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-

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. 8vo. 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 illusrtation 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 reseaches, 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 Rephidim, 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 *caphar* 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 *ŭ* (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 *ŭ* 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 *ā* the prolongation of *ŭ* 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 *caphar* 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.