigrants into Ireland and Cornwall with Spanish Celts about B.C. 720, is strongly suspected, and rests on the foundation of tradition and ethnological with etymological reasoning which is well drawn up in "Bishop Titcomb's Anglo-Israel Post-bag," pp. 45-47.

36. He considered two things proved. (1) That the Israelites, or at least some of them, may have escaped about B.C. 720 from the coasts of Israel to Tarshish in Spain, where a Hebrew colony already existed, if not in other parts of Spain also, as at Saguntum; (2) that some of the Spanish Celts (and if so, why not the Israelites' branch resident among them?) "migrated to Cornwall and Ireland." There is nothing to negative this hypothesis, but much to give it colour and consistence. On the coast of Cornwall the oldest seaport towns bear Hebrew names, such as *Marazion* and *Port Isaac*; while in the north of Ireland there are many spots recording the name of Dan, his "wanderings," and his "resting places."

ARE THE CONTINENTAL NATIONS ISRAELITES?

37. Here we must meet an objection which our subject always summons to the front; and that is that "if Israel be in Britain—because identified with the Khumri, the Cimri, the Sacre, and the Saxons of Europe—the Celts and German races now on the continent of Europe must be Hebrews too, since Israel was once a part of them."

38. In reply, we say, "that it is one thing to affirm that colonists, or tribes, or families of lost Israel joined the nomade races called the Goths or Scythians in B.C. 720, again in A.D. 100, and finally throughout the centuries up to A.D. 400, when they utterly disappear from history as *Israel*, but quite another to allege as our opponents hold us to do, that the nations to which the Israelites joined themselves were Hebrews also."

39. God's Word declares that Israel of the House of Ephraim were to become "wanderers among" the Gentiles or nations (Hosea ix. 17; Ezek. xi. 16). But He did not declare they should *always* so continue. He promised "to gather" them "out from" the countries, and "from" the Gentiles, where He had scattered them Himself (Ezek. xi. 17; xxxvii. 1-14). The "vision of the valley of dry bones" in the last quoted passage of Ezekiel, gives us the very *modus operandi*, and we saw it effected, as we have found history depicts it, by the transfer of the "wandering," or "Scy-

thian," or "Nomade," or "Hebrew" elements (all these words mean, like Woden, "the wanderers") out of the Teutonic, Scandinavian, Celtic, Frank matrices in which Israel's lost tribes had been held during their penal journeyings. (See Hosea viii. 8).

CONCLUSIONS.

40. Such, then, is the historical, ethnographical and philological explanation of our British position to-day, as the lineal representatives and descendants of "lost Israel." Our views reconcile God's Word with facts in British history; and there is nothing—as candid writers on the subject testify—in history, in philology, or in ethnic science either, which can be held to negative our contention, that the British folk derived from Celtic, Scythian, Teutonic, German, Gothic, or Frankish ancestry, were "Israelites after all."

41. May the Lord accept this attempt to bring this difficult subject within the comprehension of those many persons among us, who, repelled by the learned arguments of our scientific opponents, want some simple weapons to parry their attacks on what are in fact God's truth, founded on His Holy Word, respecting "our identity" with His chosen people Israel.

APPENDIX.

1. A review of our nation's history between A.D. 1820 and 1875, by Oscar Browning, M.A., Sen. Fellow King's College, Cambridge, plainly testifies that God's best blessing rests abundantly on the British—the blessings, *we* add, promised to Israel.

2. He finds "that England of the present day is incomparably stronger, happier, better, than England at the time of the Regency; also, that not only are Englishmen better fed, better taught, better governed, and more united than they were, but that the nation is, for all purposes of offence and defence, far stronger than it was at the time when it carried on the struggle against Napoleon."

3. Browning finds also that "in population, in wealth, in exports, in inland trade, in colonial power and colonial population too, the increase has been enormous, while relatively to the nations of Europe ours has advanced faster in numbers, in wealth, and in territorial greatness generally."

4. All these being blessings given us from on high, *because we are Israel*, we ask all our readers to recognize the facts, and to *praise the Lord* (Psalm cxlvii. 19, 20; Isa. lxi. 9).

PHILO-ISRAEL.

In my next article I hope to be able to show in a few particulars how faithfully the British nation corresponds to section two of the advertisement (see CANADA PRESBYTERIAN July 11th, page 580), viz, "They [the ten tribes of Israel] were to spread forth to the west and to the east, and to the north and to the south, and were to dwell in the coasts or sides of the earth, as well as in the islands of the sea, and to possess the 'gates of their enemies.'"

"ALWAYS READY."

STEALING SERMONS.

MR. EDITOR,—In your issue of the 8th of August a communication appeared over the signature of "Critic," charging a minister from a distant part of the Dominion with preaching a sermon which was not his own, but which had been preached by the Rev. Chas. Vince of London, Eng., and published in the second volume of the "Christian World Pulpit." The indefiniteness of the phrase, "a distant part of the Dominion," may apply to the Province of Manitoba or to the Maritime Provinces. I presume it refers to either one or the other. Shortly after the close of the General Assembly, several of the ministers from the Maritime Provinces visited Toronto and some of the towns within a hundred miles of that city, and preached in these places. I would not trouble you with the matter now, save for the fact that the name of a highly esteemed minister is mentioned in connection with the charge made by "Critic." I, for one, believe him to be incapable of anything so unworthy of a Christian minister as the preaching of another man's sermon as his own. And, now, in order that the innocent may no longer be blamed, I demand, as a matter of justice to all the ministers "from a distant part of the Dominion," who may have been preaching recently in Toronto or its neighbourhood, that "Critic" shall without any delay surrender the name of the offender with satisfactory proofs of his guilt to the CANADA PRESBYTERIAN for publication. Then it will remain with the Presbytery of which the culprit may be a member to take such action as the circumstances of

the case may demand. If "Critic" will not comply with this request, he must remain under the charge of wantonly slandering a minister of the Gospel without having the courage to prove his statements.

We have had surely quite enough of these reckless charges of plagiarism against ministers. I think it is only right that the papers which open their columns to such communications as that signed by "Critic," should be prepared to assume the responsibility of their acts.

D. WATERS.

St. John, N.B., Sept. 22nd, 1879.

"Critic," no doubt from merciful motives, did not furnish us with the name of the delinquent preacher. Even had he done so it is very probable that the same merciful considerations would have induced us to withhold it, at least in the first instance. The matter, however, assumes a different phase when an indefinite charge of that kind is taken up by parties who have some sinister object in view and used against the reputation of ministers who are perfectly innocent. We therefore join Dr. Waters in demanding "that 'Critic' shall without any delay surrender" to us, for publication, "the name of the offender, with satisfactory proofs of his guilt." In the meantime we may state that we happen to be in possession of quite sufficient information to enable us to assure Dr. Waters that the highly esteemed minister to whom he refers is *not* the guilty party. As to whether or not "we have had . . . quite enough of these . . . charges of plagiarism against ministers," our opinion is that the plagiarism should stop first and the charges afterwards. It is not a great many months since we heard a good sermon of McCheyne's delivered from a pulpit with school-boy accuracy and without quotation marks.—Ed. C.P.]

MINISTERIAL INCOMES.

MR. EDITOR,—Your editorial of last week on the Minutes of Assembly is suggestive. The classification of ministerial incomes is fitted to arrest attention, and should awaken consideration. The writer of this letter doubts his ability to lead discussion on this matter, but hopes that others more gifted and better informed may follow, so that the lesson of the past may teach in the time to come.

Beginning where your figures end, we find there are not less than seventy ministers of the Church in real, though comparative, privation, who may be able by virtue of the prudent economy of themselves and wives to provide against actual want, but must of necessity fare poorly, live meanly, and whose libraries and other requisites to a useful ministerial life must be of the most meagre description. They can *preach* the blessings of Christian charity, but are denied the privilege of being able to *give* to him that needeth. These are, no doubt, *men of faithful prayer, who amid their anxieties rely on the Word of Him who has promised "enough" to the godly and to his seed.* Let our Church remember how God answers the prayers of such—that He looks to us as His stewards to distribute his bounty, and expects us to see that each of the "seventy" gets his portion.

Passing upwards in the "List" we find a large proportion of the "Incomes" yet under the *minimum* the Church has deemed desirable and necessary, though a comparison of this with that of former years shews gained ground and cheering progress. Passing upward to the top we are reminded that whilst our church has fixed the *desirable minimum* of ministerial income nothing has been said as to the *desirable maximum*. Are we to be Congregational in this? Are wealthy congregations to follow step by step in the ways of the world in creating prizes for the popular man who may catch the passing fancy of the hour? Are we not even now paying salaries that are unreasonably large to some of our ministers whilst so many brethren of the same flock are in straitened circumstances? Has the Church no duty to perform in dealing with this matter? If so, let faithful dealing with our esteemed brethren be begun by pointing out that we are in danger of fostering the pride of our wealthy congregations, and of placing a stumbling block in the way of the faithfulness of their minister. The world points to the purple and fine linen, to the exalted title, to wealth and power, as her rewards. Let not the church we love take the weapons of the adversary into her own hands, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," let us faithfully remind each other of what and how much is meant when the Saviour says "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his