

country for quite a time. From Spain under Heber and Hereimon, two sons of King Milesius they went to Ireland in the year 1300 B.C. They conquered the Tuatha de Danann quite easily in spite of all their knowledge of the black art.

The fabulous history of Ireland, or according to Hine, the true history, may be found very fully in Dr. Kenting's History of Ireland. McGee gives a very brief sketch of it. Gibbon refers to it, vol. I. page 256.

From the account of the settlement of Ireland which I have just given it will be seen that there is a slight chronological difficulty in making the Tuatha de Danann the tribe of Dan. The Tuatha de Danann arrived in Ireland in the year 1300 B.C., whilst the tribe of Dan had not left Judea till the year 721 B.C. I believe however that the Hinites never allow dates to stand in their way; they brush them aside like cobwebs.

The word tuath in Irish means people; tuatha or tuathan being the nominative plural; the word de means of; and the word danann may mean Dane Island; thus it is probable that the words Tuatha de Danann literally mean, the peoples or hordes of Dane-land. Whatever Danann means it cannot mean simply Dan; the latter half of the word, ann, must have some meaning. What then does ann mean? It may unquestionably be the same as in; for it is a rule in Irish orthography that a broad vowel in one syllable must be followed by a broad vowel in the next, and a small vowel followed by a small vowel. The broad vowels are *a, o, u*; the small *e, i*. And what does inn mean? It is a contraction for innis, an island or grazing ground. Erin, properly Eirinn, means Iar-Innis, west-island. That Danann means Dane-island is probable however not only on etymological grounds, but from the fact that the Irish Bards always represent the Tuatha de Danann as coming from Denmark. It may of course be said that Denmark is not an island. It may not be exactly an island; but it was far more likely that an ancient Irish Bard would speak of it as an island than that a modern D.D. would say that Tuatha de Danann means the tribe of Dan.

2. The Celts of Ireland, Mr. Hine tells us, are Canaanites. He proves this to his own satisfaction from prophecy, philology, and history, three things of which he knows nothing.

Hine's prophetic proof of the Canaanitish origin of the Irish is this. "The Canaanites were to be thorns to the Israelites, the Irish Fenians are thorns to the English; therefore the Irish, especially the Fenians are Canaanites." It seems to me that there are some weak points in this argument. In the first place it takes for granted that the Canaanites were to be thorns in the sides of the Israelites, not only in Judaea, but in other countries; and also that the English are Israelites. In the second place it proves too much. Using the same species of reasoning, we may say, the Canaanites were to be thorns to the Israelites, the Indians are thorns to the Yankees, Israelites of the tribe of Manasseh, therefore the Indians, especially Sitting Bull and his braves, are Canaanites.

Let us now look at Hine's philological and historical proofs of the Canaanitish origin of the Irish.

The Irish and the Phœnician alphabet he says consist of the same number of letters, namely sixteen. Any persons who will take the trouble of looking into O'Reilly's Irish English Dictionary will find that there are seventeen letters in the Irish alphabet, namely, *a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, l, m, n, o, p, r, s, t, u*. H is not admitted to the dignity of a letter, it is used only as an aspirate. The Phœnician like the Hebrew alphabet consists of twenty-two letters, not of sixteen. Prof. Whitney of Yale College, a very eminent philologist in his very valuable work, "Language and the Study of Language," says "The Phœnician alphabet was a system of twenty-two signs, all of them possessing consonantal value. It was strictly and exclusively a phonetic system. It received from the Greeks its final perfection. To the Greek alphabet the early Celtic modes of writing trace their origin, mainly through the Latin." Page 462.

No doubt some Irish fabulists assert that Nial, the father of the great Gaelhelus, "by the assistance of two excellent scholars invented the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Irish alphabets." The same fabulists also tell us that Ireland was distinguished for its schools and colleges ages before St. Patrick was born. That Irish monks who were good scholars and had nothing to do should write fables is not to be wondered at, but that men of sense should believe these fables to

be historical facts is something astonishing. If the Irish had letters and a written literature before the days of St. Patrick, how comes it that the Irish words for books, pens, reading, writing, and letters are all of Latin origin.

The Irish language we are gravely told is "identical with the Phœnician." All scholars know that the Phœnician and the Hebrew though different dialects may be regarded as the same language. Augustine, who lived among the Phœnicians of Carthage says—"The Hebrew and the Phœnician languages differ very little from one another." Whitney says, "The Phœnicians spoke a dialect so nearly akin with the Hebrew that its scanty remains are read with no great difficulty by the aid of that language." Page 295. Now no sane man who can speak the Celtic language and spell his way through the Hebrew Bible will say that the Irish and the Hebrew are identical; the former belongs to the Indo-European family of languages, the latter to the Semitic family. A man may be a good Hebrew scholar, and not be able to read one word of Irish.

Hine's historic proof of the identity of the Irish with the Israelites consists merely in the following assertion. "There can be no doubt that the Irish are Canaanites, their own history and legends fairly prove this." It is a great pity that Hine did not condescend to name the history which proves this theory. I hope it is not a story-book.

It is well known that the Irish and the Highlanders are of the same stock. They speak the same language, and call themselves by the same name, Gael. If then the Irish are Canaanites, the Highlanders must also be Canaanites.

That the Irish are Celts is an unquestionable fact. That the Celts of Britain and Ireland came from Gaul all rational historians admit. That Ireland was peopled not directly from Gaul but from Scotland cannot very well be doubted. A learned Irishman, Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Cloyne says,—"Mr. Lhuys gives good ground to think that the first Celts who came to Ireland arrived there, not immediately from Gaul, but rather after remaining for some tract of time in the greater British isle." Gibbon in his own way of putting things says, "It is probable that in some remote period of antiquity, the fertile plains of Ulster received a colony of hungry Scots." Vol. II. page 564.

The Irish would have no reason to be ashamed of a Phœnician origin; neither would they have any cause to be proud of an Israelitish origin. Morally the Phœnicians were not much inferior to the ten tribes, especially at the time of their captivity; intellectually they were at least equal to them. Let the Irish rest satisfied with being what they are, chiefly Celts, descendants neither of Shem nor of Ham, but of Japheth. The Irish Celts were a noble race, distinguished both for their learning and their bravery. Any nation might be proud of the battle of Clontarf.

"Let Erin remember the days of old,
Ere her faithless sons betrayed her;
When Malachi wore the collar of gold
Which he won from the proud invader;
When her kings with standard of green unfurled
Led the Red Branch Knights to danger;
Ere the emerald isle of the western world
Was set in the crown of a stranger."

A. MALACHI.

JUSTIFICATION.

MR. EDITOR, Under head m, "the Christian's anxiety and encouragement," of Sabbath School Lesson XXXIV, which is an exposition of Phil. II. 12-13, the following Christian experience and doctrine are expressed. "The Christian is anxious, not to have himself justified he knows that he is justified by Christ's finished work—but to have himself sanctified." It is true that every truly godly person is anxious to have himself sanctified, but the statement that the Christian is justified by Christ's finished work is ambiguous, if not erroneous. The Bible expresses in many places that one is justified by faith, *i.e.*, faith in the finished work of Christ. If that is the meaning of the statement, it is orthodox. The complete satisfaction rendered by Christ, and His resurrection, are the ground of our justification and His imputed righteousness the condition of it. These are received by faith on the sinner's part, otherwise he is not justified.

Scripture teaches nowhere that the sinner is justified by Christ's finished work, but it teaches all through that Christ, the sinner's substitute, rendered full satisfaction, and whosoever believeth is justified by faith in His death and resurrection.

We hear that so-called modern evangelists preach that the sins of Christians have been forgiven on Calvary. It is possible they mix together the atonement and its blessed effects. If such is to be taught

in our Sabbath schools, we shall very soon have a new way of justification, it is possible many ways, whereas the Bible teaches only one way, *viz.*, by faith.

In the new way suggested, one is justified without faith, justified before he commits sins, before he is born. Yea, all are justified; all necessary on the sinner's part is to believe that he is justified already. Hence the wicked are as safe as the righteous. It is as well not to have faith as to have it, if sinners are justified without it. The article at issue teaches new gospel.

As to the allusion to Christian experience, if the doctrine from which it emanates is true, no one need be anxious about his justification. But if justification is an act of God's free grace, it is questionable if the truly godly is never anxious as to whether the act has taken place in his case.

As a general rule persons of the shallowest type of experience never doubt their conversion, and are not anxious about their justification. According to Psalm II. 7, 9, 11, David did not belong to that class of Christians, nor did Paul, Phil. III. 9; Heb. IV. 1.

A true Christian may even doubt that the act of justification has taken place in reference to him. No wonder; it takes place in heaven. He believes that there is no justification without sanctification immediately following. He believes in the thorough effectual work of the Holy Spirit in all justified persons. He feels his own progress in sanctification so slow, if any at all, that he can scarcely understand how it is possible that one so unholy as he is justified.

An honest Christian may not at all times be able to realize that it is when God blots out his sins, they appear to him in their awfulness and demerits.

It was so with David—"and Nathan said unto David, The Lord also hath put away thy sin," 2 Sam. XII. 13. David notwithstanding prays for forgiveness, Psalm II. 9. Good Christians in our day are similarly anxious.

F.

[The statement that "the Christian knows that he is justified by Christ's finished work" is correct. A Christian is a believer—a believer has faith. By a very natural and easy slip of the mind our correspondent has substituted "sinner" for "Christian," and this makes all the difference. The statement in our lesson is only the interpretation, supplied by Scripture itself, of the Scriptural statement that we are "justified by faith." Faith is, as it were, the hand stretched out to receive the boon; the ground and procuring cause of the believer's justification is "Christ's finished work." Our correspondent's quarrel with "so-called modern evangelists" he must settle with them, not with us. To say that the Christian knows that he is justified by Christ's finished work is quite a different thing from saying that "the sins of Christians have been forgiven on Calvary." Our Sabbath school teachers and even our Sabbath school scholars are too intelligent to misapprehend the statement referred to as our correspondent has done; and there is not the least danger of its leading them into any heresy. We embrace the opportunity of supporting the teaching of the lesson referred to, that the words "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" refer, not to the believer's justification, but to his sanctification.—ED. C. P.]

THANKSGIVING DAY.

MR. EDITOR, —As in all likelihood a Thanksgiving Day will soon be appointed, it might be well to make some different arrangements from that of past years. Is it expedient to have it on a week-day? Would it not be in every way better to have it when you would be likely to have the mass of church-going people out. I have the impression from what has come under my own observation, that it has been hitherto (so far as attendance was concerned, a humiliating affair.

But if there are good reasons why it should be held on a week-day, is it necessary that it should be at a time the worst possible for the great bulk of those who attend church?

I do not think I am wrong in supposing that the great majority of members and adherents of the Presbyterian Church live in the country. I believe that the most of country ministers have two churches in which they preach every Sabbath day. Is it wise then, to appoint a service at a time when the roads are usually at their worst, and the days very short? The arrangements of past years may have suited city congregations, certainly they have not suited the town and country churches; for as is well known, in many cases, if not in the majority of cases, town congregations are largely made up of those who live and labour in the country. Your correspondent found it unexpedient last year to observe the day appointed, and unless it is made with greater wisdom this year, there will be a repetition of the omission. OBSERVER.