





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1841.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus.*

(Concluded from the No. for April, p. 306.)

II. IN the examination of the essays Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus, begun in our No. for April, the second position proposed to be considered had respect to the strength of the wines in Palestine. "It is impossible," says Mr. Parsons, "to obtain strong alcoholic cider from sweet apples, and for the same reason *it is impossible to obtain strong wines from very sweet grapes, but the grapes of Palestine, Asia Minor, Egypt, &c. were exceedingly sweet.*" Anti-Bacchus, p. 203. And why is it impossible? Let Mr. Parsons answer. "Thus the sweetness of the fruits and of the juices, together with the high temperature of the climate, must have been fatal to the existence of strong alcoholic wines." p. 204.

It is true, indeed, that the expressed juice of the grape may be so rich in saccharine matter, as to interfere with its undergoing a thorough fermentation; and it is also true that, in this case, the wine will not be so strong as when the juice is less sweet. But before we conclude that a strong wine cannot be produced from "grapes exceedingly sweet," let us inquire whether there is no method of diminishing the sweetness of the must, and of so increasing the fermen-

tation, that all the saccharine matter shall be converted into alcohol? When this point is settled, we can then determine what is possible. Is there any difficulty in the way of mixing sufficient water with the must to reduce it to the state most favourable to fermentation? "It sometimes happens," says Chaptal, "that the must is altogether too thick and too sugary; in this case the fermentation is gentle and imperfect, and the wines are sweet, luscious, and clammy. . . . *It will be easy in all these cases to promote the fermentation; it may be done by diluting the must with water: also by agitating the vintage as it ferments: but all this must be subordinate to the end proposed to be attained, and the intelligent agriculturist will vary the process according to the effect which he proposes to produce.*"*

The high temperature of the climate is mentioned by Mr. Parsons as another reason, why a strong wine cannot be produced in Palestine. That this reason has no foundation in fact, must be evident from the following quotation:

"Syria has three distinct climates. The summits of Libanus covered with snow diffuse a salubrious coolness through the interior, while the maritime low situations are constantly subjected to heat accompanied with humidity. . . . In the mountains, the order of the seasons very nearly resembles that of the middle of France: the winter lasting from November to March is sharp. No year passes without falls of snow, which often cover the surface to the depth of several feet during entire months. The spring and autumn are very agreeable, and the summer not oppressive." Malte Brun's *Geography*. Book xxviii.

This statement given on the authority of Volney, is confirmed by recent travellers and residents in Syria. Carne, p. 14, speaks of "the high central chain of Lebanon covered with snow." And on page 40, he says of the villages inhabited by the Druze mountaineers, that they "are situated on one of the wildest positions of Lebanon: in *winter*, a cold and storm beat, in *summer* a welcome residence on account of its pure and bracing air." The Rev. Mr. He-

* Il arrive quelquefois, que le moût est à la fois trop épais et trop sucré: dans ce cas, la fermentation est toujours lente et imparfaite, les vins sont doux, liquoreux, et pâteux. . . . Il seroit aisé, dans tous les cas, de provoquer la fermentation, soit en délayant, à l'aide l'eau, un moût trop épais, soit en agitant la vendange à mesure qu'elle fermente: mais tout cela doit être subordonné au but qu' on se propose d'obtenir, et l'agriculteur intelligent variera ses procédés selon l'effet qu' il se proposera d'obtenir." Chaptal, *Traité sur les Vins*, chap. IV.

bard, of the Syrian mission, speaking of Mount Lebanon says, "What an excellent retreat from the sultry atmosphere of the plain is Mount Lebanon. I hardly know what we should do without it, as it would be dangerous to pass the summer in Beyroot. I doubt whether a more salubrious climate can be found in the world, than is enjoyed by the inhabitants of this goodly mount. Its cool and limpid waters gushing out of the rocks—its gentle and refreshing breezes and pure and healthful atmosphere, brace up the system and invigorate its impaired energies." *Missionary Herald* for February, 1840.

Whatever may be the heat of the low lands of Syria, the temperature of Mount Lebanon, where the best wine in Palestine was made, must be sufficiently cool for the most perfect fermentation. And if any farther testimony is desired, in regard to the seasons of Lebanon, it can be found in the letters addressed to the *New York Observer*, by Mr. Buckingham, and by the Rev. Messrs. Bird and Smith, of the Syrian mission. See also the *Biblical Researches* of Prof. Robinson, vol. iii, p. 344, and note 1, p. 440.

If then as stated by Dr. Henderson, p. 6, the temperature most favourable to fermentation is about the *sixty-fifth* degree of Fahrenheit, it must be abundantly evident, that the temperature of Mount Lebanon is not so high as to render it impossible to produce a strong wine from its rich grapes. The assertion of Mr. Parsons is not supported by a single authority, and it is moreover directly at variance with the testimony of the most credible witnesses. The Rev. Eli Smith says of the wines of Lebanon, that they are stronger than the wines of Georgia and Hungary, further north,* and yet even the Tokay of Hungary contains nearly ten per cent. of alcohol.†

Mr. Carne, in one of his descriptions of Mount Lebanon, makes mention of "the strong white wines of Lebanon," and adds that "the *vin d'or* is the champagne of the East."

And now let us ask what countries produce the strongest wines? Are they not the very countries in which the grapes arrive at the most perfect maturity, and in which they abound in saccharine matter? What modern wines are stronger than those of Madeira, Sicily, Spain and Portugal, and from what other than grapes of the richest juice do they

* See Mr. Smith's letter in the No. for April, p. 283.

† See *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 164.

obtain these strong wines, containing in general from sixteen to twenty-three per cent. of alcohol?

“If in France,” says Mr. Parsons, “where the saccharine qualities of the grape are most favourable to perfect fermentation, the wines when unmixed with alcohol are weak; if the strongest wine, that the pure juice of the grape yields, does not contain more than eight per cent. of spirit, then how weak the wines must have been in those climates, whose high temperature gave to the fruits an excess of saccharine matter; and consequently the wines of Palestine, and other hot climates, if allowed to ferment previous to the invention of stills and distillation, must have had in them a *very small portion of alcohol*, and for want of more spirit would have turned sour.” *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 203.

So then we see, that if Mr. Parsons is right, in his facts and arguments, it was not only impossible in ancient times to obtain a strong wine from the grapes of Palestine, but it was also impossible to keep a fermented liquor obtained from these grapes from turning sour. Upon whose authority but his own does Mr. Parsons make the statement, that “the strongest wine which the pure juice of the grape yields, does not contain more than *eight per cent.* of spirit”? The choicest wines of France contain from ten to twelve per cent., and the wines from which, in the southern departments of France, brandy is made, afford not less than seventeen per cent. of alcohol, as appears from the statements of Chaptal and others, who tell us that from three gallons of wine, one gallon of brandy is obtained, and brandy contains upwards of fifty per cent. of alcohol.* This fact alone is sufficient proof, that the pure juice of the grape can of itself, and without any foreign admixture, produce a wine containing more than double the quantity of alcohol assigned to it by Mr. Parsons. It would be ridiculous to suppose that they add brandy to the wines which they design to convert at once into brandy; and if so, each of the three gallons that produce a gallon of brandy must contain at least seventeen per cent. of alcohol.

Granting then that the grapes of Palestine contain a greater abundance of saccharine matter than the grapes of France, this very circumstance would enable one more readily to obtain a strong wine from the grapes of Pales-

* The quantity of alcohol in brandy, in the table given by Mr. Parsons, p. 164, is 53.39 *per cent.*

tine than he could from the grapes of France, and yet from these a pure wine is obtained, containing from twelve to seventeen per cent. of alcohol. Add to this, that the wines of Palestine were often preserved in skins, through the pores of which, the watery portions escape in greater or less quantity, while the alcohol is retained, and it will be apparent that, in ancient times, they may have had in Palestine strong wines, and wines rendered strong solely from the quantity of alcohol, produced in the course of fermentation.

III. The third position to be examined is, that the Hebrew term translated in our English version of the Bible, "strong drink" is inaccurately rendered, and should be "sweet drink."

The following passages indicate the views of Mr. Parsons: "I have made these remarks to show, that our translators had no warrant for rendering the word 'shacar'* in every instance by the terms 'strong drink.' Had they used the words 'sweet drink,' they would have approached much nearer to the truth; for there is not a particle of doubt, that shacar meant a sweet, luscious, satisfying liquor. Theodoret and Chrysostom, both Syrians, and therefore good witnesses, assert that shacar was palm wine, and Dr. Shaw says, that 'this liquor is of a more luscious sweetness than honey.'" *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 255.

"In making the preceding remarks, I do not deny that shacar might be rendered inebriating by the addition of drugs; or that those, who sought inebriation, hesitated to produce such a mixture; and wines thus drugged may constitute the sicera of which Jerome speaks; but still I maintain that when shacar is used in Scripture, we are to understand a weak, sweet palm wine, unless the context shall intimate the reverse," p. 257.

Our first remark on these passages is, that we presume Mr. Parsons has consulted neither Theodoret or Chrysostom, to ascertain the meaning of שֶׁכָּר (shekhar), but has copied the observation of Lowth, on the import of this term, and that too without any acknowledgment. Lowth's words are, "Theodoret and Chrysostom on this place, (Isaiah v. 11), both Syrians, and unexceptionable witnesses, to what belongs to their own country, inform us, that שֶׁכָּר (σικερα in the Greek of both Testaments, rendered by us by the general

* In all quotations we give the Hebrew terms as they are spelled by the authors from whom we quote.

term *strong drink*;) meant properly palm wine or date wine." In this comment, Lowth seems to have overlooked a limitation to this definition of שָׂרָא given by Chrysostom; who says, that "sicera in this place (ἐνταῦθα) is the juice of dates, which by bruising and crushing the fruit, they labour to convert into wine." What the character of this wine was is stated in the next member of the sentence. "This kind of sicera is stupefactive and efficacious in producing drunkenness."* These properties of this kind of strong drink, Lowth also most distinctly mentions. Referring to the name *cariotae*, given by Pliny, xiv. 19, to the palm or date trees, and to the remarks of this author, that the name is derived from the circumstance that the wines obtained from them are hurtful to the head, Lowth adds—"Καρος signifies *stupefaction*, and in Hebrew likewise, the wine has its name from its remarkable inebriating qualities." Our second remark on the passages cited from Anti-Bacchus, on the import of שָׂרָא is, that there is no contradiction between the significations assigned to this term by Jerome and Chrysostom, the former of whom says of sicera, the Greek term for שָׂרָא, "omnem significat potionem, quæ inebriare potest," "sicera denotes every drink which can intoxicate." Of course it includes the palm or date wine, which Chrysostom says is the import of the term in the particular passage, on which he is commenting, and the wine he describes as remarkable for its stupefying and intoxicating qualities. The comments of Theodoret on Isaiah we have not at hand, and therefore cannot give his language, but as his work is said to be an abridgment of that of Chrysostom,† and as Lowth makes no mention of any discrepancy in their statements, but on the contrary refers to them both as giving the same testimony, we may safely infer, that between Theodoret also and Jerome there is no disagreement respecting the import of *shekhar*, and that whether this term denotes palm wine, or some other drink, it always denotes a drink which can produce intoxication.

Our next remark is, that Dr. Shaw does not say that this palm or date wine is of a more luscious sweetness than honey, as is asserted by Mr. Parsons, but that the *fresh*

* Σίκερα δὲ ἐνταῦθά φησι τῶν φοινίκων τὸν ὄπον, ὃν ἐπετήδευον, συντριβόντες τὸν καρπὸν καὶ καταβλῶντες, εἰς οἴνου μετασχημασίῳ φύσιν, καρωτικὸν δὲ ἔστι τὸ τοιοῦτο, καὶ μέθης ἐργαστικόν.

† See Gregory's Church History, Vol. I. p. 293.

juice of the palm tree, which Dr. S. informs us, the natives of the Sahara in Africa, call "*honey*," not wine, is "of a more luscious sweetness than honey," and that "it is of the consistence of a thin syrup, but quickly groweth tart and ropy, acquiring an intoxicating quality, and giving by distillation an agreeable spirit, steam or arâky, according to the general name of these people for all hot and strong liquors extracted by the alembic." See Shaw's Travels, p. 225.

Mr. Parsons says, "I do not deny that shacar might be rendered inebriating by the addition of drugs." Of course he would have us believe, that *shekhar* is not intoxicating, unless rendered so by the addition of drugs. But what evidence does he give us that this is so? Does Chrysostom say that it was drugs which made the date wine stupefactive and inebriating? No. Does Dr. Shaw say so? On the contrary, he says that it acquires an intoxicating quality by becoming tart and ropy. Does Bishop Lowth say so? Not at all. His words are, "In Hebrew, also, the wine has its name (*shekhar*) from its remarkable inebriating quality." showing that the very name itself implies that the liquor denoted by it is inebriating. Does Mr. Parsons produce a single instance in which שֶׁכָּר (*shekhar*) denotes a liquor that is not intoxicating?

He does indeed cite two passages from Scripture, in which he maintains that the term *shekhar* denotes a sweet or palm wine. Grant it. Does this prove that it is not intoxicating? Do not his own authorities for rendering שֶׁכָּר (*shekhar*) palm wine, inform us that this sweet palm wine was powerfully inebriating? But let us examine the texts referred to by Mr. Parsons, and his comments on them. The first is in Isaiah—"They shall not drink wine with a song, strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it." "That shacar in Scripture is sweet," says Mr. P., "is evident from the contrast expressed in Isaiah xxiv. 9, 'strong drink shall become bitter.' Lowth translates the verse, 'The palm wine shall be bitter,' and paraphrases it, 'all enjoyment shall cease, the sweetest wine shall become bitter;' the contrast between shacar 'sweet' and the term 'bitter' is here placed in striking opposition." It is true, that the paraphrase places the contrast between *shekhar* and the term 'bitter' in striking opposition; but it is equally true that the use of the Hebrew word יָרַי rendered by Lowth 'shall be bitter,' does not determine any thing in regard to the luscious nature of *shekhar*, for we find in Exodus xv. 23, that the children of

Israel could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were *bitter*, in Hebrew, מְרִים (marim,) both words יַמֵּר and מְרִים being derived from מָרַר. Are we to infer from the use of מְרִים in Exodus xv. 23, that water “is a sweet, luscious, satisfying drink”? The truth is that the word יַמֵּר used by the prophet Isaiah would apply not only to palm wine, but with equal propriety to any other drink capable of producing exhilaration of spirits; the obvious meaning of the whole passage being, that during the terrible judgments of God denounced by the prophet, those who were subjected to them would be in such bitterness of soul, that they would have no inclination to indulge in merriment and drinking, even could they command the wine and other strong drinks, that are wont to accompany the song. And this view of the text accords with the comment of Lowth, whose words are, “Those who can command wine under this scarcity will have no heart to drink it, nor will it be able to cheer their souls under such afflictions.” The bitterness therefore spoken of by the prophet has reference not to a change in the taste of the liquor, but to the sorrow of heart, which even the use of their ordinary stimulating drinks would not be able to remove but would serve rather to increase. The Hebrew verb מָרַר and its derivatives, are not unfrequently used to express sorrow of heart, as in Job vii. 11, xxvii. 2, Isaiah xxxviii. 15, 17, Ezekiel xxvii. 31, &c. But admitting that in Isaiah xxiv. 9, the term is opposed to and suggested by the sweetness of the drink denoted by שֶׁכָּר (shekhar,) does it follow that this drink is not intoxicating? And if it be intoxicating, it is with the strictest propriety called “strong drink.”

The other text to which Mr. P. refers, in support of his opinion respecting the import of שֶׁכָּר (shekhar), is Numbers xxviii. 7, compared with Exodus xxix. 40: שֶׁכָּר (shekhar) in the one passage being used for יַיִן (yayin) in the other. From this circumstance, and also from the fact that *shekhar* does sometimes denote palm wine, Mr. Parsons would infer that it always has this meaning.

The use of יַיִן (yayin) in Exodus xxix. 40, is beyond doubt conclusive as to the point, that in Numbers xxviii 7, שֶׁכָּר (shekhar) denotes *wine*; and if it determines any thing in regard to the kind of wine, it proves that the wine denoted by *shekhar* in this passage was made from the juice of the grape; as beyond all dispute *yayin* denotes this description

of wine. That *shekhar*, in the instance before us, signifies wine, is no proof that it never meant any thing but wine; but on the contrary, when taken in connexion with the meaning of this term in other passages of scriptures, serves to confirm the definition of *shekhar* given by Jerome, viz. that it "signifies every drink that can intoxicate." According to this author, however, and others, when used in connexion with *yayin* (wine), *shekhar* signifies any intoxicating liquor other than wine;* and thus the term is explained by Onkelos, and Philo-Judæus, the latter known to be a cotemporary of our Saviour, the former probably so.

The words *וַיִּשְׁכַּר וַיִּיַיֵּן* *wine and strong drink*, in Leviticus x. 9, Onkelos renders by the phrase *וַיִּשְׁכַּר וַיִּקְרַח* wine and whatever can intoxicate. See Targum of Onkelos, in Walton's Polyglot. Philo refers several times to the command given to Aaron, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation," and for *וַיִּשְׁכַּר* (*shekhar*), *strong drink*, he commonly uses the Greek term derived from it, viz. *σίκερα*, but in his treatise on Monarchy he gives as the meaning of the phrase *וַיִּשְׁכַּר וַיִּיַיֵּן* "wine and any other intoxicating drink," *μη οἶνον μήτε τι ἄλλο πίνειν μέθυσμα*. Thus again in his treatise on Drunkenness, in quoting the answer of Hannah to Eli, in 1 Samuel i. 15, he expresses the import of *shekhar* by the Greek term *μέθυσμα*, which beyond all cavil denotes an intoxicating liquor. This explanation of *shekhar*, given by Philo, is confirmed by Origen, who, in his comment on Lev. x. 9, says, that "in the vernacular appellation of the divine scripture it is usual to name every drink which can intoxicate, *shekhar*." See *seventh* homily on Leviticus.†

The translators of the Septuagint, and also Clemens Alexandrinus, in the passage, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink

* Saepe diximus esse vinum quod de vineis fit: syceram autem omnem potionem quae inebriare potest et statum mentis evertere, quam proprie Aquila ebrietatem transtulit sive illa frumento sive ordeo, sive mileo pomorumque suce, et palmarum fructu, et alio quolibet genere conficitur. Jerome. Isaiah xxviii. 7.

† The homilies of this celebrated writer, who flourished in the first half of the third century, were translated into Latin by Rufinus, a distinguished father in the Latin Church, and who died A.D. 410. As the original is lost, we quote from the Latin the following passage, which it will be seen at once is free from all ambiguity. "Lex evidens datur, et sacerdotibus et principi sacerdotum, ut cum accedunt ad altare, vino abstineant, et omni potu quod inebriare potest, quid scripturae divinae appellatione vernacula, *syceram* (*shekhar*) moris est nominare."

is raging," Proverbs xx. 1, use for שֶׁכָּר (shekhar) the Greek term μ.έθη, drunkenness; and to express the import of *shekhar*, Jerome frequently uses the Latin word *ebrietas*, drunkenness: and we make bold to assert, that in no one passage of scripture, can it be shown, that the term *shekhar* is used to denote any other drink than one that can intoxicate; and that not one single authority can be adduced in support of the assertion of Mr. Parsons, "that undrugged shacar was not a fermented drink." pp. 255-6 of *Anti-Bacchus*.

To strengthen his assertion with respect to the meaning of *shekhar*, Mr. Parsons adverts to the fact that this term, and the Arabic, Greek, Latin, French and English words for sugar, have all sprung from the same root, and that in the Arabic language, the same word denotes "both honey and palm wine," p. 254. But may not all this be accounted for, from the circumstance, that the various intoxicating drinks, and different kinds of honey and sugar made from the juices of fruits, trees, and sugar cane, are obtained from the same sources, the sirupy or solid products by concentrating the saccharine properties of these juices, and the liquors by converting them into alcohol, the very process in the latter case greatly diminishing if not altogether destroying the sugary portions of the juices. How idle therefore to infer that *shekhar* denotes "a sweet, luscious satisfying liquor," and one that will not intoxicate, because a cognate Arabic term denotes both honey or sugar and palm wine;* especially when the Hebrew term occurs more than twenty times in the scriptures, and in not one single instance, is there the least evidence that it denotes any other than an intoxicating liquor, unless the express permission to drink it found in the scriptures, is to be taken as evidence that it was not intoxicating; as is done by Mr. Parsons. On the other hand, there are numerous passages which prove uncontestedly that *shekhar*, whether it is palm wine or barley wine, or some other drink, is an intoxicating liquor. See Leviticus x. 9, Numbers vi. 3, 1 Samuel i. 15.

In the passages just mentioned, *yayin* and *shekhar* are

* *Sukkar* is the Arabic term for sugar, and it also signifies date wine: and so do *sukr* and *sakar*: but Mr. Parsons seems to have overlooked the fact, that these terms denote inebriating liquor in general, and that the palm wine denoted by them is itself inebriating. From the same root, with these terms come *sak-rat*, drunkenness, *sikkir*, always drunk, *miskir*, apt to be drunk, *musakkar*, overcome of drunkenness, &c. See the Lexicons of Golius and Richardson. And from this statement the reader may learn what aid in establishing his position Mr. Parsons is likely to receive, from an examination of the Arabic cognate terms of *shekhar*.

both used, and together they denote every species of intoxicating drink. If further evidence is wanted in regard to the import of *shekhar*, it may be found by consulting Wetstein's Greek Testament, who quotes the Greek scholiast as saying, Σίκερα δε ἐστὶ πᾶν τὸ μέθην μὲν ποιεῖν δυνάμενον, οὐκ ὄν δὲ ἐξ ἀμπέλου, "Sicera is every drink capable of producing intoxication, that is not made from the vine." Hesychius defines Σίκερα to be οἴνος συμμιγείς ἡδύσμασι ἢ πᾶν πόμα ἐμποιοῦν μέθην, μὴ ἐξ ἀμπέλου δὲ, σκευαστὸν, σύνθετον: "Sicera is wine mingled with sweet spices, or every drink causing drunkenness, but not made from the vine; prepared, compound." Suidas explains the term σίκερα in the same manner. His words are, σκευαστὸν πόμα, καὶ παρ' Ἑβραίοις οὕτω λεγόμενον μέθυσμα, οἴνος συμμιγής ἡδύσμασιν: "a prepared drink; and with the Hebrews this name is given to an intoxicating liquor, viz. wine intermingled with sweet spices." He does not say mixed with intoxicating drugs, but sweet spices or perfumes; and he employs the very term ἡδύσμα that is used by the Seventy in their version of Exodus xxx, 34, respecting the materials from which the ointment for the service of the sanctuary was made according to the command of God.

The explanation of the word sicera, given by Suidas and Hesychius is in our apprehension confirmed by a comparison of Prov. xxiii. 29, 30: "Who hath wo . . . they that tarry long at the wine, they that go to seek mixed wine," with Is. v. 22: "Wo to them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink." The "mixed wine," in the one passage corresponding to *shekhar* "strong drink," in the other. The use too of the phrases οἴνος συμμιγής ἡδύσμασι, and οἴνος συμμιγείς ἡδύσμασι to express the import of σίκερα shows that neither Suidas nor Hesychius understood this term to denote merely palm wine; for it is not to be denied, that οἴνος is the Greek term for wine in general, and denotes in the first place wine made from grapes, and secondly, any fermented liquor made in imitation of it, whether from fruits or grain. That כֶּזַי denotes a liquor made from grain, as well as from the juice of the grape and the date and other fruits, appears from the use of this term in the Mishna or Oral Law of the Jews, in which it is employed to denote an intoxicating drink made by the Medes from grain: and Maimonides and Bartenora,* inform us that it was for the most part made from wheat or barley.

* Maimonides flourished in the twelfth century, and of all their Rabbins he

Defining the import of שֵׁכָר, Maimonides says that "it is an inebriating drink, made from many varieties, from macerated wheat, barley and other things." Bartenora explains the phrase שֵׁכָר הַמֵּדִי, the shekhar of Medes, to be a beer which they made from wheat or barley steeped in water. See the Mishna by Surenhusius, Book II. 142.

From the form of expression "*shekhar* of the Medes," used in the Mishna, and from the comments of Maimonides and Bartenora, it is probable that this *shekhar* differed from that in common use among the Jews, in being made from grain and not from the juices of fruits; yet this application of the term *shekhar* to the different varieties of intoxicating drink, made both from fruits and grain, shows that the primitive and essential meaning of *shekhar* is that of a liquor which can intoxicate. None of the numerous authorities which we have cited give the most distant intimation that it ever denotes any thing else than an intoxicating drink, although in other respects there is some difference of opinion as to the kind of drink intended. It does, however, by no means follow, that because it is intoxicating, it must necessarily intoxicate the persons who use it. When drunk in small quantity, and especially when diluted with water, it may exhilarate the spirits, and yet no unnatural excitement be produced.

To show that the verb *shakhar* does not always imply the use of an intoxicating drink, Mr. Parsons refers to the expression made use of in Genesis, in reference to Joseph and his brethren, "they drank and were merry." Mr. P. argues, and correctly so, that the Hebrew term does not necessarily imply that they were drunk; and from this circumstance, and from the character of Joseph, he comes to the very logical inference, that they could not have used an intoxicating liquor. But is there really any greater difficulty in being made merry by an intoxicating drink than by one that will not intoxicate? And if not, it is all idle to argue that they did not use an inebriating liquor, unless the use of it in any quantity, however small, must of necessity produce intoxication.

"But I must maintain," says Mr. P. "that undrugged *shacar* denotes a weak sweet palm wine." Doubtless he

is held in the highest estimation by the Jews. Obadiah de Bartenora is also distinguished for his commentary on the entire Mishna, which he commenced in Italy, and completed in Palestine, where he died in the year 1520 of the Christian era. See Wolfii Bibliotheca, 1 vol.

must do so, or else his whole scheme falls to the ground. Shall we however trust to the reasoning of Mr. Parsons with respect to the import of a Hebrew term, rather than to the authority of the translators of the Septuagint, of Aquila, of Philo Judaeus, of the Chaldee Paraphrase, of the early Christian writers, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chrysostom and Jerome, of the Greek lexicographers, Hesychius and Suidas, of the Greek Scholiast, and of the learned annotators on the Oral Law of the Jews, Maimonides and Bartenora, and of the Mishna itself? Add to all these authorities the fact, not denied by Mr. Parsons, that *shekhar* does in repeated instances in the scripture denote an intoxicating liquor, and also another fact of no less importance, that in not a single instance is there the least intimation that the term *shekhar* is to be understood in a sense different from its acknowledged import in sundry passages, as denoting an inebriating drink of one description or another; and then let the reader, if he can, believe with Mr. Parsons that *shekhar* is a weak sweet palm wine incapable of producing intoxication. Could it be shown, what is far from the fact, that *shekhar* always meant *palm wine*, of what avail would it be? The palm wine mentioned by Chrysostom and Pliny, and made from the fruit of the palm or date tree, is represented by them as exceedingly intoxicating.* And equally so is palm wine obtained at the present day in India from the *sap* of the palm tree. Speaking of the *tála*, one species of the palm, Sir William Jones says, "the liquor extracted from the tree is the most *seductive* and *pernicious* of *intoxicating* vegetable juices; when just drawn it is as pleasant as Pouhon water fresh from the spring, and almost equal to the best mild champagne." vol. ii. p. 117. None of these writers speak of the admixture of intoxicating drugs, by which alone Mr. Parsons imagines, that palm wine can be rendered inebriating; and yet they describe it as causing stupor and inebriation, and as being most pernicious and seductive. Can there be any impropriety in calling such a drink "strong drink?"

If it be a fact, as stated by Mr. Parsons, on the authority of Mr. Beaumont, in his Essay on Alcohol, that palm wine contains only four cent. of spirit," *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 256, it may still with propriety be called "strong drink." We presume that Mr. Parsons, and all who agree with him, will be unwilling to admit that the best wines of France, unless di-

* See page 476 of this vol.

luted with twice or three times their bulk of water, are not intoxicating; or that ale and porter, with equal quantities of water, are not intoxicating; and that unless they are mixed with drugs it is improper to call them strong drinks: and yet, according to the table of the respective strengths of different liquors given by Mr. P. p. 164, porter contains less alcohol than palm wine: the quantity in palm wine being 4.79, and that in porter 4.00. Mr. Parsons must take back this admission that palm wine contains even four per cent. of alcohol, or his cause is ruined, for porter contains but four per cent., and yet it is condemned by Mr. P. as a vile and pernicious drink. Yes, he must maintain, as is done on pp. 255-6, that the palm wine denoted by *shekhar* was the unfermented juice of the palm tree,* “and the fact that it was undrugged shaear or sweet wine demonstrates that it was not a fermented alcoholic drink.” A demonstration indeed! But let it pass, and let us direct our attention to

* In his account of inebriating drinks, Bacchus p. 193, Mr. Grindrod remarks that “the unfermented juice of the palm tree is described by a celebrated oriental scholar as the ‘palm wine’ of the poets.” This statement is founded upon a passage in Forbes’ Oriental Memoirs, p. 24, in which, speaking of the cocoanut tree (a species of the palm), he says, “A small incision being made, there oozes in gentle drops a cool pleasant liquor called tarcc or *toddy*, the palm wine of the poets. This, when first drawn, is cooling and salutary, but when fermented and distilled produces an intoxicating spirit.” That Mr. Forbes intended to say that this liquor was thus called before fermentation, we are very much disposed to question: and we think that nothing farther can be inferred from his words than that the palm wine of the poets is obtained from the juice of the cocoanut tree, a choice species of the palm. In this opinion we are confirmed by the definitions given of the words *táli* and *táلكى* by H. H. Wilson, of the University of Oxford, in his Dictionary of the Sanscrit Language, published at Calcutta in 1832, under the patronage of the then President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. *Táli* he defines to be “the *spirituous* juice of the palm, the common *toddy*,” and *Táلكى*, “*toddy* or the fermented exudation of the palm trees.” Not the most distant intimation is given that the term *toddy* ever denotes the *unfermented* juice of the palm. This explanation of the word *toddy* is farther confirmed by the statements of Dr. Seudder, American missionary at Ceylon, in his Description of the Value and Uses of the Palmyra Tree, pp. 24—25 of the Missionary Herald for 1839. “I do not recollect that I ever was in so vile a place, so far as drunkenness was concerned, and among so many drunkards. . . . The principal cause of drunkenness among them is *toddy*, the *fermented* juice of the palmyra tree. . . . The tree yields a sweet and very pleasant juice, which in its unfermented state is called *kudupperney*.” Let it be recollected that it is *toddy* which Forbes says is the palm wine of the poets: of course this wine must be fermented. Could it be shown that among some of the tribes of Asia or of Africa, the same term was sometimes used to express both the fermented and unfermented juice of the palm, what evidence would this be that the term *shekhar* was used in the same way, even granting that it always denoted palm wine?

what Mr. Grindrod has to say respecting the import of *shekhar*.

Mr. Grindrod does not limit the signification of *shekhar* to palm wine as is done by Mr. Parsons, yet he maintains that it does not always denote an intoxicating liquor. His words are, "The term shekar, in some of its variations at least, does not uniformly or necessarily refer to a state of intoxication, or even to an inebriating beverage. Parkhurst however concludes *shekar* to refer to intoxicating or inebriating liquor in general." p. 381. And who that has any knowledge of its import does not do the same? Mr. G. again says, that the learned Edward Leigh, in his *Critica Sacra*, thus remarks: "This word (*shekar**) is not always taken in the worst part, but is used for large drinking unto mirth, but with sobriety." Who questions the truth of this remark? And yet how does it prove that *shekhar* could not intoxicate if used freely?

Again Mr. Grindrod observes, "The words *shekhar* and *methuo*, in some of their significations, may be applied in reference to that state of mind and body produced by such lawful indulgence in unfermented wine, or nutritious food of any kind, as imparts a pleasing and satisfied state both of body and mind." p. 381. For this statement he cites no authority, and the verbs *shakhar* and *methuo* are not and cannot be thus employed: for unless used figuratively, they imply the use of an intoxicating liquor, although they do not of necessity imply any excess in the use of it, but merely, as Leigh expresses it, "large drinking unto mirth, but with sobriety."

Again Mr. G. says, "The ancients had numerous methods by which they made *strong yet unintoxicating* drinks. . . Of this nature probably was the strong drink which the children of the Lord were allowed to partake of in the house appointed by God, Deut. xiv. 26." p. 381. From this passage it appears that Mr. Grindrod does not make objection, as does Mr. Parsons, to rendering *shekhar* by the phrase "strong drink," though he agrees with Mr. P. in maintaining that the liquor denoted by *shekhar*, in Deut. xiv. 26, was not intoxicating. The reason for this is given in the passage immediately following the one last cited, and is in these words. "Whatever was its composition, it could not have

* We give this word as "we find it in" *Bacchus* p. 381, on which page, and elsewhere, the noun *shekhar* and the verb *shakhar* occur one for the other.

possessed the power of exciting unholy feelings and practices, otherwise the God of holiness would not have sanctioned its use." Conclusive reasoning this! When the very subject of inquiry is, whether God has sanctioned the moderate use of drinks, which, when taken immoderately, produce intoxication, it is assumed as a self-evident truth, that he would not have sanctioned its use, if it had been possessed of any intoxicating quality. If this be so, how perfectly idle was it to write a whole volume, as Mr. Grindrod has done, to establish a self-evident proposition.

Whether *shekhar* does or does not *always* denote a liquor that can intoxicate, we submit without further remark to the judgment of our readers.

IV. The fourth subject of inquiry has respect to the position, "*That wines which could produce intoxication were not allowed to be used at any of the Jewish festivals.*"

On this subject Mr. Grindrod observes, "The temperance observed at these festivals may be inferred not only from the nature of the occasion, but from the character of the professed people of God, as distinguished from that of the surrounding heathens. . . . The use of fermented drink, doubtless, would have been a dangerous source of temptation, &c. . . . and it is inconsistent with divine goodness to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would offer any kind of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety." pp. 362-5. On this subject also Mr. Parsons says, "It may be objected, that as the Jews were allowed the use of wine at some of their feasts, it is evident that the Supreme did not expect all his worshippers to abstain. To this we reply that there were two sorts of wine and sweet drinks: the one unfermented and innocuous, the other drugged and inebriating. When, therefore, wine was permitted, the Jews knew, from the benevolent character of the Deity who gave the permission, that the drink allowed was 'the pure blood of the grape;' and when wine or sweet drink was prohibited, they also knew, from the purity, and pity, and kindness of their divine Legislator, that the beverage was that which was inebriating." *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 288.

With the mode pursued, by both these authors, of arguing from the goodness and benevolence of God, in opposition to the plain and palpable statements of his holy word, we

frankly confess we have no patience. It argues so much self-confidence, and so much disrespect for the revealed will of God, that we find it difficult to discuss with cool and becoming temper their hasty conclusions and reckless assertions. Their aim would seem to be not so much to prove from the scripture that the use of fermented drinks is wrong, as to vindicate the scriptures from the charge of countenancing, in the least, the use of drinks which they fancy they have ascertained to be always injurious to man and offensive to God. Hence when we find in the scriptures such a passage as that contained in Deut. xiv. 26: "And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *wine*, or for *strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; thou shalt eat these before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household:" we are told that there are two kinds of wine and strong drink, and that the kind spoken of in this "so doubtful a passage," as it is styled by Mr. Grindrod, p. 381, could not have been intoxicating, for "whatever was its composition, it could not have possessed the power of exciting unholy feelings and practices, otherwise the God of holiness would not have sanctioned its use." p. 381. That is to say, it is so undeniably self-evident, that all use of intoxicating liquor as a drink, is so utterly inconsistent with sobriety, and with the exercise of holy and devout feelings, that God could not sanction its use, and therefore, although the text in Deut. xiv. 26, does not give any intimation that the phrase "wine and strong drink" is to be understood in a sense different from that in which these words are used in Lev. x. 9, "Do not drink wine and strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations;" yet the mere fact that they were allowed to be used in the one case, and forbidden in the other, is to be regarded as evidence that entirely different kinds of drinks are spoken of in the two passages; as if drunkenness, so severely condemned in the scriptures, consisted in the kind of drink made use of, and not in the excessive or immoderate use of one that can intoxicate. In his comments on the passage in Deut., Mr. Grindrod remarks, "The strong drink allowed on this occasion . . . COULD NOT, *in any degree*, interfere with the *spiritual worship*, with which it was more or less accompanied." This remark, if correct, is equally

applicable to the oxen and the sheep, and whatever else might be purchased for the feast.

These articles of diet therefore could have presented no temptation to excess; and if those who partook of them would confine themselves to the use of oxen and sheep, and whatever their souls lusted after, there could be no possible danger of their falling into the sin of gluttony; for, to use the words of Mr. Grindrod, "it is inconsistent with the divine goodness to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would afford *any kind* of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety." But, says Mr. G. "the temperate and of course moderate use is understood." What call is there for this remark, if "the strong drink allowed on this occasion *could not in any degree* interfere with the spiritual worship," &c.? Is not the very limitation an admission that the immoderate use of even unintoxicating drinks can and will interfere with spiritual worship, and with the exercise of holy feelings? And if eating the flesh of oxen and of sheep, and drinking palm juice and grape juice, may be carried so far as to produce surfeiting, and thus render the worshippers of God incompetent to the proper discharge of their religious duties, what becomes of the argument of Mr. G. against the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, being intoxicating drinks, derived from the circumstance, that if they were intoxicating they might interfere with the spiritual worship usual at this festival? Does not the use of rich and various viands present a temptation to gluttony similar to the temptation to drunkenness presented by the use of intoxicating drinks? If the temperate use of the flesh of oxen and of sheep and of unfermented drinks is understood, where is the difficulty of supposing that "the temperate and moderate use" of wine and strong drink is also understood, even should they be drinks which, if taken to excess, will produce intoxication? With respect to "the wine and strong drink" mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, Mr. Grindrod farther says, "In conclusion it appears improbable that the strong drink used on that occasion was the same as that spoken of by the inspired writer. "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise," Prov. xx. 1. And why improbable? Because the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in the latter text are undeniably intoxicating, and if there is no difference between them and the wine

and strong drink mentioned in Deut.; these also must be intoxicating, and then his whole scheme is ruined: for in that case God, in express terms, authorized the Jews to use intoxicating drinks on one of their religious festivals.

If the wine and strong drink spoken of in Deut. xiv. 26, are different from the wine and strong drink mentioned in Prov. xx. 1, why may we not conclude that the oxen, and also the sheep, are of a different species from those mentioned in Isaiah xxii. 13, 14? "And behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we shall die. And it was revealed in my ears by the Lord of Hosts, Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die, saith the Lord God of Hosts."

By the help of Mr. Parsons' logic respecting the different kinds of wine spoken of in scripture, we may argue that when the flesh of sheep and oxen were permitted to be used, the Jews knew, from the benevolence of God, that it was of that kind of flesh which could not surfeit the persons who partook of it: and that when the use was prohibited, they knew it was that kind of flesh on which riotous eaters were wont to glut their appetites.

But Mr. G., apparently somewhat apprehensive that his readers will not be altogether satisfied with his account of the meaning of the phrase "wine and strong drink" in this "so doubtful a passage," as he is pleased to style it, remarks farther, that "the permission to drink it occurred only once in the year, and for a special purpose." But did Jehovah really give his people permission to indulge once a year, and that too at a religious feast, in drinks, the use of which is always injurious, and is most strictly prohibited on all other occasions, and which cannot fail, according to our author, to excite unholy feelings? If our memory serves us, this conceit respecting the permission referred to in this passage originated with a distinguished writer on this side of the Atlantic, and has been as inconsiderately adopted by Mr. Grindrod as it was at first formed.* The permission consisted simply in

* This solution of the matter reminds us of the directions respecting the use of wine given in the Koran. Among the precepts of the Moslem prophet is one strictly enjoining total abstinence from wine as the invention of the devil, ch. v.; and among the blessings vouchsafed to his followers, it is promised that they shall drink wine in Paradise, ch. xlvii. Doubtless the sanctity of the place and of the employment, both at the Jewish feast and in the paradise of the faithful, would counteract the natural tendency of the wine, and render it perfectly harm-

this, that those Jews, who resided so far from the tabernacle, that they could not carry their tithes to the place where it was reared, were permitted to sell them, and with the money to purchase whatever things they preferred, in order to keep the feast at the appointed place, where they were required to eat before the Lord, and to rejoice with their households. To make this a permission to drink "wine and strong drink" once a year, involves also the absurdity of making it a permission to feast upon sheep and oxen once a year. On this passage, Deut. xiv. 26, Mr. Parsons contents himself with referring to his attempts to prove that the wines among the Hebrews were unfermented, and that the term rendered "strong drink" in our version was "weak, sweet palm wine" utterly incapable of producing intoxication. As we have already examined his views on these points, we shall take no farther notice of his remarks, but proceed at once to adduce some direct and positive evidence, that the "wine and strong drink" used on this occasion were intoxicating liquors. With perfect safety to those views of truth which we entertain, we might follow the example of Mr. P., and rest the decision of this question upon what has been advanced respecting the nature of the ancient wines, and the import of *skekhar*, which, in the passage now under consideration, is in our English version rendered by the phrase strong drink. But we prefer to establish our positions separately and independently of each other; and we shall therefore, as

less. It is not thus, however, the Mohammedan doctors endeavour to account for the discrepancy between the commands and promises of their prophet: they do it by saying that the wine of Paradise is different from the wine drunk by men on earth, and will not produce intoxication. It appears, therefore, that they were not ignorant of the distinction of wines into intoxicating and those not intoxicating; but they were so ignorant as to suppose that unintoxicating wines were confined to Paradise. How much wiser answers would they have been able to give to cavilling infidels, had they only been acquainted with the distinctions made by our authors and other recent writers in regard to wines made from the vines of earth. And on the other hand, we think that those who adopt the views of our authors, would find more explicit authority for their opinions in the Koran, than they can possibly do in the Bible, especially if we compare the precepts in the Koran with the traditionary sayings of Mohammed recorded by Thalebiensis, and given by Marracci, in his most valuable Edition and Refutation of the Koran, published at Padua in 1698. "Moreover, whatever inebriates shall be esteemed wine, and all wine is prohibited. God has cursed wine, and the persons drinking it, tasting and presenting it to others, buying it, selling it, treading grapes and expressing it; and also the persons receiving it, or eating any thing bought with the money for which it was sold. Shun wine, for it is the key to all evils." See *Refutatio Alcorani*, p. 237.

briefly as we can, show that the Jews were permitted to use intoxicating drinks at their feasts.

In the execution of this purpose, we shall begin with citing several different passages in which the words "wine and strong drink," when used together, do beyond all possibility of cavil denote intoxicating liquors. 1 Samuel i. 14, 15, "And Eli said unto her, how long wilt thou be drunken? put away thy wine from thee. And Hannah answered and said, No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful heart, I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink." This passage shows that the words "wine and strong drink" not only denote intoxicating liquors, but they denote all drinks capable of producing intoxication; otherwise her having abstained from these would not be conclusive as to the point whether she were drunken or not. Proverbs xxxi. 4, 5, "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink. Lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." Isaiah xxviii. 7, 8, "But they have also erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way, the priest and the prophet have erred through drink, they are swallowed up through wine, they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place for them."

No one can doubt that in these passages the words "wine and strong drink" denote intoxicating drinks, and none other, and if in Deut. xiv. 26, these words do not denote intoxicating drinks, then this text forms an exception not only to those just cited, but also to every other in the scriptures, in which these words occur in like connexion; as any one may satisfy himself by examining the following passages. Leviticus x. 9; Numbers vi. 3; Deut. xxix. 6; Judges xiii. 4, 7, 14; 1 Samuel i. 15; Prov. xx. 1; xxxi. 4, 6; Isaiah v. 11, 22; xxiv. 9; xxviii. 7; xxix. 9; lvi. 12; Micah ii. 11. These, with Deut. xiv. 26, are all passages in which the words *yayin* and *shekhar*, wine and strong drink, occur together.

Under a former head, we showed what Philo Judaeus regarded as the import of the term שֶׁכָּר (shekhar), viz. that it included every intoxicating liquor but wine, and the very form of expression used by this writer, μη οἶνον μήτε τι ἄλλο πίνειν μέθυσμα, "to drink neither wine nor any other intoxicating drink," shows that he had no other idea of the term οἶνος (wine), than that of a word denoting an intoxicating

drink. And surely it must be admitted that he understood the true import of the Greek term οἶνος (oinos), and of the corresponding Hebrew one, יַיִן (yayin), and it is more clearly evident, from his remarks at the very beginning of his treatise "on drunkenness," that he had never heard of the distinction of wines into fermented and unfermented, or into intoxicating and those not intoxicating. He begins with observing, "The sayings of other philosophers respecting drunkenness, we have, as far as in our power, mentioned in the foregoing treatise, and let us now consider what were the opinions entertained in regard to it by the in all things great and wise Lawgiver; for frequently in his laws he makes mention of wine and of the plant producing the wine, viz. the vine, and some he permits to use it, to others he does not give this indulgence, and to the same persons it is sometimes allowed and sometimes not allowed;* and he then mentions, as persons belonging to this last named class, the priests, and those who take upon themselves the great vow. And again, speaking of the command given to Aaron and his sons respecting the use of wine and strong drink, he expressly says that the prohibition was limited to the time during which the priests were engaged in the discharge of their sacred functions." Ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ τέτακται τὰς ἱερὰς λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖν. ΠΕΡΙ ΜΟΝΑΡΧΙΑΣ.

In all this there is no intimation of two kinds of wine and two kinds of strong drink; the one allowed to be used, and the other not; it is the same wine and the same kind of strong drink. And he further tells us that the ancient Greeks called the art of making wine *μανομένη*, *the art of producing madness*, since wine, to those swallowing it immoderately, is the cause of insaneness and folly," p. 183, and yet we perceive that Moses the great lawgiver of the Jews permitted some to use and others not, and yet none to excess.

But we have another witness, also a Jew, and who flourished not less than two hundred years before the Christian era: the author of Ecclesiasticus, whose testimony is explicit and to the point as to the character of the wines in common use among the Jews.

* Τὰ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης, ὡς οἶόντε ἦν ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης ὑπεμνήσαμεν βίβλῳ· νυνὶ δὲ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τίνα τῶ παντα μεγάλῳ καὶ σοφῶ νομοθέτῃ περὶ αὐτῆς δοκεῖ, πολλαχοῦ γὰρ τῆς νομοθεσίας οἴνου καὶ τοῦ γεννῶντος φυτοῦ τον οἶνον ἀμπέλου διαμέμνηται· καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἐμπνῖεν ἐπιτρέπει, τοῖς δ' οὐκ ἐφήσι, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐστι καὶ μή. κ. τ. λ. ΠΕΡΙ ΜΣΘΗΣ.

“Show not thy valiantness in wine; for wine hath destroyed many. The furnace proveth the edge by dipping; so doth wine the hearts of the proud by drunkenness. Wine is as good as life to a man, if it be drunk moderately; what life is there to a man that is without wine? for it was made to make men glad. Wine measurably drunk, and in season, bringeth gladness of the heart, and cheerfulness of the mind: but wine drunken with excess maketh bitterness of the mind, with brawling and quarrelling. Drunkenness increaseth the rage of a fool till he offend, it diminisheth strength and maketh wounds.” Ecclesiasticus xxxi. 25, 30. This passage shows most clearly that the Jews knew nothing of this fanciful distinction of wines into intoxicating and unintoxicating, and that when in the Jewish scriptures wine is mentioned, we are to understand by the term, a liquor that can intoxicate if drunk to excess, and which will not intoxicate if used with prudence and moderation. And although we do not regard the book of Ecclesiasticus as canonical, we have no hesitation in saying that the views expressed in the above passage are the views contained in the canonical books in reference to the nature, effects and use of wine. Next to the inspired writers on the subject under discussion, no better authority could possibly be produced.

We had before shown that the assertions of our authors respecting the character of the ancient wines, and especially those of Greece and Rome, were without foundation, and the views we then presented are most fully sustained by the extracts we have given from Philo Judaeus, and the son of Sirach, and, taken together, they afford an irrefragable argument, that both in the Old and the New Testaments the words rendered in our English version by the terms “wine and strong drink,” always denote liquors that can intoxicate, and consequently the passage in Deut., so often already cited, furnishes conclusive evidence that at a Jewish festival, observed in connexion with the payment of their tithes, they used fermented wines, or, in other words, wines capable of producing intoxication if drunk immoderately. “And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth, and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household.” And we have also shown that the explanations given by Messrs Grindrod and Parsons involve the

grossest absurdity. Should we compare Deut. xiv. 26 with 1 Samuel i. 1—18, we shall have additional evidence that at the Jewish feasts they were permitted to use intoxicating drinks. That they were permitted to use wine and strong drink of some description is not disputed, the question has reference simply to the kind of wine and strong drink. In 1. Samuel i. 1—18, we are informed that Elkanah and his family went yearly to worship and sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh; and that on one of these occasions Hannah, the wife of Elkanah, wept and did not eat, and that after *they had eaten and drunk* (doubtless the things mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26), Hannah rose up, and, being in bitterness of soul, prayed unto the Lord and wept sore. Eli the priest, observing her, and not knowing the state of her mind, said to her, "How long wilt thou be drunken, put away thy *wine* from thee; and she answered and said, No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit, I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord." It is evident from the whole account, that Eli thought Hannah, having indulged, as was usual on this festival occasion, in the drinking of wine, had drunk to excess, and he therefore asks her, not why she had drunk wine which it was unlawful to use, but why she continued to drink until she had become drunken. Of Elkanah, and of the rest of the family, it is testified that they ate and drank, but of Hannah, that she did not eat, but spent the time in weeping; and when Eli charged her with being drunk, she assured him that her conduct was not owing to her being overcome with wine, for she had drunk none of the "wine and the strong drink," which it was customary to use on these occasions. We have no allusion whatever, in all this account, of the yearly feast kept at Shiloh, of any distinction into wines intoxicating and those which could not intoxicate.

Let us now examine what the Jewish Rabbinical writers say respecting the nature of the wine in use among the Jews. In the Tract on Tithes, Part I. of the Mishna, it is said, "that wine" is subject to tithe "from the time it is purged," כשיקפה היין, and this phrase is explained by Bartenora to signify "from the time that the wine shall have cast off the kernels *during its effervescence.*" Maimonides gives a similar explanation. Surenhusius, I. p. 248. It was of this tithe of the wine that the Jews were to drink at the feast mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, unless the distance was so great that they could not conveniently carry it with them to the place where the

tabernacle was reared; in which case they were permitted to sell it, and buy other wine. If then, as is asserted in the Mishna, wine was not subject to tithe until it was fermented, then it is evident, that at the feast of which we speak, the Jews used the fermented juice of the grape, or, in other words, a drink which, if used too freely, would intoxicate.

On the subject we are now discussing, we have shown, 1. That the reasonings of our authors are absurd. 2. That in several passages of scripture the words "wine and strong drink" do undeniably signify intoxicating liquor of all kinds. 3. That a comparison of Deut. xiv. 26, with 1 Samuel i. 1—15, furnishes at the very least a strong presumption, that the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in the former passage were intoxicating. 4. That it is evident from the passages cited from the writings of Philo Judaeus, and from the book of Ecclesiasticus, that the Jews had no knowledge of any other wines than such as could intoxicate. 5. That wines were not tithed till they were fermented, and 6. That it appears from Deut. xiv. 26 and the context, that it was of the tithes of their wine they were wont to drink, when they eat before the Lord, and rejoiced with all their house. We have also referred to all the passages in which the words wine and strong drink both occur, that the reader may the more readily examine them and satisfy himself, whether in a single instance there is any thing in the context to warrant the assertion that "wine and strong drink" do ever denote liquors that cannot intoxicate; and if there be nothing of this kind in the context of any one of the passages cited, then our position is firmly established, and that of our authors overthrown. Let the reader judge.

V. The next subject of inquiry is, whether *the law, which prohibits the use of leaven at the feast of the Passover, includes a prohibition of all fermented drinks.*

The position that it does is distinctly assumed by both our authors, as is evident from the following extracts. "Attempts have recently been made to show that this prohibition extended to leavened bread only, and not to fermented liquors. A slight consideration of the passage in question, exhibits the inconsistency of this explanation with the original object of the festival." Bacchus, p. 363.

"As for the wine drunk at the Passover, we have the best proof that it was not fermented. The word $\chi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ (cho-

mets), in Hebrew, signifies 'leaven,' 'vinegar,' and every kind of fermentation. Now the Jews at the Passover were commanded to have no leaven in their houses; and they, from that day to this, understood the term to refer just as much to fermented liquors as to fermented bread, and therefore at the Passover were exceedingly careful that no fermented wines should be among them." Anti-Bacchus, pp, 280-1.

We shall, in the first place, show that these writers have misapprehended the meaning of their own authorities, and that they are mistaken as to the customs of the Jews; and, in the next place, we shall undertake to prove, from an examination of the law respecting the use of leaven, that the prohibition did not extend to wine. That no fermented liquors made from grain of any description were used at the Passover we grant, and we shall establish this fact not only by an examination of the authorities adduced by our authors, but by others entitled to more consideration. "Gesenius," says Mr. Grindrod, "an oriental scholar of great ability, states that the Hebrew word *seor*, which the English translators have rendered *leaven*, applies to wine as well as bread." What then? Does it follow as a matter of course that the law which prohibits the use of bread which has been leavened or fermented, forbids also the use of fermented wine?

But does Gesenius say, that the Hebrew word שֵׂאֵר (seor) applies to wine as well as to bread? Nothing of this is to be found either in his Hebrew and German Lexicon or in his Hebrew and Latin Lexicon. In one of these he gives, as the import of *seor* the term *fermentum*, leaven, and in the other *sauerteig*, sour dough, and assigns to it no other meaning. Under the head of the supposed root of *seor*, viz. שֵׂאֵר (saar), Gesenius observes that this term is not in use, and that it *probably* signified *to ferment*, *to bubble*, and that the Arabic verb *sara*, (not the Hebrew noun *seor*) is used in reference to *wine* and to *anger*.*

* The following are the words of Gesenius: שֵׂאֵר rad. inusit. cogn. verbis קִר (q. v.) שֵׂאֵר ferbuit, efferbuit, fermentavit. cf. *thara* efferbuit, erupit (ulcus). (In linguis occidentalibus ejusdem stirpis est Germ. *suar*, ap. Ottfr., Anglo-Saxon *sur*, nostra *sauer*.) Inde.

שֵׂאֵר m. fermentum, Exodus xii. 15, 19.

In his Hebrew and German Lexicon he defines שֵׂאֵר ungebr. Stw. wahrsch. ausgähren, aussieden, verw. mit *sara* med. waw ausspringen, ausbrausen vom Weine, vom Zorne (spoken of *wine* of *anger*) *thara* aufkochen, hervorbrechen von Geschwüren u. dgl. ausspringen. Davon.

But admitting that the Arabic verb *sara* is used in reference to the conversion of must into wine, does it follow that in another language a cognate term has precisely the same extent of meaning? Can Mr. Grindrod produce a single passage in which the Hebrew term *seor* is used in reference to wine made by fermenting the juice of the grape? If this could be done, which cannot, it would by no means follow that the law, which excluded from the feast of the Passover fermented bread, also prohibited the use of "fermented" wine. That question must be determined by an examination of the terms of the law itself: and at the proper place we shall show that the *leaven* which the Jews were required to put out of their houses at the feast of the Passover, was the leaven of bread, or of the corn or grain from which it was made, and not the *leaven* of wine or of anger.

The next authority adduced is the Rev. C. F. Frey, from whose remarks Mr. G. quotes the following passage. "Nor dare they (the Jews) drink any liquor made from grain, nor any liquor that has passed through the process of fermentation." We have not the work of Mr. Frey at hand, and therefore cannot venture to speak with confidence as to what it was his attention to affirm in using the words just cited. It may be that he uses the phrase "any liquor" in the first member of the sentence, to mean any spirituous liquor, as distinguished from fermented, and that it was his design to say, that the Jews dare not drink at the Passover any fermented or spirituous liquor made from grain. If this be his meaning he is correct, and if it be not, he is in error.

The third authority cited by Mr. Grindrod must be David Levi, author of "A Succinct Account of the Duties, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Jews," &c.; for although Mr. G. omits

שָׂרָא Sauerteig. (Chald. סָרָא dass.)

In his Lexicon compiled from the German works of Gesenius, Prof. Gibbs defines שָׂרָא *leaven*, Chald. סָרָא idem., and adds, "in Arabic, *sara*, med. Vav, to rise, ferment, spoken of *wine*, of *anger*." In the language of Gesenius there is nothing which of necessity leads us to suppose that he entertained different views from Golius, who, in his Arabic Lexicon, says that the verb *sara* is used to denote the *effects* of wine and anger: and he gives not the most distant intimation, that it is ever employed in reference to the fermenting of must. Among the different significations of *sara* given by Golius, are "ascendit, assilivit, saltavit, impetum fecit, Petivit *caput*, et in illud vim exeruit *vinum*: vehementer efferbuit *ira*,"—the words in *italics* being merely explanatory of the things with respect to which the words and phrases, "Petivit, vim exeruit," and "vehementer efferbuit," are used.

to mention both the work and the name of the author, yet it is evident that his quotation is from this work, published in London about sixty years ago. This writer says:

“Their drink during the time of the feast is either fair water or raisin wine prepared by themselves.” He had previously said, “They likewise may not drink any liquor that is produced from any grain or matter that is leavened.” From these two passages Mr. Grindrod, or some one else, whom he quotes, has made the following sentence: “Their drink during the time of the feast is either fair water or raisin wine, &c. prepared by themselves, *but no kind of leaven must be mixed.*” But does this prove that the “raisin wine” was not fermented? Do not raisins contain within themselves every thing essential to fermentation that is necessary to convert into wine the water in which the raisins are macerated? And is not “raisin wine” ordinarily a wine of great strength, and containing a large quantity of alcohol? It is true, indeed, it may be so prepared as to contain but a very small quantity of alcohol, and be but slightly fermented.

Levi does not say raisin water, but “raisin wine,” and the only additional remarks which he makes concerning it is, that the Jews prepare it themselves. The reason for this may be readily inferred from his observation respecting Passover cakes, and the meal from which they are made. “The meal is obliged to be bolted in the presence of a Jew, otherwise it cannot be used, and the cakes are made of flour and water only, without either yeast or salt, and the dough is not left a moment without working of it, for fear lest it should rise.” p. 40.

The obvious reason for all this care is, that by no carelessness or oversight of the persons concerned in the preparation of the meal or of the wine, the least quantity of leaven should be allowed to fall into either, and thus vitiate their bread or their drink for the purposes of their festival. But in all this there is no evidence that their “raisin wine” is not fermented, though the evidence is direct that the modern Jews do not use malt liquors in celebrating the Passover.

The next testimony adduced by Mr. Grindrod is that of R. H. Herschel, author of “A Brief Sketch of the Present State and Future Expectations of the Jews.” Before making his quotation from this writer, Mr. G. observes “The corroborative testimony of a recent writer of Jewish birth, and an individual well acquainted with the customs of his nation, contributes much to a satisfactory decision of the

question." "The word *homitz*," remarks this author, "has a wider signification than is generally attached to that of *leaven*, by which it is rendered in the English Bible. *Homitz* signifies the fermentation of *corn* in any shape, and applies to *beer*, and to all spirituous liquors distilled from *corn*. While, therefore, there are four days in Passover week on which business may be done, being as it were only half holy-days, a *distiller* or *brewer* must suspend his business during the whole time. And I must do my brethren the justice to say, that they do not attempt to evade the strictness of the command, to put away all leaven by any ingenious shift, but fulfil it to the very letter. I knew an instance of a person in trade, who had several casks of *spirits* sent to him, which arrived during the time of the Passover: had they come a few days sooner, they would have been lodged in some place apart from his house, until the feast was over: but during its continuation he did not think it right to meddle with them, and, after hesitating a little while what to do, he at length poured the whole out into the street." Bacchus, p. 364. This passage is cited also by Mr. Parsons, *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 281, with the exception that the phrase "*all spirituous liquors made from corn*," in the last part of the first sentence given above, he has changed into the phrase "*all fermented liquors*," the words "*from corn*" being altogether omitted.

Now what words can show more clearly than those of Mr. Herschel, that so far as their drinks were concerned, it was only from fermented and spirituous liquors made *from corn*, a general term for grain, and not from the fermented juice of the grape, that the Jews feel themselves bound to abstain at their Paschal feast?

That the Jews of the present day residing in Palestine are wont to drink the fermented juice of the grape during the feast of unleavened bread, is put beyond all doubt by the following passage in the letter of the Rev. Eli Smith.* "Even in the house of the chief Rabbi of the Spanish Jews at Hebron, I was once treated with fermented wine during the feast of unleavened bread. I knew it was fermented not merely from its taste, but because I had a discussion with him respecting the inconsistency of having it in his house at a time when he had professedly banished every thing that was leavened. The principal word, indeed, in

* See p. 284 of this volume.

the Arabie, for wine, *khamr*, is derived from the verb *khamar*, which means to ferment, from the same comes also *khamireh*, the word for leaven.*

In this discussion we are disposed to side with the Jewish Rabbi, in opposition to the etymological argument of our much esteemed correspondent. The fact that the words *khamireh* and *khamr* are derived from the same root can be no evidence that the law which prohibits the use of leaven forbids also the use of wine until it be shown that *khamireh* includes the ferment of wine as well as of bread, and also that *khamireh* is the Hebrew as well as the Arabic term for leaven. But this will not be pretended. Corresponding to the Arabic verb *khamaru*, to ferment, and the Arabic noun *khamr*, wine, there are in the Hebrew the terms *hhamar*, to ferment, and *hhemer*, wine, but for the Arabic term *khamireh* or *khamirat*, leaven, there is no cognate word in the Hebrew. In this language, the word for leaven is *סֵּוֹר* (*seor*) and for the thing leavened *חֶמֶץ* (*hhamets*); therefore could it be shown that in the Arabic the term *khamireh* included the ferment of wine as well as that of bread, it would be of no avail in an attempt to prove that the terms *seor* and *hhamets* do the same. Unless this be done, there is not the shadow of proof that the Jews were required to exclude from their tables the fermented juice of the grape during the Paschal feast: and were it done, yet the evidence in favour of the exclusion would be defective, until it were shown from an examination of the terms of the law, that the words denoting leaven were to be taken in their most extensive meaning. What the evidence is on this point we shall consider presently, and we hope to show that these terms express merely the fermentation of corn, as mentioned by Mr. Herschel in his remarks on the import of the *חֶמֶץ* (*hhamets*), given in Bacchus, p. 364.*

“The word *Chomets*,” says Mr. Parsons, “in Hebrew

* *ζύμη*, the Greek term for leaven, is derived from *ζεῖω*, to ferment, and yet while the verb is applied by Greek writers to the fermentation of wine, the noun *ζύμη* is never thus used. And in Latin, while the verb *ferveo* is applied to the transition of must into wine, the noun *fermentum* never is; and yet it is employed to express a drink made from grain.

“Et pocula lacti
Fermento atque acidis imitantur vitæ sorbis.”—Virgil’s *Georgics*, III. 379, 380.

This use of *fermentum* has some resemblance to the use of *חֶמֶץ* which includes fermented liquors made from corn as well as leavened bread.

signifies *leaven, vinegar*, and every kind of fermentation.” From this remark it is apparent he confounds the words חָמֵץ (hhamets) and חֶמֶץ (hhomets); the first of which denotes something *leavened*, and the latter *vinegar*: and if חָמֵץ (hhamets), and חֶמֶץ (hhomets), were the same word, it would be of no use to his argument, as it could only serve to show, and that without being conclusive as to the fact that wine, when it had become acid, or had undergone the *acetous* fermentation, not the *vinous*, was prohibited during the feast of the Passover. The following is the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Schauffler, for several years past a missionary to the Jews, and a resident in Constantinople. “But what makes an end to all strife on the subject is the invariable practice of the synagogue in the celebration of the Passover. It has happened here, once or twice, that the sale of wine was prohibited by the government, and then to be sure, the Jews did as well as they could. They mingled *petmez* and water together, because *petmez* is proper *must-sirup*; or they made some kind of currant wine. But this is not left to their discretion when wine can be had. For then every Jew, even the poorest, must have four cups of wine, and if he cannot get sufficient alms together for the purpose, he must sell whatever he has, and buy the requisite proportion of *fermented* wine.” Biblical Repository, vol. viii. p. 301.

No farther evidence can be required to prove that in all wine countries the Jews do, at this day, make use of the *fermented* juice of the grape in their observance of the Passover.

Let us now examine the statements of the Mishna, and the comments of Maimonides and Bartenora.

In the beginning of the Tract on the Passover it is said in the Mishna: “On the night of the fourteenth they make search for leaven by the light of a lamp. Places into which leaven is not taken need not be searched. But wherefore have they said two rows of the *cellar* מרתף? (To point out) the place into which they take leaven.”

On this passage Maimonides thus comments: “מרתף is the name of the *wine cellar*. Wine and oil cellars have no need to be searched.” Bartenora, in answer to the question “wherefore have they said two rows of the cellar?” gives, as the proper explanation, “that this is not said except in reference to that cellar into which they take leaven, viz. the cellar from which they obtain wine for the table; so that it may

sometimes happen that the servant may draw wine with bread in his hand, and a portion of the bread be let fall in the cellar.”* Bartenora also mentions, that in the wine cellars it was usual to arrange the casks in rows, until the whole floor was covered, and then upon these others were placed, till the cellar was filled from the ground to the roof. This statement will serve to explain why, in the Mishna, mention is made of “two rows.”

Again, in Chap. III. of the Mishna, we have enumerated the different kinds of drink, the use of which is deemed a transgression of the Passover; and the general rule regulating this whole matter is stated in terms the most explicit. “This is the general rule, whatever is made of *any species of grain*, transgresses the Passover.”† And under this head fall all drinks, except pure water and juices from fruits. With respect to these, Maimonides and Bartenora both say, that the Jews have a hypothesis that the *waters of fruits do not ferment*, and therefore the Jews consider themselves at liberty to use meal boiled with the juices of fruits, but not with water. Among the drinks not permitted to be used at the Passover, the Mishna mentions the Cutach of Babylon, a drink consisting of bread macerated in milk, the *shekhar* of the Medes, a beer or ale made from barley, and the vinegar of Idumea, made from water in which barley has been steeped. No mention is made of any kind of wine as excluded from the tables of the Jews at the Paschal feast; nor of any kind of vinegar except that of Edom or Idumea. See Mishna by Surenhusius, Tom. II. pp. 142-3.

From Chap. X. 1, we learn that “on the evening of the Passover, near *Minhha* (i. e. while two and a half hours remain), a man will not eat unless the darkness has begun. Even a poor man in Israel will not eat unless reclining, and they will not diminish aught from the four cups, not indeed if in extreme poverty.” And in the next section it is said, “When they pour out the first cup, the school of Shammai says, he blesses the day and then blesses the wine; the school of Hillel, that he blesses the wine and then blesses the day.” And in section seventh we are told that “between the first and third cups, if any one is disposed to drink he

* Under the last head we showed that by *wine* Bartenora understood a fermented liquor; and that it was in his opinion intoxicating, we shall show presently.

† זה הכלל כל שהוא כמין דגן הרי זה עובר בפסח

may; but that between the third and fourth cups he may not drink.”

“The reason,” says Maimonides, “that we do not permit him to drink between the third and fourth cups is, that he may not become intoxicated: for wine drunk while eating does not inebriate, but without food it does inebriate.” Bartenora makes a similar remark, and assigns as the reason why he may not drink between the third and fourth cups, that he may not become drunk, and be rendered unable to finish the hymn, viz. a portion of the cxv. cxvi. cxvii. and cxviii. Psalms, which were always sung at the Paschal feast. See Lightfoot, I. 967.

Whether the reason assigned be sufficient or not, there can be no doubt as to the opinions of Maimonides and Bartenora respecting the kind of wine used at the Passover.*

From the testimony cited, it must be apparent that our authors can derive but little support for their opinion on the point under discussion, from what is said by some recent writers respecting the customs of the Jews at the present day; even were it admitted that our authors have in no instance mistaken the views of their own authorities. With respect to the customs of the ancient Jews, we presume that none will venture to regard as of equal authority the testimony of the Jews of our own times, and that of the compiler of the Mishna,† and of its learned annotators. But the statement of Mr. Herschel, quoted both by Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Parsons, so far from being at variance with the authorities cited by us, is, as has been shown, in entire accordance with them.

Neither of our authors has undertaken to show, from a full and careful examination of the statute prohibiting the use of leaven at the Paschal feast; that the fermented juice of the grape was included in the terms translated ‘leaven’ and ‘leavened bread.’ Their main dependance for this hypothesis is the supposed practice of the modern Jews, and also, in the case of Mr. Grindrod, the supposed design of the law relating to the use of leaven. Mr. G. does indeed quote Exodus xiii. 7, “Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days: and there shall no leavened bread לֶחֶם חֲמֵץ be seen with

* Those who have not access to the Mishna, and the comments of Maimonides and Bartenora, edited by Surenhusius, may consult with advantage Lightfoot’s account of the Passover.

† The Mishna is generally believed to have been compiled by Rabbi Judah Hakkodosh, or Judah the Holy Doctor, in the latter part of the second century.

thee, neither shall there be leaven לֶחֶם seen with thee in all thy quarters." And he imagines that he has the authority of Gesenius for asserting that שֵׂאֵר (seor) applies to wine as well as leavened bread; and the authority of Mr. Herschel, a converted Jew, for maintaining the same respecting חֻמֵּץ (hhamets): and so confident is he of the correctness of his inferences, and of the value of his authorities, that he ventures to change the expression used in our English Bibles, and to call the feast of unleavened bread "the feast of unleavened things," (see *Bacchus*, p. 363,) as if the words 'unleavened bread' were of too limited import to express the meaning of the original.

Let us now examine some passages of scripture in relation to this subject; and first the original command in regard to it: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel. And in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, and in the seventh there shall be a holy convocation to you: no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you. And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this self-same day have I brought you out of the land of Egypt, therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever. In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. Seven days there shall be no leaven found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a stranger or born in the land. Ye shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations ye shall eat unleavened bread." *Exodus* xii. 15—20.

Had we not evidence to the contrary, we should deem it impossible for any person to imagine that the prohibition in the above passage had respect to any thing else than the leaven of bread; no other food than bread is mentioned in the passage, and the reason why leavened bread should be forbidden, and unleavened bread should be directed to be used, may be readily ascertained by a comparison of the above passage with the 33d, 34th, and 39th verses of the same chapter. "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste;

for they said, We be all dead men. And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders. And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victuals.”

When God instituted the Passover, he declared of the day on which it was observed, “And this day shall be unto you FOR A MEMORIAL, and ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord throughout your generations, ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever,” and we can readily perceive how the eating of unleavened bread would serve to remind the children of Israel of *the haste* with which their fathers left the land of Egypt, when urged by the Egyptians to depart; “the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs (or dough) being bound up in their clothes on their shoulders, because they were thrust out, and could not tarry.”*

In the next chapter, Exodus xiii., the command is repeated, that the feast of the Passover should be kept throughout their generations, as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and of the circumstances attending it. “And Moses said, Remember this day, in which ye came out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten,” v. 4. “Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters. And thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes,” &c.

In this passage, as in the one cited from the preceding chapter, no other eatable but bread is mentioned in connexion with the terms denoting leaven; and with respect to

* It was for a like purpose that the Israelites were required to dwell in booths seven days in a year. “Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths. That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God.” Lev. xxiii. 42, 43.

bread, it is required that it be unleavened during the Passover and the following six days.

What reason then is there for supposing that the Hebrew terms *seor* and *hhamets* are, in these passages, to be applied to any thing else than the leaven of bread, even admitting what we have already shown is not the fact, that they may include the ferment of wine as well as of bread? There is not in the words of the law the shadow of a reason for any such application of these terms as our authors would give them. And this view of the subject, we think, is abundantly confirmed by what is said in Deut. xvi. 2, 3. "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd. . . . Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, *even* the bread of affliction: for thou camest out of the land of Egypt IN HASTE: *that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life.*" Besides establishing our position, that the Israelites were required to eat unleavened bread as a memorial of the circumstances attending their deliverance, this passage is of itself sufficient to determine the meaning of the Hebrew term *מַצֹּת* (*matstsoth*), the plural form of the word *מֵצָה*, rendered by our translators "unleavened bread," and styled by the sacred penmen "the bread of affliction," *לֶחֶם עֲנִי*. And although this word, *matstsoth*, is used more than forty times in the Hebrew scriptures, in no instance is it used to express any thing else than an unfermented preparation of meal or flour. Sometimes it is used in connexion with *לֶחֶם* the general term for bread, sometimes with *חֲלֵוֹת* cakes; also with *עֲגוֹת* small cakes; and again we meet with the phrase *רִקְיֵי מַצֹּת* unleavened wafers, but for the most part it is used alone, and yet from the context or parallel passages it is evident that it has reference to unleavened bread, cakes or wafers. Striking examples of this are furnished by the following passages. Judges v. 19, 20, "And Gideon went in, made ready a kid, and *unleavened cakes* (*מַצֹּת*), of an ephah of flour. . . And the angel said, take the flesh and the unleavened cakes (*מַצֹּת*)." 1 Samuel xxvii. 25, "And the woman . . . took flour, and kneaded it, and did bake unleavened bread (*מַצֹּת*) thereof." With the strictest propriety therefore is *matstsoth* rendered by our English translators "unleavened bread."

In farther confirmation we will cite Matthew xvi. 5—12,

“And when his disciples were come to the other side they had forgotten to take bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves and said, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, nor remember the five loaves of five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not understand, that I spake not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” The Greek term for leaven is ζύμη, the word by which the Seventy render the Hebrew term שֵׁר. That in the above passage it has no reference to fermented wine, and that it is confined to the leaven of bread, will, we presume, be conceded by our authors and all who agree with them in opinion: and if this be so, does it not follow that when the term for leaven, viz. שֵׁר in Hebrew, or ζύμη in Greek, is not used figuratively, but in reference to an article of diet, it is sometimes at least undeniably restricted in its meaning to the leaven of bread? and if this be the case, it belongs to our authors to prove that in the scriptures it is ever used to express any thing else than the leaven of bread; and not only this, but also that in the passages relating to the Passover it is used in the more extended sense. But this they neither have nor can do.

We have a still farther confirmation of our position in the remarks of Paul, 1 Cor. v. 6—8, “But your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread (ἀζύμοις) of sincerity and truth.” In using the expression “old leaven,” Ainsworth supposes, and not without some reason, that Paul had reference to שֵׁר (seor), and in the phrase “leaven of malice and wickedness,” he alludes to עֲרֵב, the terms used in Exodus xii. 19 and xiii. 7, to denote leaven and leavened bread, שֵׁר, according to Ainsworth, expressing a remnant of leavened

dough, and חמץ its sourness of taste, or rather the first denoting the leaven by which the dough or bread is fermented, and חמץ denoting the leavened bread or dough itself.

That our translators have correctly supplied the word *bread* after unleavened, in v. 8, to express the exact import of ἀζύμοις, is put beyond all question by the use of the word ‘lump’ in v. 6, the original term, φύραμα, denoting a mass or lump of macerated and kneaded flour, and ἄζυμα is the term employed by the translators of the Septuagint to express the meaning of מצות which, in the other cases cited, we have shown denotes unleavened bread, cakes or wafers. In this passage, be it remembered, Paul is referring to the customs connected with the observation of the Passover.

The above cited passages do, in our opinion, furnish evidence the most conclusive in favour of our position, and they show that מצות in Hebrew, and ἄζυμα in Greek, when not used figuratively, do invariably denote unleavened bread, cakes or wafers, and nothing else; and also that שׂוּר (seor) and חמץ (hhamets) do invariably denote a fermented preparation of meal or corn, and nothing else: and hence we infer that the law prohibiting the use of leaven at the Passover, had no reference whatever to the use of wine or the fermented juice of the grape. Hence, too, we can perceive why the Jews, in their care to avoid all leaven forbidden by their law, abstained, during the Passover, from all drinks made from grain, and which in making them required the use of yeast or leaven, while at the same time they hesitated not to use the fermented juice of the grape, if it had been kept in such a position that no particle of leavened bread could have been dropped into the vessel containing the wine through the carelessness of a servant, as is witnessed by the most learned of the Rabbinical writers, whose testimony has already been given in the previous pages. Were it a fact that the Jews did not use the fermented juice of the grape at the Passover, would it not be a most marvellous circumstance that amidst all the various directions given by their Mishna or Oral Law for the right observation of the Passover, not the most distant allusion should be made to the supposed fact, and yet sundry fermented drinks are mentioned, the use of which is declared a transgression of the Passover, they being drinks made from corn; and the general rule regulating the exclusion of drinks is explicitly said to be this, viz. “that every thing made from corn is a viola-

tion of the Passover." And while no kind of wine is interdicted as being a transgression of the Passover, the drinking of four cups of wine is required of every person, even the poorest. How passing strange then, if the fermented juice of the grape was a transgression of the Passover, it should not have been mentioned in the Jewish traditions with the other prohibited and fermented drinks, the cutach of Babylon, the shechar or beer of the Medes, and the vinegar of Edom?

We have now examined the testimony of our authors, and we have shown, 1. That they have misapprehended the meaning of their own authorities, at least in every case where that is of any account. 2. We have shown, from the best Jewish authorities, in all matters relating to the customs of the Jews, that wine capable of producing intoxication was not prohibited at the Jewish Passover, but on the contrary was used. 3. We have shown, from the testimony of the Rev. Eli Smith and the Rev. Mr. Schauffler, that fermented wine is used by Jews at the present day. 4. We have shown that the argument founded on the etymology of the Arabic terms denoting leaven and wine is of no account. And, finally, we have shown, from a careful examination of the scriptures, that the prohibition of leaven at the feast of the Passover had respect merely to the leaven of bread.

We are now prepared to enter upon an examination of the next position.

VI. The sixth position to be examined is this, viz. *that as our Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at the Passover, he could not have used the fermented juice of the grape.*

"It is therefore certain," says Mr. Parsons, "that our blessed Lord did not use fermented alcoholic liquor at the first sacrament." *Anti-Bacchus*, pp. 281, 282. And on this subject Mr. Grindrod thus writes: "The institution of the Lord's Supper is another example commonly adduced in testimony that the Saviour both sanctioned and participated in the use of intoxicating wine. There is strong reason to believe that this occurrence took place before the conclusion of the Passover, and, in this case, the arguments in support of the absence of fermented wine during the latter observance will apply with equal force to the former." *Bacchus*, p. 419.

Although it is denied by Lightfoot and others that the

sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted at the Passover, we are not disposed to question, in the least, the statement of Mr. Grindrod on this point; on the contrary, we fully accord with it. That our Lord made use of wine at the institution of the Eucharist is distinctly admitted both by Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Parsons, and their aim is to show that it must have been unfermented, from the fact that the sacrament was instituted at the Passover, when, according to their view of the matter, the Jews were forbidden to have in their houses either leavened bread or fermented liquor of any description. That they were altogether in error on this point we undertook to show under our last head; and if successful in attaining our object, it follows of course that their conclusion falls with their premises; and that our Saviour, as was usual at the Passover, used the fermented juice of the grape, and with it and with bread instituted the memorial of his death.

Here we might rest the matter; but as there is abundant evidence in the writings of the early Christian fathers, and in the history of the Church, to corroborate our position, that the Saviour, at the institution of the Eucharist, used wine or the fermented juice of the grape, we presume that it will gratify our readers to present them with some of this evidence. In giving this testimony, we shall begin with that of Clemens Alexandrinus, one of the most learned and able men of his age, and of whom Mr. Grindrod thus speaks: "The writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished during the latter part of the second century and the commencement of the third, contain much information respecting the drinking habits of the people, and the injurious effects thereby produced on the prosperity of the church. This writer exhibits what ought to be the conduct of *genuine Christians*, and enters into directions concerning the *appetites*. He strongly reprobates *gluttony* and *luxury*, and, in particular, the use of a variety of aliments." *Bacchus*, p. 424. We have here then a witness, as to the value of whose testimony Mr. Grindrod and ourselves are agreed, and of whom Mr. G. farther says, "In the second chapter this celebrated father writes concerning the *moderate use of wine*, which he says should in general be mixed with water. There is, however, much said by this writer which probably has escaped the notice of Mr. Grindrod, and which is of no little importance in regard [to the practice of the primitive church. Not only does he say that it is best to mix with a

very large quantity of water, and that both wine and water are creatures of God, ἀμφω μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήματα, and that a mixture of both contributes to health, the one being necessary, the other useful; but in immediate connexion he describes the effects of the immoderate use of wine, viz. that by it “the tongue is tied, the lips relaxed, the eyes are turned aside, as if the sight were swimming from the abundance of the moisture; and compelled to be deceived, they imagine all things to have a circular motion.”*

Again he says, “With propriety therefore does the divine Teacher, anxious for our salvation, in the strongest terms announce the prohibition, ‘Drink not wine to drunkenness.’”†

From these passages we may learn what Clemens understood by the term οἶνος wine, viz. a liquor which when used with prudence contributed to health, but when used immoderately produced drunkenness, with all its attendant evils.

Again, p. 68, after remarking that the Scythians, Celts, Iberians and Thracians are warlike nations, and given to drunkenness, and that Christians, being a peaceful race, and feasting for enjoyment and not for violence, drink sober healths, that their friendships may be exhibited in truth as well as in name, he adds, “How do you suppose the Lord drank when on our account he was made man? So shamelessly as we? Did he not do it becomingly? Decorously? With consideration? Ye know well he also partook of wine; for even he was also a man; and he blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink, this is my blood and that it was wine which was blessed, he shows again, saying to his disciples, I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until I drink it with you in the kingdom of my Father.”‡

* Οἶνω δὲ ἀμέτρῳ ἢ μὲν γλῶττα παραποδίζεται· παρῆται δὲ τὰ χεῖλη· ὀφθαλμοὶ δὲ παρατρέπονται, οἶον κολυμβώσης τῆς ὀψέως ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῆς ὑγρότητος· καὶ ψεύδεσθαι βεβιασμένοι, κύκλῳ μὲν ἡγοῦνται περιφέρεσθαι τὰ πάντα. p. 66.

† Εἰκότως οὖν στεργύτατα ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἀπαγορεύει, τῆς ἡμετέρας κηδόμενος σωτηρίας, Μὴ πίνετε οἶνον ἐπὶ μέθῃ. p. 67.

‡ Πῶς οἶσθε πεπωκέναι τὸν κύριον, ὀπηνίκα δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο; οὕτως ἀναισχύντως ὡς ἡμεῖς; οὐχὶ ἀστείως; οὐχὶ κοσμίως; οὐκ ἐπιλελογισμένως; εὖ γὰρ ἴστε, μετέλαβεν οἴνου καὶ αὐτός· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ αὐτός· καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, Λάβετε· πῖνετε· τοῦτο μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα. . . . ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· Οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, μέχρις ἂν πῖω αὐτὸ μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. p. 68.

What testimony can be more to the point? This passage contains the very language of our Saviour when he instituted the Eucharist, and gave the cup to his disciples. If on that occasion he used an unfermented and an unintoxicating wine, surely Clemens Alexandrinus could never have heard of the fact. In confirmation of his position, Clemens adds, "And that it was wine which was drunk by the Lord, (is evident,) for he again speaks of himself, reproaching the Jews for their hardness of heart, the Son of man, says he, came, and they say, behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of sinners. Let this be firmly fixed in our minds against those called Eneeritites,"* a heretical sect, who opposed marriage, the use of animal food, and wine, accounting them an abomination.

Commenting upon the command given to Aaron and his sons, with respect to wine and strong drink, Origen observes, that before they approached the altar, they indulged in the use of wine; but that when they began to draw nigh to the altar, and to enter into the tabernacle of testimony, they abstained from wine; and he proposes, as a subject of inquiry, whether any thing similar can be found in the conduct of our Saviour and his apostles. And in order to show that there existed a striking resemblance, he says, "The Saviour had come into the world that he might offer his own flesh a sacrifice to God for our sins. Before he made this offering he drank wine. But when the time for him to be crucified was come, and he was about to approach the altar that he might immolate his own flesh, 'taking the cup, he blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take and drink of this.' Drink ye, he says, who are not now about to approach the altar. But he, about to approach the altar, says of himself, 'Verily, I say unto you, that I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.' "

That Origen here speaks of the wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper is evident from the fact that he quotes the very words of the Saviour on that occasion. It is also evident that Origen believed that the wine distributed by our Lord to his disciples, was the wine from which the

* "Αλλ' ὅτι γε οἶνος ἦν τὸ πινόμενον πρὸς τοῦ κυρίου, πάλιν αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγει, τὴν Ἰουδαίων ἐπονειδίξων σκληροκαρδίαν, ἦλθεν γάρ, φησιν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ λέγουσιν Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος. Τουτὸ μὲν ἡμῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκρατητάς καλουμένους παραπέπηχθω. p. 68.

priests were required to abstain when they entered into the tabernacle of the congregation. And that the wine from which Aaron and his sons were required to abstain was an intoxicating wine, no one pretends to question: consequently, according to Origen, in instituting the Eucharist, our Lord made use of an intoxicating wine.*

St. Cyprian is the next writer whose authority we shall adduce on this subject.† From his LXIII. Epistle it appears that even prior to his time some of the early Christians, from ignorance or from fear of being discovered by their enemies, were wont to use water instead of wine in their morning celebrations of the Lord's Supper. This practice Cyprian condemns in the most explicit terms; and in the course of his remarks, he undertakes to show that it was directly at variance with the example and command of Christ: and he maintains that our Saviour used wine mixed with water; and farther he speaks of the wine as inebriating. Our limits forbid our quoting all that is said on this subject by St. Cyprian; and we shall therefore content ourselves with citing what may suffice for our present purpose, and to show that we give a fair representation of the views of this father. His words are, "Since therefore neither the apostle himself, nor an angel from heaven, can announce or teach otherwise than that which Christ once taught and his apostles preached, I marvel that, contrary to the evangelic and apostolic discipline, it is come into use, that in some places water, which alone cannot represent the blood of Christ, is present-

* "Quid ergo precepit lex Aaron et filiis ejus? ut vinum, et siceram non bibant, cum accedunt ad altare. Videamus quomodo id vero pontifico Jesu Christo Domino nostro, et sacerdotibus ejus ac filiis, nostris vero Apostolis possimus aptare. Et perspicendum primo est, quomodo prius quidem quam accedat ad altare verus hic pontifex, cum sacerdotibus suis bibit vinum, cum vero incipit accedere ad altare, et ingredi in tabernaculum testimonii, abstinet vino. Putas possumus invenire tale aliquid ab eo gestum? Venerat in hunc mundum Salvator, ut pro peccatis carnem suam offerret hostiam Deo. Hanc priusquam offerret inter dispensationum moras, vinum bibebat. Ubi vero tempus advenit crucis suae, et accessurus erat ad altare ubi immolaret hostiam carnis suae, accipiens, inquit, *calicem benedixit, et dedit discipulis suis dicens. Accipite et bibite ex hoc.* Vos, inquit, bibite, qui modo accessuri non estis ad altare. Ipse autem tanquam accessurus ad altare, dicit de se: Amen dico vobis, quia non bibam de generatione vitis hujus, usquequo bibam illud vobiscum novum in regno patris mei." With respect to the genuineness of the homilies from which the above extract is given, let the reader consult the *Bibliotheca Graeca* of Fabricius, Tom. V. As mentioned before, our quotation from this homily is made from the Latin translation of Rufinus.

† Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 258. He ranks among the most distinguished of the early Christian fathers.

ed in the cup of the Lord. Of this sacrament the Spirit speaks in the Psalms, making mention of the Lord's cup, and saying, Thine inebriating cup, how excellent. A cup that inebriates is surely mixed with wine, for water cannot inebriate any one. But the cup of the Lord so inebriates, as Noah, in Genesis, drinking wine, was inebriated."* To prevent all abuse of this remark, Cyprian proceeds to distinguish between ebriety produced by the cup of the Lord and the ebriety occasioned by the use of common wine: and he shows that he regards the exhilarating effects of common wine as symbolical of the joys attendant on a right participation of the cup of the Lord.† It is Cyprian's object to show that in the administration of the Lord's Supper, it was proper to use wine mixed with water, and not water only; and in doing this, he is led to speak of the inebriating qualities of the wine used by our Lord in the institution of that ordinance.

Chrysostom, in his exposition of Matthew xxvi. 29, observes, that after his resurrection, our Saviour drank wine, that he might pluck up by the roots the wicked heresy of those who used water instead of wine in the celebration of the mysteries, that is, of the Lord's Supper.‡ The kind of wine made use of may be inferred from his comments on the next verse, in which he inveighs most severely against those who rise from the table drunk, when thanks are to be returned and the hymn to be concluded. *Καὶ ἀνίστανται μετὰ μέθης, δέον εὐχαριστεῖν καὶ εἰς ὕμνον τελευτᾶν.*

Again, commenting on 1 Cor. xi. 21, Chrysostom says

* Cum ergo neque ipse apostolus, neque angelus de coelo annunciare possit aliter aut docere, praeterquam quod semel Christus docuit, et apostoli ejus annu-
neciaverunt; miror satis unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam, quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in dominico calice, quae sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere. Cujus rei sacramentum, nec in Psalmis tacet Spiritus sanctus, faciens mentionem dominici calicis et dicens, '*Calix tuus inebrians quam peroptimus!*' calix autem qui inebriat, utique vino mixtus est: neque enim aqua inebriare quenquam potest. Sic autem calix dominicus inebriat, ut et Noe in Gencsi vinum bibens inebriatus est.

† Origen and Augustine take the same view of Psalms xxiii. 5, that is taken by Cyprian. See Origen, seventh homily on Leviticus, and Augustine, Tom. IX. 253. These writers all follow the Septuagint in their rendering of this verse, and whether they are right or wrong as to its meaning, their explanation of it leaves no doubt as to their views respecting the kind of wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper.

‡ *Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ ὕδωρ ἔπιεν ἀναστάς, ἀλλὰ οἶνον; ἄλλην αἴρεσιν πονηρὰν πρόβριζον ἀνασπῶν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰσὶ τινες ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδατι κεχρημένοι.*

that the apostle brings two charges against the Corinthians; one, that they treat their supper with disrespect in not waiting for the poor; and the other, that they eat insatiably and drink to drunkenness: and he adds, "therefore he said not, one is hungry and another is full, but *is drunken*," &c.*

We could readily quote more from this father, but the above must be sufficient to show what was his opinion in regard to the kind of wine used.

We shall next adduce the testimony of Augustine, who says of the cup of the Lord, that "it *inebriates* the martyrs to the apprehending of heavenly things, and not vagrants to the defiling of precipices."†

Again, writing in answer to Faustus, he says, "Why Faustus can suppose that we have the like religion with respect to the bread and the cup, I know not; since the Manichaeans esteem it not religion but sacrilege to drink wine,"‡ and that by *wine* he did not mean *must*, is evident from the fact, that in his book concerning Heresies, he distinguishes between these two things, and says that the Manichaeans "do not drink wine, . . . nor do they sup any must, even the most recent."§

Of the Aquarians, Augustine says, "that they derive their name from the circumstance, that in the sacramental cup, they offer water, *and not that which the whole church offers.*"||

Such is the testimony of these distinguished fathers of the church, in the second, third and fourth centuries, respecting the contents of the cup used in the administration of the Lord's Supper, by the Saviour himself, at the institution of this ordinance, and by his church after him. In confirmation of their statements, much may be found in other early Christian writers. From the extracts given, it is evident, that Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom and Augustine teach that, in instituting the Eucharist, our

* Πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι τὸ δεῖπνον αὐτῶν ἀτιμάζουσι· δεῦτερον δὲ, ὅτι γαστρίζονται καὶ μεθύουσι καὶ εἰς ἀπληστίαν καὶ εἰς μέθην ἐξέβαινον. διὸ οὐδὲ εἶπεν, ὅς μὲν πεινᾷ ὅς δὲ κορέννυται, ἀλλὰ μεθύει κ. τ. λ.

† *Et inebrians ad capessenda caelestia martyres, non ad funestanda praecipitia Circumcelliones.* Tom. IX. p. 253.

‡ *Cur autem arbitretur Faustus parem nobis esse religionem circa panem et calicem nescio, cum Manichaeis vinum gustare non religio, sed sacrilegium est.* Tom. VII. p. 342.

§ *Nam et vinum non bibunt, nec musti aliquid, vel recentissimi, sorbent.* Tom. VIII. p. 16.

|| *Aquarii ex hoc appellati sunt, quod aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti, non illud quod omnis Ecclesia.* Tom. VIII. pp. 20, 21.

Lord made use of wine capable of producing intoxication if used freely and not diluted.

The Encratites, the Severians, Manichaeans,* and other heretics, mentioned by these writers as condemning the use of wine, did not maintain that the Saviour used *must*, and that in celebrating their mysteries, Christians should do the same; but holding wine in abomination, they rejected all use of the juice of the grape, whether fermented or unfermented: and therefore it is that the early Christian writers speak only incidentally of the qualities of the wine used in the sacramental cup; yet enough is said by them to show most clearly that the wine was possessed of intoxicating qualities.

It is not till the latter part of the seventh century, that we hear any thing of the use of *must* in the sacrament of the supper. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," xv. 3, after mentioning the different reasons assigned for mixing water with the wine, and among others that of Cyprian, says, "And the third Council of Braga relates Cyprian's words correcting several abuses that were crept into the administration of this sacrament; as of some who offered milk instead of wine; and of others who only dipped the bread into the wine, and so denied the people their complement of the sacrament; and *others who used no other wine but what they pressed out of the grapes that were then presented at the Lord's table.* All which they condemn, and order that nothing but bread and wine mingled with water† should be offered, according to the determination of the ancient councils." Add to the foregoing statements the fact, not to be denied, that all the different branches of the Christian church, however much they differ in other respects, are yet agreed as to the use of wine, the

* The Encratites held in abhorrence marriage, the flesh of beasts, and also wine. See Aug. and Clemens Alex. The Severians held that the wine was the offspring of Satan and the earth; and the Manichaeans, that wine was the poison of the princes of darkness. See Aug. VIII. In his History of the Eucharist, L'Arroque expresses the opinion that the Encratites had also the name of Aquarians, and that they are to be distinguished from the Aquarians mentioned by Cyprian, who were not heretics, but timid and ignorant Christians.

† It is by no means certain, that our Saviour used wine mixed with water when he instituted the Eucharist; but it is certain, that it was wine and not water, that he made the symbol of his blood. Of mixing water with the wine, Vossius says: "Est enim in se ἀδιάφορος, eoque Ecclesiae hodie non tantum jus illud habent, ut mero uti in Eucharistia liceat, sed vero postquam ritus miscendi necessarius haberi coepit, prudenter merum praeferunt, ut suam in talibus libertatem ostendant. Quemadmodum et si meraci necessitas statui coeperit, melius fortasse ad mixturam redeatur." Theses Theologicae. pp. 307-8.

fermented juice of the grape, in the celebration of the Eucharist. The Roman church, the Greek church, the Armenian, the Nestorian, and all the various branches of the Protestant church are, as it regards this matter, of one mind. Is it then possible, that the whole church of Christ, from the times of the apostles, and, for what appears to the contrary, from the time of our Saviour's death, to the present time, should have agreed as to the propriety of using the fermented juice of the grape in the sacrament of the Holy Supper, and yet their doing so be contrary to the example and will of the blessed Redeemer? Let him believe this who can.

The facts stated under this head must be sufficient to establish our position, that in the institution of the Eucharist, the Saviour used the fermented juice of the grape, had we even failed to show that when wine is mentioned in scripture, it denotes an intoxicating drink, or that at the Paschal feast the Jews were wont to use an inebriating wine. On the other hand, if we succeeded in our attempt to establish these points, then we have so much additional and independent testimony in support of our views respecting the kind of wine distributed by the Saviour to his disciples, when he made it the symbol of his blood.*

VII. We are next to examine the position, *that our Saviour on no occasion used fermented wine, or furnished it for the use of others.*

That this position is held by Messrs. Grindrod and Parsons is obvious from the whole tenor of their essays: but as we have, in all our previous discussions, quoted one or more passages to show that they held the opinions ascribed to them, we shall do so now. At the conclusion of some remarks on this subject, Mr. Grindrod observes, "Hence arises a strong argument against the presumption that the Son of God made use of, or countenanced the use of intoxicating liquor." *Bacchus*, p. 421. "We may indeed rest assured that so holy a being as the Son of God would not partake of any thing improper in itself, or calculated to lead his followers into sin." *Bacchus* p. 417.

In confident assertion Mr. Parsons seldom fails to surpass Mr. G., and hence we are not surprised to find such lan-

* We find that, on page 509, we have inadvertently mentioned Lightfoot as denying that the Saviour instituted the Eucharist at the Passover. Lightfoot mentions, Vol. I. p. 995, that "some Christians have held that Christ and his disciples kept their last Passover one day before the Jews kept theirs;" but this is not his own opinion.

gtage as this: "Those who insist that the wine made by our Lord for the marriage of Cana was an intoxicating drink, appear to be reckless of every thing but their own taste for modern wines." Anti-Bacchus, p. 273.

Notwithstanding the risk we run of being regarded by Mr. P. as reckless of every thing but our own taste for modern wines, we do insist that the wine made by our Lord was intoxicating, and we farther insist that nothing but self-confidence, equal to that displayed throughout his entire essay, could render him blind to his ignorance of Jewish customs, and of the practice of the Saviour, with respect to the use of wine.

In no one passage in the gospels is their the least intimation that the term οἶνος (wine) is to be understood in a sense different from its common acceptation; and we have already shown that it always denotes an inebriating drink, unless connected with some term that qualifies its meaning. Why then is the term *oinos* to be understood in this instance as denoting an unintoxicating liquor? We agree with Mr. Parsons that μεθυσθῶσι, the Greek term rendered in our version "have well drunk," does not in this instance mean "intoxicated," but merely "have drunk more or less freely." Yet, at the same time, we maintain that it always denotes the use of an inebriating liquor; and that either within the bounds of sobriety or otherwise.

Clemens Alexandrinus, who, to say the least, understood the import of the term οἶνος (wine) full as well as Parsons, evidently regarded the wine into which the water was changed by our Saviour as intoxicating. His words are, "Although he converted water into wine, at the marriage, he did not permit them to drink to intoxication."*

For maintaining that our Saviour was wont to drink intoxicating wine, we have not only the authority of this eminent father, and of Origen, and of Chrysostom, all three Greek writers, but, what is of greater moment, we have the authority of the Saviour himself. Reproving the Jews for their perverseness, he says to them on one occasion, "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread, nor drinking wine, and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

* Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐν τοῖς γάμοις πεποίηκεν, οὐκ ἐπέτρεψε μεθύειν. p. 67.

Luke vii. 33, 34. From this passage it is evident, 1. That our Saviour drank wine of some description. 2. That for so doing he was styled "a wine-bibber," or, in other words, a drunkard. That the charge of his being a wine-bibber was utterly false, we all believe; but does the fact, that this charge was false, prove that he *never* drank any intoxicating wine? Would he have been justly chargeable with being a wine-bibber, had he occasionally used an intoxicating wine, and that too, as Clemens Alexandrinus expresses it, in a becoming, reputable and considerate manner? Is every person who drinks fermented wine, in any quantity however small, justly liable to the charge of being a wine-bibber, a lover of wine? If not, and if in the case supposed with respect to the Saviour, he would not have rendered himself justly obnoxious to the charge made against him; then surely the falseness of the charge is no evidence that the Saviour never drank intoxicating wine. And the very fact that he was called a wine-bibber, from drinking that wine from which John abstained, renders it morally certain that the wine used by himself, and in common use among the Jews, was an intoxicating wine, otherwise the charge would have been not only false, but unspeakably absurd. The absurdity would have been no greater, had they styled him a drunkard for drinking water. The Saviour admits the fact on which the false charge was founded, viz. that he drank wine from which John abstained. For his not drinking wine, John was charged with having a devil, and for his drinking, the Saviour was charged with intemperance. Shall we conclude, because the charge in the case of John was false, that it was not a fact that he abstained from wine? as Mr. P., in the case of the Saviour, infers that it was not a fact that our Saviour ever used intoxicating wine, because he was falsely charged with being a wine-bibber. If the falseness of the charge in the one case is evidence of the falseness of the fact upon which the charge is founded, why not in the other case also?

Upon what principle of interpretation are we to limit the drinking, on the part of Christ, to the drinking of the unfermented and unintoxicating juice of the grape? He made use of a drink from which John abstained: if then we ascertain what kind of wine John did not drink, we at the same time ascertain what kind of wine the Saviour did drink. Can there be any doubt as to what kind of wine it

was that John did not drink? If there be, it must, we presume, be removed by reading what is said in Luke i. 15, "For he (John) shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and *shall drink neither wine nor strong drink;*" or, in other words, he shall drink no intoxicating drink whatever.

Mr. Grindrod assumes as a fact, that the use of such wine is inconsistent with the holiness of the Saviour's character, and with the rules which, as Son of God, he laid down in the scriptures for the government of prophets, priests and kings: and thence, and also from his submitting to the rites and customs of the Jews, very conclusively infers, that "these things are a strong argument against the presumption that the Son of God made use of, or countenanced the use of intoxicating wine." When he establishes his several premises, we shall grant his conclusions.

After proving that our Saviour used fermented wine in instituting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it may seem superfluous to discuss the points considered above. But our doing so may serve to show that on other than sacramental occasions it is lawful to use wine.

VIII. The last position of which we proposed to speak, is as follows, viz. *that it is an offence against God and man to affirm that the scriptures ever speak with approbation of the use of fermented wine.*

Quotations are hardly necessary to show that our authors maintain this position. To prove that the use of intoxicating drink is a sin against God, and is always injurious in its effects upon men, is the great object of the Essays. And speaking of the miracle at Cana, Mr. Parsons says, "He wrought that miracle to show forth, or manifest his glory, that his disciples might believe on him; *but no one, except an infidel or drunkard, would say, that his 'glory was manifested' in producing a drink (i. e. fermented wine) which poisoned his friends; and the knowledge that he did so, instead of awaking or confirming our faith in him, would be calculated to beget unbelief.*" Anti-Bacchus, p. 335. We will not trust ourselves to comment on such language as this,* any farther than to say, that we have no ob-

* In the Essay of Mr. Grindrod we find nothing of this character. Mr. G. never charges those who differ with him as to the qualities of the wines used by the Saviour, with being infidels or drunkards. In "Bacchus" there is nothing in the language unbecoming a Christian writer. His statements are often inaccurate, and his reasonings not seldom unsound; sometimes indeed they are

jections to be classed with drunkards or infidels by any one who is capable of penning such a sentence.*

If the scriptures forbid the moderate use of wine, we acknowledge ourselves justly liable to the charge of sinning against God and our fellow men, in maintaining the sentiments to which we have given utterance. But if, on the contrary, we have the sanction of scripture for those sentiments, it is a matter of small moment what reproach we shall encounter for our avowal of them. And whether the views presented by us are the views of God's word, we submit to the judgment of our readers, merely requesting that, before a decision be made, our arguments may be calmly and carefully considered.

It was our purpose, when we began, to take notice of sundry criticisms of our authors, upon different passages and terms found in the sacred writings, which could not with convenience be made subjects of comment in the above discussions; but the limits of our Review admonish us that we have already trespassed too far upon its pages. And we the more readily waive farther comment upon particular texts and terms, from the conviction, that if we have made good the several points we undertook to establish, nothing more is required to show that the views which we have been defending are those of the sacred scriptures.

In the foregoing discussions we have handled, as the reader will observe, our several points separately and independently of each other. The same facts indeed are sometimes cited in support of different positions, but the arguments themselves are distinct. If therefore we have proved each

almost puerile: and if his modes of interpreting scripture were universally applied in determining matters of faith and practice, it would be no difficult matter, in our opinion, to establish, apparently on the authority of scripture, the most pernicious heresies. Not that we regard Mr. Grindrod, or any of his fellow-labourers, in promoting total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as heretics, but merely as adopting, inadvertently we would believe, the modes of arguing employed by heretics in supporting their preconceived opinions.

* After the last quotation from *Anti-Bacchus*, no one can be surprised at meeting with the following: "I have before shown that at the first sacrament our Lord drank an unfermented wine. . . . Surely we ought not to change the cup of the Lord into the cup of devils." This observation involves a charge against the church of Christ, from the age of the apostles to the present time, of participating in the cup of devils. We mean not to represent Mr. Parsons as *designedly* preferring such a charge against the body of Christ, but as employing language which of necessity involves it. Into such extravagance will fanaticism and ignorance carry a man, especially if confident of his superior knowledge and learning.

of the following propositions—1. That the wine in common use among the ancient Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, was fermented—2. That in Palestine the wine was not only fermented, but strong and intoxicating—3. That the term *shekhar*, “strong drink,” always denotes an inebriating drink—4. That intoxicating drinks were permitted at the Jewish feasts—5. That fermented wine was, and is yet used, at the Jewish Passover—6. That in instituting the Eucharist, the Saviour used the fermented juice of the grape—and 7. That our Lord, on other occasions than the one just mentioned, used such wine, and provided it for others—the whole of these propositions combined must furnish an irrefragable argument that the scriptures do not condemn the moderate and temperate use of wine and other drinks which, when taken in excess, produce intoxication.

We cannot, however, conclude without an expression of our earnest desire, that no one will pervert our remarks to his own injury or the injury of others. The apostle Paul tells us of some in his day, who turned the grace of God into licentiousness, and who hesitated not to say, “Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound.” The conduct of these men furnished no reason to the mind of the apostle for his omitting to preach the doctrine of free grace; nor can the circumstance that some will pervert the truth, be deemed a sufficient reason for a suppression of the truth in regard to any matter of faith or practice. If any one will use to excess intoxicating drink, because the scripture does not condemn the temperate use of such drink, he wilfully perverts the truth of God, and he must expect to reap the fruit of his doing: viz. wretchedness in this world, and eternal misery in the world to come.

So far from being designed to afford a pretext for the free and unreserved use of inebriating drinks, our remarks, if fairly and impartially considered, will be found not to have had for their object the encouragement of even the temperate use of them. We have endeavoured not to lose sight of the fact, that though the use was lawful, it might nevertheless, in certain circumstances, be altogether inexpedient, and therefore wrong. Whether there is any thing in the present condition of our own country, or of the world at large, that calls, at this time, for entire abstinence from every species of intoxicating drink, is a question for serious and prayerful inquiry. It is a question of expediency for every one to determine for himself: and for his decision he is respon-

sible to his God and Judge, and to him alone. "To his own master he standeth or falleth." It would occasion us no regret, if every one should come to the conclusion that it is his duty to abstain from all use of intoxicating drinks; unless he should be led to entertain scruples in regard to the lawfulness of using wine at the table of our Lord. Had this subject been left untouched, and had no rude hand been laid on the memorials of our Saviour's death, we should probably have taken no part in the discussions respecting the lawfulness or unlawfulness of using inebriating drink, content to let every one adopt that view of the subject which he deemed most in accordance with the word of God.

The wonderful success which at this very time attends the temperance enterprise, calls for the most sincere and devout expressions of gratitude to the author of all good: and while we contend for our own liberty and that of others in matters of meats and drinks, we mean not to insist upon the expediency of using that liberty. We feel not the least difficulty in adopting as our own the words of the apostle: "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." And again, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth."

A. B. Dod

ART. II.—*An Elementary Treatise on Analytical Geometry: translated from the French of J. B. Biot, for the use of the Cadets of the Virginia Military Institute, at Lexington, Va.; and adapted to the Present State of Mathematical Instruction in the Colleges of the United States.* By Francis H. Smith, A. M., Principal and Professor of Mathematics of the Virginia Military Institute, late Professor of Mathematics in Hampden Sidney College, and formerly Assistant Professor in the U. S. Military Academy at West Point. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam. 1840. pp. 212.

THE science of Analytical Geometry is one of the most brilliant inventions of modern times. Next to the Calculus, it is the most important contribution ever made to our mathematical knowledge. Its power, as an instrument of investigation, is unrivalled. Nor is it less remarkable for the sin-

gular beauty with which it classifies, in their proper relations, an endless number of particular results, than for the facility with which it discovers them.

No other branch of human knowledge is so entirely the product of one man's labours. Other sciences have reached their perfection by slow degrees. The surmises of one generation have become the discoveries of the next. Fractional and ill-arranged truths have preceded integral forms and scientific order. The guiding idea, or, as Coleridge would have called it, "the mental initiative," which is necessary to discover the relations subsisting between the truths which make up any science, and arrange them in their proper order, and without which there can be no science, but only an assemblage of isolated results, has been, in most cases, gradually evolved through the successive labours of many men. One approximation after another, each nearer the truth, has prepared the way for the production of the happy idea which is to crystallize an indigested mass of truths into order and beauty. Astronomy was so ripe for the principle of universal gravitation at the time of its discovery, that the bustling Hooke almost stumbled upon it, and filled the ears of the Royal Society with clamours against Newton for having robbed him of his property. And the previous researches of others, especially of Wallis, had approached so near the Calculus that Newton and Leibnitz divide the glory of its invention. The remote parentage of the calculus of the moderns may indeed be distinctly traced to the "method of exhaustions" of Archimedes. But there was no such preparation for the application of algebraic analysis to define the nature and discover the properties of lines, surfaces and solids. This invention is the sole property of Descartes, and it has conferred upon him an immortality which his more laborious speculations in metaphysics have failed to secure. His mathematical researches, of which he thought little, now constitute the basis of his fame.* His *Geometria*, a quarto tract of 106 pages, is one of the few treatises which mark an epoch in the history of science.

* This great man seems to have been singularly unfortunate. In his own day he was harassed by persecutions, under the charge of atheism, though he maintained that the most certain of all our knowledge, next to our own existence, is the being of a God. And but scanty justice has been meted out to him since. Absurdities have been laid to his charge which he never taught, and others have received credit for discoveries of truth to which he is fairly entitled.

Geometry, until this time, had been confined within narrow limits. Previous to the institution of the school of Plato, it had discussed only the properties of rectilinear figures, the circle, the cylinder, the cone and the sphere. The method of investigation was that which is given in the Elements of Euclid, in which nothing is permitted to be done but the drawing of a straight line or a circle, and nothing is assumed as true but a few elementary principles, denominated axioms. The Platonic school contributed to Geometry three other curves, known as the Conic Sections, the properties of which were investigated in a similar manner. In this school originated also the celebrated problems of the duplication of the cube and the trisection of an angle, the first of which was solved mechanically by Plato, and geometrically by his pupil, Menechme, by the intersection of two parabolas.

The conic sections were a most important addition to the stores of Geometry, but the chief glory of the Platonic school is derived from the invention of the Geometrical Analysis. We have the authority of Proclus for ascribing this invention to Plato himself. According to this method, the problem to be solved is assumed as done, or the theorem to be proved as true, and from the relations established by this assumption a train of reasoning is carried on until we come to some conclusion known to be true or false, possible or impossible. A synthetical proof or solution is then found by returning from the elementary truth or construction to the original assumption. The conception upon which this method rests is a refined one, and the method itself more fruitful in the discovery of truth than any other of the inventions of the ancients. In the hands of Apollonius and Archimedes, it led to those beautiful constructions and demonstrations which excited the astonishment of the mathematicians of the 14th and 15th centuries, who were ignorant of the means by which they were accomplished.

His famous "*cogito, ergo sum,*" the starting point of his philosophy, has been misconstrued and derided. He has been made to teach a doctrine respecting *innate ideas* which he expressly disclaims, his true opinion on that subject being nothing more than must be held by every one who would escape from the materialism to which Locke's philosophy was carried in the hands of Condillac. And he has been accused of fatalism, though he was the first to teach the paramount authority, in all our reasonings upon the human mind, of the evidence afforded by consciousness, and to apply this principle in proof of the liberty of our actions. But whatever may be thought of the value of the contributions made by him to our knowledge of the mind, he was indisputably the first to cast off the trammels of authority, and set the example of a proper *method* in mental philosophy. He was a great man among the great men of his age.

But the geometrical analysis of the ancients, though the only tentative method which they possessed for the discovery of truth, and the most valuable of all their inventions, is tedious and elaborate in its processes. It contains no general rules or methods of investigation. The discovery of one truth has little or no tendency to lead to the discovery of another. The preliminary constructions and steps of reasoning to be employed, must depend upon the particular circumstances of each question, and much tact is often required to conduct the investigation to a successful issue. A kind of contrivance is necessary in selecting the affections of the quantities upon which to found the analysis, and in making the proper graphical constructions, which, proceeding upon no general methods, demands for its successful practice only that sort of ingenuity which is no essential part of a philosophical mind. Lagrange or Laplace might be at fault in the solution of a mathematical riddle, which would present less difficulty to some contributor of the *Diarian Repository*, who had spent his life in poring over particular results instead of studying general principles; even as Napoleon, we doubt not, might have been foiled at fence by many a *petit maitre* of Paris.

The only other general method of investigation known to the ancients, was that which has been called the *method of exhaustions*, the invention of Archimedes. The general object of geometrical science being the measure of extension, it was soon found that the same methods which sufficed for determining the ratios of right lines to each other, or of the areas contained by right lines, failed when the question was respecting the length of a curve, the measure of the space bounded by curve lines, or the volume comprised within a curve surface. Right lines and rectilinear figures are compared with each other on the principle of superposition. Two lines are of the same length, when the one being placed upon the other, they would exactly coincide,—two triangles, parallelograms, or other rectilinear figures, are equal, if it be shown that they can be made to occupy the same space. In the last analysis of our reasonings in elementary geometry, it will be found that they rest upon the idea of equality derived from coincidence in space. But this principle of superposition is obviously inapplicable when we come to consider curve lines, curvilinear areas, and volumes. In a curve, like the circle, which is of uniform curvature throughout, we might take any portion of it as a linear unit, and

determine the ratio which it bears to the whole curve, or any assigned portion of it; but we could not thus, by means of the principle of superposition, solve the general problem of assigning the length of the circumference of a circle, or any other curve, in terms of a right line. The same difficulty prevents the comparison of curvilinear with rectilinear spaces. It was to overcome this difficulty that the method of exhaustions was invented by Archimedes. This method essentially consists in inscribing a rectilinear figure within a curve, and circumscribing another around it, and obtaining thus two limits, one greater and the other less than the required perimeter or area. As the number of sides is multiplied, it is evident that the difference between the exterior and the interior figure, and, *a fortiori*, between either of them and the curve, will be continually diminished. In pursuing this method of approximation, it was found, in some cases, that there was a certain assignable limit towards which the perimeter or area of the inscribed figure tended, as the number of its sides was increased, and that the circumscribed figure tended to the same limit. This limit was taken to be the perimeter or area of the intermediate curve. It was thus that Archimedes proved that the area of a circle is equal to the rectangle, under its radius and semi-circumference, by proving that this rectangle was always greater than the inscribed, and less than the circumscribed polygon. Any modern mathematician would accept the demonstration founded upon this principle as sufficient, but the ancients always felt it necessary to strengthen it by means of the "*reductio ad absurdum*." But the cases are comparatively few in which such a limit can be found. When, for instance, the length of the circumference of the circle is sought, it is impossible to determine any line which shall be constantly greater than the perimeter of the inscribed, and less than that of the circumscribed polygon. The only resource in such cases is to approximate to the value sought, by increasing the number of sides of the interior and exterior polygons, and thus diminishing the difference between them, and of course between either of them and the intermediate curve. It was thus that Archimedes, by inscribing and circumscribing a polygon of 96 sides, discovered the approximate ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter, to be as 22 to 7, a result which is too great by the 800th part of the diameter, but of which, nevertheless, this greatest

of the ancients was so proud that he directed it to be engraved upon his tomb.

This method of investigation, though subtle and ingenious, laboured under very serious difficulties. Like the Geometrical Analysis it furnishes no general methods, so that the discovery of one truth puts us in no better condition for discovering another. The reasoning, too, is in all cases indirect, and the demonstrations to which it leads are so involved and difficult, that without some more compendious and effective instrument of research, science must ever have remained in its infancy. The ancient geometers succeeded in discovering and demonstrating the chief properties of rectilinear figures, the circle, and the five regular solids. When we add to this an imperfect investigation of the conic sections, the cissoid, the conchoid, the quadratrix of Denostratus, and the spiral of Archimedes, we have the sum of the ancient geometry. But instead of wondering at the fragmentary and imperfect character of abstract science among the ancients, our wonder ought rather to be, that with such feeble instruments they were able to accomplish so much. That their methods were not more general and powerful was a necessary consequence of the early state of science; that with these methods they were able to reach so many valuable results, is in the highest degree creditable to their skill and subtlety.

From the decline of Grecian science until the seventeenth century, a period of nearly two thousand years, geometry made no considerable progress. The Romans were incapable of appreciating what the Greeks had done, much less of adding to it; and the Arabs did nothing more than to translate the works of the Greek geometers. In the same state in which Archimedes and Apollonius had left it, the science came into the hands of Descartes, but it left them completely revolutionized. Before the time of Descartes algebra had been applied to geometry by Bombelli, Tartaglia, and especially by Vieta, in his treatise on angular sections. But they had applied it only to the solution of determinate problems, and derived from it no advantage, except in the greater brevity and power of the language with which it furnished them.* The general method of representing every plane

* The following illustration will put the reader in possession of the difference between a *determinate* and an *indeterminate* problem. Suppose the problem

curve by an equation between two unknown quantities, and deducing all its properties by algebraic operations upon this equation, is unquestionably the sole invention of Descartes. No hint of it is to be found in any previous writer; and they who have adduced the algebraic solutions of geometrical problems given by Vieta and others, in disparagement of the claim of Descartes, have shown thereby that they had not penetrated the real spirit of the Cartesian geometry.

In attempting to explain the fundamental conception of the modern geometry, it will be necessary, in the first instance, to establish the possibility of translating, in all cases, considerations of a geometrical nature, into such as shall be purely analytical. There is no apparent connexion, at first sight, between geometrical forms and analytical equations; and yet a little reflection will show that it is in all cases possible to substitute pure considerations of *quantity* for those of *quality*, and thus bring the whole science of geometry within the range of analysis. All our geometrical ideas may be distributed into the three classes of magnitude, form, and position. No ideas can enter into any geometrical question which are not comprehended in one of these three categories. The first of these presents no difficulty. The ratios of magnitudes to each other are expressed by numbers, and come properly within the scope of algebraic representation and analysis. The second class of geometrical ideas, those which relate to form, may be always reduced to the third, since the form of a body must of necessity depend upon the mutual position of the different points of which it is composed. The form of a triangle is completely determined, if the place of every point on its three sides is known; and so of any other figure. The idea of form, in its widest extent, is evidently comprised in that of position, since every affec-

to be, "upon a given line as a base to construct a triangle of which the other two sides shall be equal to two given lines;" it is evident that the conditions are sufficient to determine the triangle in magnitude and position; and the problem is said to be determinate. The vertex of the triangle would be at the intersection of the two circles described around the extremities of the base as centres, with the given lines respectively as radii. But if the base be given, and the vertical angle; and it be required to find the vertex of the triangle, it is evident that an infinite number of points may be found which would satisfy the conditions. Suppose the vertical angle to be a right angle, then since every angle contained in a semicircle is a right angle, if we describe a semicircle upon the given base, every point in this semicircle will be the vertex of a triangle which will fulfil the conditions of the problem. The problem in this case is indeterminate, and the semicircle upon which the required point is situated is called the *locus* of the point.

tion of form may be made to depend upon an affection of place. The preliminary difficulty then which seems to lie in the way of subjecting geometry to the analytical operations of algebra, is reduced to the simple question of representing, in all cases, considerations of position or place, by those of magnitude or quantity.

In showing how to effect this representation, and thus flashing a sudden light over the whole field of geometry, Descartes did nothing more than to generalize a method which is every day used, even by the most ignorant. Whenever we wish to indicate the situation of an object, the only means which we can employ is to refer it to other objects which are known; and this reference is made by assigning the magnitude of the geometrical elements which connect the unknown with the known. Thus we determine the place of any point on the surface of the earth by its distance from the equator, and from another fixed line chosen as a first meridian. Or if one point be determined, we can assign the place of any other, provided its bearing and distance from the known point be given. These two common methods of defining the position of a point on the surface of the earth are complete illustrations of the two kinds of construction most used in analytical geometry. The methods are obviously susceptible of universal application. Let us call the geometrical elements whatever they may be, which make known the position of a point, the *co-ordinates* of the point, the name imposed upon them by Descartes, and continued by all his successors. The co-ordinates of a point upon a plane are evidently two in number. The position of any point upon a plane is determined if we know its distances from any two fixed lines, not parallel to each other, in the same plane. These distances are the *rectilinear* co-ordinates of the point; and the two fixed lines, which are generally taken perpendicular to each other, are termed the *axes*. We may also fix the position of a point upon a plane, provided we know its distance from a fixed point, and the angle made by the line of direction of this distance with a fixed line. These two elements, the distance of the point, and the angle contained between its line of direction and the fixed line, are the *polar* co-ordinates of the point. An infinite number of other systems, besides those of rectilinear and polar co-ordinates for determining the position of a point, may be imagined, but these are the only two systems that are of extensive use. But whatever may be the system of co-or-

dinates adopted, it is evident that by means of them we may in all cases, make ideas of position depend upon simple considerations of magnitude, since we may represent always a change of place in a point by variations in the numerical value of its co-ordinates.

Having thus shown that all ideas of position, and, consequently, all our elementary geometrical notions, may be reduced to simple numerical considerations, it will be easy to conceive the fundamental idea of Descartes, relative to the analytical representation of geometrical forms. It is at once evident, from the account which has been given of the manner of representing analytically the position of a point upon a plane, that when a line has been defined by any characteristic property which it possesses, this definition will give rise to a corresponding equation between the variable co-ordinates of the point which describes the line. If a point be supposed to move irregularly upon a plane, its two co-ordinates being connected by no relation, will be independent the one of the other. But if the point moves, subjected to such a condition as to make it describe any definable line, it is plain that its two co-ordinates will have, throughout its course, a constant and precise relation to each other. This relation may be expressed by a corresponding equation between the co-ordinates, which will be an exact and rigorous definition of the line, since it will express an algebraic property which belongs exclusively to all the points of this line. The numerical relation which, for every point upon the line, exists between its co-ordinates, may be in some cases difficult to discover; but it is clear, from general considerations, that such a relation must exist, even though we should be unable, in any particular case, to determine its precise nature, and express it by means of an equation. One of these co-ordinates we know must be a *function* of the other, though the form of this function may not be in every case assignable.* These considerations seem sufficient to show,

* One quantity is said to be a function of another when they are so related that the value of the one depends upon the value of the other. Thus the space passed through by a falling body is a function of the time of descent: the length of the circumference of a circle is a function of its radius: and, in general, y is a function of x , if the value of y depends in any manner upon the value of x . There are many cases in which it can be shown that one quantity is a function of another, though we are not able to assign the precise form of the function, and others still in which we can determine the analytical form of the function, but are unable to find its calculable value. The object of every department of natural science is to determine the relations subsisting between the phenomena

in its widest extent, the possibility of defining any curve by means of an equation between the co-ordinates of every point situated upon the curve. And this equation will so exactly and completely represent the curve, that the one can receive no modification, however slight, without producing a corresponding change in the other. Every property of the curve will be implicitly included in its equation, and may be deduced from it by proper analytical operations.

We have, for the sake of simplicity, confined the illustration of the leading principle of the modern geometry to the case of curves, all the points of which lie in the same plane. Since every such curve may be represented by an equation between two co-ordinates, the discussion of their properties is termed geometry of two dimensions. A similar course of reasoning would show that, as the position of a point in space is completely determined when we know its distances from three fixed planes, no two of which are parallel to each other, we may define any curve of double curvature, or any surface, plane or curved, by means of an equation between the three co-ordinates of every point upon the curve or surface. The definition, or the mode of genesis, of the curve or surface will express a property common to every point upon it, and the algebraic expression of this property, in terms of the three co-ordinates, will constitute its equation. We thus have a geometry of three dimensions.

We have attempted thus to state, and to justify, upon general principles, independently of its application to this or that particular case, the conception upon which Descartes founded his geometry. There is not in the whole range of science a conception that has been more fruitful in results. It would be difficult to overrate its importance in a scientific view. Immediately upon its announcement geometry passed beyond the narrow limits which had hitherto circumscribed it, and entered upon a career which can never be exhausted. Nor did geometry alone profit by this fertile discovery. The science of rational mechanics was remodelled by it, physical astronomy derived from it inestimable advantage, and it is at this day lending its aid to almost every department of natural philosophy. It has afforded substantial help to experimental science by giving the means of constructing and

which it considers, or to discover the form of the functions which connect them. The moment this is done, the science passes into the hands of analysis, and takes a rational form.

expressing those partial hypotheses, which, prior to the discovery of a complete theory, are necessary to classify the facts that are already known, and guide to the investigation of new ones.

In comparing together the ancient and the modern geometry, it is impossible not to be struck, in the first instance, with the great advantage possessed by the latter in its language. This advantage is so striking that some writers have been deceived into making it the essential distinction between the two methods. All mathematical language consists of two parts; the one expressing the objects themselves about which we reason, the other expressing the manner in which these objects are combined or related, or the operations to which they are subjected. In the ancient geometry magnitudes are represented by *real* symbols, a line by a line, an angle by an angle, a triangle by a triangle, &c.; and the relations of these magnitudes to each other, and the operations to be performed upon them, are described in words. In the modern geometry, on the contrary, the magnitudes about which we reason, the relations which they bear, and the operations to which they are subjected, are all denoted by *conventional* symbols. These symbols are simple, brief, and comprehensive. Instead of a diagram, sometimes exceedingly complicated, accompanied by an enunciation of the truth to be proved, often awkwardly expressed because of the limitations by which it must be guarded, and a demonstration which brings the matter slowly and in successive portions before the mind, we have in the symbols and operations of algebra, as applied to geometry, so much meaning concentrated into a narrow space, expressed with such distinctness and force, and brought with such entireness to the notice of the mind before the impression made by one part has been weakened, that the reasoning powers cannot but be greatly aided, and guarded against error. These symbols afford us also the means of simplifying all the operations to be performed. By means of them we are enabled to reduce all possible relations between the objects of our reasoning to the simplest of those relations, that of equality; and a still more important advantage is gained in the substitution which we are able to make of the arithmetical operations of multiplication and division, instead of the geometrical method of the composition and division of ratios.

But immense as is the superiority conferred upon the modern geometry by the comprehensiveness and power of its

language, it is not in this that its essential spirit resides. Without the aid of this language it never could have reached its present state of perfection ; but we are not entitled therefore to infer that its peculiar character is derived from the symbols it employs. The use of these symbols, or of others possessing a like simplicity and concentration of meaning, was essential to the development of the science as we now have it, but its logical character is independent of its language. This language may be, and often is, applied to the solution of determinate problems in geometry, which possess, nevertheless, the character of the ancient geometry ; and it is possible, on the other hand, to apply, in some cases, the substance of the modern method without the use of its peculiar notation. A little reflection upon the spirit of the two methods will be sufficient to show, that any independent investigation of a particular truth, whether conducted by means of graphical constructions representing by real symbols the quantities about which we reason, or by algebraic characters and processes,—that is, that any special result which is obtained in any other way than by the application of some more general truth to the particular case, belongs essentially to the ancient method in geometry. The ancient geometry is, in other words, an assemblage of particular results ; the modern geometry is a collection of general truths, each comprising under it an endless number of particulars.

We have spoken of geometry as the science which has for its object the *measure* of extension. This definition, though it may seem at first sight, by its precision to limit the scope of geometry, does in reality require, for the absolute perfection of this science, that it should discuss all imaginable forms of lines, surfaces and volumes, and discover all the properties which belong to each form.* This statement immediately suggests two essentially distinct modes of investigation ; the one by taking up, one by one, these geometrical forms, and determining separately all the properties of each ; the other, by grouping together the discussion of analogous properties, no matter how different in other respects may be the bodies to which they belong. In other words, our geometrical researches may be conducted, and the results of

* For a lucid exposition of this and some other points briefly discussed in this article, the reader is referred to M. Comte's *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, *Leçon 10c.*

† We use the term *body*, for convenience sake, to designate the objects of geometrical study, lines, surfaces and volumes.

them arranged in relation to the different bodies which are the object of study, or in relation to the properties which these bodies present. The first of these was the method pursued by the ancients. They studied, one by one, the properties of the straight line, the circle, the ellipse, the hyperbola, &c., separating the different questions pertaining to each from those which related to other curves or surfaces, no matter how strong the analogies might be between them. This method of investigation, though simple and natural, is obviously characteristic of the infancy of science. The complete mastery of the properties of one curve affords no aid for discovering those of another, beyond the skill and tact which the previous study has imparted. No matter how similar may be the questions discussed respecting different curves, the complete solution of them in relation to one leaves us to commence the investigation anew for every other. However similar a problem may be to one already solved for some other curve, we can never be certain beforehand that we shall have sufficient address to solve it under its modified form. Though we may, for example, have learned how to draw a tangent to an ellipse or hyperbola, this gives us no aid in determining the tangent to any other curve. Geometry, thus studied, is, as we have already called it, evidently nothing more than a collection of particular results, destitute of those general classifying truths which are necessary to constitute a science.

The modern geometry, on the other hand, instead of investigating *seriatim* the properties of each geometrical form, groups together all affections of a like kind and discusses them without regard to the particular bodies to which they belong. It passes over, for instance, the particular problem of finding the area of the circle, and solves the general problem of finding the area bounded by any curve line whatever. Instead of investigating the asymptote to the hyperbola, and then remaining in no better condition than before for discovering whether any new curve has asymptotes or not, it puts us in possession at once of a general method for determining the asymptotic lines, straight or curved, which belong to any curve whatever. The modern geometry treats thus, in a manner perfectly general, every question relative to the same geometrical property or affection, without regard to the particular body to which it may belong. The application of the general theorems thus constructed, to the particular circumstances of this or that curve

or surface, is a work of subordinate importance, to be executed accordingly to certain rules that are invariable in their mode of application and infallible in their promise of success.

Let any new curve be proposed to one who is destitute of the resources of the modern geometry, and he must commence first by surmising, and that chiefly through the suggestive power of graphical constructions, what its properties are, and then endeavor to prove by methods altogether peculiar to the curve in hand, that it possesses the properties the existence of which he has divined, with no certainty derived from his previous knowledge that he will be able to succeed in this particular case. Foiled amid its intricate specialities he may be reduced, as was the great Galileo, to the mortifying necessity of calling in the mechanical aid of the scales to supply the defect of his mathematical resources.* Let the same curve be proposed to one who has the modern geometry at command, and he will immediately determine its tangent, its singular points, its asymptotes, its radius of curvature, its involute and evolute, its caustics, its maximum and minimum ordinates, its length, its area, the content of the solid generated by its revolution, in short all its important properties.

The brief exposition which we have given of the different methods pursued by the ancient and the modern geometry, is enough to show on which side the scientific superiority lies. In the ancient geometry special results are obtained separately, and without any knowledge of their mutual relations though they may be, in truth, only particular modifications of some general truth which embraces them and innumerable like phenomena. The modern geometry investigates this general truth, and then applies it, in the way of deduction, to all particular cases. Had we gone on for ages in the steps of the ancients, we could have done nothing more than add to the *indigesta moles* of particular truths; and no matter how great our success there would still always remain an infinite variety of geometrical forms unstudied and unknown. On the other hand, for every question resolved by the modern geometry, the number of geometrical problems to be solved

* The only stain upon the scientific reputation of this great man is his seeking to determine the area of the cycloid in terms of its generating circle, by cutting the cycloid and the circle out of a lamina of uniform thickness and weighing them. It is a striking illustration of the power of the modern analysis that any tyro can now solve problems that eluded the forces of such men as Galileo, Fermat, Roberval, and Pascal.

is diminished, for all possible bodies. The one is a science, with its general theorems lying ready for all possible cases; the other is made up of independent researches, which, when they have gained their particular end, shed no light beyond it.

It is not our purpose to enter fully into the exposition of the peculiar logic of the modern analysis, or to contrast in detail its merits with those of the ancient geometry. Many interesting points of view could be obtained by pursuing this comparison to a greater length; but we have gained the end which we at present have in view if we have given an exposition of the subject sufficiently plain and extended to enable the reader to pronounce upon the *scientific* claims of the two methods. We entertain no doubt what will be the judgment rendered.

The superiority of the analytical methods of the moderns is so evident and vast, that there has been no attempt, since the publication of the "Geometry of Curve Lines," by Professor Leslie, to revive the ancient method. This attempt was a signal failure. Mr. Leslie avows himself the champion of a juster taste in the cultivation of mathematical sciences, but unfortunately for his success, no sooner does he enter upon any question which lies beyond the mere elements of geometry than he betrays most painfully the poverty of his resources. We have but to open his book and read of "a tangent and a point merging the same contact," of points "absorbing one another," of "tangents melting into the curve," of "curves migrating into one another," &c., to make us sympathize with the humiliation which he must have felt in invoking the aid of poetry to establish the theorems of geometry. We know of no similar attempt made by any *scholar* since. It is now universally conceded that without the aid of the modern analysis, the science of geometry cannot be established upon a rational basis. And without the help of geometry, thus established and ordered, all the real sciences, excepting only those included in the department of natural history, must be deprived of their full development and perfection. The new geometry has its ample vindication in the "Mecanique Analytique" of Lagrange, and the "Mecanique Celeste" of Laplace.

In our own country, prior to the publication of the work named at the head of this article, we had but two treatises on the subject of Analytical Geometry; the one a republication of the elementary treatise of Mr. J. R. Young, which 'is chiefly made up from the "Application de l'Algebre a la

Geometric" of Bourbon; the other, a more recent publication from the pen of Prof. Davies. We do not, for reasons that will be obvious enough, include among treatises upon Analytical Geometry, the Cambridge translation of the imperfect and antiquated work of Bézout. We are glad that Prof. Smith has added his contribution to our scanty stock, by giving us a translation of the masterly work of Biot, one of the most perfect scientific gems to be found in any language. The original needs not our commendation, and of the translation it is enough to say that it is faithfully executed.*

We regard the multiplication of text books, on this subject, as affording cheering evidence that juster ideas are beginning to prevail in our country respecting the proper scope of mathematical education. And yet there are colleges in our land that comprise, in their course of study, nothing of the geometry of curves beyond what is contained in Simpson's or Bridge's Conic Sections, that leave the study of the Calculus optional with the student, and that are compelled, therefore, to teach, under the name of Natural Philosophy, a system that, at the present day, is scarcely level with the demands of a young ladies' boarding school. The graduates of these institutions may be able to classify plants, insects and stones; they may fancy themselves qualified to decide upon the comparative merits of rival systems of world-building in geology; but they cannot read, understandingly, the first ten pages of any reputable treatise on mechanics from the French or English press. We have grieved long over this state of things, and we hail with pleasure every symptom of a change for the better in public sentiment. If our ancient and venerable institutions of learning will not elevate their course of study into some approximation to the existing state of mathematical science, the day, we hope, is not far distant when the public will discern that they are standing in the way of a thorough education, and visit them accordingly.

* We regret to see so many typographical errors in the work, and some of them of a character fitted to perplex the student. On page 88 there is an omission of the transformation of the equation of the Ellipse, to remove the origin from the vertex of the axis to the centre of the curve, which confuses all the subsequent investigation.

ART. III.—*Essays*: by R. W. Emerson.—Boston: James Munroe and Company. 1841. 12mo. pp. 303.

James W. Alexander

THIS beautiful production of the Boston press is truly inviting to the fastidious reader, and as he turns over the pages he finds them sparkling with phrases which belong to elegant letters and profound science, and with abundance of names which betoken varied reading: but on a nearer inspection he cannot but exclaim with the fox of Phædrus on finding the mask, *O quanta species, cerebrum non habet!* A book more void of real meaning certainly never fell into our hands, nor one which seems so much to be constructed with the view of hoaxing the public. The air of philosophical profundity which is thrown over it is the obscurity not of a deep but a muddy stream, and the brilliancy of the surface is little else than the iridescence on a bowl of soap-bubbles. Vague as the title is, it is not too much so. The book, if about any thing, is *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*; and we see no reason why such essays might not be produced during a lifetime as rapidly as a human pen could be made to move.

We do not suppose the author to be intellectually all that his book might indicate. It is the property of affectation to make a man even of wit and learning ridiculous. It is only the cross-gartering and the grimace of Malvolio which excite a snile. There are passages here and there throughout the work which evince literary accomplishment and natural sensibility, with a remarkable talent for figure and for melody of construction; but these are just the places where the writer has forgotten the trick of his style, lost sight of Carlyle, and displayed, as the vizor slipped aside, an agreeable and intelligent countenance.

The motto on the third page is portentous and profane:

I am owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Caesar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart, and Shakspeare's strain.

Forsooth, the brain of Plato has become in the hands of its present owner little better than a *caput mortuum*. The titles of the twelve chapters are, History—Self-Reliance—Compensation—Spiritual Laws—Love—Friendship—Prudence—Heroism—The Oversoul—Circles—Intellect—Art.

For any thing that appears, these labels have been assigned by lottery; as from beginning to end there is a total absence of coherence and unity. We deny not the existence of here and there a fine sentiment or beautiful period, but we grow weary of oscillating so quickly between the sublime and the ridiculous. The heterogeneous collection reminds us of those ancient drawers in the cabinets of our grandmothers, in which our childish hands used to turn over shells, ribands, brooches, gold rings, shreds of brocade, and paste-diamonds, intermingled with leathern thongs, crusts, and potsherds; an illustration, by the by, which we flatter ourselves is in our author's happiest manner.

"A man" says Mr. Emerson. "cannot bury his meanings so deep in his book, but time and like-minded men will find them. Plato had a secret doctrine, had he? What secret can he conceal from the eyes of Bacon? of Montaigne? of Kant? Therefore Aristotle said of his works, 'They are published, and not published.'" The same may be said of Mr. Emerson, and as to the discovery of the hidden meanings, either the time has not come, or we are not like-minded men.

We do not consider the following extract as by any means below the general average of the work.

"Society never advances. It recedes as fast on one side as it gains on the other. Its progress is only apparent, like the workers of a treadmill. It undergoes continual changes: it is barbarous, it is civilized, it is christianized, it is rich, it is scientific; but this change is not amelioration. For every thing that is given, something is taken. Society requires new arts and loses old instincts. What a contrast between the well-clad, reading, writing, thinking American, with a watch, a pencil, and a bill of exchange in his pocket, and the naked New Zealander, whose property is a club, a spear, a mat, and an undivided twentieth of a shed to sleep under. But compare the health of the two men, and you shall see that his aboriginal strength the white man has lost. If the traveller tell us truly, strike the savage with a broad axe, and in a day or two the flesh shall unite and heal as if you struck the blow into soft pitch, and the same blow shall send the white to his grave.

"The civilized man has built a coach, but has lost the use of his feet. He is supported on crutches, but loses so much support of muscle. He has got a fine Geneva watch, but he has lost the skill to tell the hour by the sun. A Greenwich nautical almanac he has, and so being sure of the information when he wants it, the man in the street does not know a star in the sky. The solstice he does not observe; the equinox he knows as little; and the whole bright calendar of the year is without a dial in his mind. His note-books impair his memory; his libraries overload his wit; the insurance office increases the number of accidents; and it may be a question whether machinery does not encumber; whether we have not lost by refinement some energy, by a Christianity entrenched in establishments and forms, some vigour of wild virtue. For every stoic was a stoic; but in Christendom where is the Christian?" pp. 69, 70.

After a quotation from an old play, Mr. Emerson utters the following sentences, which afford a good notion of the manner in which he jumbles together things the most unlike and distant :

“I do not readily remember any poem, play, sermon, novel, or oration, that our press vents in the last few years, which goes to the same tune. We have a great many flutes and flageolets, but not often the sound of any fife. Yet, Wordsworth’s *Laodamia*, and the ode of ‘*Dion*,’ and some sonnets, have a certain noble music ; and Scott will sometimes draw a stroke like the portrait of Lord Evandale, given by Balfour of Burley. Thomas Carlyle, with his natural taste for what is manly and daring in character, has suffered no heroic trait in his favourites to drop from his biographical and historical pictures. Earlier, Robert Burns has given us a song or two. In the *Harleian Miscellanies*, there is an account of the battle of Lutzen, which deserves to be read. And Simon Ockley’s *History of the Saracens*, recounts the prodigies of individual valour with admiration, all the more evident on the part of the narrator, that he seems to think that his place in Christian Oxford requires from him some proper protestations of abhorrence. But if we explore the literature of Heroism, we shall quickly come to Plutarch, who is its Doctor and historian. To him we owe the *Brasidas*, the *Dion*, the *Epaminondas*, the *Scipio* of old, and I must think we are more deeply indebted to him than to all the ancient writers. Each of his “*Lives*” is a refutation to the despondency and cowardice of our religious and political theorists. A wild courage, a stoicism not of the schools, but of the blood, shines in every anecdote, and has given that book its immense fame.

“We need books of this tart cathartic virtue, more than books of political science, or of private economy. Life is a festival only to the wise. Seen from the nook and chimney-side of prudence, it wears a ragged and dangerous front. The violations of the laws of nature, by our predecessors and our contemporaries, are punished in us also. The disease and deformity around us, certify the infraction of natural, intellectual, and moral laws, and often violation on violation to breed such compound misery. A lock-jaw, that bends a man’s head back to his heels, hydrophobia, that makes him bark at his wife and babes, insanity, that makes him eat grass ; war, plague, cholera, famine, indicate a certain ferocity in nature, which, as it had its inlet by human crime, must have its outlet by human suffering. Unhappily, almost no man exists, who has not in his own person, become to some amount, a stockholder in the sin, and so made himself liable to a share in the expiation.” pp. 205—207.

If there is a pleasure in going one knows not whither, through passages that lead to nothing, to have startling positions without proof, and seeming argument without conclusions, then nothing can be pleasanter than this species of composition. And this, we should infer, is the very law of the production ; for the author quotes Cromwell as declaring that “a man never rises so high, as when he knows not whither he is going.” Our author certainly is, by this rule, always *in nubibus* ; and he says himself, “*Dreams and drunkenness, the use of opium and alcohol are the semblance and counterfeit of this oracular genius, and hence their dangerous attraction for men.*”

Mr. Emerson is not pleased with the present aspect of

society; the tone of his criticisms is discontented and morose. As an instance take the following passage, which is not without cleverness, and not without a characteristic profanation of scripture.

“The sinew and heart of man seem to be drawn out, and we are become timorous desponding whimperers. We are afraid of truth, afraid of fortune, afraid of death, and afraid of each other. Our age yields no great and perfect persons. We want men and women who shall renovate life and our social state, but we see that most natures are insolvent; cannot satisfy their own wants, have an ambition out of all proportion to their practical force, and so do lean and beg day and night continually. Our housekeeping is mendicant, our arts, our occupations, our marriages, our religion we have not chosen, but society has chosen for us. We are parlour soldiers. The rugged battle of fate, where strength is born, we shun.

“If our young men miscarry in their first enterprizes, they lose all heart. If the young merchant fails, men say he is *ruined*. If the finest genius studies at one of our colleges, and is not installed in an office within one year afterwards in the cities or suburbs of Boston or New York, it seems to his friends and to himself that he is right in being disheartened and in complaining the rest of his life. A sturdy lad from New Hampshire or Vermont, who in turn tries all the professions, who *teams it, farms it, peddles*, keeps a school, preaches, edits a newspaper, goes to Congress, buys a township, and so forth, in successive years, and always, like a cat, falls on his feet, is worth a hundred of these city dolls. He walks abreast with his days, and feels no shame in not ‘studying a profession,’ for he does not postpone his life, but lives already. He has not one chance, but a hundred chances. Let a stoic arise who shall reveal the resources of man, and tell men they are not leaning willows, but can and must detach themselves; that with the exercise of self-trust, new powers shall appear; that *a man is the word made flesh*, born to shed healing to the nations, that he should be ashamed of our compassion, and that the moment he acts from himself, tossing the laws, the books, idolatries, and customs out of the window,—we pity him no more, but thank and revere him,—and that teacher shall restore the life of man to splendour, and make his name dear to all History.” pp. 61—63.

But when we come to inquire what it is which Mr. Emerson would apply as the great curative means to the diseases of the age, we can smile no longer; contempt for his finical display gives place to a deep detestation of his false and impious conclusions. And our recurrence to his name must be ascribed to this, and not to any thing either literary or philosophic in the work itself, which can deserve even a passing notice. But having heard of the working of a mock-transcendentalism among the Unitarians of Boston, and knowing the results which the genuine system has produced abroad, we were truly solicitous to learn more accurately the progress of the evil: and we are more than satisfied. Other and abler minds than our author’s have been less communicative, and have spoken ambiguous oracles, but it happens in every great conspiracy that the alarm is given by weak brethren who let out the secret; and the secret

which Mr. Emerson reveals is the extreme of Pantheism. Let us adduce the proof. As a preparatory note, we find such expressions as these:

“The great distinction between teachers sacred or literary; between poets like Herbert, and poets like Pope; between philosophers like Spinoza, Kant, and Coleridge,—and philosophers like Loeke, Paley, Mackintosh, and Stewart; between men of the world who are reckoned accomplished talkers, and here and there a fervent mystic, prophesying half-insane under the infinitude of his thought, is, that one class speak *from within*, or from experience, as parties and possessors of the fact; and the other class, *from without*, as spectators merely, or perhaps as acquainted with the fact, on the evidence of third persons. It is of no use to preach to me from without. I can do that too easily myself. Jesus speaks always from within, and in a degree that transcends all others. In that, is the miracle. That includes the miracle.” p. 237.

Then we have a gradual ascent towards the arcanum:

“There are degrees in idealism. We learn first to play with it academically, as the magnet was once a toy. Then we see in the heyday of youth and poetry that it may be true, that it is true in gleams and fragments. Then, its countenance waxes stern and grand, and we see that it must be true. It now shows itself ethical and practical. We learn that God is; that he is in me; and that all things are shadows of him. The idealism of Berkeley is only a crude statement of the idealism of Jesus, and that, again, is a crude statement of the fact that all nature is the rapid efflux of goodness executing and organizing itself.” p. 256.

“In youth we are mad for persons. Childhood and youth see all the world in them. But the larger experience of man discovers the identical nature appearing through them all. Persons themselves acquaint us with the impersonal. In all conversation between two persons, tacit reference is made as to a third party, to a common nature. That third party or common nature is not social; *it is impersonal; is God.*” p. 229.

“Our moods do not believe in each other. To-day, I am full of thoughts, and can write what I please. I see no reason why I should not have the same thought, the same power of expression to-morrow. What I write, whilst I write it, seems the most natural thing in the world: but, yesterday, I saw a dreary vacuity in this direction in which now I see so much; and a month hence, I doubt not, I shall wonder who he was that wrote so many continuous pages. Alas for this infirm faith, this will not strenuous, this vast ebb of a vast flow! *I am God in nature; I am a weed by the wall.*” p. 253-4.

“Ineffable is the union of man and God in every act of the soul. *The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God; yet forever and ever the influx of this better and universal self is new and unsearchable.*” p. 241.

“The Supreme Critic on all the errors of the past and the present, and the only prophet of that which must be, is that great nature in which we rest, as the earth lies in the soft arms of the atmosphere; *that Unity, that Over-Soul, within which every man's particular being is contained and made one with all other; that common heart, of which all sincere conversation is the worship, to which all right action is submission; that overpowering reality which confutes our tricks and talents, and constrains every one to pass for what he is, and to speak from his character and not from his tongue; and which evermore tends and aims to pass into our thought and hand, and become wisdom, and virtue, and power, and beauty.* We live in succession, in division, in parts, in particulars. Meantime within man is the soul of the whole; the wise silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the eternal

ONE. And this deep power in which we exist, and whose beatitude is all accessible to us, is not only self-sufficing and perfect in every hour, but the act of seeing, and the thing seen, the seer and the spectacle, *the subject and the object are one*. We see the world piece by piece, as the sun, the moon, the animal, the tree; but the whole, of which these are the shining parts, is the soul. It is only by the vision of that Wisdom, that the horoscope of the ages can be read, and it is only by falling back on our better thoughts, by yielding to the spirit of prophecy which is innate in every man, that we can know what it saith. Every man's words, who speaks from that life, must sound vain to those who do not dwell in the same thought on their own part. I dare not speak for it. My words do not carry its august sense; they fall short and cold. Only itself can inspire whom it will, and behold! their speech shall be lyrical, and sweet, and universal as the rising of the wind. Yot I desire, even by profane words, if sacred I may not use, to indicate the heaven of this deity, and to report what hints I have collected of the transcendent simplicity and energy of the Highest Law." p. 222-3.

This is surely enough. We have now arrived at the very acme of the Identical or Absolute System of Transcendentalism, in which the subject and the object are one. Schelling could ask no more. And this it is, which, if we are rightly informed, is to take the place of Unitarian Rationalism. The change is certainly great, but not surprising. Step by step Unitarian theology has come down from the true position as to the inspiration of the scriptures, and thus having abandoned the only sure footing, those who are foremost in the descent have found themselves among the ooze and quicksands of atheistic philosophy. We believed that the Unitarian system was too cold to live. It had too little for the heart. Hence its services were formal, its increase was checked, and some of its most learned and able ministers were seen turning aside to spend their lives in discussions merely literary or political, and even in a remarkable number of signal instances abandoning the pulpit altogether. But cold as it is, there can be no greater madness than to leave it for Pantheism. As well might the shivering Icelander cast himself into Hecla.

We are awaiting with anxious expectation the issue of this controversy. That a schism is now about to take place, real if not ostensible, in the Unitarian body, no well-informed person can doubt. There is much in the new system to attract certain minds; and not the least of its charms is its very novelty. It connects itself also with transatlantic speculations, and the names of great men in Germany. It is dark, mysterious, and inexplicable, and therefore stimulates the imagination and awakens curiosity. To those who best know its penetralia, it is a soothing fatalism, which destroys the distinctions of moral good and evil, and reinstalls the flesh

in the throne from which Christianity had excluded it. And, finally, as the extracts above shew, it gives to man the highest exaltation which the most maddened pride could ask, by merging his personality in that of the Divinity, and saying to the eager worshippers, *Ye shall be as Gods*. We feel justified, by this view of the subject, in dwelling at some length on the phases of this grand delusion in former ages, in order to shew how remarkably, in the cycle of human opinion, the vaunted discoveries of one age are the mere returns of ancient unbelief.

The basis of all sound theology is in revelation alone; and the sublime opening of the book of Genesis contains that fundamental position, in deserting which all Pantheism and atheism take their rise. Never have we so felt the sublimity of the passage, or the value of the doctrine of creation out of nothing, as while we have been attempting to thread our way through the mazes of the old theosophy. "Take away," says Coleridge, "the first verse of the book of Genesis, and then what immediately follows is an exact history or sketch of Pantheism." Let a profane criticism fritter away the sense of this prime oracle of inspired wisdom, and we find no end in wandering mazes lost. The ancients experienced this. The source of all their follies, whether theistic or pantheistic, was their ignorance of Creation. They had no conception of an Omnipotence which could pass the gulf between nonentity and existence. Substance, in their view, could not be originated, and all essence was the same essence; we therefore doubt not that there was Spinozism in the world, five thousand years before Spinoza.

There are some to whom Pantheism appears in the light of a novelty, associated as it is in their thinking with the vagaries of a recent philosophy. A more egregious blunder could scarcely be made in the history of opinion. Far back as we can reach among the hoary systems of primitive speculation, we find this delusion rearing itself in gigantic terrors, like the inaccessible summits of the primitive mountains. And every new discovery, whether of hieroglyphic documents or symbolical architecture, brings us nearer to the mind of the early races, and shews that this hideous system is one of the most ancient forms of falsehood. The researches of antiquaries in Egypt, and the labours of science under British auspices in the East, are destined to reveal still greater wonders; so that in regard to the Oriental theosophies, that

which is last in the order of discovery may prove to be the index of what was first in the order of time.

If the deluge had been universal in regard to the human race, so as to have swept away every individual, it is plain that a new race could have no relic of ancient tradition or manners. But we are too apt to treat of ancient times as if such had really been the case. On the contrary, it is natural to seek among the people nearest to the flood a vivid recollection and reproduction of the more ancient customs, habits and belief. The waters were not waters of the Lethe, and men who had lived some centuries in a different state certainly retained their memory and their habits. In the oldest existing architecture of the world therefore, especially in that which from its being excavatory is least liable to change, we must expect to find in the form and general expression a shadow more or less satisfactory of that which existed before the old world perished. The same is true of opinion, and the fragments which we have of the cosmogony and theology of the ancient Orientals, may be regarded as relics of antediluvian theories. Of the life and character of Ham, before the great catastrophe, and of his alliances by marriage, we know nothing; but it is not very unlikely that as a bold, bad man he had been contaminated by the errors of the Cainites, and not impossible that the first germination of post-diluvian error was from seeds preserved in the ark. If, as some have conjectured, the decay of man's intellectual vigour was gradual, and if it was the abuse of mighty faculties, protracted life and vast experience, that resulted in the horrible licentiousness which the deluge swept away, it is not irrational to look for the reproduction among Noah's descendants of the same falsehoods which had been rife before the flood. Hence there might arise, as from some cause we know there did arise, a revival of the grand Titanic schism, between the children of God and the children of the wicked one; and hence polytheism, pantheism, and atheism. It is among the antiquities of India and Egypt that we must look for the traces of these ancient corruptions, and as the philosophy of those nations seems to have changed in scarcely any particular since the days of Alexander the Great, there is reason to presume that it is many centuries older. The researches of Sir William Jones, Mr. Colebrooke, and other modern Orientalists have opened a mine from which we have received only the earnest-penny, but this is so

marked as to settle the question respecting the characteristic and predominant system of the Indian philosophers. "The Vedanta philosophy," says Frederick Schlegel, "is in its general tendency, a complete system of Pantheism; but not the rigid, mathematical, abstract, negative Pantheism of some modern thinkers; for such a total denial of all personality in God, and of all freedom in man, is incompatible with the attachment which the Vedanta philosophy professes for sacred tradition and ancient mythology; and accordingly a modified, poetical, and half mythological system of Pantheism may here naturally be expected, and actually exists."

Even in Japan, we find traces of this primeval heresy. The doctrine of their Bonzes is thus summed up by Bayle, from accounts of the Jesuit Possevin: they teach "1. That there is but one principle of all things, that this principle is most perfect, that it is wise but understands nothing, &c. 2. That this principle is in all particular beings and communicates its essence to them, so that they are the same thing with it, and return to it, when they have an end."

The Egyptian worship of beasts and birds and reptiles, and insects and plants, admits of an easy explanation from the comparison of an analogous degradation of speculative Pantheism among the Indians: these objects became manifestations of nature or God. But we are not left to the work of inference. Plutarch gives us a celebrated inscription from the temple of Sais, which though brief speaks volumes: *Ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονός, καὶ ὄν, καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τον ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν.* *I am all that has been, is, and shall be, and my mantle hath no mortal ever yet uncovered.* To which may be added the inscription to Isis, still extant in modern times at Capua:

TIBI.

VNA. QVAE.

ES. OMNIA.

DEA. ISIS.

That the early Greek philosophy migrated from Asia and Egypt is no longer a matter of disputation. Cecrops and Danaus could bring to Europe no other than oriental theosophy; and the Pelasgic teachers were in the estimation of some apostles direct from India. On this subject the greatest revelations are yet to be made from the research of the Indo-German ethnography. There are abundant signs of this among the relics of the Orphic poems, which sing main-

ly of Chaos, the very hieroglyph of Pantheism, and the production of all things from the teeming womb of nature. Proclus gives us a passage of Orphic verse, which might well beseem a German transcendentalist, and which admits of no reference to any but a pantheistic system. And the testimony of Plutarch is remarkable: "Whereas there are two causes of all generation, (divine and natural) the very ancient theologians and poets directed their minds only to the greater of these two, resolving all things into God, and pronouncing this of them universally, that God was both the beginning and middle, and that all things were out of God. Inasmuch that these had no regard at all to the natural and necessary causes of things." The allusion is here to the Orphic poets, the verse which is cited being one of the Orphic verses.

Ζεὺς ἀρχὴ, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα πέλονται.*

That these were the ordinary topics of philosophical discussion in a later age is evident from the chorus in the *Birds* of Aristophanes: "Chaos was, and Night, and dark Erebus, at first, and broad Tartarus; nor yet was air, or earth, or heaven; but in the boundless bosom of Erebus, in the first place of all, Night, with her black wings, brings forth a light egg, from which, in fulness of time, sprung the desirable Eros, his back glittering with golden wings, like to the whirlwind's eddying currents. But he, having cohabited with winged Chaos dark as night, in broad Tartarus, gave rise to our race of nestlings, and first led them forth to light: and erst the race of mortals was not, ere that Eros commingled all things. But when one thing was commingled with another, heaven came into being, and ocean, and earth, and of all the blessed Gods, the race incorruptible:"† a passage of which the extravagance of supposing the birds to have been begotten between Love and Chaos, before all the gods, is supposed by Salmasius and others to be given not as a joke, but as part and parcel of the old atheistic cosmogony, in which the universe, gods and all, by a horrible inversion are made to emerge from brute matter and chaos.

Upon this subject, we cannot do better than refer to such

* Cudworth, vol. i. c. iv. § 17.

† Χάος ἦν, καὶ Νύξ, Ἐρεβός τε μέλαν πρῶτον, καὶ Τάρταρος εὐρύς. Γῆ δ', οὐδ' ἀήρ, οὐδ' οὐρανὸς ἦν. Ἐρέβους δ' ἐν ἀπειροῖσι κόλποις τίττει πρῶτιστον ὑπηνέμον Νύξ ἡ μελανόπτερος ὦν. κ. τ. λ.

writers as Cudworth, Brucker, Fries and Rixner, in whose collections it will be seen that the Trismegistic theogony, the Panic worship, and the Eleatic philosophies were full of pantheistic tenets. The Trismegistic books are supposed to be least corrupt in those portions which are most strongly marked with these doctrines: for they savour of the antique, and this renders probable the testimony of Jamblichus, that they contain snatches of the old Theutic or Hermaic philosophy.

The Eleatic school of philosophy is always referred to as having in the most distinct and formal manner avowed pantheistic tenets; and every reader of Cudworth is familiar with the One-all-immovable of Xenophanes, Parmenides, Melissus and Zeno. If Cudworth had lived in our day, and had seen the facility with which polar opposites can be maintained by one and the same school, in one and the same sentence, he would have had less trouble in reconciling the discordant statements of Plato and Aristotle as to the theism or atheism of the Eleatics. The object of Cudworth being to detect every trace of theism in the ancient philosophy, he has not always inquired whether a personal God or a mere pantheistic unity was that which was acknowledged. It is scarcely possible for any one acquainted with the Schelling and Hegel school to mistake the very same doctrines among the Eleatics. *Xenophanes*, says Cicero, *mente adjuncta omnia præterea quod esset infinitum, Deum voluit esse*.* He taught according to Aristotle that the universe, as being the eternal All-one, is God, and that this unity was possessed of reason.† In the genuine spirit of a transcendental ‘antinomy,’ he declared that the All-one is neither finite without being infinite, nor infinite without being finite, but both at once.‡ His scholar and friend Parmenides taught that the τὸ ὄν is eternal and immutable, and pervaded by reason, and that what men consider temporal change is mere illusion. Melissus, the Samian, differed little from Parmenides, though his language is thought by Cudworth more consonant with our present theology. He declared, in common with Xenias of Corinth, that the diversities of things in the universe are mere products of sensual apprehension, and therefore illusive: πάντα εἰπὼν ψευδῆ, καὶ πᾶσαν φαντασίαν, καὶ δόξαν, ψεύδεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον γίνεσθαι, καὶ εἰς τὸ

* De Nat. Deor. lib. i. c. 11.

† Arist. Met. I. 5.

‡ Aristotle, ap. Rixner, II. p. 117.

μη ὄν πᾶν τὸ φθιρόμενον φθείρεσθαι.* “Although this system,” says Schlegel, “was first propounded in verse, it was by no means, in its essential and ruling spirit, a poetical Pantheism like that of the Indians—but more congenial with the intellectual habits of the Greeks, it was a Pantheism thoroughly dialectic, which at first regarded all change as an illusion and idle phenomenon, and at last positively denied the possibility of change.” The climax of Eleatic theory was reached by Zeno, famed for his proof that there is no such thing as motion. This was a trifle however to his other tenets, which have never been approached till the days of Transcendentalism. His grand doctrine was that the great substance is at the same time one and many, finite and infinite, the same and different.† Of this it has been kindly remarked by Kant, in his Critique of Pure Reason, that Zeno was not venting scholastic paradox and contradiction, but that he rather intended to show, that where the two antagonist propositions contradict one another, and each is indisputable, the resulting truth is that neither is demonstrable. But the reader must see what he says on the Antinomies of Pure Reason.

Incerta haec, si tu postules
Ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas,
Quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.

That these doctrines which had hovered as a mist over all the ancients should now and then darken the field of classic poetry, is no more surprising than that the elves and fairies of our forefathers should still haunt the fancies of our children. Hence Aeschylus,

Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθὴρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανός.
Ζεὺς τοὶ τὰ πάντα, χῶτι τῶν δ' ἔθ' ὑπέρτερον.

and Lucretius,

At nunc, inter se quia nexus principiorum
Dissimiles constant, aeternaque materies est,
Incolumi remanent res corpore, dum satis acris
Vis obeat pro textura cujusque reperta:
Haud igitur redit ad nihilum res ulla; sed omnes
Discidio redeunt in corpora materiai.

and Virgil,

Principio coelum, ac terras, camposque liquentes,
Lucentemque globum lunae, Titaniaque astra,

* Fries. Gesch. d. Phil. I. § 30, p. 151, ed. 1840. Rixner, ii. 125.

† Τὰ αὐτὰ ὅμοια καὶ ἀνόμοια, ἐν καὶ πολλὰ, μένοντα τε ἄν καὶ φερόμενα.
Plato, Phaedr.

Spiritus intus alit: totamque infusa per artūs
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.

and Lucan,

Superos quid quaerimus ultra?
Jupiter est quodeunque vides, quodeunque moveris.

We willingly pass by the traces of Pantheism in the Oriental corruptions of Christianity, which would demand our attention if we should address ourselves to a history of the error; the rather as we have recently indicated some of the points of resemblance between the ancient Gnostics and the German Transcendentalists. The subject is frequently touched by Neander, to whose works we would earnestly direct the attention of the reader. It promises more practical benefit to glance at the pantheistic tendencies of unshackled and unsanctified speculation among the schoolmen, as being more allied to the extravagances of the German school, and like the latter the natural consequence of a Babel-like attempt to rear a structure without God. On this topic we also touched, but it is not our intention to go over the same ground. We need scarcely say that to an original acquaintance with the numberless folios of schoolmen we make no pretensions; life is too short for this, and we rely upon the extracts of Hallam, Rixner, Eichhorn, Fries, and others, who wrote with an entire freedom from any bias in regard to the subject we are treating.

On a former occasion we introduced the name of John Erigena, or Scotus, but we beg leave to give a fuller view of his system as connected with the present investigation, and this shall be done from his own statements, of which a syllabus in the original may be found in Rixner.

It is remarkable that in the bold and almost irreverent speculations of Erigena, we find him on the one hand tending towards the Platonic idea of a Great Supreme, so far removed beyond all being, as that we can predicate nothing, not even existence, of him; and on the other hand, reaching some of the very speculations, and the very forms of speech, of the modern German Transcendentalists. Thus the trajectory of opinion is found, after the lapse of ages, to be a re-entering curve; and there is nothing new under the sun. The cardinal principles of Johannes Erigena were those which follow.

1. There is no other philosophy than religion. To discuss philosophy, therefore, is nothing else than to unfold the

principles of true *religion, by which is worshipped God—the highest cause of all things.

2. In order to attain this knowledge, there are four ways or methods, viz. those of Division, Definition, Demonstration, and Analysis. The *Diaeretic* method, or Division, separates one thing into many: the *Horistic*, or Definition, collects one thing out of many: the *Apodictic*, or Demonstration, lays open what is obscure by means of what is clear: the *Analytic* method resolves what is compound into its simple parts.

3. Nature, the object of all knowledge, admits of a division into four species: (1) *Natura Prima*, which creates, but is not created; (2) *Natura Secunda*, which is created, and also creates; (3) *Natura Tertia*, which is created, but does not create; (4) *Natura Quarta*, which neither creates, nor is created. These are alternately opposed to one another; and the first and fourth coincide in the divine being. For the divine nature may be called ‘*creatrix quae non creatur*,’ when viewed in itself, and with equal justice ‘*nec creatrix nec creata*,’ insomuch as, being infinite, it never proceeds beyond or out of itself; nor was there ever a time when it was not in and of itself.

4. The primary being, or divinity, being infinite reality, and unconditioned simplicity, can be neither understood nor comprehended; neither spoken nor known. Every conception would limit that which is illimitable. And accordingly the knowledge which God has of things is not mediate, by the means of conceptions, but immediate or in idea.*

The expressions of Erigena upon this topic are highly transcendental, at once reminding us of those modern Germans who have defined God the ‘universal nought,’ *das allgemeine Nichts*.

God is all, says Erigena, that truly is; since he makes all, and is made in all [et fit in omnibus]. For all that is understood and known, is nothing but the appearance of the non-apparent, the manifestation of the hidden, the affirmation of the denied, the comprehension of the incomprehensible, the utterance of the unutterable, access to the inaccessible, intelligence of the unintelligible, embodying of the incorporeal, *essentia superessentialis*, form of the formless, measure of the incommensurable, numbering of the innumerable, weighing of the imponderable, materializing of the spiritual,

* See Fries, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. ii. § 139, p. 170. Halle, 1840.

visibility of the invisible, location of the illocal, time of the timeless, limiting of the infinite, and circumscription of the uncircumscribed.—Far be it from me to mean that God does not know himself, when I say that he does not know *what* he is, *quid sit* : for by this very thing he immediately knows that he is above all that can be conceived apart from himself, *se ipsum esse super omne quid* ; and herein infinite ; so that the most adorable wisdom shines forth in this species of divine ignorance.

5. The ideas of the divine Intelligence are the primordial causes of all things : the things themselves are only representations of these existences, which are the first productions of God. These primal causes are the same which the Greeks denominated prototypes, ideas, divine purposes. They differ from the unformed mass, or original matter, in this respect, that they are nearest to the true essence, whereas this rude matter is nearest to non-entity. And the unformed matter is perpetually betraying some motion of the non-existent striving towards a place in that which truly is.

No one can fail to recognise in this a mere modification of the Platonic hypothesis. For this philosopher taught that the visible world was a transcript of the invisible God, a copy of the eternal in the temporal : and that every thing is, and subsists, only in and through the divine Idea. The whole subject suggests an inquiry into the speculations of the New-Platonists, with whose subtle disquisitions, those of the Schoolmen, and we may add of the modern Germans, have a remarkable analogy.

6. The world is an eternal production of God. It is not an accident for God to create the universe. God subsisted not *before* the creation of the universe. God precedes the universe in no sense other than that he is its cause, but not in the order of time. God is, and was, and ever shall be the cause of all things, and the creation is his eternal manifestation.

7. The nothing, out of which according to the scriptures all things were created, is the incomprehensible essence of God himself ; for this essence, being inaccessible and inconceivable, even to the highest intelligences, may be thus denominated, inasmuch as, viewed in itself, it is not, was not, and will not be. It can be embraced by no predicate, and represented by no creature, for it is infinitely above all creatures. With reference to us it is a sublime negation ; yet

by the divine condescension it reveals itself to us, by glimpses in the creatures, which may then be said to proceed out of nothing, in respect to our apprehension. Thus every creature is a theophania, or obscure manifestation of the infinite Supreme. Though above all essence, it gives essence to all.

8. All created existence eventually returns into the uncreated self-existent God, and then God is all in all. Even at present, God is all in all, considered in himself, but then he will be recognised as such by all divinely illuminated beings.

9. The human intellect is an immediate product of the divine Mind. The intellect which perfectly knows itself, is thereby united to God, and knows God. He who knows not God, cannot perfectly know himself. God is the intellect of all.

10. Time and space are relative to created existence, and not eternal. When the sensible world shall perish, time and space will be annihilated. Time is the measure of motion, as space is the measure of extension.—Here we have an anticipation of Kant's fundamental position, that time and space have no objective reality, but are merely the forms of sensation, or the conditions under which the mind apprehends objects of sense; an exposition of which may be found in the author's Latin treatise entitled *De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis*. There are those who would explain all these pantheistical expressions in accordance with the philosophy of emanation. Hallam, for example, charges Brucker with great injustice, in accusing John Erigena of Pantheism.* But if we allow such latitude of interpretation, it will be difficult to establish against even Spinoza himself this hateful charge. Our authority for the extracts is Rixner, ii. § 11.

We ask special attention to the remark that we are far from attributing pantheistic error to the great Anselm, but we name him here in order to allude to his famous argument for the being of God from the idea in the human soul. Leibnitz commented upon it, and discovered this flaw in it, that it assumes the *possibility* of divine existence. The argument, says he, proves that there is a God, if such an existence be possible. The modern Pantheist, Hegel, has also examined and defended, or rather subsidized, the same ar-

* Bruck. Hist. Crit. Phil. iii. 620. Hallam's Middle Ages, iv. 392.

gument. The objections raised against it, all arise, Hegel thinks, from the false supposition that the subjective idea has a separate existence by itself, and the Divine Being, or object, a separate existence by itself; whereas, adds Hegel, very characteristically, ‘the basis of all true philosophy is the absolute identity of the conception and its object:’ the thought and the thing thought of are one and the same. ‘The contemporaries of Anselm objected,’ says Hegel, ‘that from a bare subjective thought no objective or real existence could follow, because thought may be conversant with what is false. In this they utterly misunderstood his meaning, for Anselm is not speaking of a subjective thought, but of an eternal and unchangeable intuition of Reason, Vernunftanschauung, which necessarily carries objective reality with it.’*

This allusion to modern Transcendentalism must be pardoned, upon the ground that there is nothing in the whole investigation more important, than the discovery of this singular coincidence of recent German metaphysicians with the most subtle schoolmen.

Attempts have been made by modern authors, and particularly by Fessler, in his *Life of Abelard*, to show that this theologian maintained a hypothesis concerning the existence of all things in God, and God in all things, which is not very different from the Pantheism of Spinoza.

The rashness of scholastic speculation was further manifested in the case of Gilbert de la Porrée (ob. 1154), a contemporary of Abelard, and somewhat notorious in the church-history of that period. He was condemned by the councils of Paris and Rheims, in 1147 and 1148. But his name is here introduced, simply for the sake of showing how naturally the wildness of philosophy runs into the same absurdities in distant ages. De la Porrée held, as Hegel has done in our own day, ‘that God, or rather the Godhead, as well in himself, as with respect to us, is nothing.’†

We digress for a moment to note a singular coincidence of scholastic with transcendental theory in the case of the celebrated Parisian Hugh of St. Victor. This philosopher not only recognises a threefold partition of human faculties into Sense, Understanding, and Reason, as Kant and the Germans have done, but adds a supreme cognitive power,

* Hegel's *Encyclopedie*, p. 97.

† Deum, seu potius Deitatem, tam in se, quam quoad nos, nihil esse. Rixner, ii. 31.

Mens, for the sole purpose of contemplating God. And, indeed, the principle of classification which would erect into a separate genus the cognition of things above and beyond time and space, or Reason, would seem to warrant the addition of a further faculty for the knowledge of God. Because, if the human faculties are to be divided by the differences of their objects, it is reasonable to say that the great inscrutable God belongs to a category independent of, and infinitely superior to all others. This arrangement of the faculties is however whimsical, and incomplete, and lies very near the base of the whole transcendental figment.

The seventeenth century produced a number of men whose names are beginning to be revered by the initiated as martyrs in the cause of Pantheism, and this even before Spinoza. If some of these were denounced, and one of them burnt, for atheism, it may be observed that a similar misconstruction seems to have awaited their successors in every age. Andrew Caesalpinus, of Pisa, lived through most of the seventeenth century. His fundamental doctrine was, that the primary and actuating substance is and can be but one, namely, God; he denied creation out of nothing, and seems to have anticipated the grand tenet of Spinoza.* Lucilio Vanini was burnt alive at Toulouse in 1619. He has usually been styled an atheist, but if Rixner rightly reports his tenets he was a genuine Pantheist; for he taught that "God is all in all, but neither included nor excluded; God is simple and pure; the first, middle and last; he is all, is above all, before all, and after all; the world, like God, is one and not one, all and not all, like and unlike, eternal and temporal, immutable and mutable."† This is in the very vein of Hegel and Marheineke. Of Jacob Boehme, the inspired shoemaker of Alt-Seidenberg, the object of a common and affectionate veneration to Goethe, Coleridge and Schelling‡ we need say the less, because he is better known than most we have mentioned, and especially because his fond disciples, as zealous as those of Swedenborg, are about to give the whole of his original works to the public. Dr. Robert Fludd, an Oxonian, who died in 1635, deserves also to be named among those who, in Cudworth's language, "have made God to be all, in a gross sense, so as to take away all real distinction between

* Buddeus, *De Spinozismo ante Spinozam*, § 16.

† Rixner ii. 276.

‡ See Goethe's *Tag-und Jahres-hefte*, 1807—1822, *Werke*, vol xxxii. p. 72.

God and the creature, and indeed to allow no other being besides God; they supposing the substance of every thing, and even of all inanimate bodies, to be the very substance of God himself, and all the variety of things, that is in the world, to be nothing but God under several forms, appearances and disguises.”

But all these lesser lights pale their ineffectual fires before the luminary of modern Pantheism. Baruch or Benedict Spinoza, a Jew of Portugeze parentage, was born at Amsterdam in 1632. In 1660 he renounced Judaism, without, however, receiving baptism, though he sometimes attended the Lutheran worship. He died in 1677.*

The whole system of Spinoza proceeds upon the falsehood to which we have already pointed as the the source of all pantheistic atheism, namely the impossibility of a proper creation, and the unity, self-existence, and infinity of all substance. Of his teaching concerning God and nature, the following may be given as a fair summary. “By *substance* I understand that which is in itself, and is conceived by itself; that is, the conception of which needs the conception of nothing beside itself; moreover, such substance can be but one;—nor can it be produced by another;—it is necessarily infinite. By *attribute* I understand that which the understanding perceives as belonging to the essence of substance; by *mode* the affections of substance or that which is in another, and by which also it is conceived. By *God* I understand the absolutely infinite Ens, or substance consisting of infinite attributes, of which each one expresses an eternal and infinite essence. Moreover God, or the substance consisting of infinite attributes, exists truly eternally, and necessarily.—Whatsoever is, is in God, and nothing can be, or be conceived without God.—God is the immanent, not the transient cause of all things.—The *natura naturans* is that which is of itself, and is conceived by itself, namely God, so far forth as he is viewed as a free cause: the *natura naturata* is that which results from the necessity of the Divine Nature, or of each of the divine attributes; in other words all modes of the divine attributes, considered as things, which are in God, and which cannot be nor be conceived without God—God does not work of his own free will; and things

* His works are these: *Cogitata Metaphysica ad principia Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*; 1663. *De libertate philosophandi*; 1670. *Posthumous works*, containing his Ethics, Correspondence, and a tract *de Emendatione Intellectus*, edited by his friend and physician Louis von Meier, 1677.

could not be produced by God in any other order than that in which they are actually produced.”*

Such is the system of which Coleridge was wont to speak in terms of apologetic kindness, and which he gave due notice would be discussed at length in the fifth treatise of his ‘Logosophia;’† a scientific structure to be found only among the *châteaux en Espagne* of the amiable opium-eater. The system so nearly resembles those of the modern ‘absolute-philosophy,’ that one of the adherents of the latter says: “If we compare Spinoza with Fichte and Schelling, his spiritual kindred in our day, the system of Spinoza appears a philosophic Epos in contemplation of the absolute, as reposing on the eternal and sole being and life, consequently as objective, realistic, and plastic. On the other hand the Ego-doctrine of Fichte, describing the wrestling and struggle of the Ego to comprehend itself in its root, is purely subjective, consequently ideal, lyric, and musical. And Schelling’s system of Identity, as the harmonizing summit of Spinozistic Realism and Fichtean Idealism, beholds the finite life as locked in the infinite; while nevertheless neither finite nor infinite thereby ceases to be in itself real, each passing over into the other. Thus Schelling’s system is neither an Ego-doctrine nor a Unity-doctrine, but an All-one-doctrine, and therefore truly dramatic.”‡ Not merely dramatic, we would humbly add, but in the highest degree comic.

The revival of pantheistic infidelity in Germany is one of the most remarkable phenomena of our day. The tendency of the reigning philosophy in that country is towards this form of atheism, and every day shows more and more the practical evils of a corrupt system when once it escapes from the schools of the disputant, and spreads its miasma over Christianity and literature. It is not our intention, however, to make our long article yet longer, by entering upon this boundless subject. We have already, in more than one instance, raised our warning voice against the impieties of transcendental theology. Upon some, we are assured, our caveat is not entirely lost. Upon others, already infidels of another complexion, all our advices fall as idle tales. And if there is still a third class, who indulge the hope of combining the anti-scriptural absurdities of Hegel and Daub with

* Rixner iii. p. 60. ff. Fries. Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. ii. § 165, p. 321.

† Biographia Literaria, vol. 1. p. 165. note; also p. 86.

‡ Weder Eins-Lehre, noch Ich-Lehr, sondern Alleins-Lehre.

the doctrines of the reformed Confessions, though we doubt not a moment that the experiment will produce the successive results of latitudinarianism, infidelity and atheism, we can only leave them to the bootless task of pouring new wine into old bottles, and harmonizing Christ and Belial.

While we cannot feel serious apprehensions of the spread and ultimate prevalence of pantheistic irreligion as a system of American belief, we should be blind not to perceive a tendency in certain minds to embrace some of its worst errors. Though it is a forced growth, and though we are unacquainted with any indigenous system of Transcendentalism on English or American ground, yet exotics sometimes flourish, and where the plant is deadly, its culture even in the hothouse or the conservatory is to be dreaded. It is, we suppose, conceded, that to the writings of Coleridge we are indebted for the first impulse in this direction. The reputation of this great man as a poet, his varied and recondite learning, his remarkable facility in wielding the English language, and above all the mystic obscurity of his oracles, intimating the most philosophic depths, combined to give him influence with young and inquiring minds. The *Biographia Literaria* was therefore a fascinating work, and all the more so for the constant intermingling of elegant criticism and the delights of literature, with the portentous shadows of metaphysics. The philosophical hypotheses occurred only here and there, like caverns in a land of meads and flowers. No foreigner perhaps ever became so fully transformed into a German. The years which he spent abroad were the most ductile of his literary life; and they were submitted to the moulding touch of Schelling, whose enthusiasm was also then at its height. It is not wonderful then that the doctrines of his school were indelibly impressed upon the mind of Coleridge, and that they were reproduced whenever he spoke or wrote upon this subject.

We have not learnt that the borrowed philosophy ever had many converts in Great Britain, and its progress was slow in America. But the leaven wrought extensively here. The charm of real or seeming profundity was too strong to be resisted. To profess a creed which not one in a thousand could understand was a cheap distinction. By those who glory in being unintelligible to the profane vulgar, the fame of greatness is soon acquired. To be a La Place, an Airy or a Bowditch, requires years of sedulous and wearisome application, and the laborious concatenation of proof on

proof, every link of which is subjected to the acumen of a thousand practised eyes; but Transcendental philosophy exacted no such Herculean toil of her votaries. It was but to plunge into the turbulent and darkened flood to emerge a sage. It was easy for the novice to vaunt his esoteric lore, and denounce the shallow, empirical, or sensuous philosophy of the crowd without.

Conformably to these statements was the fact that the converts to the new sect were mutually allied in character. From whence did these profound philosophers proceed? Not from the schools of pure science, where the patient research of mathematical relations—esteemed since Plato the best discipline for the philosopher—had chastened the imagination, and taught the judgment to take no step without proof; not from the laboratories of physical inquiry, where jealous wisdom repeats her experiments a thousand times, and spends a lifetime in making firm and broad the basis on which induction may rear the pyramid of just theory; not from the cloisters where philosophy loves to ‘outwatch the Bear, with thrice-great Hermes, or unsphere the spirit of Plato;’ from none of these, but from the coteries of gay sciolists, and petit-maitres. Among their ranks we have described not one great savant, linguist, or mathematician; but a glittering assemblage of upstart ‘litterateurs,’ dapper clergymen, small poets, and fashionable sentimentalists. Philosophy was never so genteel. The shibboleth of Transcendentalism now rolls from organs which scarcely rest from the prattle of the saloon; the same names appear in defence of the ‘Pure Reason,’ and in the fugitive vapidity of the ladies’ magazines; and the Entered Apprentice talks as freely as an old acquaintance about Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Daub, Goerres, and Schleiermacher; or as the Frenchman did of Cicero, on seeing his works in a library, *Ah! mon cher Cicéron! Je le connais bien; c’est le même que Marc Tulle!*

It is our serious belief, that never since there was such a thing as science in the world, has it been so easy to attain a name for profundity, as since the origin of the new philosophy. And accordingly we are confident in ascribing the popularity of the system with a certain class of minds, to its affording a royal road to greatness for those who could not reach the goal by the common highway. The ostentation of great depth and originality has therefore been most obvious in the younger classes of literature. The egg deposited by foreign wisdom lay addle in many a nest, but asserted its

vitality in the resorts of bachelors-of-arts and inchoate preachers, who sprang forth ready to mystify the world ;

Feathered soon and fledge,
They summed their pens, and soaring th' air sublime
With clang despised the ground, under a cloud
In prospect.

That among the throng of professed admirers, there are some real disciples of the German systems, we cannot doubt for moment. We even fear that to some cultivated and tasteful minds, misguided and sickened by the opposite extreme, there has been a point of attraction even in the pantheistic element. The musings of a poetic mind always connect themselves with the contemplation of nature, and it is easy for admiring love to brighten into adoration. The capacity for veneration and worship, the native principle of religion, will have an object, and when the depraved soul turns aside from the living and true God, it bends before external nature. This is the pregnant source of every mythological system, and of idolatry itself. "This pure and simple veneration of nature," says Frederick Schlegel, "is perhaps the most ancient, and was by far the most generally prevalent in the primitive and patriarchal world. In its original conception it was no by means a deification of Nature, or a denial of the sovereignty of God—it was only at a later period, that the symbol, as it so often happens, was confounded with the thing itself, and usurped the place of that higher Object which it was destined originally to represent." "Nature in its origin was nought else than a beautiful image—a pure emanation—a wonderful creation—a sport of Omnipotent love ; so, when it was severed from its divine Original, internally displaced, and turned against its Maker, it became vitiated in its substance and fraught with evil. This alienation of Nature from God, this inversion of the right order in the relations between God and Nature, was the peculiar, essential and fundamental error of ancient Paganism, its false Mysteries, and the abusive application of the higher powers of Nature in magical rites. On the other hand, we ought to regard every similar derangement in the divine system, though established on the basis of Christianity, and by Christian philosophers—we ought I say to regard every such attempt as being in its essential nature and principle a heathen enterprise—the foundation of a scientific Paganism, although no altars be erected to Apollo, and no Mysteries be celebrated in honour of Isis." The allusion of the last sentence is to Schelling,

who was at an earlier period closely allied with the Schlegels, as also with Tieck, Novalis, and Ritter.

The legitimate end of this tendency is the recognition of the all-present Jehovah in his works; but, in default of this, poetry worships the phenomenon. It is a form of counterfeit religion which has re-appeared in every age, and among the most godless men; the devotion of Art, which no doubt glowed intensely in the creative minds of antiquity, and has left its expression on the Pyramids, the Parthenon, and the Apollo Belvedere. It may co-exist with fetishism, with lust, or with atheism.

“How often we forget all time, when lone
 Admiring Nature’s universal throne,
 Her woods, her wilds, her waters, the intense
 Reply of hers to our intelligence!
Live not the stars and mountains! Arc the waves
 Without a spirit? Are the dropping caves
 Without a feeling in their silent tears?
 No—no—they woo and clasp us to their spheres,
 Dissolve this clog and clod of clay before
 Its hour and merge our soul in the great shore.
 Strip off this fond and false identity!
 Who thinks of self when gazing on the sea?”

We presume there is no reader who does not feel within him a profound response to these sublime verses, and no reader of sensibility and taste in whom they do not awaken an emotion of delightful awe, which he has often experienced among the scenes of nature: yet they are godless. Here is more than the personification—here is the deification of nature. And it is easy to see how short the step for such a mind into Pantheism; for we have here the life of nature—commerce of devotion with her—and the merging of personal identity in the great whole. This is what atheism substitutes for the worship of God. “We are assured,” says M. Benjamin Constant, “that certain persons accuse Lord Byron of atheism and impiety. There is more religion in these few lines, than in all the writings, past, present, and to come, of all who denounce him put together.”

A God from whom moral attributes are thus abstracted, an impersonal, changeful, aesthetic divinity, among whose lineaments every taste may make selection, is exceedingly agreeable to the depraved mind; and hence this is the form of religion which prevails in the poetry of our age. Even good men may forget the Creator in the midst of his work. In Goethe or Shelley this might be expected, but what shall

we say of Wordsworth, the great meditative poet of our generation? We will not say that he is either an atheist or a Pantheist, we rejoice to recognise him as a Christian; but there are passages of his in which we cannot mistake the tendency towards a neglect of God and a worship of the creature, or at least a mystic devotion to the works of nature:

“ To them I may have owed another gift,
Of aspect more sublime; that blessed mood
In which the burden of the mystery,
In which the heavy and the weary weight
Of all this unintelligible world,
Is lightened:—that serene and blessed mood,
In which the affections gently lead us on,—
Until the breath of this corporeal frame
Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
In body, and become a living soul:
While with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
We see into the life of things.”

Wherever an exquisite sensibility combines itself with devotional elevation, the tendency to mysticism is irresistible, and when regulated and fixed on the true object, it results in some of the most lovely characters, in whatever Christian persuasion it may be found; hence we have a Synesius, a Fenelon, a La Martine, and a Tholuck. Such a one cannot look abroad on nature without a sense of God; delightful if not overpowering. The starry heavens, the sea, the mountains, vegetable nature, the very insect throng, are full of God, and the tendency is to regard the things themselves as God, and thus to lapse into Pantheism or idolatry. “ Take ye good heed, lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them,” Deut. iv. 15, 19. The Pantheist plumes himself on this, as a flight beyond the level of vulgar minds; yet there is about it a crudity unworthy of the philosopher. For it is a false merging of matter and spirit, of cause and effect; it stops short of the highest analysis, and rests in a concrete visibility, from which a more trenchant discrimination would abstract the divine ethereal part. This it is which led Bossuet to say of such philosophers, *Tout était Dieu, excepté Dieu même*. We therefore say to the Pantheist, Come up higher, to a more spiritual summit. Your boasted advantages are all possessed by us. We, no less than you, admire the glories of nature: we, no less than you, behold God among

them and in them. He is as near to us as to you. His all-pervading essence is fully and intimately present in all parts of his dominions. In every flower that blows, in every contour, hue or motion of leaf or wing we discern the expression of the infinite Mind. But mark the difference between us: Where we see a work, you see a deity. The conception is gross and material, we reject it, and glory in the apprehension of One who is not a congeries of mind and matter—not the sum of an infinite series of phenomena—not a chaotic tumultuating ocean of self-developments—not a mere physical first cause or regulative law—not a mere *anima mundi*—but a Creative Spirit, separate from all his works, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and ever present; and who is moreover in the purest and highest sense personal, accessible, and suited to be adored, loved and eternally enjoyed; yea, *this God is our God for ever and ever!*

The contemplation of the whole subject is fitted to inspire a holy caution in every Christian inquirer. From the awful ruins of philosophic speculation in age after age the cry reaches us, *Noli altum sapere, sed time.* In those things which concern the divine nature and the infinite glories of the unseen world, God has made a positive revelation of so much as concerns us; to renounce this authority, and pretend discovery on the same points, is not merely futile and delusive, but irreligious. But, through the pride of human reason, it is this very experiment which has been repeated in every age, and always with the same results. The profane speculation of Christians is of course vastly more culpable than that of the heathen; yet even of the latter, we know that they are without excuse. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise they became fools. It is as true now as in the days of the Temanite, that God taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and that the counsel of the froward is carried headlong. The analogy is striking between the modern atheistic metaphysics and the ‘philosophy and vain deceit,’ whereby some were ‘spoiled’ in apostolic times; and we should be happy to believe that young ministers of our day needed no cautions against profane and vain babblings, and the oppositions of counterfeit philosophy, ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως.

W. B. Hope
ART. IV.—*The General Assembly of 1841.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, met agreeably to appointment, in the 7th Presbyterian Church in the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday, the 20th day of May 1841; and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. Wm. M. Engles, D.D., the Moderator of the last Assembly, from Luke xviii. 13, "On the evils resulting to the church of Christ and the world, from a deficient conviction of sin."

The Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, D.D. was elected Moderator, and the Rev. James C. Barnes, Temporary Clerk.

There were present in all, eighty-eight clerical, and fifty-six lay Commissioners. Two delegates were in attendance from the General Association of Connecticut, one from the General Association of Massachusetts, one from the General Conference of Maine, and one from the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.

The following letter was received from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

"Letter of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America.

"REVEREND AND DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD:—The delay which has occurred, on our part, in answering your letters of the years 1837 and 1838, (both received by us at the same time,) will not appear to you extraordinary; nor will it be accounted a cause of offence; when you consider the circumstance, noticed by yourselves in your latest communion, that almost simultaneously with the opening of your correspondence with us, we were addressed by another body claiming the same title with you, and seeking to be acknowledged by us, as the Church with which we ought to cultivate alliance and communion, in that part of the world which you are called to occupy. That now, after the lapse of nearly three years, and on a mature consideration of the facts which, during that period, have come to our knowledge, we feel ourselves at liberty to meet, with all cordial and Christian confidence, your brotherly advance; this result, we trust, you will know how to understand and appreciate. And, at all events, we entreat you to be assured, that neither indifference to the great duty and benefit of fellowship between churches however remote, nor any oversight or neglect, which, perhaps, our increasing cares and troubles might have excused,—nor finally, any want of interest in the spiritual prosperity of a people bound to us by many ancient ties; has occasioned our apparent slackness in returning your salutation, as brethren beloved in the Lord.

"With unfeigned sympathy, we congratulate you on the issue of the trial through which you have been led—and we give God thanks on your behalf; we trust that it has proved, and will more and more prove, to have been the trial of your faith, which being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, will be found unto praise and honour and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.

"We do not profess to be minutely and intimately acquainted with the merits

of the contest in which you have been engaged, and from which you have been delivered not without a sacrifice which must have been deeply painful to you—involving a schism in a body formerly united as one, in the faith and fellowship of the gospel. At the same time we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction of the substantial truth and soundness of the views on which you have acted. Great as is our desire of unity among Christians, we are persuaded that all attempts to promote that object, by artificial schemes of comprehension, are without warrant of scripture, and must, in the issue, fail. The constitution, as well as the creed of every Church of Christ, ought to be founded on the word of God—and the duty of maintaining entire the government which Christ has instituted in his House, is not less sacred than that of bearing testimony to the whole truth which he has revealed. It is indeed deeply to be deplored that the followers of the Saviour see not, as yet, eye to eye; and earnestly do we long and pray that the stumbling block thus occasioned may be removed; and that the society of the faithful in Christ Jesus may be seen again to resemble rather the seamless coat, than the parted garments of the Lord. But our present duty is to walk according to our light; and our conviction is, that if we so walk, as a branch of the Church universal, in the exercise of faithfulness to Him who calleth us, and charity to those who differ, we do more to promote this union in the end, than if we sought to hasten it, by any plan of human devising—dissembling differences, and combining things practically irreconcilable. Among churches, as among individuals, pressing on toward the same mark, but not all on precisely the same line, the just and safe rule is that of the holy Apostle—enjoining alike, the highest perfection of each apart—and the mutual forbearance of all, together. ‘Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded—and if, in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.’

“We rejoice to learn, from your communications to us, and from the reports of your more recent proceedings which have since reached us, that you are fully alive to the danger of departing from the form of sound words delivered to you, as well as to us by our common fathers, and especially that you strenuously, and without wavering, hold fast the blessed doctrine of the free and sovereign grace of God, in the redemption of the sinner, against all the subtle and dangerous errors by which it has always been assailed. It grieves us much to understand that such errors, tending to dishonour the Creator, and vainly to exalt the creature, prevail too extensively around you, even among not a few, who still make an evangelical profession, and whose zeal we cannot but commend. We bless God who has enabled you to be faithful to the trust committed to you, and we confidently hope that your increasing zeal and faithfulness in every good work, may adorn the doctrine which you profess, and prove that a full recognition of the Divine sovereignty is, to churches, as well as to individuals, the best security, under God, for the preservation of their purity, and the development, in the highest degree of all their practical energies.

“Your account of your Missionary operations, is cheering and animating to us; as well as what you mention respecting the training of your students. We are persuaded that these two objects of care and prayerful solicitude, are intimately connected; and that scarcely any better sign of the real prosperity of a church of Christ can be selected, than the combination of faith, to enter in at every open door with foresight, in the use of means, for preparing the labourers whom, in answer to prayer, the Lord may send forth into his harvest. To undertake extensive obligations, in the work of the Lord, might be rash and hazardous, were it not for his own promise, which the Church may boldly plead. But in pleading this promise, the Church is pledged to do all that in her lies, for calling her best and noblest sons to the service of the Lord, and then, in confidence and patience of hope, to sow beside all waters.

“As regards our own Church, and the interests of religion among us, we will not detain you with many words.

“You are partly acquainted with the very peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, and with the controversy which has been going on for nearly two years respecting the present position of our Church. It would be out of place, in a communication of this nature, to enter upon the merits of that controversy. The struggle in which she is involved, is not new in the annals of the Church of Scotland. From the beginning of her history—from the period of the Reformation from Popery—the very same great question which is now agitated, has been always at intervals, recurring. It would seem, indeed, as if to the humble Presbyterian Church, in this remote Island, had been especially committed, by her great Head, the task of vindicating his double prerogative, as King of nations and as King of saints; and how, in times past, she hath fulfilled this task, you, as well as we, must have learned, from the testimony of that noble army of Martyrs whose memorials and names belong equally to us both.

“Our difficulty arises out of the principles which we hold respecting the relation which should subsist between the Church and the State. We maintain that it is the duty of the Civil Magistrate to recognize, to protect, and to support the Church, to act within his own sphere, with a due regard to the glory of God; and to provide the means of religious worship and instruction for the people under his care. But, in doing so, we contend that as he has no right to have recourse to measures of oppression and persecution against the enemies of the Church, so neither is he entitled to control and govern the Church herself. He is bound to acknowledge her entire freedom and independence, in the exercise of her spiritual jurisdiction, and the enjoyment of her spiritual privileges; and beyond the disposal of all the temporal resources or endowments, which he bestows on the Church, and over which he must always have entire command, the Civil Magistrate is not at liberty to interfere in the internal regulation of the Church's affairs.

“Such are our principles, of which the practical developement has brought us in the mean time, into trouble.

“In consequence of our holding the former principle, we cannot, as an established Church, of our own accord, relinquish our position. The responsibility of dissolving our connexion with the State must lie with the other party, with the State itself; nor can we feel ourselves justified in withdrawing from it, unless compelled to do so, by an express act of the state, or by an unavoidable interference with our conscientious views of our duty, according to the word of God.

“At the same time, in virtue of the latter principle, we cannot, and dare not, consent to compromise our spiritual liberty. Hence, while yielding implicit obedience to the decisions of the civil courts of the country, in all temporal matters, and in particular, in the disposal of the endowments secured by law to our parishes, we have refused and must still refuse, to receive orders and directions from these courts in the performance of our spiritual functions, and especially in the settlement of ministers.

“Thus, we are fixed. We cannot relieve ourselves, either by dissolving our alliance with the state, or by agreeing to submit to the civil courts. Our principles require us to remain in our present attitude, even although the consequence of our refusal to submit, in things spiritual, to the civil courts, should be the suffering of personal sacrifice and hardship, by our ministers, our elders, and our people, through the loss, in some instances, of the public provision made for the support of the ministry, and through the infliction, also, of severe pains and penalties.

“Various processes have been commenced, and are now going on, in the civil courts, tending to bring the matter to a crisis: and in the meantime, we have been earnestly soliciting the interference of the Legislature to put an end

to this unseemly and disastrous collision, by a new legislative enactment. We have, as yet, been unsuccessful in seeking this desirable end; nor is this much to be wondered at, when it is considered that the British Legislature has in it but a small infusion of Scottish and Presbyterian influence. But our efforts continue unabated, to impress upon the minds of statesmen, and of our countrymen generally, the extreme importance of a speedy adjustment of so critical a question.

“We may add, that the embarrassment of our position has been considerably increased, by the insubordination of a few ministers among ourselves, whose conduct has rendered it necessary for the Church to resort to measures of precaution and of discipline, which have not a little contributed to expose us to misrepresentation.

“You will expect that we should say something of the original occasion of this dispute; but, here we need not enter into particulars. You are probably aware of the resolution which the Church adopted, some years ago, for giving full effect to the ancient and fundamental principle of her constitution, that no minister be intruded into any parish, contrary to the will of the congregation. It has been found by the courts of law, that when we act upon that principle and reject a presentee on the ground of the dissent of the people, we act illegally, in violation of the statute of Queen Anne, restoring patronage. Against that statute, the Church, from the first protested; and in acting under it, as she was forced to do, she never surrendered her inherent and inalienable right, to judge of the fitness of every candidate for the ministry, and the propriety of his settlement in any particular parish; and to reject him, if found unqualified, or unacceptable to the people.

“The decision of the civil courts, the Church fully recognizes, in so far as it affects civil matters. These courts must determine every question relating to the emoluments of the benefice, in every parish, in which the Church, acting upon her fundamental principle, rejects an unacceptable presentee. But the Church strenuously denies the right of the civil courts to go farther, and to control and direct the church courts in the discharge of their proper functions, relative to the trial and settlement of ministers.

“Such is a brief, and necessarily imperfect account of our present interesting and critical position. We do not expect you to approve of every particular in our conduct, or even of all the views which we hold. We are aware that your different circumstances may somewhat modify your judgment of what is passing in this land. But we feel assured that you will give us credit for sincerity and faithfulness in occupying a post of no ordinary difficulty, and that you will cordially give us your sympathy and your prayers. We feel that we need the prayers of the churches. We desire to recognize, in all this trial, the hand of our God, and the signs of his just controversy with our Church and our country. Remembering our misimprovement of most unwonted privileges and advantages, and our manifold short-comings and backslidings; we acknowledge the sins of our fathers, and our own sins, and accept the punishment of our iniquity.

“It is a matter of unspeakable thankfulness, that in the midst of our perplexities and troubles, we have still tokens for good. The Lord is not utterly forsaking us. On the contrary, we have reason humbly to hope, that he has been, and is, reviving his work. We recognize his goodness in raising up, of late years, many faithful and devoted pastors, in calling forth a spirit of prayer, and in pouring out his Spirit, remarkably, on many portions of the vineyard; in some, even so remarkably, as to recall the days of Cambuslang and Shotts.

“We have also been enabled to prosecute our Missionary schemes, for the extension of our Church, and of the means of education, at home for the good of our countrymen in the colonies, for the propagation of the Gospel among

the heathen in India, and for the conversion of the Jews, with unabated energy and success; and we hail, in the continued prosperity of these institutions, a proof of the undeserved loving kindness of the Lord, and a pledge of deliverance in his own good time and way, out of all our troubles. We would desire to be patient, and to be chiefly concerned, that when deliverance does come, it may be evidently the Lord's doing, after his work of trial and purification has been effectual.

“For the particulars and details of our Missionary plans and operations, we take the liberty of referring you to the Reports laid on the table of the General Assembly, as well as to the monthly periodical, which is published under the sanction of the Church, all which documents, we hope to send you regularly, for your information, and that we may have your prayers.

“And now, beloved brethren, we bid you heartily farewell. Your recent trials, in some points singularly coincident with those in which we are still involved, may concur with old associations, in knitting us together in the bonds of the Gospel: and our fellowship together, in the Lord, may, by his blessing, be mutually edifying. It will much refresh and rejoice our hearts, to see any of your fathers and brethren, and confer with them face to face; nor are we without hope, that in these days when many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased, personal intercourse, even between remote churches, may be steadily cultivated. But at all events, by our letters, we may encourage one another. And as that word of God, to which we have just now referred, reminds us that even now, it may be very near the time of the end, and that the day of the Lord draweth nigh, let us stir up one another to a holy watchfulness and zeal—and let our prayer ever be that the bride may be prepared and made ready for the bridegroom's coming.

“Signed in name, and by appointment of the Commission of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland.

“A. MAKELLAR, *Moderator.*

“*Edinburgh, 14th April, 1841.*”

Letters were also received, accompanied by copies of the minutes of their proceedings, from the General Synod of Ulster, and from the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connexion with the Church of Scotland. The Synod of Ulster, on the next day after the date of their letter, July 9, 1840, entered into union with the Synod of the Seession Church, and formed the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

The subject of correspondence, by interchange of delegates with other ecclesiastical bodies, was referred to a special committee. The report of this committee was adopted by the Assembly, and is as follows:

“The Committee on Correspondence with the several ecclesiastical bodies to which the Assembly, previous to the secession of a part of their body in 1838, sent delegates, report,

“That in the year 1840, and again this year, the General Association of Connecticut sent delegates to the General Assembly. The Committee recommend that agreeably to the original terms of correspondence, this Assembly elect three delegates to attend the next meeting of the General Association of Connecticut; and that the delegates so elected, propose to the General Association of Connecticut, to reduce the number of delegates from each body to the other, to two or one.

“The Committee further report, that on a request from the General Conference of Maine, the correspondence with that body was formally renewed by the General Assembly of 1840, which Assembly appointed a delegate to Maine, and that there is a delegate from that body in this Assembly. The Committee recommend to the Assembly to elect a delegate to the next General Conference of the state of Maine.

“The Committee also report, that they have learned, that the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, at their meeting in June last, appointed delegates to attend this Assembly; and they therefore recommend, that two delegates, a minister and a ruling elder, be elected to attend the next General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.

“With respect to the other bodies formerly in correspondence with the General Assembly, inasmuch as they have not, since the year 1838, when a part of the Assembly seceded, and constituted a new body, sent any delegates to the General Assembly, or any communication on the subject of correspondence, the Committee recommend that no delegates be sent to these bodies, and that the Assembly consider the correspondence with them as having *de facto* terminated.”

Subsequently to the adoption of this report, a delegate appeared in the Assembly from the General Association of Massachusetts, and the Assembly resolved to continue their correspondence with this body. It also appeared from a copy of the printed minutes of the General Convention of Vermont, that this body, at their session in August 1839, had voted to “invite a correspondence with the Assembly of which the Rev. Dr. Wilson was last moderator;” and it was accordingly resolved “that agreeably to the above invitation of the General Convention of Vermont, the Assembly will correspond with that body by delegation as formerly.”

Thus the Assembly is in correspondence again with the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, the General Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts, the General Conference of Maine, and the General Convention of Vermont. We rejoice in this restoration of our friendly intercourse with these bodies. While we engage in cordial communion with these, our fellow Christians, without endangering the points of doctrine and discipline in which we differ from them, the intercourse must be productive of mutual benefit.

The first judicial case which came before the Assembly was the complaint of J. Kirkpatrick and others, against a decision of the Synod of New Jersey. This case had its origin in an application made by certain persons residing in and near the Lower German Valley, to the Presbytery of Raritan, requesting them to organize a new church in their neighbourhood. This application was resisted by the elders and trustees of the adjoining churches of Upper German Valley and Foxhill. The Presbytery of Raritan appointed

a committee to visit the place, and, if the way was clear, to proceed to the organization of the church. An appeal was taken from this decision of the Presbytery to the Synod of New Jersey, and the Synod sustained the appeal, thereby reversing the action of the Presbytery in the premises. It was against this decision of the Synod that a complaint was brought to the Assembly by J. Kirkpatrick and others. This case consumed much time, nearly or quite one-half of which was wasted in determining who were the "original parties," and settling other points connected with the order of procedure. The complainants at the bar of the Assembly, when they were at length heard, rested their case chiefly upon two points, first, that the organization of new churches is the peculiar province of the Presbyteries, and that the Synod had no right to disturb in any way the action of the Presbytery in this matter, except when it has been unconstitutionally done; and, secondly, that the original decision of the Presbytery, not having been the issue of a strictly judicial case, was not properly the ground for an appeal, and was therefore irregularly brought before the Synod. The Assembly refused to sustain the complaint, and thus decided anew, in accordance with the ancient and uniform practice of our church, the constitutional questions which had been raised.

The second judicial case taken up by the Assembly was "the complaint and appeal of the first church of Peoria, against the Synod of Illinois, and the commission of the Synod."

A complaint of Samuel Lowrie, an elder of the first church of Peoria, against a decision of the Synod of Illinois, was before the last Assembly. In disposing of the case, that Assembly directed the Synod to appoint at its next meeting a committee to visit that place, and endeavour to effect a reconciliation between the first and second churches of Peoria, (both of them being small and feeble, and each consisting of less than thirty members.)

In anticipation of the action of the Synod of Illinois on this subject, the Presbytery of Peoria, on the 17th of October last, adopted the following minute :

"On motion, resolved, That in view of the Assembly's minute, expressive of their desire for the pacification of the difficulties in Peoria, and directing the Synod to appoint a committee 'to visit said churches, and use their best endeavours to bring them together in one harmonious body,' &c., Presbytery have unanimously thought it proper hereby to inform the Synod, that should they think best to give discretionary powers to said committee, to dissolve either the first or second church, or to dissolve both the churches, that a new church may be

formed, and its officers elected—they will not only waive any questions which might arise, as to their presbyterial powers in this particular, or as to the right of Synod to confer such power on a committee; but in view of their desire for the good of the Presbyterian interest in Peoria, in view of the smallness of our body, and of the peculiar delicacy, if not difficulty of the subject, we prefer that Synod should directly proceed in the case.”

The Synod adopted the following minute :

“ Whereas the General Assembly have directed the Synod of Illinois to take measures to settle the difficulties in the church in that place (Peoria), Resolved, That a commission of Synod be appointed for that purpose, and in addition to the duties enjoined by the Assembly, said commission be, and they are hereby empowered by the Synod to call for persons and papers, to inquire into the conduct of Mr. Kellar, to hear the statement of the Presbytery of Peoria, and to ascertain the state of the whole case respecting both the Presbyterian churches of Peoria, as to the regularity of their organization, &c., and if in their judgment they deem it best calculated to harmonize the Presbyterian church there, they are invested with power to dissolve either or both the churches of Peoria, and to organize a new Presbyterian church in that place. And they are also directed to publish their proceedings in such a way as they may judge best for the rights and interests of all concerned, and they are directed to make a full report to the next General Assembly and to the Synod, at their next meeting.”

The Synod accordingly appointed a committee (calling it a commission), consisting of five ministers and five ruling elders, seven of whom met in Peoria, October 29, 1840, and proceeded to the object of their appointment.

The Presbytery of Peoria met in the same place at the time of the meeting of the commission, and on the following day, after the commission had proceeded in the business assigned said Presbytery by a vote of four against three, adopted the following resolution :

“ Resolved, That however the former action of Presbytery, in this case, may be viewed by Synod or the commission, Presbytery do hereby revoke the authority given to Synod at its sessions in Rushville, so far as relates to dissolving the churches in Peoria, because Presbytery cannot consent that the first church in Peoria should be dissolved by the commission, or any measures taken by them for the formation of a new church.”

A protest against the above resolution was entered on the minutes of the Presbytery, signed by five members of that body, and another member who subsequently appeared requested leave to add his name to the protest, which was not granted.

The commission proceeded in the business assigned them, and dissolved both the churches in Peoria; and after giving a public notice of the fact, and a general invitation to the members of both, and such others as chose to unite with them, they proceeded to organize a church under the name of the Presbyterian church of Peoria. And an election hav-

ing been held, they ordained three ruling elders and one deacon.

At the close of the proceedings of the commission, "Mr. Samuel Lowrie gave notice that he would, on behalf of the first Presbyterian church, complain to the next General Assembly against the proceedings of the commission in this whole case."

In presenting his case before the Assembly, Mr. Lowrie stated that his complaint was against the Synod for appointing the commission, as well as against the proceedings of the commission itself.

This case was at first styled an appeal and complaint, but upon examination it was taken up and considered as a simple complaint.

In the discussions to which this case gave rise, much was said for and against the constitutionality of the proceeding of the Synod in delegating to a commission plenary powers to act in the premises. But the ultimate decision of the case rested upon grounds which left this question untouched. It was also urged here, as in the last case, that the organization and dissolution of churches belongs exclusively to the Presbytery, and the Synod have no right in such a case to interfere, except it be to correct what has been irregularly done. A motion made to dismiss the case upon this ground was put to the house and lost.

The complaint was finally, after much discussion, dismissed as irregular, on the grounds, that so far as this complaint related to the action of the Synod in appointing a commission with plenary powers, no notice had been given to Synod of an intention to complain, and no opportunity, of course, afforded them to defend the propriety of their course; and that so far as the complaint related to the doings of the commission, it could not be entertained by the Assembly, inasmuch as this commission was not a body known to the Assembly, and could be arraigned or defended only through the court that appointed them, and that the Synod itself could not be called upon to answer for the acts of their commission until they had been reported and sanctioned, nor then without legal notice of intention to complain. We may remark, however, in passing, that the appointment of commissions or committees, to act with the full powers of the body appointing them, has been common in our church from its first organization in this country, and is customary in all other Presbyterian churches. It has the obvious ad-

vantage of saving the time of the appointing body, and often leads to a wiser decision than could otherwise be expected. A commission can go to the theatre of contention, and by the examination of all the parties, often arrive at a much better understanding of the case, than a presbytery or synod sitting at a distance could possibly attain. We are, therefore, glad to see that the synod of Illinois has availed themselves of an usage which is undoubtedly consistent with the strictest principles of presbyterianism, and which may be made so conducive to the ends of good government.

The only other judicial case was a complaint of T. B. Clark and others, members of the Presbytery of Sidney, against the Synod of Cincinnati. The facts of this case are as follows :

“ Upon the division which took place in the Presbyterian church in 1838, Messrs. David Merrill and George G. Poage, members of the Presbytery of Sidney, expressed their willingness to continue members of said Presbytery, but refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of either the Synod of Cincinnati or the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Besides this they united themselves with a convention of ministers which had declared to the world, that as soon as any of their members should be dealt with by any of the Presbyteries to which they severally belonged, that they would proceed to organize themselves into a Presbytery, and thus protect themselves from what they deemed oppression.

“ As soon as the Presbytery of Sidney had satisfied themselves of these facts, by the personal attendance of one of these brethren, and by evidence entirely satisfactory in regard to the other, they proceeded to order their names to be erased from the list of their members.

“ The Synod of Cincinnati, in reviewing the records of that Presbytery, took exception to their procedure in this particular, and adopted the following resolution :

“ ‘ Resolved, That the action of Sidney Presbytery in the case of these brethren be not sustained, and they are hereby considered as members of Presbytery, and still subject to the discipline of the church as heretofore.’ ”

It was against this decision that the complaint was brought. The complainants alleged,

“ 1. That the Synod disregarded the ground on which the Presbytery based its action, viz. that they had connected themselves with a body unknown to the Presbyterian Church, as a court of appeals, under the name of a convention for mutual advice and protection.

“ 2. That they had renounced all ‘ authority of the Synod and General Assembly,’ with which the Presbytery of Sidney is connected.”

The Assembly, after hearing the parties in the case, decided that the complaint was well founded, and that the decision of the Synod be reversed.

Annual Reports.

Foreign Missions. The Annual Report of the Board of

Foreign Missions was presented on Tuesday, May 25th ; and addresses were delivered by different members of the Assembly on this occasion, and on the reception of the reports of the other Boards for receiving and dispensing the charities of the church. This report was referred to a committee who subsequently brought in the following resolutions, which were adopted by the Assembly :

“ 1. Resolved, That the report be approved, and referred to the Board for publication.

“ 2. The General Assembly recognize it as the duty and the privilege of every professing Christian to pray for the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom, and to contribute of his substance for that great object, as God in his providence has prospered him.

“ 3. The General Assembly are deeply grieved to learn from the report of the Board, that, for the last year, not one half of the churches, enjoying the stated means of grace, have contributed any thing in support of this cause ; and they would affectionately call upon those churches and the ministers placed over them, and also the vacant churches, no longer to stand at a distance, but to join the other churches and ministers in sending to the benighted heathen, the knowledge of the Saviour's love and mercy.

“ 4. With the blessing of God, all that is wanted to insure a sufficiency of the necessary funds, is united and systematic action on the part of the whole church ; and when every member is brought to contribute steadily, there will no longer be embarrassment for the want of means.

“ 5. The General Assembly would earnestly and solemnly call upon all their ministers to bring this subject frequently before their people, in the public prayers in the house of God, and in the other stated ministrations in the sanctuary. And especially would they urge upon ministers and people, the deep importance of the monthly concert ; and that collections be then taken up to sustain the brethren in the foreign field, for whose success their prayers have been offered. In this connexion, the General Assembly would again call the attention of the churches to the *Missionary Chronicle*. No head of a family is doing his duty to his children whilst he withholds from them the knowledge of the condition of the perishing heathen, and what the church is doing for their salvation ; and how can a Christian pray with understanding for his brethren among the heathen, while he neglects to inform himself of their trials and their wants ?

“ 6. In the midst of much that calls for deep humility and self-abasement in the sight of God, there is much cause of thanksgiving, and many grounds of encouragement, for continued and enlarged effort on the part of the church. And whilst we mourn over our unfaithfulness, the General Assembly would, with gratitude, acknowledge the many evidences of the presence of the Spirit of God in the midst of our beloved branch of his church.

“ 7. The General Assembly would recognize, with affectionate regard, all their missionaries among the heathen, as labourers with them in the Saviour's vineyard ; and they would exhort these dear brethren to diligence and perseverance in the work of the Lord ; to yield to no discouragements, but by faith and prayer seek for the sustaining influence of the Saviour's presence, and the consolations of the Holy Spirit ; to be instant, in season, out of season, rightly dividing the word of truth, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth ; that they bear one another's burdens, and be careful to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace among themselves. And whilst we assure these brethren of an interest in our prayers, we ask them to pray for us, that God would revive his work among the churches of their native land.”

In connexion with this subject we notice the interesting fact, that the Assembly organized two new Presbyteries, of *Furrukabad* and of *Allahabad*, in India, and formed them, in conjunction with the existing Presbytery of Lodiana, into the Synod of Northern India, in connexion with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Domestic Missions. The subject of Domestic Missions occupied much of the attention of the Assembly, not only on the presentation of the report of the Board, but in the discussion of a plan proposed by the venerable Dr. Blythe for the supply of destitute regions in the South and West. Interesting addresses were delivered, among others, by two aged ministers, Dr. M'Whir of Georgia, and Dr. Brown of Florida, who are themselves devoting their last years to the service of this cause.

The Assembly adopted the following series of resolutions, presented by the committee to whom the report of the Board had been referred :

“ Resolved, 1. That it becomes this General Assembly to express its gratitude to the Divine Head of the Church, who has so eminently prospered the cause of Domestic Missions, and blessed the efforts of the Board, although it has been inadequately sustained by the great body of the Presbyterian Church.

“ 2. That the magnitude of the work before us, the extent of the field yet to be occupied, and the moral destitutions of our frontier regions, brought to the view of this Assembly, both by the Report of the Board, and by members of our body at the time of its acceptance, are most deeply felt and acknowledged.

“ 3. That this work of Domestic Missions, is worthy the attention, and demands the labours, of the strongest ministers of our Church: and that the presence in this body, of two venerable fathers in Christ, who, now living in the midst of this great moral waste, after more than a half a century already spent in fulfilling their Master's last injunction, still feel impelled to devote the very twilight of life to the arduous work of missionaries, should make an irresistible appeal to ministers, who are in the meridian of vigour and experience, to enter upon this field.

“ 4. That until a sufficient number of suitable men can be found to occupy this field of labour, it is the duty of the churches enjoying regular pastoral labours, and of settled pastors, to take part in the work, by devoting a portion of their time to missionary labours; and it is recommended that every Presbytery take order on the subject, and see that the burden of this work be equally distributed among its churches.

“ 5. That it is the duty of every member of the Presbyterian Church to support her Domestic Missions. That each Synod and Presbytery is enjoined to adopt such plan as seems best suited to secure this contribution of all the members in its own bounds with system and certainty, and to report its action in this matter to the next General Assembly. And, that when this is done from year to year with regularity, the Church will be found abundantly able, in the strength of the Lord to occupy all the field.

“ 6. That the system of itinerating should be a prominent plan of missionary operation. That, while it is proper that the Board, as heretofore, continue to

aid destitute and feeble churches, they are directed to assign a full proportion of their missionaries to the work of itinerating. And that in their next annual report, the Board distinguish between these two classes of labourers.

“7. That the interest of the churches in the work and objects of this Board will be greatly increased, if its operations, successes and wants are periodically communicated: and that as a medium for this purpose, the Foreign Missionary Chronicle be selected, enlarged, and its title altered, to that of the Foreign and Domestic Missionary Chronicle, so as to become the vehicle of information, for all the missionary operations of the Presbyterian Church.

“8. That we approve the recommendation of the Board, to the rich in our churches, to place the books of the Board of Publication in the hands of our Domestic Missionaries, for distribution: and that the Assembly's Board of Missions be authorized to receive donations for this specific object.

“9. That the plans by which Presbyteries and Sessions may become auxiliary to this Board, and the plan for church or congregational associations, as adopted and published by the General Assembly of 1839, be republished in the Report of the present year, and in the Appendix to the Minutes.

“10. That this General Assembly accept the charter of the Board of Missions, as submitted to them; that the trustees named in the charter be continued in office until June, 1842: that thereafter, on the first meeting of the Board in June, in each year, one-third of the number be elected: and that it be left with the Board of Missions to classify the present trustees, so that one third shall vacate their office every year, as the charter provides.

“11. That the Report of the Board of Missions is highly approved, and recommended to the serious attention of our Synods, Presbyteries, churches, and members; and that it be returned to the Board for publication, at their discretion.”

Board of Education. The report of this Board disclosed the alarming fact that the number of candidates under its care has diminished, and that there is reason to fear a still further diminution. The Assembly adopted the following report of the committee to whom the report of the Board had been referred:

“As it appears from the report of the Board of Education, that the number of candidates under its care has continued to diminish, and that there is great reason to apprehend a further diminution, from the fact that so few pious young men are seeking a liberal education; And whereas, it is perfectly manifest that the world cannot be saved according to the gospel, without a large increase of the ministers of the word, to bring men to the knowledge of the way of salvation through Jesus Christ:

“The General Assembly, therefore, would distinctly recognize their entire dependence on God for the increase of such ministers as he will employ in the conversion of the world, and that the only effectual means which we can employ is fervent, importunate prayer, without which all our organizations are vain and impotent: therefore,

“Resolved, That, in accordance with the suggestion of the Board of Education, the General Assembly do earnestly recommend to all the churches under their care, that on the first Sabbath in November next, special prayer be offered in all our churches to the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth more labourers into his harvest.

“It is also recommended to all our pastors, that on the same day, if convenient—if not, on some other suitable day—a sermon be preached on the subject of ‘*A call to the Ministry.*’

“The Assembly approve of the charter obtained by the Board, and order that, in accordance with the terms of the charter, it shall hereafter be known by the name of ‘The Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.’”

“The Assembly would also provide, in accordance with the requirements of the aforesaid charter, that at the annual meeting of the Board of Education in the year 1842, on the day when the Board meets to re-organize and elect its officers, they shall proceed to elect, by ballot, three persons in the room of the three first named of the Trustees of the Board of Education, incorporated by the aforesaid charter. On the day of the annual meeting in 1843, they shall proceed in like manner to elect three persons in the room of the second three Trustees named in the charter aforesaid; and on the day of the annual meeting of the Board of Education in 1844, they shall elect, in the same manner, three persons in the room of the three remaining Trustees of the aforesaid Board; and thenceforward annually electing three persons in the room of that class which has served three years; provided always, that the same persons shall be re-eligible.

“The Board of Education may also, at any of its regular meetings, elect persons to fill vacancies occurring by death, resignation, or otherwise.”

Board of Publication. From the report of this Board it appears that they have discharged the duties committed to them with much zeal and faithfulness, having already, though much limited in means, supplied the church with many valuable works. The Assembly adopted the following report of the committee, to whom the report of this Board was referred:

“The Committee on the report of the Board of Publication, beg leave to say:

“In their opinion, the thanks of the Assembly and the Church are due to the Board, for the ability, zeal and diligence with which they have prosecuted the great enterprise committed to their management.

“The Committee have learned with regret, that the funds at the disposal of the Board are not nearly equal to what we had reason to expect, in consequence of many sums having been included in statistical reports to the Assembly, which were *subscribed*, but *are not yet paid*. They deem it important that the pecuniary means of the Board be enlarged as soon as practicable. To effect this,

“Resolved, 1. That each Presbytery be directed to take effectual measures for the circulation of these books among the people.

“2. That it be recommended to the Board, to append to at least one edition of the Psalm and Hymn Book, about to be published, the Confession of Faith, with the scripture references, and the Directory for Worship.

“3. That this Assembly would recommend, that at least one set of the publications of the Board be obtained by every church, as a congregational library, to be under the direction of the church session.

“4. That the report under consideration, be committed to the Board for publication.”

We are glad also to find the following report of a special committee, upon the publication of records in the Minutes of the Assembly. It is to be hoped that such encouragement may be furnished by the sale of the volume already published, as will warrant the Board in publishing the entire records of the Assembly.

“The Committeo to whom was referred the report of the stated clerk on the publication of the records of the Supreme Judiciary of the Presbyterian Church, reported a minute which was adopted as follows, viz.

“This Assembly learns with great pleasure that the Board of Publication have issued a volume containing the minutes of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, of the Synod of Philadelphia, of the Synod of New York, and of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia—and which thus forms a documentary history of the Presbyterian Church in these United States, from its origin in 1706, to the formation of the General Assembly in 1788. These records which have never before been published—which were in danger of being lost,—and which were inaccessible to the church at large, are now offered to all in a neat octavo volume of 548 pages, and at a very low price. And as the entire expense of this publication has been incurred by the Board, and the continuance of the work, by the republication of the minutes of the General Assembly from its organization until the present time, depends upon the support given to the present undertaking—this Assembly would enjoin it upon all Synods and Presbyteries to take such order as may be most efficient in securing the sale of the present volume and the complete publication of the documentary annals of our church.”

The Assembly also passed a resolution, directing the Board of Publication to take into consideration the propriety of publishing a new edition of the Assembly's Digest; “having first caused a thorough re-examination of the Minutes of all the years embraced in the present Digest, and also a full examination of all those published since: so that the balance may contain, in a small space, and a cheap form, all the important acts of the Assembly now in force: to which may be added such statistical and other information, in regard to our Church, as may be judged important.”

Two important subjects, which were brought before the attention of the Assembly were referred to committees who are to report to the next General Assembly. The first of these related to the establishment of a directory for the admission of persons to the church on a public profession of their faith, and also on the administration of adult baptism, involving in it the grave question of the terms of communion in our church. This subject was referred to a committee composed of the following members, Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., Joseph McElroy, D. D., John C. Backus, Henry A. Boardman,—to whom the Assembly added, Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D.

The other subject was brought up by a memorial or overture, which called upon the Assembly to institute measures for such a change in our Book of Discipline as should limit ordination to such as are called to a pastoral charge, with no exception but in the case of foreign missionaries, and should also provide for the resignation of the ministerial office, without a process of deposition, on the part of those who have

reason to believe that they have mistaken their duty in entering upon it, or are constrained from any cause to lay aside the discharge of its appropriate functions. This subject was referred to a committee, to report to the next General Assembly, of which Rev. Robert J. Breekinridge, D.D., is chairman, by the appointment of the Assembly, and its other members, Rev. Wm. W. Phillips, D.D., John M. Krebs, Cornelius C. Cuyler, D. D., and Alexander Maeklin.

The attention of the Assembly was called to the subject of Popery, by a memorial from the Presbytery of Philadelphia. This memorial was referred to a committee who brought in the following report :

“The committee on the memorial of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the subject of Popery, made a report, which was adopted as follows, viz.

“1. Resolved, That a preacher be appointed to deliver a discourse before the next Assembly on some given topic connected with the controversy between Romanists and Protestants.

“2. Resolved, That this Assembly most earnestly recommend to the bishops of the several congregations under our care, both from the pulpit and through the press, boldly though temperately to explain and defend the doctrines and principles of the reformation, and to point out and expose the errors and superstitions of Popery.

“3. Resolved, That as the most effectual antidote not only against papal but all other forms of error, it be solemnly enjoined upon all the bishops and elders of the several churches, as also upon our evangelists in the domestic and foreign fields, diligently and statedly to engage in the instruction of the people, and especially of children and youth, in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of our church.

“4. Resolved, That this Assembly solemnly and affectionately warn all our people of the danger and impropriety of supporting, or in any manner directly or indirectly patronizing or encouraging Popish schools and seminaries.

“5. Resolved, That this Assembly recommend to the special attention of all our people the works on the Reformation and Popery, which have been issued by the Board of Publication.

“6. Resolved, That the delegates of the several Presbyteries be called on at the next meeting of the Assembly, to report what has been done in compliance with these resolutions.”

The Rev. Robert J. Breekinridge, D.D., was appointed, in conformity with the first of these resolutions, to preach before the next General Assembly ; the subject of discourse to be, “What is the rule of faith.”

The Committee to whom the accounts of the Treasurer were referred, presented a report, which was adopted by the Assembly, accompanied by statistical tables exhibiting the amount and condition of the funds held by the General Assembly. From this report it appears that the Assembly holds stocks, bonds and notes, to the amount of \$149,810, estimated according to their par value ; that they paid for these

stocks, &c., \$161,609 82: and that if sold at their present market value they would yield only \$123,213 40; thus making a loss of \$38,396 42. The chief investments are in stocks of the southern and south-western banks. The change of financial policy which led to this investment was commenced in 1833, by the trustees acting under the express direction of the General Assembly. After the investment had been made, the Trustees reported the state of the funds to the General Assembly of 1834, who sanctioned what had been done in obedience to the direction of a previous Assembly, and recommended a continuance of the same policy. Whatever of imprudence may now, in the light of subsequent disclosures, be charged upon this policy, and whatever of loss may be incurred from the practice of it, must be laid at the doors, not of the Trustees, but of the General Assembly, which, at every step, advised, directed, and sanctioned their proceedings. It should also be noticed that if the funds of the Assembly had remained in the same form as in 1833, when the change in their mode of investment was commenced, they would now have been worth only \$98,839; less by \$24,374 40 than their present estimated value. The Trustees were directed, by a resolution of the present Assembly, "to invest all the funds in bond and mortgage on real estate as soon as it can be done with convenience and safety."

The Assembly adopted the following report which was presented by a Committee who had been appointed to prepare a minute that should express the sentiments of the house in view of the death of the President of the United States.

"Whereas it has pleased the Sovereign Ruler of nations, in his infinite wisdom and righteousness, to remove by death William Henry Harrison, President of the United States; and whereas, there are circumstances connected with this event, which render the dispensation peculiarly marked, instructive and afflicting; it being the first instance since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, more than fifty years since, that a President has died in office, and his death having occurred suddenly and in one month after his inauguration; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, convened in the city of Philadelphia, feel themselves called to give a united and public expression of their sentiments in view of this solemn dispensation. Therefore,

"Resolved, 1. That we recognize the Providence of God, as clearly manifested in this event; and we call upon the people connected with our church also to see and acknowledge His hand; and while we desire to bow with submission to His righteous will, we feel the event to be a great national bereavement.

"2. That we feel this bereavement to be the greater, when we consider the repeated acknowledgements made by the illustrious deceased, in his inaugural address, of the Providence of God, and his dependence on the Most High, to en-

able him to discharge the duties of his station; and especially, the explicit and noble declaration he made in that address, of his profound reverence for the CHRISTIAN RELIGION, and his thorough conviction, that sound morals, religious liberty, and a just sense of religious responsibility, are essentially connected with all true and lasting happiness; and also the sacred regard he manifested in his high station for the holy Sabbath, inspiring the hope, that under his administration, so commenced, a salutary influence, in favour of good morals and the institutions of religion, vitally important to the best interests of our country, would be diffused throughout the land.

“3. That we view this dispensation as a solemn rebuke to this nation for their sins; and a solemn call to all, rulers and people, to feel and acknowledge that the Lord reigns, and seriously to inquire, wherefore it is, that He has thus contended with us, and to repent and reform.

“4. That we sympathize with the bereaved widow and family of our deceased President, and pray that the Lord will be to them the widow’s God, and the Father of the fatherless.

“5. That, while we mourn the loss the nation has sustained in the death of our late President, we rejoice and thank the Lord that his successor, John Tyler, placed over this nation, in a very special manner by His providence, has acknowledged this Providence, and was led promptly to recommend a day of *fasting and prayer* throughout the nation; and we rejoice in the general and hearty response with which this recommendation was received; and the solemn manner in which, as far as we have heard, the day was observed. We fondly hope that this is an indication of good to our nation; and we pray that the Lord will overrule the painful bereavement with which we have been visited, for the promotion of the best interests of our beloved country.

“6. That our ministers and people be, and they hereby are, earnestly exhorted particularly and constantly, agreeably to the injunctions of the word of God, to remember our civil rulers in their prayers.

“7. That a copy of this minute, signed by the Moderator and Permanent Clerk, be transmitted to the widow and family of the late President; and also a copy to the present President of the United States.”

On the last day of the Sessions of the Assembly, Wednesday, June 2d, when many members of that body had left, the following minute was adopted:

“The General Assembly has reason to believe that the practice of reading sermons in the pulpit, is greatly on the increase amongst our ministers; and being decidedly of opinion that it is not the best method of preaching the gospel, it hereby recommends the discontinuance of the practice, as far as possible; and earnestly exhorts our younger ministers to adopt a different method as more scriptural and effective.”

We regret that the Assembly should have taken it upon itself to express any opinion on such a matter. It does not seem to us to be a fitting subject for legislation. It is impossible to prescribe any mode of preaching which shall be equally suited to all. There are undoubtedly some men who never ought to read their sermons, and it is equally clear that there are others who ought never to preach without reading. We can find no scriptural warrant that can be pleaded on behalf of preaching without reading, which

would not apply with equal force to forbid the preacher taking any thought beforehand what he should say. Before the scriptural examples can be binding as authority, or applicable as argument, it must be shown that we are authorized to expect the same extraordinary assistance which was vouchsafed to the apostles. And as to the effectiveness of any particular method of preaching, it is preposterous to lay down any general canon.* Every man must be left to select that mode which he finds that he can use with the best effect. And thus every man will do. We have no fear that the resolution of the Assembly will do any harm, because it will shape the practice of none, who would not without its help have fallen into the same mode; and our only reason for regretting it is that the Assembly lessens its influence by thus wasting it upon matters that, from their very nature, are governed and shaped by causes that lie beyond their control.

By Prof. J. Addison Alexander

ART. V.—*Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai, and Arabia Petraea. A Journal of Travels in the year 1838, by E. Robinson and E. Smith. Undertaken in reference to Biblical Geography. Drawn up from the Original Diaries, with Historical Illustrations, by Edward Robinson, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York: author of a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, etc. With new Maps and Plans in five sheets. 3 vols. Svo. Boston. 1841.*

WE are not aware that any work by an American author has been brought before the public with such an array of European recommendations as the one before us. Geographical societies and individual geographers of the highest eminence have set the seal of their approbation and applause upon it; nor have the necessary pains been spared, during the printing of the work at home, to make the native population duly sensible of what was coming. The means adopted for

* President Davies, one of the most acceptable and useful preachers that our country has produced, was in the habit, and that too in Virginia, of reading his sermons.

this purpose by the author's friends, may possibly be charged with having shown more policy than taste; but they have certainly excited expectation in the public mind, already accustomed to regard books of travels, and especially books of topographical discovery, with special favour. The stimulus thus given to the public curiosity has no doubt helped the first sale of the book; but whether it will promote its future popularity, may well be doubted. In our own opinion it is utterly unsuited for mere popular effect. The reader for amusement cannot but be disappointed by the necessary dryness and minuteness of the author's topographical details, while the less scientific parts are rendered almost equally repulsive by a style, at once laborious and barren, often inelegant, sometimes incorrect, and never more conspicuously faulty than when most ambitious. We have spoken of the *necessary* dryness and minuteness of a large part of the work; for the extreme particularity of its details is that which constitutes its scientific value. It is this that furnishes geographers with data for their systematic labours: it is on account of this that it has been so highly prized, as we have seen, by European scholars. In fact, a large part of the work is nothing more nor less than a collection of materials for authentic maps, in gathering and recording which the travellers would seem to have been guided by instructions, or at least suggestions, from some eminent geographers. To propose that these minute details should be excluded, for the sake of rendering the work more readable, would be absurd; for it would then be not worth reading. The fault, if any fault there be, lies not in the insertion or the quantity of this uninteresting matter, but in the vain attempt to make the book a popular instead of a professional and scientific work. The narrative form is not adapted to the subject, except so far as to record the actual process of investigation, and this could have no interest except for scholars and for men of science. We are glad to see the promise of another work, to be produced hereafter, in which the results of these investigations are to be embodied in a systematic form, and we are not surprised that in the mean time an attempt was made to use the same materials for popular effect. The fame and profit which have been obtained by American travellers of far less learning, science, and exactness, would of course hold out a strong temptation; and that this has actually been the case is evident we think from the obvious effort to combine the merit

of exact observation and perspicuous detail with that of picturesque description and fine writing. That this attempt has proved a failure, and that those parts of the book which were written *ad captandum vulgus* are decidedly the worst parts and the least attractive, will not seem strange to those who are aware of the very different degrees, or rather kinds, of taste and talent, required for topographical and picturesque description. These different talents may be possessed, but they are very seldom actually exercised, by one and the same person; and even when they are, it can only be in different and alternate states of feeling. One thing at least seems certain from the work before us, that its principal author has not had both these powers in successful exercise. We judge that he has very little taste for the beauties of scenery, and no peculiar talent for describing them. When he makes the attempt, it is commonly by the use of certain stereotype phrases, which are almost as well suited to one landscape as another. One of the clearest proofs of the deficiency, to which we have alluded, is his strong propensity, whenever he attempts picturesque description, to dwell upon circumstances not at all peculiar to the scene before him, and incapable of adding to the strength of the impression which it makes upon the reader's mind, such as the rising of the sun, which is repeatedly described in terms almost identical. Another proof of the same thing is his disposition to describe his own feelings, real or imaginary, instead of forgetting them in what he saw before him. When a writer is so often 'thrilled,' and talks so much of 'thrilling associations,' he is not very likely to excite his reader's feelings, or even to gain credit for his own. Good picturesque describers are in every case original; the very act of recurring to established formulas is proof of a cold temperament *quoad hoc*, and of an intellectual constitution far more favourable to minute exactness than to sentiment or eloquence.

As a mere topographical describer, Dr. Robinson has no superior within our knowledge, and we are not sure that he has any equal. It is not mere minuteness that entitles him to this praise; without some higher qualities, the more minute, the more confused and unintelligible. It is a felicitous and rare combination of minute precision with a graphic clearness. While his sketches of scenery are vague and unimpressive in the last degree, his topographical details are vivid and distinct, impressing as it were a perfect

map of the localities described upon the memory. He never omits any thing essential to an accurate and clear view of the subject. He never gives, as many others do, the distance of a place without its bearing from a point already reached. We always know in what direction we are looking, and are placed successively at so many different points of observation that the mental map is finished without any reference to that on paper. Of this fact we may be considered competent witnesses, because we have actually read a large part of the work, and that the very part including the most complex and minute details, without any map whatever. This privation might be supposed to have operated to the disadvantage of the work in our opinion; but in point of fact it has enhanced our admiration of the one great merit which we think that it possesses. It is true, this merit will, in no case, be apparent without close attention on the reader's part; but we have read books of a like kind which, in spite of all attention, were obscure or unintelligible. It must be confessed, however, that this absolute necessity of fixed attention helps to make the book more utterly unfit for the production of mere popular effect. It is not easy reading, and without this attribute it cannot be a favourite except with men of learning, or with those to whom the subject is especially interesting. These of course will prize that very fulness and minuteness of detail which others find disgusting, and especially that clear precise description, not of landscapes, but of bearing, distances, and relative positions, which is merely irksome to the reader for amusement.

But it is not merely the ability, with which the facts are put on paper, that commends the work to scientific readers. There is no small merit in the observation of the facts, in the sagacity with which the necessary means have been selected and applied for the eliciting of truth in most unfavourable circumstances. How much of this merit is to be ascribed to Mr. Smith, we know not; but we do know that between the two there is a large amount of it. Without this talent for judicious and successful observation, a mere talent for description would have been of no avail, or might have availed only to give currency to error. In this important qualification we include a sound discriminating judgment, a capacity to separate hypotheses from facts, and mere tradition from the fruits of observation. The possession of this power of discrimination is abundantly

evinced throughout the work, and lays a sure foundation for the reader's confidence. We always know the ground on which we tread, and the authority on which our faith is challenged. We are not left, as in many other works of kindred character, to guess, or to discover at our leisure, how much of the information given has been drawn from other writers, how much rests on the tradition of the country, and how much is the result of actual observation. Closely connected with this quality, or rather comprehended in it, is the singular forbearance of the authors from conjecture, and the total absence of a disposition to pursue conjecture, where it is indulged at all, beyond the limits of the strictest moderation. This extraordinary abstinence from fanciful hypotheses arises in a great degree no doubt from a defect of imagination, from the very circumstance which places poetry and sentimental eloquence beyond the author's grasp, in spite of his convulsive efforts now and then to reach them. But let the cause be what it will, the effect is sufficient of itself to distinguish Dr. Robinson's performance in an honourable way from almost every other of a like description that we ever saw. Even the most accurate judicious writers have a proneness to excess in the indulgence of conjecture when their data fail; but in the work before us we have no recollection of a single case in which this morbid appetite displays itself. On the contrary we see a strong and uniform propensity to understate the plausibility, not only of hypotheses proposed by other men, but even of conjectures which the travellers themselves throw out. In one case, if we understand the author's words aright, he goes so far as to describe a suggestion of his own as "of very questionable value." (Vol. iii. p. 412.) This kind of moderation and impartiality increases greatly the respect and confidence of all discerning readers. For the production of an entertaining book, a leaning towards credulity may be considered an important qualification; but in works devoted to the cause of science, even skeptical reluctance to believe where doubt is possible, commands our confidence, because, though it may possibly exclude what is true, it will almost certainly exclude what is false. When a writer of this character expresses his belief, the reader believes with him; and from this cause there arises a peculiar danger, that of trusting too implicitly the truth of his conclusions, when his own discoveries are in question, which is frequently the case in the work before us. We have said already

that our author shows no fondness for his own conjectural hypotheses; but it would be astonishing indeed if he were subject to no bias from the natural and innocent desire to assert his own claims to priority as an observer, and in some important cases as an actual discoverer. His solicitude on this point is, in fact, his foible. While we freely grant his perfect right to claim what is his own, we think he might, without loss, have occasionally sacrificed his personal pretensions to the dignity of science, and contented himself with stating what he knew to be true, without attempting to demonstrate the comparatively unimportant fact that no one knew it to be true before him. We do not speak of this as any serious blemish in the work, but merely as an illustration of our statement that a writer of the coolest and severest temper may be biassed in relation to his own discoveries, and thus, without intending it, abuse the confidence with which his readers swallow his conclusions. But against this danger, there is one important safeguard in the case before us, in the fact that the author is no vague describer, but precise and definite, so that if zeal for his discoveries should bias his own judgment, he supplies us with the necessary means for the detection and correction of his error.

It deserves indeed to be distinctly mentioned as a characteristic merit of the work, that in regard to every interesting question of topography, the author gives not only a detailed account of what he saw himself, but a summary view of previous observations and opinions on the subject. The names of places are in this way traced from author to author, and from age to age, until the reader knows not only what is ascertained fact and what is mere conjecture, but the precise authority on which the facts alleged lay claim to his belief. This part of the work is what the title-page describes as "historical illustrations." When we first saw this expression, we confess we were a little apprehensive that the author had adopted at least one of the objectionable arts of the book-maker by profession, that of swelling out his volumes with a mass of matter drawn from accessible and common books. Examples of this practice are too often furnished by our travellers in Europe, who, not content with giving the result of their own observation and inquiries, fill their diaries and letters with abridgments of the road-books and uninteresting extracts from familiar histories. We soon found, however, that the mere suspicion of a

practice so unscholarlike had done the author gross injustice. His "historical illustrations" are among the most elaborate and valuable parts of his performance. So far from having been supplied by trivial and familiar sources, they are drawn, in a great measure, from a class of works, which can be found in a complete collection only at the great royal libraries of Europe, as for instance at Berlin, where the work before us was prepared for publication. It is not, however, the sole merit of these "illustrations," that they have been drawn from original authorities. The principle on which they have been framed is new to us, and, as it strikes us, excellent. The object has not been to give a history of the places which are made the subject of these illustrations. Such a plan, however admirably executed, would have fallen far short of the one which has been really adopted, both in interest and scientific value. The design has evidently been to give a history, not so much of the place itself, as of the progress of opinion, observation, and discovery respecting it. The consequence of this arrangement is, that although these "illustrations" may possess but little interest for superficial readers, or for any readers on continuous perusal, they afford, on reference to any given place, a store of valuable information as to when and where the place is first referred to, and the accounts of it by later writers, with minute and (we have no doubt) accurate references to the very page of the original authorities. This constitutes a perfectly distinct and characteristic feature of the work, for which the reader is indebted, we presume, to Dr. Robinson exclusively.

We have already mentioned the indications of sagacity and good sense, in the travellers' method of pursuing their inquiries. There are two peculiar features in their plan of operations, which require and deserve to be stated more distinctly. One of these is the ingenious and important rule laid down at the beginning of their actual researches, respecting the distinction to be made between *ecclesiastical* and *popular* tradition. Their views on this point seem to us so just and yet so new, and have exerted such an influence on all their observations and conclusions, that we earnestly invite attention to them as they are propounded in the seventh section (vol. i. pp. 371—378.) We can only state in a summary way here, that, according to our authors, the ecclesiastical tradition of the Holy Land, by which most travellers have been guided, was

arbitrary and uncertain in its origin, has been maintained exclusively in convents and by foreign monks, and has for ages become fixed, without the least improvement from more recent observations and discoveries; whereas there exists among the native population a tradition perfectly distinct from this, apparently more ancient, and undoubtedly more pure, not only on account of its comparative exemption from disturbing and corrupting causes, but also on account of the affinity of the modern language of the Holy Land (of which the foreign monks know little or nothing) with the ancient Hebrew and the later Aramaean, a fact which would naturally facilitate the preservation of the ancient names as well as the tradition of the ancient sites.

“In view of this state of things, we early adopted two general principles, by which to govern ourselves in our examination of the Holy Land. The *first* was, to avoid as far as possible all contact with the convents and the authority of the monks; to examine every where for ourselves with the scriptures in our hands; and to apply for information solely to the native Arab population. The *second* was, to leave as much as possible the beaten track, and direct our journies and researches to those portions of the country which had been least visited. By acting upon these two principles, we were able to arrive at many results that to us were new and unexpected; and it is these results alone, which give a value (if any it have) to the present work.” Vol. i. p. 377.

The mere adoption of this rule would have induced us to expect a great addition to our stores of information with respect to the topography of Palestine; and we have not been disappointed. In the same connexion we may speak of a precaution which might seem too obvious to be neglected, but which really appears to have been strangely overlooked by many travellers. We mean that of avoiding what are called leading questions, that is, such as of themselves suggest the answer which is wished for. The effect of such a practice on the value of a traveller's collections and conclusions, is suggested in the following acute remark, for which we are in all probability indebted to the good sense and experience of Mr. Smith.

“A tolerably certain method of finding any place at will, is to ask an Arab if its name exists. He is sure to answer Yes; and to point out some spot at hand as its location. In this way, I have no doubt, we might have found Replidim, or Marah, or any other place we choose; and such is probably the mode in which many ancient names and places have been discovered by travellers, which no one has ever been able to find after them.” Vol. i. p. 165.

It has been so rare a thing with travellers to lay down any rules or principles at all, for the conduct of their own researches, that the bare fact of our authors' having done so

would afford a strong presumption of their fitness for the work; and this presumption is of course greatly strengthened by the wisdom of the rules themselves, and converted into certainty by the results which have been actually realized. There can be no doubt that this book has put a new face on the whole subject of biblical geography, and we are not surprised at the welcome which it has received from eminent geographers abroad, adapted as it is to fill up chasms and to solve vexed questions, with respect to which a large proportion of the best modern travels have only served to tantalize the thirst for information, if not to make the previous confusion of the subject worse confounded. In Germany especially, where this field of learning has been cultivated with an ardour quite unknown among ourselves, the work before us has no doubt excited feelings, not only of approbation, but of gratitude.

The advantages enjoyed by Dr. Robinson in reference to such an undertaking are well known to have been great. Some of these we shall enumerate, without including in the list, however, one which he makes prominent, and dwells upon at some length in his introduction.

“As in the case of most of my countrymen, especially in New England, the scenes of the Bible had made a deep impression upon my mind from the earliest childhood; and afterwards in riper years this feeling had grown into a strong desire to visit in person the places so remarkable in the history of the human race. Indeed in no country of the world, perhaps, is such a feeling more widely diffused than in New England; in no country are the scriptures better known, or more highly prized. From his earliest years the child is there accustomed not only to read the Bible for himself; but he also reads or listens to it in the morning and evening devotions of the family, in the daily village-school, in the Sunday-school and Bible-class, and in the weekly ministrations of the sanctuary. Hence, as he grows up, the names of Sinai, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, the Promised Land, become associated with his earliest recollections and holiest feelings.” Vol. i. p. 46.

Without disputing the extent to which religious education has been carried in New England, we have no hesitation in saying, that of all enlightened and religious countries, there is none in which the poetry, the oriental charm, of scriptural language and associations, seem to have so little power, and to be so little cherished, as among our brethren of the eastern states. There is no part of Protestant Christendom in which even orthodox theology has shown so strong a tendency to substitute the barren forms and heartless phraseology of metaphysics, for the lively figures and the rousing, melting, soul-subduing eloquence of God's own word. There are portions of our own country, not so happy as to be in-

cluded in New England, where a sermon, made up of mere technical formulas, without a sprinkling of the dialect of scripture, would be thought a homiletical monster. We do not say that the priority is not due to New England, with respect to strength of argument and logical acumen (though on this point also we might show our opinion) but we do say that she has no right to claim superiority in tenderness and depth of pious feeling, or in the multiplicity and strength of her associations with the sacred volume. Scotland and New England have been frequently compared, as to the shrewdness, industry, frugality, religious education, and good morals of their people; but even where other things are equal, there is a great difference between the dry metaphysical religion of the one, and the warm-hearted whole-souled devotion of the other. Even the clergy of New England make a sparing use of scripture, in their most public and elaborate performances; while, on the other hand, the very peasantry of Scotland speak a dialect offensive to the world because it overflows with scripture. Or to come still nearer to the point in question, let the work before us, with its cold, exact, scientific use of scripture, be compared with the reports and letters of the Scottish deputation to the Holy Land. We do not put the two things in comparison at all, so far as scholarship and science are concerned; but no one can peruse the glowing tissue of allusions to the bible and unsought quotations from it, or observe the truly oriental tone and spirit which pervade the documents referred to, without wishing that a little more of this Scottish enthusiasm could have been combined with the erudite precision of the work before us, or without some wonder that the author should have mentioned his New England birth and habits as a reason why he looked for such intense enjoyment from an actual visit to the Holy Land.

The real advantages, which Dr. Robinson appears to us to have enjoyed, are chiefly these: a strong taste and talent for the study of geography; the early period at which the plan of these researches was conceived, and the abundant leisure since enjoyed for moulding and digesting it; habits of accurate and patient observation; sound scholarship, at least in the department of biblical learning; an intimate acquaintance with the German literati, their opinions, and their methods of investigation, an acquaintance formed by means of long residence and study in the country; and, last not least, the counsel, aid, and company of Eli Smith. Of the

last two particulars in this enumeration it may not be improper to speak more at length.

The influence of German books and notions upon those who have studied them without sufficient previous discipline of intellect and heart, has rendered German learning and theology so justly obnoxious to suspicion, that we deem it but an act of justice to anticipate the question, whether Dr. Robinson betrays in this work any leaning to either of the favourite forms of German unbelief. Of transcendentalism no one will suspect him who has read any half-dozen pages of his writing. His tendency might rather be supposed to lie towards that form of neology called rationalism. We are bound to say, however, and it gives us pleasure so to do, that the sentiments expressed throughout the work are those of unhesitating and consistent faith in the divine authority of scripture. Once or twice, in our perusal of the work, we have been struck with forms of expression which belong much more to the German school than to the English or American;* but these we look upon as simple inadvertences, which ought not to be more severely judged than the few German idioms which mar the author's style, and make it sometimes seem as if the English were a mere translation.† On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the success of Dr. Robinson's undertaking has been signally promoted by his personal intercourse with eminent geographers, and other men of learning and science in Germany, to whose suggestions, we presume, may be ascribed the mode of observation which the travellers adopted, and the form in which their observations are recorded.

But of all the advantages enjoyed by Dr. Robinson in these researches, none seems to us so remarkable and valuable as

* The following sentence, though it really contains nothing positively objectionable, is very much in the German taste and spirit. "Here it was [at Ajalon] that this leader of Israel [Joshua], in pursuit of the five kings, having arrived at some point near Upper Beth-horon, looked back towards Gibeon, and down upon the noble valley before him, and uttered the celebrated command: 'Sun, stand thou still on Gibeon, and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.'" Vol. iii. p. 63. The following, though probably through mere inadvertence, seems to intimate the author's acquiescence in one of the lowest German views of the prophetic inspiration. "In a like degree the national hatred of the Jews against Edom became still more inflamed; and the prophets uttered the strongest denunciations against that land." Vol. ii. p. 557. The juxtaposition of "national hatred" and "the prophets," though it may be accidental, is certainly unfortunate.

† Besides something occasionally foreign in the structure of the sentences, we may refer to the peculiar use of "too," "perhaps," "already," and "over," (in the sense of *via*, "by the way of,") as examples of the fault in question.

the aid of such a coadjutor as Mr. Smith. In order to appreciate the worth of this advantage, we have only to consider that, in almost every other case, the oriental traveller has been dependent, more or less, upon native interpreters, who, besides being almost always illiterate, have often been dishonest, and of course without the slightest interest in the truth of the results obtained by their assistance. What explorer of the east, before the days of Dr. Robinson, has been accompanied, throughout his journey, by a man superior to himself in activity, if not in strength, of mind, equal to say the least in general knowledge, equally interested in the subject, previously fitted for inquiry by the laborious collection of materials,* a master of the language, an experienced traveller, familiar with the country and the habits of the people, unusually skilful in eliciting testimony even from the most reluctant witnesses, and far above the least suspicion on the score of personal integrity? We know not how we can express more clearly our sense of this extraordinary combination of important qualities, not in the principal explorer but his helper, than by saying that, so far as we can see, Mr. Smith might have made the book with scarcely any aid from Dr. Robinson at all, whereas the latter would have been incompetent to take a single step without the aid of his "companion." All this is handsomely acknowledged, in the plainest terms, by Dr. Robinson himself,† by means of which acknowledgments, both general and special, he commands respect and confidence, while at the same time he enjoys substantially the undivided credit of the whole performance. The book being literally written by himself, it bears his name of course, and will be naturally looked upon, by almost every reader, as his exclusive work, in spite of his own frequent and explicit declarations, that the materials, from which it was compiled, included Mr. Smith's journals, written on the spot, and, so far as he has given us the means of judging, no less minute and ample than his own. It is a well known fact in bibliography, that the ostensible author of a book is, to all practical intents and purposes, its only author in the public estimation. Dr. Robinson had nothing

* In an appendix of more than eighty pages, Mr. Smith has given lists of places in the Holy Land, the fruit of his own laborious inquiries through a series of years. The names are given both in Arabic and Roman letters, and exhibit proofs, not only of industrious research, but also of the utmost care and effort to secure entire correctness of orthography.

† See, for example, vol. i. p. 2.

then to fear from the openness with which he has acknowledged these important services; and we are therefore the more sorry that, in one slight particular, he should have inadvertently afforded an occasion for the groundless charge of keeping Mr. Smith out of the reader's view. This remark has reference to Dr. Robinson's peculiar and, as we think, ludicrous habit of describing Mr. Smith in almost every case where he alludes to him at all, by the endearing phrase of "my companion." This anonymous description is adhered to so tenaciously as almost to create a suspicion that the Doctor does not look upon "Smith" as any name at all; for even when he gives it, which is not very often, he subjoins the indispensable specification, "my companion," or "my friend," as if for the charitable purpose of distinguishing his friend and companion from the vast mixed multitude of "Smiths," who are confounded under that mere shadow of a surname. We suspect, however, that the name of Eli Smith is sufficiently well known, in Europe, Asia, and America, to stand by itself; and we beg leave to suggest that, in the next edition, its insertion in the narrative would save some room, be in much better taste, and free the volumes from the only thing which even seems to be at variance with the author's frank acknowledgment of obligation to the gentleman in question, with respect not only to the labour of research, but also to the final preparation of the manuscript. This last acknowledgment has reference especially to the orthography of oriental names, which seems to have been left to Mr. Smith's exclusive management. On this important feature of the work we shall venture to make one or two remarks.

We lately had occasion, in reviewing Mr. Barnes's work on Isaiah, to express our views of his attempt to romanize the Hebrew words occurring in his commentary. Some of the observations then made would apply with equal force to Mr. Smith's notation; but between the cases there are two important points of difference. The first is, that Mr. Barnes, without the least utility, annexed the roman form of the Hebrew word to the Hebrew word itself; whereas Mr. Smith merely meets the unavoidable necessity of representing oriental names to English readers, whether acquainted with the Arabic or not, the Arabic form being given only in an index or appendix. The other obvious distinction is, that in the one case, the words of a dead language were to be expressed in other letters, at the mere discretion or caprice

of the notator ; while in the other case the roman alphabet is used to represent, as far as possible, the actual sounds of a living language, and by one who has been long accustomed both to speak it and to hear it spoken. Mr. Smith's qualifications for the task, and the authority with which he has a right to speak on such a subject, are too notorious to need remark. The consistency and care with which the system adopted has been carried out, are worthy of a scholar, and deserve all praise. Upon the system itself we take the liberty to make a very few brief strictures.

In the first place, we were much surprised to find an orientalist of Mr. Smith's distinction, professing to adapt Mr. Pickering's method of notation, for the Indian and Polynesian dialects, to Arabic orthography, without the least allusion to Sir William Jones's system, which has been familiar to the learned world for more than half a century, has been applied to the notation of a variety of oriental dialects, and really includes every valuable feature of the method here exhibited, departing from it only where the latter seems to us least exact and philosophical.* Not to mention the apparent incongruity of borrowing a system formed in reference to meagre alphabets before unwritten, for the representation of an old and complicated system of orthography, the fact is simply this, that so far as the scheme of Pickering can meet the case at all, it is substantially identical with that of Jones, while the latter includes much that is unknown to the former, but essentially necessary to the end in view.

In the next place, it appears to us that Mr. Smith's notation, however admirable in itself, is not sufficiently adapted to the nature of the work in which we find it introduced. He appears to have assumed it as the ground-work of his system, that the most important object was to represent, as far as possible, in roman letters, the precise *sound* of the oriental words. This appears from the fact that whenever the same letter has a different sound in different situations, that diversity is indicated by the use of different representatives. Now this would all be well enough in missionary journals, or in books relating merely to the modern east. But in the work before us, an essential object is, or ought to be, to show the correspondence, and in many cases absolute identity,

* For a brief account of Sir William Jones's system, and of Mr. Gilchrist's, with a notice of the controversy carried on respecting them by Anglo-Indian scholars, the reader is referred to an article entitled "New Application of the Roman Alphabet," in the *Princeton Review* for 1838, pp. 405, 406.

between the ancient and the modern names. Now the impression made by such coincidences is of course much weakened by the difference in form arising from an effort to describe the sound of the Arabic word with punctilious exactness, while the Hebrew word is given in a different notation, viz. that adopted in the English Bible.* If the latter could not be assimilated to the former (and we certainly are far from wishing that it had been), might not the process have been partially inverted, and the Arabic words romanized upon a principle affording some approximation to the one adopted in the English Bible? This would have served to show more clearly the identity or likeness of the name, an object which appears to us far more important, in a work like this, than a representation of the nice varieties of sound existing in the spoken Arabic, even if that representation had been absolutely perfect. But we need not say that such perfection is impossible. We may say, however, and we say it with surprise, that it has not been even aimed at, with respect to some of the most important consonants. Between Te and Ta, He and Ha, Dal and Dad, Sin and Sad, Kef and Kaf, there is no etymological affinity whatever, while there is a marked distinction in pronunciation; but in the body of the work before us there is no such distinction in the method of notation. In the appendix, it is true, Mr. Smith points out in what way these distinctions might be made perceptible by dots below the letters; but he has not done so in the body of the work, upon the ground that the original orthography is given in the index. But if this be a sufficient reason for confounding consonants, why was it thought necessary to distinguish vowels so laboriously, even at the risk of disguising or concealing the remarkable resemblance which exists so frequently between the Arabic and Hebrew name? If either class of vocal elements could thus be left without precise notation, ought it not to be the vowels? Is it not one of the great distinctive features of the family of languages, in which both Arabic and Hebrew are included, that the consonants are the substance of the word, while vowels, though essential to the utterance, are looked upon, in theory,

* When, for instance, we are told that the Hebrew word *capbar* still occurs in many proper names, in the Arabic form *kefr*, an adept in comparative philology, or any one who has habitual occasion to compare the two alphabets, will no doubt see at once that the Arabic form is not even a modification of the Hebrew one; but how are other readers to infer this from a cursory comparison of two words which appear to coincide in one letter only?

as merely accidental? And has it not resulted from this universal principle, and from the peculiar mode of writing the Semitic vowels which it has engendered, that the vowels in many words have changed perhaps a dozen times, without one alteration in the consonants or letters? If this be so, then we cannot but regard it as a violence offered to the fundamental laws of Semitic orthography, to confound some of the consonants, and at the same time to represent with scrupulous exactness, in another character, not only the difference between the vowels which is recognized in writing, but the more intangible varieties of sound, of which every written vowel is susceptible in different situations, even where the attempt at this punctilious nicety confounds the mutual relations of the vowels as exhibited on paper. When, for instance, Mr. Smith denotes a very common sound of *fatha* by the vowel \ddot{u} (representing *u* in *but*)—without insisting on the strong probability that this sound after all is nothing more than that obscure *a* which, in certain situations, is the true sound of our own first vowel*—it appears to us that the advantage gained by the precise notation of this sound, where it occurs in the vernacular pronunciation, is by no means sufficient to atone for the confusion into which it throws the etymology of some names, and the darkness which it spreads over the mutual relations of the Arabic and Hebrew.† It was natural that Mr. Smith, from long established habit, should regard the exact sound of the spoken language as a primary object, and our only wonder is that he did not at

* “The short sound of the *a* is precisely the English *u*, which is nearly heard in the last syllable of *America*.” Princeton Review, 1838, p. 405. Mr. Smith would be more apt to denote this sound by \ddot{u} instead of *a*, because it is a well-known peculiarity in the pronunciation of New England, that it gives the final *a* the same sound as in *fate*, instead of the obscure sound referred to in the text.

† One of the agitated questions in the controversy as to the two systems which have been applied to the notation of the languages of India, has relation to this very sound of *fatha*; but with this distinction, that in Gilchrist's system it is *always* given to that vowel when not prolonged by a quiescent letter, while in Jones's system it is represented by the letter *a*. The theoretical absurdity of making \bar{a} the prolongation of \ddot{u} was held by Jones and his adherents to be a greater evil than a mere failure to express the sound according to the native utterance of the present day. This is indeed a main point of the controversy whether in transferring sounds from one alphabet to another, it is necessary to aim at more precision of distinction in the one than in the other. If one sign in Arabic denotes two sounds so heterogeneous as *a* and *u*, which method of notation is in fact the best, that which includes these same two sounds under one sign, or that which employs two signs to represent them? Is not the one method better in itself, and the other better as a faithful copy of the system represented?

the same time allow due weight to the importance of maintaining some degree of correspondence in the mode of writing Arabic and Hebrew.* When considered without reference to this important object, Mr. Smith's notation is entitled to all praise; and his detailed explanation of it in the appendix is by far the most exact and satisfactory account of the Arabic sounds that we have ever seen. It can scarcely fail to render valuable service to the oriental traveller, or to the missionary during his novitiate. And this suggests the query whether it would not be worth the time and labour, if the same accomplished scholar should prepare an Arabic grammar, with a special view to the convenience of our missionaries, and of those at home who are preparing for the work. We know that some missionaries have discountenanced all study of the living oriental tongues before the arrival of the learner in the country where they are vernacular. But this objection has, in no case, we believe, proceeded from a missionary who had brought the matter to the test of actual experiment. We think we may venture to assert that Mr. Smith is not of this opinion. It appears to us indeed to be a glaring paradox, to hold that the possession of a vast stock of words and of grammatical inflexions is an advantage not sufficiently important to outweigh the inconvenience of an imperfect or erroneous system of pronunciation. If the latter cannot be corrected or unlearned without a sacrifice of all the verbal knowledge previously gained, it is a proof of very mediocre talent for the conquest of a language. It would indeed be desirable, in all such cases, that the learner should be guarded against certain habits, and as perfectly instructed in the true sound of the language as he can be in the absence of a native teacher; and for this very purpose, it appears to us, a grammar written in the East by such a man as Mr. Smith, would be invaluable. It might

* The end, however, might have been attained without any change in the system of notation, by the mere addition, in a foot-note, of each name which has been handed down, in Hebrew and Arabic letters, without the points, and with a Roman equivalent, exhibiting the letters only, upon some one uniform principle of representation. Thus, in the case before referred to, instead of bringing *capfar* and *kefr* into juxtaposition, the identity of the radicals might be made apparent, even to the English reader, by the symbol KFR, which applies to both; or by reducing both to one notation, and distinguishing the consonants and vowels thus: Heb. KaFaR, Arab. KeFR, where the sameness of the letters and the difference of the vowels are displayed at one view. We are well persuaded that no mode of writing oriental words can be considered perfectly successful which does not adopt some typographical contrivance to retain and render visible the grand distinction between consonants and vowels.

also serve to show the true relation which the Arabic of common parlance bears to that of books ; a point respecting which there has been much dispute and still more misconception, which the statements of most travellers have tended to increase. We have constantly observed, that those east versed in Arabic are most accustomed to exaggerate the difference, and we are therefore less surprised than pleased to find Mr. Smith asserting that "spoken Arabic differs so little from the language of books, that all books written in a plain style are intelligible to the common people." (Vol. iii. p. 453.) If this be true, as we suppose it is, of all those countries where the language is vernacular, it opens a vast field for intellectual exertion and for moral influence, and furnishes new motives for the study of the Arabic, apart from its intimate connection with the Hebrew, and with some modern oriental tongues which are not of the same family, the Persian, Turkish, Hindustani, and Malay.

Another book which we should be delighted to receive at Mr. Smith's hands, is a work on archaeology, designed expressly to illustrate scripture, and constructed on the principle which gives such interest and value to Dr. Robinson's historical illustrations of biblical geography. Such a book originally written in the East, and then completed in the neighbourhood of some great European library, would be among the most important gifts which any foreign missionary has it in his power to bestow upon the church at home. The books already extant on the subject are comparatively useless from the large admixture of conjectural and fanciful matter, without any adequate means of satisfactory discrimination. What we want is something to inform us definitely what is known, and how it has been ascertained, whether from undisputed statements of the word of God itself, or from authentic ancient writings, or from tradition still preserved among the people of the Holy Land. As to the last point, there is no doubt much to be accomplished, and we long to see it undertaken by some one competent to do the subject justice. We must not conclude these brief suggestions without saying that the work before us contains many incidental illustrations of the bible, drawn from personal observation. These are rendered more available for purposes of reference by means of a digested index. It may be added, as a general remark, that the value of the work is much increased to students and to scholars by the completeness of those parts which, in America, are most neglected.

The appendixes and indexes attached to the third volume add much to the value and convenience of the whole. The typography does credit to the press of Mr. Trow, especially in that part where a failure would have been entitled to the most indulgence. We refer to the Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek, which really do honour to the printer as well as the corrector of the press. It is singular enough that the few typographical mistakes which we have noticed occur almost without exception in the English and the Latin.

In addition to our critical remarks upon the work, we had intended to present the reader with a rapid sketch of the author's journeys, and a brief enumeration of the points at which he has been led by his inquiries to original discovery, or even to remarkable results of any kind. But this part of our plan we are compelled to relinquish, with a bare allusion to the chapters on Mount Sinai and Jerusalem, as those which we have found to be pre-eminently interesting. If, as our travellers suppose, they have identified the very spot on which the law was given, and discovered architectural remains belonging to the age of Solomon, these two exploits might almost be considered as sufficient in themselves to make amends for all the time and labour spent in the whole journey.

We have waited till the last allotted moment in the hope of being able to obtain the maps; but we are still without them. They would probably have furnished very little occasion for additional remark, although they constitute the chief claim of the work to popularity. We speak on the authority of some of the most eminent geographers of Europe when we say that the construction of these maps is an era in the history of biblical cartography. The sooner they are brought into extensive circulation, and allowed to supersede the worthless maps now in the market and in common use, the better will it be for geographical science and the correct interpretation of the scriptures.

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

- No. 1. Not Tradition, but Scripture. By Philip N. Shuttleworth, D.D., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts. First American, from the third London edition. Philadelphia: Hooker and Agnew. 1841. pp. 125.
- No. 2. Tradition Unveiled: or an Exposition of the Pretensions and Tendency of Authoritative Teaching in the Church. By the Rev. Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., &c. of Oriel College, Savilian Professor of Geometry, Oxford. From the London edition. Philadelphia: Hooker and Agnew. 1841. pp. 66.

Messrs. Hooker and Agnew have announced their intention of publishing, under the title of the Churchman's Library, a series of works. Since the Oxford Tracts have been republished and widely circulated in this country, it is very desirable that the most instructive and able of the counter publications should be spread before the American reader. A judicious commencement has been made with the works, the titles of which are given above. They both relate to the main point in dispute between Protestants on the one hand, and Papists and Tractarians on the other. If men are agreed as to the rule of faith, there is an end of all controversy as to subordinate points between the parties just named. Neither Papists nor Puseyists profess to be able to establish their peculiar doctrines from the written word of God; and both are effectually refuted if scripture and not tradition be proved to be the pillar and ground of truth. The proof of this point is conducted on very different principles in the two tracts now before us. The Bishop of Chichester, the author of the former of the two, shows with learning and force that tradition is not and cannot be a safe or authoritative guide to truth. Professor Powell's argument reaches the same conclusion by a *reductio ad absurdum*. He very clearly shows that the principles adopted by the Traditionists necessarily lead to the claim of infallibility by the present teachers of the church, and to "the maintenance of the principle and spirit of persecution." He no less clearly demonstrates that these principles lead directly to infidelity; that they destroy the landmarks and evidence of Christian truth, and, by discarding evidence, place truth and fable on the same level. Both of these tracts are well written. The former has more the impress of the Christian divine, the latter of the able logician. They agree however in producing the con-

viction that the present controversy in the church of England concerns "THE PRESERVATION OF THE VERY FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH."

Lectures on Spiritual Christianity. By Isaac Taylor, New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 244.

The subjects of these lectures are, The exterior characteristics of spiritual Christianity, The truths peculiar to spiritual Christianity, Its ethical characteristics, Spiritual Christianity the hope of the world. The work has the excellencies and the faults which characterize the writings of Mr. Taylor. They are sound as to the great doctrines of the gospel; the subjects which they discuss are presented in a novel and striking point of view, and the spirit which pervades his books is good. His mind is speculative and imaginative, but not remarkable for strength. And hence though he may say fine things about a subject, he never presents the whole matter in a clear or strong light. His manner also is wearisome, not because of the want of spirit, but because of the amplitude of statement, the superabundant preparatory annunciations of what he is going to do, and the habit of descanting about the subject, instead of directly discussing it. These blemishes notwithstanding, the influence of his writings is salutary, and we are always glad to see them republished in this country.

The Monthly Lecturer of the National Society of Literature and Science. Lecture III. Popular Reading. By George Potts, D.D.

We are glad to see that this discourse is popular. Its doctrines are directly in the teeth of public sentiment, or what is called the spirit of the age. Instead of swimming with the stream the author stems it with a 'heart of controversy.' If such truths, spoken with such strength and plainness, can be swallowed by our newspaper-reading public, even as a medicine, we may look for great improvement in their intellectual and moral health.

A Spiritual Treasury for the Children of God, consisting of a Meditation for each day in the year, upon select Texts of Scripture. By William Mason. Selected from his morning and evening meditations. New York: American Tract Society.

A well-known and admirable work, which many a child of God has found indeed to be a spiritual treasure.

History of the Covenanters in Scotland. By the author of the History of the Reformation, &c. 2 vols. First American Edition. Philadelphia (Pres. Bd. of Pub.), 1841.

This is an interesting and instructive book upon a subject to which no true Presbyterian ought to feel indifferent.

Revue Théologique. Première Année. Montauban: 1841.

Montauban is one of the Protestant theological seminaries supported by the French government. It has now several orthodox and evangelical professors. One of these, M. de Félicc, has been long known in America as the

French correspondent of the *New York Observer*. Another, M. Adolphe Monod, is among the most eloquent and useful preachers of the French Protestant Church. Two others, Messrs. Jalaguier and Encontre, appear to be engaged in the management of this review. It has already given circulation to some admirable articles. We take this method of acknowledging the regular receipt of the review, and assuring our Montauban brethren of our sympathy and kind regard.

Defence of the Rights of the Christian People in the Appointment of Ministers, from the Constitutional Standards and History of the Church of Scotland. By William Cunningham, Minister of Trinity College Parish, Edinburgh: 1840.

Mr. Cunningham is one of the younger leaders of the Church of Scotland in its present movement. He is a warm adherent of Dr. Chalmers in his opposition to civil encroachments, but goes beyond him as an advocate for the entire abolition of patronage. This pamphlet contains much valuable information, and evinces the possession both of learning and ability.

The Four Gospels with the Acts of the Apostles, in Sanscrit. Calcutta. Printed at the Baptist Mission Press, for the American and Foreign Bible Society, and the English Baptist Missionary Society. 8vo. 1840.

Speech of Jacob F. Price, before the West Lexington Presbytery, on the trial of Rev. J. C. Stiles, for his agitating, revolutionary, and schismatical course. Frankfort, Ky. W. M. Todd, 1841, pp. 48.

The division in our church has been unavoidably attended with much collateral evil. Many cases of unnecessary and unnatural separation of friends, of congregations, of ministerial brethren have occurred over which the friends of the Church have reason to weep. In no one case, within our knowledge, does this separation appear more unreasonable and blame-worthy than in that of the brethren of Kentucky. We shall not be expected to express any opinion of the merits of the trial to which the above speech refers, as we have but one side of the question here presented. But we have been attentive observers of the course of events which have resulted in the schism by which the peace and prosperity of that portion of the Church have been so seriously compromised. We knew nothing of Mr. Stiles beyond what we gathered from the concurrent testimony of his friends, that he was an eloquent and fervent preacher; and we believe that he was the object of affectionate respect wherever his name was known. Our recent controversies however have developed traits in his character which show that he is well suited to be a disturber of the church. "I knew him," says Mr. Price, "to be a man of peculiar temperament; that, when excited, he would magnify molehills into mountains; that he believed himself divinely called to do whatever he desired, however absurd; and that no effort to enlighten his mind on any subject, however uninformed he might be, would have the slightest influence upon him." This judgment, by a man who had long enjoyed his acquaintance, coincides so

much with the impression of his character, which we had received from his writings and public conduct, that we cannot doubt its general correctness. The Synod of Kentucky had approved the acts of the General Assembly dissolving our connection with the western Synods. A small minority of the Synod disapproved of those acts, but agreed to recognise the authority of the Assembly, provided they were allowed to insert the expression of their disapprobation of the acts in question upon the minutes of the Synod. Permission being readily granted, they recorded their dissent, and there the matter was supposed to rest. Mr. Stiles, however, brought up the subject at a subsequent meeting of the Synod, and in the very face of the record of his disapprobation of the acts of the Assembly of 1837, insisted that his brethren required an avowal of the approbation of those acts as a condition of ministerial communion. He clearly showed that disapprobation of those acts was his term of communion, and that he could not and would not rest until he brought the whole Synod to think and feel as he did on the subject. His determination not to be satisfied with his brethren, he mistook for a determination on their part not to be satisfied with him. Hence his agitating course; his efforts through the press, the pulpit, and private intercourse, to make the church think as he did, or to give it no rest. Hence his exaggerations of all the faults of the old school, and his apologies for the errors of the new. Taking credit to himself for not having read the writings of the advocates of the New Divinity, he absurdly assumed the office of judge as to the nature and prevalence of their doctrines. To him, therefore, and almost to him alone, belongs the responsibility of the schism in the Presbyterian churches in Kentucky, and we sincerely hope he may live to see the error of his course, and to labour as assiduously for the peace, as he has of late laboured for the distraction of the church.

In answer to the application of this little knot of separatists in Kentucky to the American Home Missionary Society, for assistance, an assurance has been given that care will be taken to send them men of the right stamp. So far as the A. H. M. S. is a Presbyterian institution, we do not know that we have any right to complain of their sending men to aid those who are disposed to co-operate with them, though they should be found in the bosom of an old school Synod. The Assembly's Board, we presume, would not hesitate to obey a similar call from Western New York. But so far as the society depends on New England support, we think that this attempt to foment division in a neighbouring church, involves a breach of all ecclesiastical courtesy; and so far as it is sustained by that large portion of the New England brethren who profess to disapprove of new school doctrines, it seems to us to involve a breach of far higher obligations.

It is due to Mr. Price to say that the speech above mentioned, does him honour not less for its spirit, in reference to Mr. Stiles, than for its ability.

The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession examined, and the Protestant Ministry defended against the assumptions of Popery and High-

Churchism. In a series of Lectures. By Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Charleston, S. C. Boston, 1841. Crocker and Brewster. 8vo. pp. 568.

As we have not yet seen this work, we can do nothing more than give its title, and express for its author's sake, and for the sake of the subject, the hope that it may meet with a favourable reception, which we have little doubt it will be found to merit.

ERRATA FOR THE JULY NO. 1841. ART. III.

Page 409, 8th line from the bottom, for $\frac{2r-s}{A(20-r)}$ read $\frac{2r-s}{A(2s-r)}$

Page 409, 7th and 6th line from the bottom, for 20 read 2s.







