

The Students' Scrap Book,

TO ONE WHO DRINKS.

BY FAITH.

Oh! it cannot be, as they tell me,
That you'r nearing the fatal goal;
It cannot be as they tell me,
That the demon will ruin your soul.

They tell me, his chains are around you,
Filling your life with pain.
That you rise above the tempter
Only to fall again.

It cannot be! that your manly form
Must be crushed by the fatal spell,
Will honor be lost, and bright hopes fade
From the hearts that you love so well?

Oh! how often since first we met,
I have wondered with sad surprise,
Why one of such strength and tenderness,
So earnest, and manly and wise—

Should be crushed by the tempter's spell,
Should be lured from the path of right,
But I trust that it will not subdue.
You must put on your armor and fight.

Two paths are now open before you—
One leads upward to honor and fame;
The other goes downward and backward
To darkness and horror and shame.

With God by your side you will conquer,
And to you are his promises given,
The tried that endureth temptation,
Shall be crowned in the kingdom of heaven.

WHO WERE THE FOUNDERS OF THE MODERN ENGLISH RACE?

Until within the past fifty years, the Ancient Britons were universally regarded as the ancestors of the English people, and the advent of the Saxons was considered a mere episode in the national life. No one stopped to consider how the name English came to be applied to a so called Celtic country, or why the language was not Celtic. But with the revival of the study of the Anglo-Saxon language, opinion changed. After a superficial study, writers jumped to the conclusion that the English people are Teutons.

Recently a third opinion has been advanced, a kind of compromise between the two preceding theories. It claims that only the rural districts of the south-eastern counties are Teutonic; that the counties of the north and west are Celtic. Between these two districts the two races are gradually combined, forming the modern English race.

Our writer says that the pendulum of popular opinion has swung from the exclusively Celtic, to the exclusively Teutonic theories; but now bounds backward almost to the starting point, each vibration bringing the see-saw of opinion one degree nearer the equilibrium of truth.

The term Celt applies to the descendants of the inhabitants of Britain and Ireland previous to the Roman occupation. Strictly speaking they were not Celts, but a

mixture of the aboriginal Euskarian, and the Aryan Celtic races.

It is an established fact that the Celts were not destroyed by the Romans—as the connubium was not granted them, they kept quite distinct from Roman colonists, the Anglo-Saxon invasion. There has been much controversy as to whether the Saxons exterminated the Celtic population of England. The supporters of the Teutonic theory contend that they were entirely driven out. Their chief authority lies in the history of that period. But this has been proved spurious. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, on which all later works are based, is the earliest record extant. This record, written some centuries after the events which it narrates occurred, undoubtedly had for its foundation the traditions of a more than half barbarous people. This fact is apparent from the chronicle itself. It is very explicit in giving dates, but at the lowest reckoning, when compared with Roman dates, it leaves some ten years, which cannot be accounted for. Hengist and Horsa are different names for the national emblem, the horse, and are no more the names of leaders than the eagle is the name of an American leader. In fact the Anglo-Saxon chronicle is about as authentic as the legends of the hero kings of Greece and Rome.

Then again the fact that the Welsh writers make no mention of their eastern kinsman, has been given as another proof that they were driven out. But the Welsh hated and despised a Celt who would submit even more than they did the Saxons, and by their silence showed their contempt. Because the language is Teutonic, the Teutonists contend that the people are Teutons. But philology has little connection with ethnology, only so far as it suggests. Take for example, French History proves that the French are the descendants of three different races; that they have adopted the names of one of their invaders, and the language of another. Suppose that the French language remained as the sole evidence of the ancient population of Gaul, would the keenest philologist arrive at any conclusion other than that this people is essentially a Latin race, which has had a slight connection with the Celts and Teutons? Could not the same be true of England? As the influence of the Celtic and Teutonic languages suggests the presence of those races in France, does not the slight presence of the Celtic in the English language suggest the same in England?

While the Celts were compelled by their conquerors to adopt the Anglo-Saxon language and laws, they still remained Celts in reality. That they still retained their individuality, and exerted an influence over their conquerors, is evident from a comparison between the Teutons of England and Germany to-day.

There are two reasons why the classic Anglo-Saxon language was little affected by the Celts. It would have been unnatural for the Saxons conquerors to have adopted the language of their subjects: all Germans have a natural aversion to foreign words, preferring always to translate rather than to transpose a word. Hence any survival of the Celtic in Anglo-Saxon language is doubly important, since it proves a close connection between the two races. Because of the hostility between the Celts of Wales and the Saxons, this influence could have come from no other source than the Celts of England. But in the dialects the Celtic influence is much more prominent than in the classic language. Classic lan-