évonsious,” then there is an end of the argument; but my answer to What can the Fellows do? is, "What we are doing," we are, we are in the midst of the battle, and in the midst of the battle is the power, every St. Andrew’s day, to overthrow our government, and elect whomsoever we please. And at the meeting for election of Fellows in June it would be easy for us to make any mistake in the name of the Society, and in putting the name of a better man. Whether invalids or not, is beside the question; for in selling we are but exercising an unquestionable right. We, the Fellows, have the right to sell, our name, our money, our goods, our brains, our health, their health, our brains, their brains, our beauty, their beauty, their good works, to whom we please. If their health were to decline, and they were to become invalids, twenty, thirty, or the whole list of candidates, should our occasions or our pleasure lead us to do such a thing as to elect them? Or, if their brains were to decline, should we not have the right to elect others? And if they are not capable, shall we hardly be persuaded to abandon them? No; we shall remain in the same position as before, a safeguard. Whether it shall continue to be a safeguard, in the most literal sense of the term, depends on ourselves.

S. R. F.

THE SHEPHERD-KINGS.

Bekesbourne, June 19, 1869.

The distinction between the Mitmar of sacred history and the Egypt of profane history for which I once listened, and which the discoveries of M. Mariette Bey, now brought to public notice by Prof. Owen, go so far to prove, is not made by me to depend on the mere use or disuse of the horse or draymyn hours of the one and the other; but it is at any particular period, as I understand my friend, Mr. Hyde Clarke, to imply, is but a fact established, as far as it can be established on negative evidence, as the disappearance of all signs of the existence of those animals in the one, and the apparent increase or comparative late period, whereas they are proved by the early history of the Israelites to have been well known in Mitmar, which country I identify with that part of the Hyksos or Shepherd-Kings of Manesche.

To this identification, the objection has, however, been raised that in Genesis xli. 34, it is said, "As the shepherd of Mitmar," which objection would be conclusive, were it not that the word "abomination," used in this and other passages in the Pentateuch, is a mistranslation of the Hebrew, which is properly "labbor," (to labor), may be thus satisfactorily shown.

The word in question is derived from the root "labbor," of which Gesenius says in his Lexicon, "It is used only in the plural, and the primary idea seems to be to thrust forth, or cast out, and hence to refuse, to labor, to abominate;" comparing it, however, with "labbor," (to labor), to which he gives the double meaning of "to desire, to long after," and "to abominate, to hate, etc., etc.

Now, I conceive that the two roots are, in fact, identical, the guttural "b" in the one being softened into "a" in the other, and that their primary meaning is not to thrust forth or cast away in a bad sense, but indefinitely, to put away or aside, to set apart, to separate, either in a good or in a bad sense, and hence to desire or hate, and consequently, and this, too, either for a good or for a bad purpose, as is so remarkably the case with the root "habbath.

The Greek avvarbig, the Latin sacer, the French secret, and even the English sacred and secret, are derived from the same root. These last two words are thus used together in a bad sense by Milton:

But to destruction sacred and secret.

Consequently, the primary meaning of the Hebrew noun-substantive, "secret", is "a person or thing set apart," belonging to a distinct class, and thus approved of or rejected; and this word is further changed into a verb, or otherwise, either in a good or in a bad sense. The tabob of the South Sea islanders offers an exact parallel. It is taboo for the two sexes to eat together, and the punishment if they do so is to be put out with strangers (Genesis xxviii. 32); and in like manner many persons, animals and things are taboo, as shepherds and goatherds and their flocks were to do.

When, therefore, Joseph told his brethren to say to Pharaoh, "Thy servants’ trade hath been about cattle," he did so, not because every shepherd was an "abomination" unto the Mitmar, which would have been an absurdity, but because shepherds