

Angles, Saxons and Jutes. In their extremity they invited the Jutes to aid them, promising to give them in return the island of Thanet and rations and pay. The Jutes agreed, and for several years fought side by side with the Britons. The Isle of Thanet was particularly agreeable to both parties. To the Jutes because they had no faith in the Britons' word, and to the Britons because they feared and trembled lest they had invited to their island a foe more terrible than the Pict or Scot. The settlement of the Jutes drew hither, others of their kinsmen, until the Britons refused to comply with the terms of agreement. The Teutons turned upon them and after stubborn fighting made the first Teutonic settlement in the little county of Kent. The Jutes were followed by the Angles and Saxons, and before the end of the sixth century the Teutons claimed as their own all the land from the German Ocean to the Severn, and from the English Channel to the Firth of Forth.

Let us now inquire into the character of the conquest. Did the conquerors merely overrun the country, leaving the inhabitants undisturbed, and only supplying the ruling power, or did they make England truly English, leaving no trace of the former inhabitants?

When the English undertook the conquest of the island, they entered upon a fierce struggle. The Briton was as stubborn and as determined as in Roman times. The English wrested from him, bit by bit, the land for which every inch was heroically fought. The Britons were aided in their resistance by the nature of the country. Vast forests and swamps covered the island, and in these, and in the numerous caves they took refuge, only to be driven from them by the barbarians. The English, savage and ferocious by nature, were made more so by the stubborn resistance offered. In their heathen creed, death in battle admitted them directly to their heaven and having little regard for their own lives, they had still less for the lives of others, especially those of their enemies. We are not to suppose that the Celts in Britain were entirely exterminated. But as the Teutons advanced, the Celts returned, and from the nature of the conquest we may reasonably conclude that those who were not expelled, were either slain or reduced to slavery. Stubbs says, "The same weak obstinacy which failed to combine against invasion refused to accept the new dominion, and the Saxons, merciless by nature, were made more so by the sullen and treacherous attitude of their victims. The Britons fled from their homes; whom the sword spared, famine and pestilence devoured. The few that remained, either refused or failed altogether to civilize the conquerors."

After the English had established themselves on the island, the age became one of divarication; the cities went to ruin; christianity became extinct, and all culture with it; England became heathen and barbarous. The Celtists have claimed that the lower classes were Celts, and that the Anglo-Saxons formed only the landed aristocracy. Would not the mere settlement of predatory bands without their homes or families, have resulted in their adoption of the native institutions, those natives being their superiors in civilization? Can anything pure be produced from mixed materials? Could the Teutons have retained their tribal organization so long and so closely if it had been shattered at starting? When the

English came, they came not to conquer merely but to settle, and they brought with them their families, their cattle and slaves, without which they could not have occupied the land. In the days of Bede, the land formerly occupied by the Angles on the continent was without an inhabitant, testifying to the truth of the statement.

If there had been numerous Celts in the community would they not have had some influence upon the language and religion, upon the laws and civilization of the people? Yet we carefully examine all records and survivals, but find no such trace. Contemporary tradition is everywhere the same. Had Celts been numerous in English settlements they must have been known to the Welsh beyond the border. But in the one British record which we possess, that of Gildas, no hint of such a thing is given. To him and his countrymen, England and her inhabitants are utterly foreign. In the English chronicle we find no British names. Had the Celts been so numerous it is quite probable that there would have been Celtic names in the history of the joint population. In the "History of Gaul," by Gregory of Tours, we find almost as many Roman names as Frank, but in the history of England after the conquest we find no British or Roman names at all, although Britons of the independent districts are sometimes mentioned.

We have the same evidence in language. Would the language of the age have been so purely Teutonic if the Celts had been numerous? Would they, with their intense hatred of all things English, have immediately adopted the language and religion, laws and customs of the conquerors? If England had been conquered like the other Roman provinces, the case would have been the very reverse. When the Teutons were conquered by the Western Roman Empire they formed the ruling class, but the language did not change, French still remained a dialect of the Latin: the only change was a large infusion of Teutonic words. The religion was the same, the laws were the laws of the province. Now if England had been conquered in a similar manner, would not the result have been similar? How is it then that after the English conquest the language remained, not Welsh but became purely Teutonic? All the Welsh words in the English vocabulary, such as basket, funnel, mop, etc., apply to the smallest domestic matters, and can be compared to the words which Americans have borrowed from the Indians. While these words are so few in number, all the terms of government and war, and nearly all the terms of agriculture are exclusively Teutonic. The Celts, under their Roman lords, had tilled the soil, and if they had remained in large numbers in English settlements they would probably again have formed the peasantry, and must have introduced a large number of words, since the English were preeminently a warlike race. The conversion of the English, and later the Norman conquest, paved the way for a large infusion of Latin and French words, but, we are told, as in French it is impossible to compose a sentence without a Romance word, while it is perfectly possible to compose sentence after sentence without a foreign word, so in English it is impossible to compose a sentence without a Teutonic word, while it is perfectly possible to compose sentence after sentence without a foreign word. Thus it is seen how the conquest affected the different languages. Had the Celts been as numerous as the Celtists would have us believe, would not English be to-day, not English but Welsh, with