



48-5
5

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case,..... *Division*..... **I**

Shelf,..... *Section*..... **7**

Book,..... *No.*.....

SCC #10,961 v.17

The Chinese repository



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

CHINESE REPOSITORY.

 VOL. XVII.—DECEMBER, 1848.—No. 12.

ART. I. *Reply to the Essay of Dr. Boone on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Θεος into the Chinese language, contained on pp. 17, 57, et seq.* By W. H. MEDHURST, D. D. (Concluded from page 574.)

DR. BOONE undertakes, on page 68, to answer the chief objections to the use of *Shin*, as the rendering of Θεος in Chinese, and first takes up the following: "That the acts and attributes of the chief God are never predicated of *Shin*. *Shin* is never called the Lord and Governor of the world, &c. It is never used for God καὶ ἕξοχῆν, as Θεος was by the Greeks."

IN the Inquiry, the objections against the use of *Shin* on the above ground will be found stated in full; we refer especially to p. 14, "It can not be shown," &c.;—page 26, "The Greeks had an idea;" &c.;—p. 29, "In Europe we never speak, &c.;—p. 35, "There is no reference," &c.;—so also pp. 38 and 154. Again on p. 52, "Certain divine acts," &c.

From the above references it will appear that the argument brought forward in the Inquiry was, that *Shin* is never used by Chinese writers for God by way of eminence, in speaking of what he is and does; therefore it does not mean, in their estimation, God by way of eminence. Further, that most other nations have used the generic term for God, if any such existed, when speaking of God par excellence; the term which is assumed by Dr. Boone to be the generic term for God is never used by the Chinese for God par excellence; it is therefore presumed that the term in question is not

the generic word for God: and as we have shown that it does mean Spirit, the inference is that it is generic for *Spirit*, and not for *God*.

In endeavoring to meet this objection, Dr. Boone takes the last first, and considers it as an argument against *Shin* being the generic name of God, which, he says, may be thus stated:

“There are many things predicated of the chief God of the Chinese, which are never predicated of *Shin*; therefore *Shin* can not be the generic name of God in Chinese.”

It will easily be seen, that this statement of the argument differs from that put forth in the Inquiry, nor do we think it in accordance with any of the propositions made by us. If the sum of the observations which we have made on this point, were to be thrown into a form resembling Dr. Boone's statement of our argument, it would be something like the following: There are many things predicated of the Supreme God among the Chinese which are not predicated of *Shin*, therefore the term *Shin* is not sufficient to designate the Supreme God, in their estimation. Further, the generic word for God in Greek was used to designate the Supreme God; the word *Shin*, which is supposed to be the generic name of God in Chinese, is never used to designate the Supreme God; therefore it is presumed that it is not the generic name of God.

These two propositions of ours are thrown into one in the statement of our argument drawn up by Dr. Boone, and the inference deduced from the latter is annexed to the former, in what appears to us an inconsequential manner. Had it been expressed like his parallel argument regarding the lion, we should have seen the object of the reasoner, but disclaimed the inference. For instance, in the parallel argument, Dr. Boone asks, “Who would maintain that because there are many things said of lions which are never predicated of the genus quadruped, therefore the lion does not belong to this genus?” To which we should of course answer, No one. And had the argument regarding *Shin* been stated in the same way, the answer would have been of a similar kind; viz. if it had been said, “There are many things predicated of the chief God of the Chinese which are never predicated of *Shin*, therefore the chief God of the Chinese does not belong to the class of *Shin*?”—the impropriety of the inference would have been immediately seen, and we should have agreed with Dr. Boone that it was an incorrect proposition, for the excellence of one individual in a class does not prove him not to belong to his class. But the inference that the chief God of the Chinese does not belong to the class of *Shin*, and the conclusion that

Shin is not the generic name of God in Chinese, are two very different things; for the chief god of the Chinese may belong to the class of *Shin*, without *Shin* being the generic name for God in Chinese. As a lion may belong to the class of quadrupeds, without supposing the word *quadruped* to be generic for *lion*; and a man may belong to the class of animals, without admitting *animal* to be the generic word for *man*. It is a mistake to suppose that the genus may be put for the species, or that the name of the genus is a sufficient designation of the species. The genus, in each of the cases above referred to, is *quadruped*, *animal*, and *Shin*, or Spirit; and the species *lion*, *man*, and *God*. If we had to state the proposition contained on page 69, we should express ourselves as follows:

Though a lion may be said to belong to the genus quadruped, there are many things predicated of a lion which can not be predicated of quadrupeds in general; therefore quadruped is not the generic term for lion. So also, though the Supreme God in the estimation of the Chinese may be said to belong to the genus *Shin*, or Spirit, there are many things predicated of such Supreme God which are not predicated of *shin*, or spirits in general; therefore the word *Shin* is not the generic term for God. As lion belongs to a smaller class than quadruped, and the term quadruped is inadequate to describe it; so God belongs to a smaller class than *Shin*, or Spirits, and the word *Shin* is insufficient to represent him. *Quadruped* is generic for more than *lion*; it stands for the genus of four-footed animals, and does not call up to the mind the idea of a *lion* at all. So *Shin*, or Spirit, is generic for more than *god*; it stands for the genus of invisible intelligences, and does not when heard call up to the mind the idea of God. Again, man is an animal; but man possesses attributes and faculties which animals in general do not possess; therefore, though the word *animal* includes man, it can not be the generic term for *man*, because it is of too wide an extent. So God is a Spirit; but God possesses attributes and faculties which all spirits do not possess; therefore, though the word *spirit* includes God, it can not be generic for God, because it is of too wide an extent.

Thus, instead of our arguing, that "whatever may be predicated of any individual of a genus, may be predicated of a whole class;" we maintain, on the contrary, that much may be predicated of an individual, or of a species included in a genus, which can not be predicated of the whole genus; and that when qualities and attributes are applicable to an individual or species, and not to the whole genus, then that individual or species must be arranged under

a separate classification, to which the rest of the genus do not belong : and a word proper for describing the genus becomes unfit for designating that species or individual. We do not deny that the supreme God in the estimation of the Chinese belongs to the genus *Shin*, and God by way of eminence is said to belong to the genus *spirit* ; but we do deny, that the genus *Shin* possesses those distinctive attributes which belong to the individual called *God* in the estimation of the Chinese ; as also that the genus called *spirit* possesses those attributes which belong to the individual called God with us. It is on this account, that we do not employ the term *spirit* to designate God, and for the like reason, doubtless, the Chinese do not employ *Shin* to designate God in their estimation.

Our view of the matter is as follows : God by way of eminence, among the Chinese, is a *shin*, or spirit ; the various invisible intelligences supposed by them to be employed in the economy of nature are *shin* or spirits ; and the souls of men, whether embodied, or disembodied likewise *shin* or spirits. *Shin* is, therefore, a term descriptive of the genus *spirit*, including the above species. But inasmuch as it is generally applicable to every one of the three species abovementioned, it is not adapted for designating definitely either of them, and if we wanted to bring up the distinct idea of any one of the three species, we should not use the term *Shin*. Thus *Shin* is not generic for God, but for spirit. We do not deny that God belongs to the genus *Spirit* with us, nor that the highest deity in the estimation of the Chinese belongs to the genus *Shin* ; but we do deny, that *Spirit* is generic for God with us, as that *Shin* is generic for God with the Chinese.

Shin belongs to a larger class than God, and does not fully represent the idea of God. When the name of a genus, or larger class, is not distinctive of the smaller, and when the smaller possesses qualities and attributes which the larger class does not possess, then the name of the larger class is insufficient to designate the smaller ; and the use of the name of the larger class for the smaller would introduce an indefiniteness into language greatly subversive of the purpose for which language is generally employed. If, for instance, I predicate the term *quadruped* of the lion, I speak the truth, indeed, but only such *portion* of the truth that I might equally predicate the same of a horse or a cat ; and if I predicate the term *Shin* of God, I speak the truth, indeed, but only such a portion of the truth as I might equally predicate of a malevolent demon, or of the human soul. But if I employ the terms 天帝 *T'ien ti* for God,

魔鬼 *mó kwei* for a malevolent demon, and 靈魂 *ling hwan* for the human soul, I use a more full and complete expression for each than the term *Shin*, or Spirit.

The impropriety of using the name of the larger class to designate the smaller, may be illustrated by the different terms we employ, according as we are more or less acquainted with the genus, species, and individual, to which we allude. If, for instance, I see something at a great distance which I can not make out to be either living or dead, I call it an *object*; on approaching nearer I find that it moves, and conceive it to be some *animal*; on a still nearer approach, I find that it is a *horse*; and coming close up to it, I perceive that it is the *very horse* which I have been accustomed to ride. To call it an *object* now, would be by far too indefinite a term; or merely to speak of it as an animal would be inadequate to convey the impression of my discovery. It not only belongs to the genus *animal*, and the species *horse*, but is the identical horse which I have been in the habit of riding. If we had no further knowledge of God than that he was some invisible intelligent being, belonging to the same class with the human soul, we might then use the term *Shin* or Spirit to designate him, and the whole class to which he is supposed to belong. But when we find that he is an underived and perfect Being, ruling over universal nature, the word *Shin*, or Spirit, is not sufficient to convey an impression of the discovery we have made to the minds of others.

Indeed, it appears rather disparaging to an individual or species to designate them by the name of the genus to which they and others inferior to them equally belong instead of the species which is proper to them or their fellows. Thus, if we speak of a man as *that animal*, it is evident we intend to undervalue him; but, if we use the terms *a man*, or *the man*, a very different impression is conveyed. Thus the disciples of Pythagoras intended to honor him when they called him *the man*; and the Arabs intended to express their sense of the greatness of the one Supreme, when they called him *Allah, the God*; but had they, in the one case, used the word *animal*, and in the other *spirit*, the impression produced would have been very different. The Chinese have not used *Shin* to designate the Supreme in their estimation, perhaps for this very reason that they conceived the term to be too widely generic to convey a proper idea of his being and perfections to the mind.

We come now to the consideration of the second part of our

objection against Shin, which Dr. Boone, says (page 69) may be thus expressed :

“ It is true that the great mass of the Greeks were polytheists, and Θεός was used by them as the generic name of God ; but besides this use of Θεός for a god, any god, there were a few philosophers and some poets, who seeing the folly of the popular polytheism used this word to designate a single being, whom they regarded as the Framer and Governor of the world. *Shin*, however, is never used for God κατ' ἐξοχήν, therefore we must not use it in this way ; we must not employ it to designate the true God.”

In thus stating our argument, Dr. Boone would intimate that the word Θεός was originally used generically, and was applied by way of eminence to a single Being, merely by a few of the philosophers of Greece, and that only at a late period, when they had become dissatisfied with the popular superstitions. Upon which we may remark, that such is not our view of the case ; neither is it according to the representations of Cudworth, who contended that the earliest and most influential poets and philosophers, from Orpheus to Pindar, and from Pythagoras to Plato, maintained the doctrine of one Supreme God. He says the pagans held both many gods and one God, in different senses, viz., the produced and the unproduced. See our quotations from Cudworth in a former part of this reply.

Mosheim, in his note on that writer says, “ Cudworth undertakes to prove that most of the philosophers, although otherwise worshiping many gods, nevertheless referred all things to one fountain and cause. He does not contend that all these philosophers entertained such exalted notions of this one principle and cause of all things, as to leave no room for censure. He is satisfied with maintaining that the generality of them acknowledged one Supreme God ; but whether they taught correctly or otherwise concerning this God, he leaves undetermined ; nor does he take upon himself to prove that nothing can be deduced from their precepts, except what is sound and consistent.” See Cudworth's Intellectual System, Vol. II, page 145.

Thus we find that most of the Greek writers acknowledged one Supreme God. It is true, they also taught the existence of many subordinate deities, and were, as Cudworth says, polytheists and monotheists at the same time. The number of persons acknowledging one Supreme God, in Greece, does not much affect the argument. It matters not whether two or twenty of the Greek philosophers, regarded a single being as the parent of the universe ; or whether such was done at an earlier or later period of their history ; it is sufficient for us that it was done, and that this single being was called

Θεός : it is enough for us to know, also, that the word Θεός contained in itself so much of the idea of divinity, that wise and sober men felt themselves warranted in using it alone to designate God by way of eminence; while no one, it would appear, ever questioned the propriety of their so doing. But this is by no means the case with the word *Shin* among the Chinese. Dr. B. assures us, that the generic name given to the highest class of beings worshiped in China (viz. *Shin*) is not by Chinese writers used for God, κατ' ἐξοχὴν. It is not, in this matter, a question of early or late, of many or few; for the word *Shin* never was used, by any native writer, for God by way of eminence. Not, let it be observed, because they never had occasion to speak of a single Being, whom they considered the Parent and Governor of all things, for they have repeatedly spoken of and firmly believe in the existence of such a being; but they have never, in a single instance, used the term *Shin* to designate him.

They have also had a variety of sects in China, differing widely from each other; yet neither of these sects ever used *Shin* for God by way of eminence. Here, then, is a manifest difference between the practice of the Greek writers with regard to Θεός, and the practice of Chinese writers with regard to *Shin*. If *Shin* be generic for *God* in Chinese, as θεός was in Greek, how is it that such a difference appears, when the respective terms come to be applied to God by way of eminence? The Greeks naturally and frequently employed Θεός in this sense: the Chinese instinctively and systematically avoid doing so. Is it not because there is some essential difference in the meaning of the two terms? We have proved that the Chinese use *Shin* in the sense of *spirit*: it can not be shown that the Greeks used θεός in the same way. This, then, is the ground of difference between the two terms; the one means *God*, and the other *spirit*; therefore, though the former may be safely employed for the Divine Being, the latter can not properly be so used. The question as to whether the generic word for God among the Greeks was first in order of time, and whether its restriction by a few to denote God by way of eminence came afterwards or not—does not materially affect the argument. It appears much more probable, that the application of the word θεός to one Supreme was prior in order of time, to its application to a number of individuals supposed to belong to the same class; inasmuch as the ancients most likely derived their earliest views of religion from traditionary revelation, which would have taught them monotheism; and it is most natural to suppose that they conceived first of a single being called God, before they

extended their ideas to a class of beings whom they thought like that one, and therefore entitled to be considered gods.

The latter part of the objection, supposed by Dr. Boone to be urged by us against *Shin*, exhibits us as coming to a conclusion, which we should not have arrived at without some intermediate steps. Thus, on page 70, he says, "Because the word *Shin* is not employed by Chinese writers for God, κατ' ἐξοχήν, therefore it is concluded that *Shin* should not be so used by us: we must not employ it to designate the true God." The inference we should draw from the premises is, that since *Shin* is not used by Chinese writers for God κατ' ἐξοχήν, therefore *Shin* did not mean God κατ' ἐξοχήν, with them; and as a consequence therefrom we should argue, that if we wish to write in Chinese so as to be understood by the people, we should not so employ it. We are to ground our opinion of the meaning of terms upon the way in which they are used by the people. The question is, how do the best writers in China use a given term, or not use it; and according to their *usus loquendi*, we must form our opinion of it. If they never use a term in a certain sense, and we do, we are in danger of being misunderstood without a glossary.

Dr. Boone says again, on page 70, "That some of the Greek φιλοσοφῶν use the generic name, given by their countrymen to the highest class of worshiped beings, for God κατ' ἐξοχήν, and that this was a step in the right direction, an advance towards the monotheism taught in the Sacred Scriptures:" no such step has been taken, he says, in China; "the generic name (*Shin*) is not by Chinese writers used for God κατ' ἐξοχήν." And yet he demurs to the conclusion that *Shin* should not be so used by us, contending, on the other hand, that "We must do for the Chinese word *Shin* what the Greek philosophers commenced to do for θεός, and what the apostles completed; viz. make it, by our usage, designate, not any one of a class to be determined by the context, but the God κατ' ἐξοχήν."

Here Dr. Boone seems to take it for granted, that we know as much of the Chinese language as the Greek philosophers did of Greek, so as to be able to determine whether a given term can bear a certain sense, notwithstanding no Chinese writer ever put that sense upon it. His statement goes upon the supposition, also, that we are in the same position in China, as the Greek philosophers were in Greece, having access to all parts of the country and being at the head of every school of learning, so as to be able to exert an influence over the mind of the masses, and to mould their language

according to our will. Whereas, on the contrary, we are but just located at a few border cities of the empire, and can only personally influence one in a million of the population. With regard to the rest, we have yet to affect them through the medium of their own tongue, and can only do it by using that tongue in the way in which they have been accustomed to use it, and in a way which they can understand. If we use new terms, or terms in a sense in which they have not been accustomed to employ them, we shall only render ourselves unintelligible, and not succeed in teaching them anything. We may indoctrinate individuals into our views, but by employing a new nomenclature, we shall leave the mass untouched, and how then are we to do for China what the Grecian philosophers did for their country? But Dr. Boone says that we must make a term, which never, according to this own showing, was used by any Chinese writer in the sense intended—we are to *make* that term, by our usage, designate what we please; and we are to teach the Chinese to use the word *Shin*, which they understand in the sense of *spirit*, to designate “not one of any class to be determined by the context, but the God *καὶ ἕξοχὸν*.” That is, to determine for the Chinese how they are to understand their own terms, in spite of classical writers and dictionaries, and then to induce them to use such terms in the sense which we choose to put upon them.

Those of us who have had any experience in instructing the Chinese, know how difficult it is to teach them religion, even when availing ourselves of all the helps which their own *usus loquendi*, in regard to terms and idiomatic phraseology, afford; how much more would the difficulty be increased, were we to write and speak to them in an unknown tongue; instructing them first in the nomenclature which we choose to adopt, and then indoctrinating them in the religion which we have come to teach? Particularly, if this is to be done by means of the sacred Scriptures, which are to be published without note or comment, and which, if abounding in terms used in a sense authorized by no native writer, would be a sealed book to them. Let us picture to ourselves the Herculean task of teaching the Chinese to change the meaning of their own terms, and of making them acquainted with the sense in which strangers understand their language; insisting that it must be so understood, in order to the reception of the new doctrines which foreigners come to diffuse. This, however, is not the peculiar business of missionaries; we come to this country in order to disseminate religion, and in so doing, it is our's to avail ourselves of the medium of communication already

established among the people, using terms in the sense in which they are generally employed, and clothing our ideas in a dress which is familiar and intelligible to the generality.

Dr. Boone says that the apostles completed, with regard to Θεός, what the Greek philosophers commenced. But he would set us a task far more difficult than that undertaken by the apostles. The philosophers of China have not commenced doing for *Shin* what the philosophers of Greece are said to have done for Θεός; so that we do not find China in the same position in which the apostles found Greece. We must then perform the part of philosophers as well as apostles, in this country; we must first remodel the language, and then disseminate our religion; and not only so, we must even do more than the philosophers of China ever attempted to do. They had frequently to speak of a Supreme Being, but they never ventured to designate him *Shin*;—doubtless because they knew that *Shin* meant *spirit*, and was therefore inadequate to express the idea. We are, however, to overcome that difficulty; we must, as Dr. Boone says on page 88; use *Shin* to render *Elohim* and Θεός, in spite of all objections: we must make *Shin* mean *God* and not *spirit*; whether the Chinese will so understand it, or not. Had any of the Chinese philosophers or poets used *Shin* for the Supreme in their estimation, we might have had some ground to go upon in establishing this meaning for *Shin*; but as not a single authority can be adduced, our difficulties increase, and we are left to perform a philological task more than philosophers or even apostles accomplished, without any assistance from either classics or dictionaries.

Dr. Boone says, that “these two facts, viz. that the Greek philosophers found Θεός just where we find *Shin*, and that they used Θεός to designate the Supreme Being, is a direct argument why we should make a similar use of *Shin*.” But the Greek philosophers did not find Θεός just where we find *Shin*; they did not find it used for every kind of spiritual energy and being, including the human soul, with its powers: on the contrary, they found that Θεός contained in it so much of the full idea of Deity, as to warrant them in using it for God καὶ ἕξοχῶν. We do not find *Shin* in the same position; and as a proof of it, we adduce the well-known fact that no Chinese writer has ever ventured to use *Shin* for God by way of eminence. Again, it is requiring too much; that we should suppose ourselves in the same position in China, that the Grecian philosophers occupied in their own country. It is enough for us to imagine ourselves in the circumstances in which the apostles were placed, as it respects the

propagation of the Gospel in an extensive empire. Could the advocates of *Shin* put us in the same position in which the apostles were with regard to *θεος*, we should have nothing to reply; but as we do not find *Shin* where the apostles found *θεος*, i. e. used by the philosophers and best writers of the nation among whom they went to designate God by way of eminence; and as we find *Shin* embracing a much larger number of meanings than ever were attached by the Greeks to *θεος*, we conclude that we are not warranted by the example of the apostles in using *θεος*, to make a similar use of *Shin*.

Dr. Boone thinks that though the Chinese do not predicate the origin and government of all things of *Shin*, we may still do it; because "we may predicate anything of any subject which is consistent with truth and right reason; otherwise, if we confine ourselves to the predicating of those things which the Chinese predicate of any given subject, we shall never be able to make them acquainted with the character and attributes of the true God." The true God in our estimation is God *καὶ ἕξοχόν*; and the question to be decided is, by what name he shall be designated in Chinese. Dr. Boone proposes *Shin*, notwithstanding he owns that no Chinese writer ever used it for God *καὶ ἕξοχόν*. In order to ascertain whether *Shin* really means God in the estimation of the Chinese, we inquire, whether they predicate what they conceive to be divine acts and attributes of *Shin*; and when we find that they do not predicate the origin and government of all things of *Shin* (though they consider these to be peculiar to the Divinity in their estimation), we conclude that those have not conceived aright of the meaning which the Chinese attach to the term *Shin*, who understand it in the sense of God *καὶ ἕξοχόν*.

The thing to be ascertained is the meaning of *Shin*, and how it is understood by the Chinese; if we employ it in the way in which they are accustomed to use it, we may succeed in conveying some correct ideas to their minds; but if we assign to it a sense which they never ascribe to it, and go on predicating the acts and attributes of the less numerous class to the more extended genus, contrary to their *usus loquendi*, we may altogether fail in giving them any definite conceptions of the subject. Suppose a Chinese were to come amongst us; and, understanding the word *spirit* in the sense of God, were to insist upon predicating of the former term the acts and attributes which are peculiar to the latter. His so doing would never alter our view of the real meaning of *spirit*, nor induce us to relinquish the practice of using it with reference to the human soul,

or malicious demons; which classes we had ever conceived the word *spirit* to include, while we should deem the sole application of the term to designate God, as indefinite and improper. Should he persist in saying, that Spirit created the world, and that Spirit is the lord of the universe, we should consider that he spoke only a portion of the truth, without employing such distinctness of expression as would insure his being understood by all. In the same way, suppose a person were to insist on using the word *animal* for man; and predicate of the word *animal* such attributes as are peculiar to human beings, such as the exercise of reason and the employment of tools, on the ground that man was an animal, and that we may predicate of the genus whatever qualities are possessed by every species included in that genus: we should reply, that it is not proper to predicate the reasoning faculty of animals, because all animals do not exercise reason; while there is a specific term for denoting the class of animals who do exercise the reasoning faculty, viz. *man*.

The second class of objections against *Shin* may be seen at full in the Inquiry, page 143, and we conceive have not been completely met. We therefore leave them as they stood in that paper.

The third class of objections refers to the *Shin* of *Ti*, which was considered by us as an adjunct of *Ti*; and as designating, not the divinity, but the spirit of the Supreme Being, in the estimation of the Chinese. This subject has been fully discussed on pp. 47-53 of the Inquiry. It is only necessary now to make a few remarks upon the observations of Dr. Boone relative to the same point. He says it is admitted by all, that *Shin* is here used in the abstract sense, and we may add, as the adjunct of a being; but there is a difference of opinion as to its precise meaning. He supposes that the Chinese mean by *Shin*, in the case alluded to, the divine energy or influence of *Ti*; we think it means his spirit. We have shown in the Inquiry, by a reference to the *Shin* of 文王 *Wan wáng* ascending and descending in the presence of *Ti*, and other instances, that *Shin*, when considered as belonging to a being, must mean his spirit; besides which, the meaning universally attached to *Shin*, in native dictionaries and commentaries, leads to the conclusion that it means spirit. But even supposing, for a moment, that *Shin* meant the divine energy or influence of *Ti*, it must be considered as belonging to him, and as deriving all its importance from its connection with him (for the same energy or influence belonging to another person would not necessarily be divine); the conclusion to be drawn from such supposition is, therefore, that *Ti* is the being worshiped, on

occasion of the principal sacrifice offered in China, and that *Shin* is merely his energy or influence, coming and going at the commencement and termination of the service. *Ti*, then, is God in the estimation of the Chinese, and *Shin* is merely his energy or influence.

Dr. Boone says, whichever of the opinions taken of the *Shin* of *Ti* be the correct one, whether it mean the divine energy, or the spirit of that being, even supposing the spirit of *Ti* to be the exact idea of the phrase, it is no argument against our use of the term as the appellative name of God in the concrete sense. To this, however, we demur; and contend that if it mean spirit in the abstract, there is every reason to suppose that it means spirit also in the concrete; so strong is the presumption that it does so, that it would require very conclusive evidence to prove the contrary, the burden of which proof we leave with the advocates of *Shin*. Dr. Boone says, "that the term occurs much the most frequently as the appellative name of God in the Chinese writings;" but the sense in which it is to be understood in such a connection is the subject in dispute; and the fact of the word *Shin* being explained to mean *spirit*, and never having been used by any Chinese writer for God καὶ ἕξοχῆν, strengthens the presumption, amounting almost to a certainty that it is to be rendered *spirit* and not *God*, even in those places where it is supposed to stand for the appellative name of God.

Taking it for granted that the word *Shin* does mean divine influence or energy, in the phrase 帝之神 *Ti chí shin*, and that it is used in the sense of the appellative name of God where it occurs in the concrete, Dr. Boone says, "We have an instance of a word being applied to this double use in the word *divinity*, when we speak of Christ's divinity, and when we call God, the Divinity." Thus we may also say, we have an instance of a word being applied to a double use in the word *spirit*, when it means the energies and intelligence of invisible beings, and those invisible beings themselves; so that, as far as the double use of the word is concerned, *Shin* may as well refer to the one as the other; and viewed in connection with the interpretation and use of the word as found in native authors, it must refer to *spirit* and not *divinity*.

We do not stop to examine into the theological question, as to whether Christ's being everywhere present by his Divinity, refers merely to his Divine influence or energy. We perceive that Dr. Boone has appended a note of interrogation to the expression, and we therefore leave the question in his hands, as one with which this controversy has nothing to do.

The fourth objection against the use of *Shin*, to which Dr. Boone alludes, is that the human spirit is sometimes designated by this term. Dr. Boone does not deny that such a use of *Shin* is met with, but he suggests that it occurs especially in medical authors, from whom he thinks the philosophers took the idea; and says that it is not in common use among the people. We have in the Inquiry, pp. 92, 103, 104, adduced a number of instances from native authors, in which the word *Shin* is used in the sense of the human spirit; not one of which, as far as we know, is extracted from medical books; and the theory that *Shin* means spirit is not derived from such sources. On page 97 of the Inquiry, an extract is given from the 禮祀 *Lí Kí*, in which Confucius explains the *Kwei Shin*, or spirits generally, as derived from, and identical with, the soul and anima of man, particularly at death; at which period, says the commentator, the body and spirit separate, when the subtile essence of the spirit expands, and mounting aloft, becomes a (神靈 *Shin ling*) spiritual intelligence. Nánhčen, in remarking upon the words of Confucius (see Inquiry, p. 99) says, "Using the words (*Kwei Shin*) with reference to the human body, then the soul and spirit constitute the *Shin*, while the anima and the substance constitute the *Kwei*." Chú fútsz' also (p. 100) says, that "With regard to man, the grosser fluid is the anima, which constitutes the fulness of the *Kwei*, and the breath or spirit is the soul, which constitutes the fulness of the *Shin*." And much more might be adduced to the same purpose, so that the use of *Shin* for the human spirit is not derived from medical books, but from the classics, and from the Confucian school.

As to the assertion that the word *Shin*, in the sense of the human spirit, is not in common use among the people, we can only say, that our experience of the matter goes to prove the very reverse of this; and almost every Chinese whom we have asked, as to whether he possessed a *Shin*, has readily replied in the affirmative, adding that if he had not a *Shin*, or spirit, he could not continue alive. There can be no doubt that the word *Shin* is commonly used in the sense of the human spirit, numerous instances of which we have already given, and, if necessary, we could bring forward many more. Dr. Boone suggests, that such use of the term has grown out of the pantheism of one class of the Chinese philosophers: we will not at present enter on the question of Chinese pantheism, as it would lead to a wider discussion than the limits of this paper will allow; we merely observe, that pantheism was extensively maintained by Grecian phi-

losophers, who considered $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ to be diffused through and connected with the $\tau\omicron\ \pi\alpha\nu$, or universal nature; and yet we never find, in any Greek writer, the human spirit denominated $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$; we can not understand, then, why the Chinese should, in consequence of pantheistic notions, apply the word *Shin* to the human spirit. On the other hand, we conceive that the word *Shin* was first applied to the human spirit, and then to the 氣 *k'i*, or spiritual energy, supposed to pervade nature; which, instead of resembling the $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ of the Greeks, is more fitly represented by their $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, the breath of nature, or *anima mundi* of the ancient philosophers, which was supposed to pass through all lands and seas, heights and depths.

Dr. Boone thinks, that the application of the word *Shin* to the human spirit amounts to no more than the poetical expression, "The divinity that stirs within us," sometimes employed by western writers for the human soul. This, however, goes on the supposition that the word *Shin* is originally of the same signification with the word *divinity*, and that when employed to designate the human spirit, it is used in a metaphorical sense, or in an extravagant manner; and rarely applied to such a subject, except by poetic license;—all of which we have shown not to be the case. On the contrary, we have given abundant evidence, that *Shin*, when used to designate the human spirit, is employed in its natural sense, in nowise overstrained, and in sober, every-day writing. There is, therefore, in the use of *Shin* for the human soul by Chinese writers, nothing either forced or figurative;—no elevation of the humanity, nor depression of the divinity, in order to bring them to a temporary level, but the term in such connection is used properly and correctly, because it means spirit, and spirit only.—We may remark in passing, however, that in the quotation to which Dr. Boone refers, "the *divinity* that stirs within us" is most probably not used for the human soul at all. It is taken from Addison's *Cato*, and runs as follows:

"Why shrinks the soul

Back on herself, and startles at destruction?

'T is the Divinity that stirs within us,

'T is Heaven itself that points out an hereafter,

And intimates eternity to man."

Here the question is asked, Why does the soul abhor the thought of annihilation? It is, says the poet, because God has, by some inward impulse, discovered to it a future state of being. It would seem that 'the divinity' in the third line is the same with 'the

heaven' in the fourth, namely the Supreme Being: also that 'the stirring within' mentioned in the one sentence, is the same sort of thing with the 'pointing out an hereafter,' alluded to in the next; while the soul in both is the party affected and wrought upon, in being aroused to a presentiment of a future state of being. This is the view taken of the passage by Dr. Johnson, in his Dictionary; who, under the word 'Divinity,' gives, as the second meaning of the term, "God, the Deity, the Supreme Being, the cause of causes," quoting this very passage, "'T is the Divinity that stirs within us." Thus in the passage under consideration, according to the views of the great English lexicographer, "the divinity that stirs within us" is not used for the soul, but for God.

Dr. Boone says, that "our use of *Shin* to render Θεός, whether referring to a true or false god, can never be misunderstood, from the existence of this limited use of the word *Shin* to designate the human soul by the writers mentioned above." To which we reply; that the use of the word *Shin* to designate the human soul is not limited, and not confined to medical, or a few philosophical writers, but occurs every day, and pervades the whole literature and language of the people. We contend also, that such constant use of the term *Shin* for the human soul by the Chinese, will be very likely to lead to a misunderstanding, were we to employ it to designate God; because the natural sense of the word *Shin* being spirit, the Chinese reader would be very likely to apprehend that we were speaking about spirits, when we intended to speak about gods; while the use of the term *Shin* in connection with a possessive pronoun, or other noun, to whom it is said to belong, will necessitate its being understood of the spirit, and not the god of the individual.

This leads us to notice Dr. Boone's answer to the 5th objection to *Shin*, viz. that if *Shin* is used for God, there is great danger of being misunderstood, when the god of a deceased parent, or the god of any one is spoken of. This objection we conceive to be of primary importance, and to have been very inadequately replied to by Dr. B. He says, "there can be no doubt that *Shin* is often used for the manes of the dead, who are regarded by the Chinese as proper objects of worship;" and owns that "the objection has much weight if we translate literally the *Shin* of Abraham;" adding that "there would be much danger" of the Chinese misunderstanding the phrase to mean the manes of Abraham, "until the Christian usage of the word should have taught them better." Here we conceive Dr. Boone has himself offered evidence that *Shin* must be understood in the

sense of *spirit*. The question is about the meaning of the term *Shin* in the estimation of the Chinese. Dr. Boone says that it is the appellative name of God; we say, that it means *spirit*. We refer to the *usus loquendi* of the people, to settle the sense in which they understand it, and we find that, according to such *usus loquendi*, it means, in certain connections, the manes of a dead man. We all know that the manes of a person must be understood to mean the *spirit*, and not the *god* of that person. The conclusion is, that the term in such connection means *spirit*, and not *god*. Dr. Boone himself acknowledges that there is much danger of its being understood of the manes by the Chinese, until the Christian usage of the word shall have taught them better:—intimating, of course, that the Chinese usage of the word is different from the Christian, and that if Christians persist in using the term in their way they will use it in a way different from the Chinese, and that the Chinese will misunderstand them. In writing for hundreds of millions of people, who are scattered over a territory of five millions of square miles, into only seven hundred of which Protestant missionaries can penetrate to explain themselves; the absurdity of using terms in a sense, which the missionaries understand, and which the Chinese must misunderstand, will appear obvious to every one who reflects on the subject. Indeed Dr. Boone himself acknowledges that there is much danger of this, until the Christian usage of the word shall have taught the Chinese better. The phrase *teaching them better*, implies that they are now doing wrong, which they must be instructed not to do. The impropriety supposed is an impropriety of speech. But where is the impropriety, we would ask, in using a term, which they understand in the sense of *spirit*, to denote the spirit of a deceased person? Do not the Scriptures speak of the spirits of just men made perfect, and say, When the dust returns to the earth as it was, the spirit returns to God who gave it? If we choose to use their word *spirit* for God by way of eminence, when they never do so, we can hardly charge them with impropriety of speech for using their own word *spirit* in the sense of *spirit*, merely because we wish it to be appropriated solely to God.

But we may here anticipate an objection, with reference to a statement in the Inquiry, page 78, that “we should discountenance the use of the word *Ti* for an emperor just as much as the apostles would have done the employment of *Θεός* before *ναύαρχ*, or *Divus* before *Augustus* :” and suppose it may be urged, that the advocates of *Shin* are in like manner at liberty to discountenance the use of

Shin for the manes of a deceased person. To which we reply, the cases are entirely different. The apostles found the Greeks using the word Θεός for God by way of eminence, as we find the Chinese using the word *Ti*, in the same sense; thus their adoption of Θεός, and ours of *Ti*, to express God by way of eminence, is sanctioned by the classical usage of the people among whom we come; and we could very easily point out to the Chinese, as the apostles might have done to the Greeks, the impropriety of employing a word, which they themselves had used for the Supreme, to designate a human being, however exalted. The advocates of *Shin*, however, do not find the Chinese using that term for God by way of eminence, while they do find them employing it for spirits of every kind; they can not, therefore, on the ground that the word *Shin* has been used for the former, interdict the Chinese from employing it in the latter, sense; because the restriction of the general term *Shin*, spirits, to the specific idea of *god*, is entirely an invention of foreigners, with which the Chinese have nothing to do.

The way in which Dr. Boone proposes to obviate the difficulty arising from *Shin* being understood in the sense of manes, is, we conceive very unsatisfactory. He says, "all danger of mistake may be removed by translating 'the *Shin* who protected Abraham, Isaac, &c.' 'The God of our fathers' may be rendered," he says, "'the *Shin* who protected our fathers,' or, 'the *Shin* whom our fathers worshiped.'" Thus an unwarrantable circumlocution must be employed, in these and such-like cases, or else the use of *Shin* endangers a serious misunderstanding. If so, then it is evident, that a wrong term has been selected, and that those who use it are employing it in a sense in which the Chinese do not understand it. Supposing the term *Shin* to be the appellative name of God, as Dr. B. contends, then there could be no danger of mistake if we used it, when speaking of the God of Abraham, &c.; so also if *Shin* really were the appellative name of God, the Chinese themselves would be necessitated to employ a circumlocution 禹 when speaking of the *Shin* of 文王 *Wan wáng*; the *Shin* of 禹 *Yü*, or the *Shin* of 關帝 *Kwántí*, in order to prevent their readers misunderstanding the term in such circumstances, as meaning the God of *Wan wáng*, &c. They ought, under such circumstances, to have said, that the *Shin* here spoken of is *not* the *Shin* whom *Wan wáng* worshiped, or who protected *Wan wáng*, but the spirit that animated him when alive, and which existed in the disembodied state after his death. But they do nothing of the kind; and on the contrary, employ the term,

naturally and easily, as meaning of its own native force the spirit of 文王 *Wan wáng*, and nothing else. If a foreigner, writing in English, were to use the word *spirit* as the appellative for God, and on coming to the phrase, "Israel offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac," were, in order to prevent misunderstanding, to employ the circumlocutory phrase, the *spirit* who protected his father Isaac; we should tell him that the difficulties arose from his using the word *spirit* in a wrong sense, and that all danger of misapprehension would be obviated by his using the term which we employ for God by way of eminence.

The allusion to the practice adopted in my former version (where *Shángtí* was employed for God), of rendering "the God of our fathers," the "*Shángtí* whom our fathers worshiped," is not to the point, unless Dr. Boone could show that such circumlocution was still intended to be employed. Much study has of late been directed towards this subject; and it is more than probable that the views of the different parties on some things have been modified, as their acquaintance with the topic under discussion has enlarged. This is the case with regard to the passage just quoted, and others of a similar character. We now see, that no circumlocution is necessary or warrantable; that the term, or terms, chosen by us to translate Θεός may be retained throughout, and need no periphrasis to guard or to explain them; as they are established by native authority in every sense in which we propose to employ them. If Dr. Boone thinks that the term he has chosen does need a circumlocution to remove all danger of misunderstanding, then it is evident, that he has selected a term which in the sense in which he employs it is not warranted by native authority, and would, if used alone, according to the *usus loquendi* of the Chinese, be misunderstood.

Dr. Boone then passes on to state the reasons which forbid him to use 帝 *Ti* as a translation of *Elohim* and Θεός. The chief reason, he says, is that *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese, nor the name of any class of beings; but a title given to men, as well as to invisible beings, who are the objects of religious worship.

To establish this assertion, he brings forward two ancient and concise dictionaries which give to *Ti* the meaning of *ruler* and *judge*; respecting which see our remarks in the Inquiry, page 68. To what has been there advanced we have little at present to add, but merely wish to remark, that while Dr. Boone has quoted native dictionaries largely, in order to combat the arguments of the abettors of *Ti*, he has carefully abstained from referring to them, to

establish his views of *Shin*. In our estimation none of these authorities give any sanction to the idea that *Shin* is the appellative name for God, while all concur in stating that *Shin* means *spirit*. On the other hand, the Imperial Dictionary states specifically that *Ti* is the name of the Divinity as far as the Chinese are acquainted with him, and that it is also used for a variety of invisible beings superior to man, who have an agency in the government of the world.

Having referred to the Imperial Dictionary, we will now proceed to examine what Dr. Boone has advanced from that work, point out the parts in which his translation differs from our own, and defend the latter where necessary.

First, with regard to our translation of the quotation from the 白虎通 *Peh-hú-tung*, which we have rendered "he who in virtue is united to Heaven is called a *Ti*:" this has been translated by Dr. Boone "he whose power corresponds to heaven is designated a *Ti*." In a note, he says, "we have translated the word 德 *tih*, power, and not *virtue*, as this latter word, being generally used for a moral quality, would mislead the English reader." He then says, "that 德 *tih* means power, influence &c;" and as a proof of the assertion quotes Morrison who gives two classes of meanings, first *virtue*, commonly in a good sense; and secondly, *power, force, &c.* Also the dictionary published by myself, wherein the same ideas are set forth, viz. virtue and goodness; with vigor and energy. According to these statements, therefore, two meanings may be assigned to 德 *tih*, viz., virtue and power. Dr. Boone says, that to employ the former here would mislead the English reader; he therefore prefers the latter.

Now when a word is said to be capable of two meanings, the way to decide upon the one which the writer intended should be put upon it, is to consult the context, or to refer to such definitions of the term as he himself has given. If we examine the immediate context we shall find, that the lexicographer refers to 堯 *Yáu*'s intelligence and accomplishments; upon which the commentator remarks, that Heaven (or the Divinity) is called *Ti*, because of his justice as the moral governor of the universe; while *Yáu*, and the rest of the ancient emperors, were called by the same name, because in their 道 *táu*, right principles, they assimilated to this standard. Here it is evident, that moral qualities are intended, because the word 道 *táu* is employed; which, when connected with 德 *tih*, never imparts power and influence. On referring to the preface to the

Shú King, from which the above quotation is made by Kánghí, we find that the monarchs who succeeded 堯 Yáu and 舜 Shun could not come up to their predecessors in virtue, and therefore they were called 王 wáng, kings, only. Their power was fully equal to that of their predecessors, but their goodness was deficient; hence they were less esteemed.

Should any further evidence be necessary, to prove that 德 *tih* is here to be understood in the sense of *virtue*, we may refer to Morrison's Dictionary, Vol. II, page 128, where he speaks of (德配堯舜 *tih pei Yáu Shun*) virtue equal to the ancient sovereigns Yáu and Shun; and Vol. I, page 522, where Dr. Morrison quotes Confucius, as saying, "Only Heaven is great, and only Yáu imitated it;" upon which the commentator says, "of emperors and kings mentioned in books, there never was any whose virtues were more abundant than those of Yáu; and of all the praises bestowed on the virtues of Yáu, there never was any more complete than this." Who can doubt after this, that 德 *tih* here means moral virtue, and not power and influence. Further, if we refer to those definitions of the terms which the lexicographer himself gives, we shall see that this is the precise idea to be attached to 德 *tih*. In the Inquiry, page 11, we have subjoined, in a note, a translation of all that Kánghí says on the term, in which there is not one word about physical force, power, or influence. It is not necessary to add anything to what is there detailed, but merely to adduce Morrison's idea of the meaning of 德行 *tih hing*,—the first definition given by Kánghí,—which he calls "a course of splendid virtuous actions."

Bearing in mind Kánghí's definitions of the word 德 *tih*, we now turn to Dr. Boone's explanation of the sentence first quoted from the lexicographer, viz. "he whose (*tih*) power corresponds to Heaven is designated a *Ti*," which he says means, "he who rules over the whole empire, which is styled by Chinese magniloquence 天下 *T'ien hia*, all under heaven, as Heaven rules over all things that are under it, is styled *Ti*, Ruler." We feel no hesitation in appealing to any one acquainted with Chinese, who will examine the context in which the word is found, to judge whether such a sense as this can be extracted from the passage before us; if it can, we must confess that we have yet to learn what Chinese sentences mean.

With the translations given by Dr. Boone of the extract from the Shú King (Essay, page 75), we have no fault to find. This is far from being the case, however, with his translation of the com-

mentary thereon. We have given a rendering of the passage on page 6 of the Inquiry, which we submit to the consideration of Chinese students in general. Let them also examine Dr. Boone's version of the same passage, and judge of the general correctness of the two. Our business now, however, is with those parts of his translation which affect the present controversy. The first in importance is the rendering of the word 名 *ming*, which we call *name*, and which in Dr. Boone's estimation means *title*, but as he has reserved the discussion on this term till all the cases in which it occurs come before us, we shall in our reply do the same.

On the quotation from a writer in the Chun-Tsiú we have nothing to remark, but on that from Kwántsz' 管子 which follows, we would observe, that the words *táu* 道 and *tih* 德 in the two members of the sentence, serve to illustrate each other; as is frequently the case in Chinese parallelisms. The word *táu* has been rendered by Dr. Boone "principles," and *tih*, "the powers and capacities of things." *Táu*, according to Morrison, in its primary signification, is a way, a principle; when applied to human conduct, it refers to "correct virtuous principles and course of action," and when connected with *tih*, it means virtue, virtuous. The sentence, as translated by Dr. Boone, would suit the description of a natural philosopher rather than a judge, or ruler of mankind; which he maintains is the original signification of the word *Ti*. Hence he suggests, that "the fanciful distinctions" referred to exist only in the mind of the writer; whereas, if we suppose *táu* and *tih* to refer to human conduct, the inference is natural, and the meaning of the writer by no means obscure. In a note on page 76, Dr. Boone refers to *Ti* Chí 帝摯 a prince who is said to have proceeded to unlimited dissipation; and argues from it that 帝 *Ti* was a mere title conferred on any one who might sit on the imperial throne, without reference to his moral qualities. To this we reply that ancient emperors were called *Ti*, on two different grounds, viz., properly and improperly. Persons were properly called *Ti* (according to the ideas of the Chinese), when in virtue they were supposed to be united with Heaven, or the Divinity; as was the case with the five ancient emperors. These did not receive the empire by right of inheritance from their ancestors, nor bequeath it to their posterity, but left it to the most virtuous; hence they were called *Ti*. Those were improperly called *Ti*, who came into power only by the right of succession, without the possession of any moral qualities; these were

endured for a time, and afterwards put out of the list, as was the case with 帝摯 *Ti Che*, just referred to; who, according to the ritual of the present dynasty, is excluded from the list of those emperors sacrificed to at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes; much stress, however, can not be laid upon the circumstance of unworthy persons being at that time called *Ti*, as *Chú fútsz'* says, "it is impossible to give entire credence to the traditions of those remote ages."

In the same note Dr. Boone says, "that during the three dynasties *Híá*, *Sháng*, and *Chau* (namely, from B. C. 2170 to 243), the word *Ti*, as applied to human rulers, fell into disuse. The reason of this is given in the preface to the *Shú King*, according to which, the monarchs of the three dynasties, being inferior to their predecessors in virtue, and bequeathing the empire to their immediate descendants, instead of the most virtuous, were not considered worthy of the name of *Ti*. About the period last specified, 秦始皇 *Tsin Chi-hwáng*, having engrossed the power of the contending states, and constituted himself sole monarch of China, usurped the title of 皇帝 *Hwángti*, since which time the emperors of China have always been thus designated; and the phrase, having been employed in this sense from age to age, has come into general use, most probably without reference to its original meaning. When analyzed, it is found to consist of two terms, the one meaning *august*, *great*, &c., and the other, *ruler* or *judge*, with especial reference to the Ruler of all. There can be no doubt that the word *Ti* is used by the Chinese for God by way of eminence, and for invisible beings, who have some agency in the management of nature. The Imperial Dictionary tells us, that such is the principal, if not the original, sense in which the term was used. It has been employed also for human beings who were supposed to resemble the Divine in moral qualities. Taking these terms together, therefore, it might seem that the combination resulting therefrom would indicate something very grand and exalted. Dr. Boone suggests that, on the supposition that we use *Ti* for *God*, we must admit the phrase *Hwángti* to mean *august God*. This, however, does not necessarily follow. Instances occur of words which, when separated mean something very great, but in combination convey different or perhaps inferior ideas; such is with us the epithet *godfather*. If the two words constituting this term were separated, one would mean the Supreme Being, the Author of all, and the other a progenitor; joined together the term imports merely the sponsor for a child at baptism. Custom has, however, sanctioned the usage, and no one,

on hearing the phrase *godfather*, ever applies it to the Divine Being, or even to the procreator of children. In like manner, the phrase 皇帝 *Hwángtí*, however much its component parts might seem to convey the idea of august divinity (supposing the latter term to be understood in the sense of God), does not convey that idea to the Chinese mind. It means, in their apprehension, *emperor* only, is never used by any Chinese writer for August God, and if so used by us would not be understood by them.

Dr. Boone says, "should we adopt the word *Ti*, as that by which to render Θεός in the Scriptures, we must either declare war against the emperor's title, and forbid all Christians to call him by this title; or we must call a man *august God*, than which it would be better for us to cut out our tongues." This argument, if it have any force, makes equally against *Shin*, as it does against *Ti*; for *Shin* has been the common term for *spirit* in all ages, and the well known phrase 精神 *tsing shin* has been employed for animal spirits in Chinese ever since books were written in the language. This being the case, should we adopt the word *Shin*, as that by which to render Θεός in the Scriptures, we must either wage war against the established phraseology of the Chinese, and forbid all Christians to use this expression, or we must call the animal spirits *pure essential divinity*, than which it would be better for us to cut out our tongues. Thus the same line of argument can be pursued in both cases; there is this difference, however, between the two; viz. that while we might justly represent to the Chinese the impropriety of using a term, which they had been in the habit of employing, unmistakably and alone, for God by way of eminence, to designate a human being, however exalted; we could not, with any degree of justice, insist, even on our converts abstaining from the use of a term for the animal spirits, on the ground that it had been used for the Deity par excellence, because it never has been so employed by any Chinese writer, and is thus used only by foreigners, who can not be supposed to be as well acquainted with the language as the Chinese themselves.

With regard to the propriety of Christians using the title which the Chinese accord to their emperors, we may observe, that if it be found that terms are employed for earthly monarchs which have been used for the Deity, and still call up to the mind the idea of the Divinity whenever used; there can be little doubt that the use of such terms for human rulers should be discouraged. The phrase 皇帝 *Hwángtí*, however, is not of that character; it never has been used

by the Chinese to designate God; and is understood by them only in the sense of emperor. There are terms, however, accorded to the emperors of China, which may be considered extravagant appellations, and should be forbidden; for they call their emperor *heaven*, in the sense of the Divinity, and pay divine honors to him during his lifetime, all a part of the worship of kings which has prevailed among pagans, both in the eastern and western worlds. The Greeks and Romans employed the terms ὁ Θεός, ὁ Κυριος, and Σεβαστος, *Deus, Divus, Dominus, &c.*, to designate their sovereigns; while incense was burnt to them during their lifetime, as though they were gods.

The Egyptians went further than this; on referring to the Rosetta stone and other Egyptian inscriptions, we find that people calling one of the Ptolemies, "God Epiphanes, most gracious." We have also "the gods Soterēs," meaning Ptolemy Soter and his queen; "the gods Adelphi," meaning Ptolemy Philadelphus and his queen. In like manner, on the Egyptian coins is found the Grecian inscription, Θεων Ἀδελφων. The following title also occurs: "Priest of Osiris, priest of the gods Euergetæ, of the gods Philopateres, of Isis, of Osiris-Apis:" in which the deified kings of the Egyptians are placed between the well-known immortal gods of that country. In the same way, we have "the queen Arsinoë, the goddess Philadelp^ha:"* and thus throughout the whole series, forming an exact parallel with the Chinese practice of deifying their monarchs, and calling them by the same name with which they designate the Supreme Being.

The practice of according extravagant titles to kings in the west, became very much modified under the influence of Christianity; but the application of improper expressions did not altogether cease, when the Gospel had taken deep root in the Roman empire. The apostles found these titles employed in their days, as we do now in China; and without setting themselves directly to oppose such practices, they left Christianity to work its way. We may safely do the same, but as we have before observed, if it be found that terms are employed for earthly monarchs, which call up the idea of Divinity equally with that of the imperial dignity, we may very properly discourage their employment.

The word *Ti* does call up such ideas, and instances occur in Chinese writings, where it is used in the same page for God, and for a

* See Sharp's Early History of Egypt, London, 1836; and Vyse's Pyramids of Gizel, together with Belzoni's narrative, where the application of the words God, and gracious God, to the kings of Egypt is of very frequent occurrence.

deceased emperor. This being likely to create confusion, the Chinese may be told that they must, in order to act consistently, relinquish the use of the term in one sense or the other, as it can not properly designate both. The same mode of reasoning would not be conclusive with respect to the word *Shin*, which the Chinese have never used to designate God by way of eminence, and therefore can hardly be said to do wrong when they employ it in its legitimate sense of *spirit*.

Dr. Boone then refers to Kánghí's definition of *Ti*, when used as a posthumous title, and translates the sentences quoted by the lexicographer thus: "He whose 德 *tih*, power or influence, is like that of heaven and earth is called *Ti*." The word 德 *tih*, here, as in the former case, should be rendered virtue, or moral quality, and not power or influence. Confucius, in the Book of Changes, when enumerating the virtues of the five emperors who were first called *Ti*, specifies the discovery of the eight diagrams by 伏羲 *Fuh-hí*, the invention of husbandry by 神農 *Shinnung*, and the easy and paternal government of the empire by 黃帝 *Hwángtí*, 堯 *Yáu*, and 舜 *Shun*; in which they imitated the *jin*, 仁 benevolence, and 義 *i*, righteousness of heaven and earth; if such be their 德 *tih*, what can the meaning of it be, but virtue?

After alluding to Kánghí's reference to the compound term 上帝 *Shángtí*, which the lexicographer says means Heaven, or the Divinity, Dr. Boone proceeds to notice what the Imperial Dictionary says about the 五帝 five *Ti*, viz., 五帝神名, *Wú Ti shin ming*, which he translates "Five Rulers is the title of gods." We have already, in frequent instances, shown that 神 *Shin* means a spiritual being; and we shall presently state our views regarding the translation of 名 *ming* by title.

Dr. Boone then refers to the quotation given by Kánghí from the 周禮 *Chou Lí*, on the subject of the five *Ti*, informing us where they were worshiped, and specifying their individual names. Our translation of the Chinese commentator quoted in the Imperial Dictionary, differs a little from that given by Dr. Boone; and as the terms employed in some measure affect the question, we may as well point out the difference.

The commentator says, "the Azure *Ti* is 曰 called 靈威仰 *Ling-wei-ngáng*; the vermilion *Ti* is called 赤熛怒 *Chih-pián-nu*, &c." Dr. Boone has rendered it, "He who is styled *Tsáng Ti*, the Azure Ruler, is named *Ling-wei-ngáng*, &c." The Chinese

student will however perceive that the words *styled* and *named* do not occur, but simply the word 曰 *called*, before the name.

The sentence quoted from the Family Sayings of Confucius, is thus rendered by Dr. Boone: "The disciple 季康子 K'í K'ángsz' asked an explanation of the 名 title Wú Tí, or Five Rulers; when Confucius replied, Heaven has five elements, &c.; the (*Shin*) gods of these elements (i. e. the gods who preside over these elements) are styled 五帝 Wú Tí, the Five Rulers." A translation of this passage, according to our view of it, will be found on the 8th page of the Inquiry. We do not mean now to discuss the minute differences that appear between these two versions, but simply wish to draw attention to the rendering of the word *ming* by *title*, instead of *name*. K'í K'ángsz', according to Dr. Boone, asked Confucius "an explanation of the (*ming*) title Wú Tí." On referring to the Family Sayings, from which the above quotation is an extract, we find the question of the disciple thus stated: "I have for a long time heard of the 名 name of the Five Tí, without knowing their 實 reality; I beg to ask, therefore 何謂五帝 what is the meaning of the Five Tí?" From this it appears, that the word *ming*, 'name,' is here used in opposition to *shih*, 'reality,' as distinguishing that which is commonly said of a person or thing, from that which may really be affirmed of the same. He wanted to know what the Five Tí actually were, and Confucius informed him what in his estimation constituted the five Tí. K'í K'ángsz' did not ask for an explanation of their title, neither is there any warrant for here rendering the word *ming* by *title*. We are by no means satisfied with Dr. Boone's rendering of the closing sentence quoted from the commentator: "the *Shin* (gods) of the elements, &c., are styled Wú Tí." For, in addition to the proof we have given that *Shin* means *spirit*, or spiritual being, one of the commentators on this very passage has explained the word *Shin* here as meaning "五行之精神 the essential spirits of the five elements;" and the word 謂之 *wei chí*, which Dr. Boone renders *styled*, is given by Dr. Morrison as meaning *it is called, it expresses*.

Having gone through the quotations from the Imperial Dictionary, Dr. Boone proceeds to state the conclusions which the different parties profess to draw from the premises. The one party concluding, that as Tí is the *name* of Heaven, or the Divinity, and the name of five invisible beings who preside over particular departments of nature, and are honored with religious worship—while it is a name

given to certain ancient sovereigns, who on account of their virtues were raised to divine honors—that it is therefore a name common to several beings, who are accounted gods, and one of the appellatives of God in Chinese. The other party says, that *Ti*, when applied to these various individuals is not an appellative name, designating a distinct genus, who are regarded in the Chinese estimation as gods; but a title, by which individuals belonging to different genera are distinguished. The objection of the latter party against *Ti* being considered as an appellative, is grounded on the assumption that the individuals to whom it is ascribed belong to different genera. But it should be remembered, that though in other respects they may belong to a different class, yet in respect to their being called *Ti*, or honored as divinities, they belong, or are supposed to belong, to the same class. It was not unusual for the pagans of antiquity to treat their kings with divine honors, and on account of the qualities displayed by them to consider them superhuman: notwithstanding they had the evidence of their senses that their monarchs were but men, they still considered them as possessors of a divine nature, and honored them accordingly. Thus in China, *Ti* was used as one of the names of Heaven; and because human rulers were supposed to imitate heaven in virtue, and thus belong to the same class with the Divinity, they were called *Ti* likewise.

The question on which Dr. Boone lays most stress, in this stage of the argument, is, whether the word *ming* should be translated *name* or *title*. He admits that *ming* is used either for a name or a title, by the Chinese; and the only question is in which of these senses it is used in the present case. To prove that *ming* may mean either name or title, Dr. Boone quotes the dictionaries published by Dr. Morrison and myself. It is true, Dr. Morrison, in which he has been followed by me, has included *title* as well as *name* among the definitions which he has given to *ming*; but in all the phrases quoted to illustrate the definitions given, he has not adduced a single instance in which *ming* is used as an appellation of honor or dignity; from which we may infer, that Dr. Morrison employed the word *title* in the sense in which it is synonymous with *name* (see Webster's 5th class of definitions under *title*). Should any think that Dr. Morrison has included *title* among the definitions of *ming*, because K'anghí has defined 名 *ming* by 號 *háu*, we would reply, that *háu* does not signify a title of honor, but is a word employed by the Chinese to indicate one of the classes of proper names by which individuals are designated; such as the cognomen or compellation

with us. (See Morrison's Dictionary, part I, vol. I, page 359.) In order to settle the question, however, in what sense Kánghí used the word 名 *ming*, we have only to refer to his own Dictionary, under the article *ming*, a translation of which may be found in page 9 of the Inquiry; from which it will appear that *ming* is not given by him as importing a title of honor, but simply as the name of a person or thing, which sense it invariably bears throughout the Imperial Dictionary, where it occurs thousands of times.

Dr. Boone, however, quotes a passage from the 淵鑑類函 *Yuen-kien-lui-hán*, to prove that *ming* is once used in the sense of a title of honor. The passage, as he renders it, is as follows: "Heaven only is one (*Shin*) God; but because he is most honorable, we give him many (*ming*) titles: as in the case of a human prince, we call him King, Augustus, His Majesty, Celestial King, the Son of Heaven, and August Ruler, or Emperor." We may remark here, in passing, that the first clause in the above passage should be rendered (in conformity with the universal application of the word *Shin* throughout the Chinese classics), "Heaven, or the Divinity is only one spiritual being;" i. e. not two or more, as might be thought from the circumstance of his being called by many 名 names. The writer in effect says, the reason of his having many names is because he is most honorable; as in the case of an earthly ruler who is supreme amongst men, we have various modes of 稱 designating him, such as *king*, &c.; but we do not mean thereby that the sovereign is multiplied in proportion to his names, as he in fact constitutes but one individual.

Dr. Boone thinks that this observation of the Chinese writer is the nearest approach to monotheism which we have met with among that people; and calls particular attention to the fact that the writer uses 一神 *yih shin*, which he renders *one God*. With reference to the monotheism of the Chinese, we may observe that this is a doctrine not unfrequently referred to in the classics. 天 *T'ien*, heaven, is called 一大 *yih tá*, the one great one, he that dwells on high, and regulates all below, being the summit of all things (see page 19 of the Inquiry). The 太一 *t'ai yih*, supreme one of the 禮記 *Lí Kí*, is the undivided one, who is honored as 帝 *Ti* (see Theology of the Chinese, page 82). The operations of nature, in nourishing and rendering living things happy, is, according to the commentator on the 易經 *Yih King*, entirely owing to the 一帝 *one Ti* who superintends the whole (see Theology, page 237).

In the above passages, the monotheism of the Chinese is very apparent, but the being referred to is 天 *T'ien*, or 帝 *Ti*, and not *Shin*. If *Shin* meant God elsewhere, and particularly the one Supreme, in the estimation of the Chinese, which 天 *T'ien* undoubtedly does, it might very properly be rendered *God* here; but as *Shin* never means God by way of eminence, and always imports, when occurring in the Chinese classics, *spirit*, we are constrained to render it *spiritual being* here also.

In the passage now under consideration, Dr. Boone has rendered the 多名 *to ming*, 'many names,' which are given to heaven, by 'many titles,' as we conceive, without sufficient reason: because the various appellations by which Heaven, or the Divinity, is known, to the Chinese, are not titles, but names. Thus, for instance, 乾 *k'ien*, 上玄 *shang huen*, 太一 *tai yih*, 大鈞 *ta kiun*, 洪鈞 *hung kiun*, 眞宰 *chin tsai*, 眞元 *chin yuen*, 大塊 *ta kw'ái*, 大區 *ta kü*, 上天 *shang t'ien*, 太皓 *t'ai hau*, 太和 *t'ai ho*, 太虛 *t'ai hü*, 太初 *t'ai ts'ü*, &c., are all names of heaven, in the sense of the originating and ruling power, but none of them can be considered as titles; they are names descriptive of the being to whom they refer, and who is known to the Chinese by these appellations. Dr. Boone says, that all the words and phrases which are cited as instances of the various *ming* that are given to a human prince are titles; but we beg leave to call attention to the fact, that the word *ming* is not used with reference to the epithets by which human rulers are known, but 稱 *ching* (a term more directly connected with complimentary phrases) is there employed; so that the arguments drawn from the fact of the word *ming* being used for the various designations of earthly rulers, to show that it may therefore be translated *title*, is here inapplicable.

On referring to English lexicographers, it appears that a distinction is made by them between those words which are descriptive of certain stations or dignities, and those which men lay claim to in consequence of holding such stations or dignities. Thus *king*, according to Johnson, is the *name* of sovereign dignity; and *majesty* is the *title* to which a king lays claim. So with regard to the words *prince* and *highness*, *duke* and *grace*, *ambassador* and *excellency*, &c. When the words *king*, *prince*, and *duke* are applied to individuals who rule over a certain portion of territory, and fulfill the duties which belong to those stations, the words become the name by which those offices or dignities are known; but when the individuals referred to

have no political influence or authority, and the words are merely hereditary in a family, irrespective of territory, then they are mere titles of honor. Thus the titles of the late Francis Hastings, were viscount Loudon, earl of Rawdon, and marquis of Hastings; but master-general of the ordnance, and governor-general of India, were names of the offices he held.

It has been said, that *Ti* is one of the titles of heaven, and that it is a title common to the Divinity, the five invisible beings presiding over the elements, and the five ancient monarchs of China. To which we reply, that in accordance with the views elicited in the preceding paragraph *Ti* is no title at all. Whatever translation be given to it, whether *judge*, *ruler*, or *god*, it is no more a title than governor or president is. A *judge* is one who presides in a court of justice, or decides causes; a *ruler* is one who governs, or exercises supreme power over others; and *god* is either the Supreme Being or a false god; but neither of these words can be considered as a title, or an appellation of honor.

Dr. Boone says, that if *Ti* is to be considered a name, such as the name of heaven, the name of the five invisible beings, and the name of the five ancient monarchs of China, it must either be a proper name, or an appellative. On the supposition that it is not the former, Dr. Boone proceeds to discuss the question as to whether it be the latter; and if not, the inference is left to be drawn, that it is no name, but a title. In order to show that *Ti* is not an appellative, Dr. Boone quotes De Sacy, who defines appellative nouns as follows: "Other nouns designate beings by the idea of a nature common to all the individuals of a species, such as man, horse, cat, &c., which do not of themselves call to mind any individual in particular, but are applicable to all the individuals of the same species: these are called appellative nouns." Here, if we understand the drift of the argument, De Sacy is quoted to prove, that *Ti* is not an appellative noun, because, according to him, appellative nouns designate beings by the idea of a common nature; and because *Ti* is applied to different beings who have no common nature, therefore *Ti* is not an appellative. He have no means of judging in what sense De Sacy used the word *nature* here: it is most probable that he intended by it *sort*, *kind*, or particular *character*; because it is not necessary to constitute an appellative noun, that the individuals, to whom it is equally applicable, should have one common nature, as it respects essence or essential qualities.

According to the definition of an appellative or common noun,

given by other grammarians and logicians, it appears that those terms are called *common*, which denote any one individual of a whole class, as *river, conqueror, &c.*; now *conqueror*, and all similar terms, such as *builder, author, maker, savior, parent, tempter, ruler, tyrant, destroyer*, do not necessarily imply that the individual, whom these various classes may include, are of one common nature as it respects their standing in the class of being: they may possess the divine, angelic, or human nature, and yet be equally *builders, makers, rulers, conquerors, &c.*; and the terms descriptive of these classes are undoubtedly appellatives. It would be in vain to call the words *tyrant* and *tempter* titles: they are words descriptive of individuals, who perform certain acts or possess certain attributes; and because there are a number of individuals, who perform those acts, or possess those characteristics, therefore the words, which are equally applicable to all the individuals of this species, are common nouns. So with regard to the words *judge, ruler, or God*, which have been suggested as the translation of *Ti*.

But Dr. Boone says, that in his estimation, the word *Ti* is not used in the sentences quoted in Kánghí as the appellative name of a class of beings; for various reasons: "1. Because it is defined by the lexicographers themselves as a title, i. e. judge, ruler, prince." We submit, however, that these are not titles in the strict sense of the word. Kánghí says that *Ti* is one of the *names* of Heaven. Webster, in his second definition of *judge*, says that it means the Supreme Being. He also gives *The Eternal* as an appellation of God; Gesenius calls *Shaddai*, an epithet of Jehovah. Are these all to be looked upon as titles, or as names of the being referred to? Would it be at all congruous to call *El*, one of the titles of God? 2d. Dr. Boone says, that he can not consider *Ti* as the appellative of a class of beings, because we know from history that "*ming*, in the last clause of the sentence quoted from the commentator on the Shú King," as that which was taken by the five emperors, "must mean *title*, and not *name*, as neither of these emperors were named *Ti*." Their proper names, we admit, were not *Ti*, but *Yáu, Shun, &c.* *Ti*, however, may be considered their cognomen, which latter term denotes a name given from any accident or quality, as Alexander the Great. *Ti* was originally one of the names of Heaven, on account of the universal and impartial justice exercised by the Supreme; the same moral character having been supposed to be exhibited by Yáu and Shun, this cognomen was therefore applied to them, as well as to the Divinity.

Dr. Boone argues, that as *ming*, in the second clause of this sentence means, as he thinks he has shown, a *title*, therefore *ming* in the former part of the sentence must mean a *title* likewise; since the writer could not have used the word *ming* in different senses, as “the reasons assigned why Heaven and the 五帝 *Wú Tì* respectively had this (*ming*) title is the same.” To which we may reply, that this argument makes with equal, if not with greater, force for the other side of the question: and we might say,—as the word *ming* in the first part of the sentence means *name*, one of the names of Heaven,—the word *ming* in the latter part of the sentence must mean *name* also; since the writer, having used the word in the opening clause in one sense, could not have employed it in the same sentence in a different sense, where the reason for its use is the same.

The third cause which prevents Dr. Boone from considering *Tì* as an appellative is, that “the reason given by the commentator why Heaven and the five *Tì* had this *ming* assigned to them, is not that they belonged to the same class of beings, but that they were both judges.” Here, let it be remembered, that Heaven was called *Tì*, on account of the exercise of universally and superlatively just judgment; and because it was considered that the five *Tì* assimilated in their virtuous principles to Heaven, therefore they had the same name applied to them. It was not therefore merely in consequence of judging just judgment, that Heaven and the five *Tì* were alike called by this name; but because there appeared to be some things equally great and good in the judgment they respectively dispensed. They did not originally belong to the same class of beings, but they were considered by their votaries as equally entitled to the name referred to, from their 道同, assimilation in moral qualities.

The fourth reason which Dr. Boone says prevents him from considering *Tì* as the appellative of a class of beings, is, that “the word *Tì*, when applied to the *Shin* who preside over the five elements, is used as a title, and not as an appellative. We have,” he says, “the class of beings referred to designated by the word *Shin*; we have the proper name of each of these *Shin* given, 靈威仰 *Ling-wei-ngáng*, &c.; the separate title of each, *e. g.* Azure *Tì*, Yellow *Tì*, &c.; and lastly, the title of the five collectively, *Wú Tì*, or Five Rulers.” Upon this we may remark, that this affords us the genus, species, and individuals; the genus, or general class of spiritual beings is called *Shin*; all spiritual beings, however, are not called *Tì*,

or designated by the name which is used as the appellative of Heaven, the Divinity. *Ti*, therefore, is the name of a species included in the genus *Shin*; of this species there are various individuals, who have not all the same private designation; a peculiar epithet is therefore used, in conjunction with the name of the species, to designate the different individuals; which individuals are again pointed out by names wholly peculiar to themselves, which are in fact their proper names. Now, in the commentary on the 周禮 *Châu Lí*, from which this account is taken, the word for name, when speaking of the various individuals, *Ling-wei-ngáng*, &c., is 名 *ming*; in the Family Sayings, the word for name, when speaking of the species to which these individuals belong, is also 名 *ming*; and in the Imperial Dictionary, the word for name, when speaking of the genus to which they all belong, is again *ming*. Thus *ming* is used for name, whether speaking of the name of the individual, or the species, or the genus. There is no more reason for rendering the word *ming* by *title*, when speaking of the species, than there is when speaking of the genus, or the individual; and the same reason which would warrant the translation of *ming* in a given way in one place, would warrant its being so rendered in another. As an illustration, we may say, that *man* is the name of the genus to which all human beings belong; *author* is the name of the species of men who write books; while the *author of Waverley* is the name of one individual who is distinguished from all others, by being called the author of a particular work; his proper name, however, is Walter Scott. So *Shin* is the name of the genus of spiritual beings; *Ti* is the name of those spiritual beings who have some agency in the government of nature; and *Tsing Ti* is the name of one individual of that class, rendered distinctive by the combination of a particular name with one common to the whole five; while *Ling-wei-ngáng* is the proper name of such individual, every part of which is peculiar to himself, and none of it common to others.

Dr. Boone says, "if we are correct in translating the word *ming* by *title*, then the argument drawn by the advocates of *Ti* from the Imperial Dictionary falls to the ground." We conceive that he is not correct, and that the usual, if not universal, practice of the compilers of the Imperial Dictionary, with regard to the use of the word *ming*, is against him. *Ming* is used by Kánghí everywhere else, in the sense of name; and it is asking too much, in a question involving important consequences, and in which strong reasons are urged on the other side, to be allowed here to translate it *title*, in

order to carry the point contested. He observes in the next sentence, "that we find nothing in Kánghí, to countenance the idea that *Ti* is the appellative name of God;" to this we reply, that an appellative is an appellation that has become common to several individuals. Kánghí says, that *Ti* is the appellation of Heaven, or the Divinity, and that it is common to several others whom he considers divine: how then can the author of the Essay say, that we find *nothing* to countenance the idea of *Ti* being the appellative name of God, in Kánghí? He says further, "We have the clearest proof that *Ti* is a title conferred on either *Shin* (gods) or men;" we say it is a name, applied either to invisible or visible beings, who are supposed to resemble each other in moral character; but when the word *ming*, which Dr. Boone renders *title*, is used throughout the same book in which it is found, thousands of times in the sense of *name*, we can not conceive on what ground he is warranted in saying we find the clearest proof of its meaning *title*.

In adducing the meanings given in Doctor Morrison's Dictionary, Dr. Boone has quoted that lexicographer as saying, that the 五帝 *Wú Tí* means "the god of Heaven, and the god of the four seasons;" and yet Dr. Boone adds at the close, "It is plain from all the meanings and illustrations given by the Doctor, that *Ti* is not an appellative name of a class of beings."

After quoting the whole of the dictionaries, native and foreign, which he has conceived it right to adduce, Dr. Boone concludes, "that it is clear, beyond all reasonable ground of doubt, that *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese." We can only refer the reader again to what has been adduced and argued from the Imperial Dictionary on this subject; in addition to which we may recall attention to the statement of the Tonic Dictionary called 諧聲字典 *Kiái-shing Tsz'-tien*, quoted on page 10 of the Inquiry, that "*Ti* means the Lord and Governor of Heaven; but because emperors are appointed by Heaven to regulate matters, they are also honored as *Ti*." The same Dictionary has the following: 帝者天之宰也。天之主宰曰帝。身之主宰曰心 *Ti* is the Ruler of heaven; the lord and ruler of Heaven is called *Ti*, as the lord and ruler of the body is called (*sin*) mind." To us, therefore, it is clear, that *Ti* is used as one of the appellatives of God in Chinese, notwithstanding the unhesitating conclusion which we have above quoted.

Dr. B. adds, that "there is no difference of opinion among the dictionaries to be settled by an appeal to the *usus loquendi* of good

writers," and therefore does not appeal to them. We may observe here, that the Chinese do not seem to have doubted that *Ti* is one of the names of Heaven, and therefore do not vary in their statements respecting it. Some may quote the word in this sense, and others may have omitted to quote it with this meaning (for lexicographers, particularly brief ones, do not quote all the meanings that are attached to every word), but we are bold to say, that no Chinese dictionary can be produced, which says that *Ti* is not one of the names of Heaven, or that *Ti* is never used in the sense of the Divinity; as to the *usus loquendi* of good writers, we have given such an abundance of classical quotations in the Inquiry, in order to prove this point, that it is unnecessary here to enlarge. Let the reader carefully consider those, and he will have no reason to doubt, that the best authorities in China use *Ti* in the sense of God by way of eminence.

To the objection that *Ti* means *Ruler* in all cases, and not *God*, Dr. Boone represents its advocates as replying, that in addition to the government of all things being predicated of *Ti*, *Ti* is said to produce all things, to confer a virtuous nature on the people, &c; and as these acts are not properly predicated of a ruler, but of God, therefore *Ti* must in these cases be rendered God, and not ruler. See Inquiry, pp. 12, 13, where the word *Ti* is used absolutely and alone for God, as designating him who produced and governs all things.

Dr. Boone endeavors to invalidate this reply, by saying that "the Being referred to is 天 *T'ien*, whom he calls the chief God; and that it is indifferent whether he is pointed out by his title, or by his name." Here he admits that *T'ien* is the chief God (or, according to our view, God by way of eminence), but says that *Ti* is his title; translating the word 名 *ming* by title, against the universal practice of the author from whom he quotes; and then tells us, that nothing is more common than the use of a title for such a purpose. It would have been as well, however, had he given us some instances where the word *Ruler* (by which he translates *Ti*, and calls it a title) is used alone, and in an unqualified manner, to denote Him who produces and governs all things. These acts are indeed ascribed to "the Ruler of all," but in such connection the phrase is an appellation of the Supreme Being. We may safely say, that no passage can be found in any author, wherein the acts above referred to are predicated of the words *ruler* or *sovereign*, without any qualification or addition: if any can be found, then is the term, when used in such a sense, not to be considered a title, but as one of the appellations of the Being referred to.

Having suggested that it was said by the advocates of *Ti*, that "since it is affirmed of *Ti*, that he produced all things, which act is not properly predicated of a ruler, but of God, therefore the word *Ti* must, in this instance, be rendered *God*, and not *Ruler*:" Dr. Boone endeavors to meet this argument, and to account for the use of *Ti* in such connection, by saying, "if in any case the title, and not the name, is used to designate the individual, when the act performed is not done in virtue of the authority implied by said title, we are not therefore to infer, that the writer uses this title in some unusual sense, not sustained by the common usage of the word; but to suppose that he merely means to designate the particular individual whose well-known designation it is." As an instance of this, Dr. Boone adduces "the king dining at Windsor," and "the king being dead;" these are cases in which, he says, "nothing more is intended by the use of the title *king* than to designate a particular individual as the subject of discourse." Upon this we may remark, that the reply of Dr. Boone, and the illustration adduced by him, do not meet the argument which he professes to answer. In that argument, it was affirmed that an act is ascribed to *Ti*, which is not properly predicated of a mere ruler, but of a God; and therefore *Ti* must in such case be understood as used in the sense of God, and not of ruler. Dr. Boone, in his answer, adduces instances of acts which may properly be designated of a king, such as dining and dying. In the former case, the act spoken of is above, and in the latter only on a level with, the station of the individual designated by the term employed. No mere ruler, unless he be something more, can be said to produce all things; but a mere king, without being anything more, can dine and die. Thus, though we are not required to suppose that the word *king* is employed in an unusual sense, not sustained by the common usage of the word, when it is said that the king dines or dies; yet we are necessitated to suppose that the word *ruler* is used in an unusual sense, not sustained by the common usage of the word, when a ruler is said to produce all things. When all things are said to be produced, the act performed is certainly not done in virtue of the authority implied by the word *ruler*, unless he be the Ruler of all. And if *Ti*, when used alone, designates the *ruler* of all, in Chinese (the same not being the case with the word *ruler* in any other language), then is the word *ruler*, as used by the Chinese, one of the appellations of God by way of eminence, and would be readily understood by them, if used in that sense by foreigners.

In a note on page 82, Dr. Boone undertakes to explain the phrase

“producing all things.” “This phrase,” he says, “is expressed in Chinese by 生萬物 *sang wán wuh*; literally, engendering, or begetting all things;” from which he is led to suspect, that the Chinese intend the begetting all things by the 氣 *k’i*, which he calls the primordial substance. The phrase *sang wán wuh*, 生萬物 is, however, not the only one used by the Chinese in describing the production of all things. In a work called the 前漢賈宜傳 *Tsien Hán kú-i Chuen*, we have the following sentence: “大鈞播物塊垠無垠, the Great Framer spread abroad things, and the atoms were diffused throughout unlimited space.” Upon this a commentator remarks, “陶者作器于鈞上, 此以造物爲大鈞也, 言造化爲人亦猶陶之造瓦耳, a potter forms an earthen vessel upon his wheel; in this passage the maker of all things is called the Great Framer, implying that he makes and transforms men, as the potter makes an earthen vessel.” The dictionaries tell us that 大鈞 the Great Framer is 天 *T’ien*, the Divinity; and that 天 *T’ien* is 帝 *Ti*. Here, the being who makes things, and the mode of making them, are distinctly pointed out. The phrase 生萬物 *sang wán wuh*, is analogous; and when it is employed, we have no need to suspect that anything is intimated by it relative to the begetting of all things by the primordial substance, but simply the making of all things by the Great Framer.

Dr. Boone says, in the note just referred to, that “the production of all things is sometimes ascribed to Heaven, to heaven and earth, to the five elements, to the 陰 *yin* and 陽 *yáng*, and occasionally to 帝 *Ti*, or 上帝 *Shángti*, in modern writers.” Upon this we may observe, that the production of all things is, according to the analogy of Chinese doctrine, properly ascribed to Heaven, or the Divinity, who is the same with *Ti* or *Shángti*. They sometimes use the compound phrase *heaven and earth*, in this connection, referring not to the objects intimated by those terms, but to the ruler over all nature: and if they ever ascribe the production of all things to the five elements, or the *yin* and *yáng*, it is only as these elements and principles are employed by him, who in their estimation is the Divinity.

On page 83, Dr. Boone urges an objection to the use of *Ti*, grounded on its unsuitableness to express the doctrine of the Trinity. On pages 86-88 of the Inquiry, this objection has been re-

plied to. Some remarks, however, contained in the Essay, on this subject not having previously been seen by us, require a distinct notice. Dr. Boone, after setting forth the doctrine of the Trinity, asks, "suppose we were to render the 'Father is Ruler, the Son is Ruler, and the Holy Ghost is Ruler, and these three Persons are one Ruler;' there would be no unity of substance, or *even of nature*, implied by the use of the word *Ti*; for, as we have seen, it is used as the title of living men as well as *Shin* (gods), beings belonging to entirely different species." We reply, that the Chinese use the word *Ti* for God by way of eminence, as well as for invisible intelligences, who have some agency in the management of the world, as has been proved by many quotations from their books. Granting, that the word *Ti* means *Ruler*, it is clear that it also signifies *God*. When a word, capable of two meanings, will in certain connections be readily understood by the natives in one of these two, it is not giving a just representation of the view they would take of a passage written for their information, when translating it back into our language, to affix to it the one which the Chinese would most probably not assign to it. If the Chinese had never used *Ti* for God by way of eminence, and never would understand it in that sense, the rendering of it by *ruler* only would be allowable. Now suppose we reverse the argument, and use *Shin* instead of *Ti* in the sentence here quoted. Seeing that *Shin* never is used, by any Chinese writer, for God καὶ ἕξοχόν, but is proved, by the united testimony of Chinese dictionaries and commentators, to have been used in the sense of *spirit*, we are not at liberty to attach to it an idea which the Chinese never have attached to it; but are compelled to put upon it that interpretation which the natives would most probably assign to it, were they left to themselves. We must therefore render it, "The Father is a Spirit, the Son is a Spirit, and the Holy Ghost is a Spirit." This, we admit, conveys the impression of unity of nature, but we question whether the advocates of trinitarian principles would be satisfied with it. The sentence, we are persuaded would convey to the Chinese mind nothing more than that the three Persons mentioned were spiritual beings, but could not, without a glossary, give the Chinese to understand that the three constituted but one and the same Supreme and Essential Deity, because no Chinese writer ever used the word *Shin* for God καὶ ἕξοχόν.

Should 天帝 *T'ientí* be employed for God, as recommended at the close of the Inquiry, the force of the objection would be still more weakened, because the Chinese never understand *T'ientí* in

any other sense than that of a Divine being, or God. It will be seen that Morrison has used it in this sense, with especial reference to the Trinity; see Inquiry, page 168.

Another objection urged against *Ti* by Dr. Boone, page 84, is, that in the classical works of the Chinese, this epithet is applied only to six beings, who were the objects of religious worship; viz. to 天 *t'ien*, and the 五帝 *Wu Ti*, who presided over the five elements; and from this Dr. Boone infers that *Ti* is not a generic term. But surely it cannot be denied, that the term is generic for these six beings. Whatever those beings were, they all belonged to the same class or species, and *Ti* is the appellative common to them all. Visdelou, in his remarks on this subject, calls them all *Sháng-ti*. His words are, "They give to each of these genii the name of *Shángti*, and also the color appropriated to him. Thus the genius who presides over the east and spring, is that of the element of wood, or the azure *Shángti*," &c. After giving an account of the influence which the various *Shángti* are supposed to have exerted over different dynasties, and of the theory which the Chinese have built thereupon, for the promotion of political designs; he says, "Each of these elements produces a dynasty. Thus the element of wood produces one, and its *Shángti* forms its founder. Then the element of fire another, and so on." Again, "This is the doctrine of the Chinese philosophers regarding the revolutions of the elementary generations, or five *Shángti*. . . . On the doctrine which we have been considering, depends in part the knowledge of what the Chinese deem Divinity: each dynasty, in all its acts, guiding itself solely by the revolutions of that element by whose power it rules, so as to show forth in everything the glory of the *Intelligence* of the dominant element, or the *Shángti* which governs it." In the next section, he says, "Besides the Supreme *Shángti*, who presides over all heaven, there are five other *Shángti*, who preside separately over the five regions of heaven, the five seasons of the year, and the five elements, thus dividing the burden of the Supreme *Shángti*." De Guignes, in a note says, M. Visdelou should have quoted the passages from the authors who establish the belief of these various *Shángti*; as this doctrine is not to be found in the *Shú King*."

It is to be found however in the 孝經 *Hiao King*, where it is said, that "Chau Kung at the celestial sacrifice associated 后稷 *Hautsih* with 天 *Heaven*; and in the ancestral temple, he associated 文王 *Wan wáng* with the *Shángti*." The commentator tells us, that the *Shángti* there mentioned, were the *Shángti* of the

five quarters. Another commentator on the same passage, says, that "those five *Ti* are the azure *Ti* of the eastern quarter, 靈威仰 *Ling-wei-ngáng*; the Red *Ti* of the southern quarter, 赤嫫怒 *Chih-pián-nú*, &c.; and that these *Shángti* of the five quarters are each of them *Shángti*." This is again referred to in the 38th section of the 廣博物志 *Kwáng-poh-wuh Chi*, where the emperor, in sacrificing to the *Shángti* of the eastern quarter, is described as putting on an azure robe and crown; and in sacrificing to the *Shángti* of the southern quarter is said to have put on a red robe and crown, &c., with especial reference to the colors which are supposed to distinguish the five *Ti*. Again, a commentator on the *Chau Li*, Vol. 3. page 10, says, "according to the regulations of the Chau dynasty, the ceremonies observed in sacrificing to the five *Ti* were the same as those observed towards Heaven, in order to denote their elevation; but they differed in some respects from those offered to Heaven, in order to mark the distinction between them."

From a review of the above remarks, we conclude that the 五帝 *Wu Ti*, and 天 *T'ien*, have various points of resemblance. They are alike called *Shángti*, or the Divinity. They are, according to Káng-hí, severally worshiped with the highest honors at the various borders of the country. The ceremonies employed towards them are in many respects alike, to show the resemblance between them. In paying divine honors to ancestors, the highest homage is associating them either with 天 *T'ien*, or the 五帝 *Wu Ti*. These are supposed to have a presiding control, either generally or particularly, over various departments of nature, and to take under their patronage the different dynasties. Neither *T'ien*, nor the 五帝 *Wu Ti*, who preside over the elements, are ever spoken of as deified mortals, and the private names attached to the latter are denounced by the orthodox, as unclassical and superstitious. The inference therefore is, that they are like gods in the Chinese estimation, and that the word *Ti* is an appellative applying equally to the whole six, in the sense of an invisible being not of human origin, having an agency in the government of the world. *Ti* is thus a generic term, used to designate a class of invisible Beings, in the estimation of the Chinese, of the highest kind.

Dr. Boone adds, with regard to Heaven and the *Wu Ti*, that "neither of these invisible beings, distinguished by the title of *Ti*, have ever been worshiped by the people of China, but the worship of them has always been confined to the emperor." This but con-

firms the suggestion we have thrown out in the preceding paragraph, that they were in the estimation of the Chinese invisible beings of the highest kind. For it is a well-known theory of the Chinese, that like must worship like, or the invisible beings can not be induced to come. Thus the emperor worships the Supreme in their estimation, and those who are supposed to resemble him in any way, while the worship of invisible beings of an inferior kind is left to the various grades of officers. Of course, this is a theory of which no Christian can approve; but when the object is to ascertain the views of the Chinese regarding certain invisible beings, we may legitimately infer that the circumstance of their worship being confined to the emperor is a proof of their divinity in the estimation of that people.

Dr. Boone says further, that "the worship of the Five Rulers was discontinued by the Ming dynasty, A. D. 1369, and has never since been resumed; so that the title of *Ti* is applied to only one Being, who is now an object of worship in the state religion, viz. *T'ien*." If so, then the religion of China has assumed a monotheistic feature during the last few hundred years, more decidedly than before; inasmuch as but one invisible and underived Being is designated by a term which is said to be one of the names of Heaven; and only one being is honored with supreme regard in the services of the state ritual; this one being is *Ti*, and therefore God *par excellence* in the estimation of the Chinese.

But Dr. Boone adds, "this Being is not worshiped by any of the people of China, but only by the emperor; the honor of worshipping *Shángti*, the Ruler on High, being reserved exclusively to the *Hwángti*, August Ruler on earth." We grant that the privilege of *sacrificing* to the Supreme, according to the state ritual, is exclusively claimed by the emperor, as the high-priest of the nation; and any interference with such right is considered as a usurpation of imperial dignity, and punished as treason against the state. But every man is at liberty to 事天 serve Heaven, and to 獻天 pray to Heaven, as well as 禋祀 while the ugliest person, if he but fast and bathe, may 祀上帝 even sacrifice to the Supreme in the ordinary way, so long as he does not attempt to imitate any of the sacred rites which are peculiar to the imperial services. Instances of this calling upon and honoring the Supreme occur every day. In a collection of essays by various learned men of the present dynasty, we have one on praying to Heaven, in which the writer speaks of his daily prostrating himself before the Deity in his estimation,

offering up incense with prayers and tears, confessions and supplications, with the greatest reverence to *Shángti*. This must be considered worship, as much as prayer was among the Israelites, under the Mosaic economy, when the business of sacrifice was confined to one class of the people, and the highest services of religion were performed by the high-priest alone. It could not be said, that Jehovah was not worshiped by the people of Israel, because the high-priest alone could enter into the Holiest on the day of atonement; and so *T'ien* or *Shángti* may be worshiped by the people of China though they do not engage in the services of the state ritual. "How can it be maintained," asks Dr. Boone, "that the term *Ti* (thus restricted to one being) is the appellative name of God?" To this we reply, the term *Ti*, or *Shángti*, having been restricted from several beings to one, does not alter its appellative character in the Chinese language, no more than the words *Elohim* and $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ could be considered as less appellatives than before, because these words were taken as the appellations of one Being only, to whom they might be said properly to belong.

With regard to Dr. Boone's argument on page 85, that the use of the word *Ti* for God, in the first commandment, would forbid all obedience to civil rulers, we have only to refer to pages 79-83, of the Inquiry. In addition to what is there said, we may just observe that in Dr. Boone's statement, there is in our estimation a want of consistency, which, if observed, would greatly weaken the force of his objection. He says, supposing the first commandment to run thus: "The Ruler says, besides me thou shalt have no other Ruler;" what does this say, but that *He*, who is *the Ruler par excellence* forbids men to sustain the relationship of *the ruler* towards any other being than himself? Here we may observe, that the word *Ti* in the above sentence, whatever it means, ought to be understood in the same way throughout; if so, then it would mean, "He who is *the Ruler par excellence* forbids men to regard any as *the Ruler par excellence* besides himself;" or he, who is the Divine Ruler, forbids men to regard any as the Divine Ruler besides himself. This we conceive would not be interfering with civil obedience, nor "forbidding men to sustain the relationship of *the ruled*" towards any other being than the one speaking. Whatever that one Being is, he requires men to regard him only as such, and forbids men to look upon any other in the same light. The word must convey the same meaning in the former part of the sentence that it does in the latter; as no writer would use a single term in different senses, when the

reference is the same. Dr. Boone, by varying the term in the sentence, has endeavored to make the commandment thus rendered, bear against civil obedience in what we conceive an inconsequential manner.

For an answer to the other objection urged by Dr. Boone against the use of *Ti* as the translation of *Elohim*, because it would not exclude from religious worship multitudes of beings who are worshipped by the Chinese, we refer our readers to the remarks on page 84 of the Inquiry.

On the subject of 上帝 *Shángti*, and 天帝 *T'ienti*, Dr. Boone remarks, that "Neither of these phrases is the appellative name of God in Chinese; and the use of *T'ienti* could only be advocated on the ground that it was a title of the chief God." In reply to this, we refer to pages 164-168 of the Inquiry, wherein it is shown that *T'ienti* is used by the Chinese literati for various spiritual intelligences, besides the Supreme in their estimation, while the Táuists employ it, not only for the Supreme Being, but consider it as generic for a large class of beings treated by them with divine honors. The Budhists also designate the God 釋加 *Sakya* by the appellation *T'ienti*. Thus it appears that *T'ienti* is not the title of the chief God, but an appellative for Divine beings generally, on which grounds the use of it is advocated.

The remarks of Dr. Boone on page 87, have already occupied our attention in the Inquiry, pages 35, 67, and 84. We merely refer now to his query, "what would be thought of the English translator who should use the word *king* as that whereby to render *Elohim* into English? and yet *king* is not more commonly used as the title of the ruler of the English nation, than *Ti* is as the title of him who rules over the Chinese people." To this we reply, that had the word *king* been used by English writers unqualified and alone, for God by way of eminence, and other invisible intelligences having some share in the management of the world, as has been the well known practice of the Chinese, we should then have been warranted in using that term as the translation of *Elohim*, because it would have conveyed to the English mind the idea which *Elohim* was intended to convey; indeed, we should have been necessitated to use it, if the English had no other term by which to convey the natural idea of God. But allow us to ask, what would have been thought of the English translator who should use the word *spirit* to render *Elohim* into English? And yet *spirit* is not more commonly used for invisible intelligences of every kind, both high and low, good and

bad, among the English, than *Shin* is among the Chinese; while it is admitted by those who plead for the use of *Shin*, that it is never used by any Chinese writer for God $\alpha\lambda' \xi\zeta\omicron\chi\eta\nu$.

After summing up the arguments in favor of *Shin*, Dr. Boone concludes by saying that "whatever objections may be urged against the use of *Shin*, must be answered by the exigencies of the case, and this word must be used to render *Elohim* and $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ *malgré* all objections." This pleading of the exigency of the case as answer to every argument appears to us a tacit admission, that the objections against *Shin* can not be otherwise met. It surely could not have escaped the mind of Dr. Boone that the exigency of the case must be very strong indeed to weigh against all and every objection, and that the exigency of the case could be pleaded on one side as well as the other. Should we say that *Ti*, and its corresponding terms, are the only words which the Chinese language affords to express the idea of God $\alpha\lambda' \xi\zeta\omicron\chi\eta\nu$, and that therefore it must be used to render *Elohim* and $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, in spite of all objections, we are persuaded that Dr. Boone would not readily yield assent to our assertion.

Dr. Boone's statement, that "he would, if he could, remodel the literature of the country, and forbid the employment of *Shin* for the human soul," is equivalent to an admission that it is necessary to remodel the literature of the country, in order to establish his point. If so, then it must appear evident to every attentive observer that he has chosen a wrong term, which he can not carry without turning the language of China upside down. "But we must," he says, "take the Chinese language as it is, and only use the best term it affords us, it being the only medium through which we can make the Chinese acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures." In this we entirely coincide; but this is very different from remodeling the literature of the country as before intimated. "To make ourselves intelligible to a people, we must use their language as they are accustomed to employ it; all departures from this rule will only ensure the defeat of our own object. To use *Shin* for God $\alpha\lambda' \xi\zeta\omicron\chi\eta\nu$ is a departure from this rule; to use *Ti* and its corresponding terms for God by way of eminence, and other invisible beings having an agency in the government of the world, is not; therefore we prefer the latter.

The objection which, in Dr. Boone's estimation, has weighed most with the missionaries against *Shin*, is, that "it is used for so many contemptible deities, that it seems almost a contamination to call Jehovah by a name that is common to such beings." This, however, has had little weight with us. Our objection against the term

is that it means *spirit* in every instance, and God by way of eminence, in none. In this, then, it differs entirely from $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ or *Deus*, which terms, though they were employed for Priapus, Sterentius, &c., were never used for the human spirit, and were frequently employed for God by way of eminence. Let the advocates of *Shin* divest it of the former, and prove that it is used for the latter by sufficient classical authority, and we will gladly adopt *Shin*, notwithstanding it may be used for the whole *turba Decorum*, down to the very lowest and most insignificant Divinity.

ART. II. *Anecdotes given by Chinese authors to inculcate a moral or to illustrate human conduct.*

The man who was anxious about his two-hundredth birthday.

An old man, both rich and honorable, whose sons and grandsons filled his hall, had a large crowd of guests assembled around his door to congratulate him upon his hundredth birthday; but he knit his eyebrows as if he was unhappy, till the crowd asked him what he was grieving at amidst the general joy. "I am not anxious about anything," said he; "only I was thinking that on the anniversary of my two hundredth birthday, there will be many hundreds and thousands more guests, and how shall I be able to remember them all?"

Moral. How silly thus to borrow trouble!

Deducting two taels a night.

There was a kind old man, who took pleasure in charitable acts, who one wintry night saw a man sheltering himself under his eaves, and invited him into his house. A glass of warm spirits cheered him up, and he remained through the night, but owing to the snow the host made him stay that day and the next, when the weather cleared up. As he was about to go, he begged of the old man the loan of a knife; taking it up, he said to him, "We did not know each other before, but I am going to destroy this body in order to requite your great kindness." The old man much surprised, stopped him; "You would greatly injure me by such a deed, for to have a man die in my house without any reason will waste twelve taels or more money, besides all the trouble." The rogue replied, "I avail of your suggestion; it will not be well to have so much annoyance, just

get the twelve taels for me, and I will go." The old man, greatly provoked, aroused the whole neighborhood with his objurgations, but in order to appease him, gave six taels, sighing as the wretch was going, "Who would have thought I should ever meet such an unconscionable man?" "You do'nt call yourself unreasonable," rejoined the chap, "but say that I am so; now if you had but a good heart, you would not only have kept me the three nights, but would not have deducted two taels for every night I stopped here, from what I should have cost you if I had used the knife."

Moral. We regard this man as very ungrateful thus to requite the kindness shown him, but how many people there are in the world like him! Men are placed in positions of power, honor, influence, and emolument by imperial bounty, who never think of the favors they have received, but requite these benefits by injuring the people, destroying their property, and weakening the authority of the monarch. Parents rear their children with infinite labor, anxiety, and expense, and how often these sons regard them as enemies, and embitter their declining years with unnatural ingratitude.

"Leaving me only that wretched beggar."

Cháng and Lí were once walking together, when seeing a rich old man coming in his sedan with many slaves, Cháng pulled his companion aside within a doorway to hide themselves, saying, "The man in that sedan is my near relative, and if I do not retire from his presence, he will needs get out of it to salute me, which would be very troublesome and inconvenient to him." Lí replied, "Of course, then, you ought to step aside." Going on, in a little while, they saw a man on horseback, followed by many runners, whose dress and cap were well arranged; and Cháng again pulled his friend aside into a doorway, observing, "The gentleman on horseback has been my intimate friend from boyhood, and if I meet him it will cause him great trouble, for he will certainly stop and get off his horse to salute me." "To be sure, then, you ought to withdraw," said Lí. They then both went on, and soon saw a beggar, with tattered garments and torn cap, bowling out as he came up. Lí, pulling Cháng, and turning aside into a doorway, said, "This miserable beggar is my near relative and intimate friend, and I wish to avoid him, for if he sees me, he will not be at all ashamed of me." This surprised Chang, who said, "Why do you have such sort of friends?" Lí said, "You pick out all the rich and good for your friends, and leave only the empty handed beggars to annoy me; what else can I do?"

Moral. This general practice of currying favor with the rich, and inducing men to despise the low is very mean: how much more base, when persons lie about it!

The man who wished to be changed into a father.

An old rich man called his debtor to his house and told him, "You barebacked beggar, you've nothing with which you can pay me; swear to me how you will repay me in the coming world, and I will burn the account, and not ask for anything." The man said, "I should wish to be changed into a horse, that your honor might ride me till I had paid the whole debt." Upon this, the old man assented, and taking up the bill burned it. Another one of his debtors, coming in afterwards, and saying, "I should like to become an ox, and plough the fields, or drag the harrow for my lord till my debt was cancelled," he likewise burned his account. Sometime after this, one of his largest debtors remarked to him, that he should like to be changed into his father that he might liquidate his debt. "You not only owe me considerable money, which you will not repay," said the old man, rather provoked, "but you also wish to urge me to depart from right; what justice is there in this?" "Just hear me," rejoined the man; "I owe you a great amount, and instead of being metamorphosed into a horse or an ox in the next world to repay you, I wished much rather to become your father; the care and labor of a life, without regarding myself, might perhaps accumulate many fields and houses, which I should not think of enjoying myself, but would joyfully give them over to you. Would not this be settling your debt!"

Moral. When persons have spendthrift children, who dissipate their wealth like "boiling water or melting snow," such conduct as this old man's is explainable; but it is painful to see an old man growing so foolish.

A dumb man speaking.

A certain beggar feigned dumbness, and begged for alms in the streets and markets, pointing with one finger to his clap-dish, and with the other hand to his lips, grunting, Ah! Ah! One day he got two cash, with which he bought whiskey, and drinking it up, said, "Give me a little more whiskey." The rum-seller said, "You come in here constantly, and have never been able to talk; how is it you can speak to-day?" "I got no money other days, what should make me talk; but I got two cash to-day, and now of course I can say something."

Moral. Money nowadays will make most men speak.

Brothers cultivating a field together.

Two brothers were partners in cultivating the same field, and when the time of harvest came, and the younger was about dividing

the grain, the elder said, "You and I are good brothers, but if we take this petty carefulness about our portions, I am afraid observers will say we are measuring and estimating everything to the loss of harmony and propriety. Let me take the upper part of the grain this year, and you the lower straw part, while next year you can take the upper part, and I will take the lower; and thus alternate year by year." The younger assented. Next year, in the spring, the younger remarked to his brother that it was time to set out the rice shoots, to which he replied, "That is true, but I hear that it is going to be a very dry season this year, and I am decided to plant taro this spring; besides, you agreed to take the upper half of the crop this year, and I the lower part, alternating year by year, which we considered a fair division; and now you must not alter the arrangement."

Moral. Those who scheme only for their own benefit and never think of others, are plenty everywhere, and even friends offend each other in this manner; "but who can tell whether Venerable Heaven will let you trifle so with rectitude?"

ART. III. *Notice regarding Christian Tracts, in the Chinese language, designed for publication under the patronage of the American Tract Society.*

IN connection with the subjoined *Notice*, some facts relative thereto will not be deemed out of place. It is now almost twenty years since the American Tract Society began to appropriate its funds for the publication of tracts in this country, and it has already expended several tens of thousands of dollars in their preparation and publication. From what we know of its generous designs, we are warranted to expect these operations will be continued, and extended, and enlarged. The tracts hitherto distributed by its agency have consisted of Scriptural extracts, translations of its own standard tracts, —or new tracts written for and approved by the Society. To facilitate its operations, a Committee was long ago appointed, consisting of gentlemen, acquainted with the Chinese language, to examine and report to the parent society on all new tracts.

This committee at present consists of three members, the Rev. Bp. Boone of Shánghái, the Rev. Dr. Bridgman of Canton, and the Rev. Wm. Dean of Hongkong.

At a meeting held in Shánghái, in September last, among the resolutions adopted, were two, which we give as we have had them reported to us.

The *first* relates to a *New Series of Tracts*, to be composed of such as shall be written expressly for the Society, or of the old ones thoroughly revised. The *second* refers to the word in Chinese that shall be used for *God*; the Committee, being unanimous that no tract should henceforth be recommended to the Tract Society in which the word *Shángtí* is used for God, resolved to recommend the word *Shin*.

Although any comments or opinion we might express, touching these two resolutions, could have little influence with persons in China whose duty it may be to prepare the *new series of Christian Tracts*, we yet gladly seize the opportunity of expressing our entire and hearty concurrence in the action of the Committee. The old tracts were no doubt the best that could be had when they were adopted; some of them may still be good, and when carefully revised, every way worthy of continued patronage. Still the time has come when new and better ones can, and should be prepared. It is time, too, we think, that some *one* term should be agreed upon, among Protestants, to stand in Christian publications in this language, where *Θεός* does in the Greek, and אלהים in Hebrew. We do not know the opinion of all the Protestant missionaries in China on this subject, but we think that a majority of them prefer the word *Shin*.

N O T I C E .

It is requested, that persons furnishing tracts in Chinese, for the patronage of the American Tract Society, will send to the subscriber six copies of each, for the use of the Committee of examination.

WILLIAM DEAN,

Secretary of Committee.

Hongkong, January 1st, 1849.

ART. IV. *Journal of Occurrences: Robbery in Canton; pirates captured at Shánghái; security enjoyed by foreigners there; cold weather and sickness at Shánghái; death of Rev. John Lloyd; memorial of the governor-general relating to cassia; a god honored by the emperor; opium cultivation extending.*

Robbery and arson. A daring robbery took place on the 11th inst. at Canton. One of the servants in the employ of Messrs. Blenkin, Rawson, & Co. having purloined part of the plate, which he knew would be wanted at a dinner party on the morrow, endeavored to conceal his crime, and convey the impression that the house had been attacked by robbers, by suspending

from the verandah a rope, near which a knife and some loose powder was found, and placing slow matches in such positions as would explode several small parcels of gunpowder in the parlor. The powder went off in the night, destroying the carpet and injuring the furniture, but the noise aroused the household, so that no other damage was done by the fire. The criminal was examined by the magistrates, and we hear has been since beheaded.

Pirates captured at Shánghái. Within the last month, several piratical vessels have been seized, and numbers of their crews brought to Shánghái as prisoners, to be decapitated. These seizures are the results of the special efforts recently made to suppress these piracies, which of late have been so injurious to the native trade. The government has now eight or ten new cruisers building, intended for this service.

Security enjoyed by foreigners, residing in Shánghái, or visiting the place, is gradually extending. By the *Fixed Regulations*, the distance to which they may go is limited to such places as can be visited within one day; no one can be absent from Shánghái beyond 24 hours. But the local authorities are willing to allow a longer period in special cases. Mr. Alcock, H. B. M.'s consul, with his family, and Mr. Interpreter Parkes, left the city for the "Hills," more than a week ago, and are still absent. Two or three weeks since, the Rev. Mr. Way and family, and the Rev. Messrs. Dean and Goddard, with a passport from the intendant of circuit, proceeded in boats, viâ *Chápú*, from Shánghái to Ningpo. The latter gentleman has just returned by the same route. Dr. Medhurst and other missionaries continue to repeat their visits to the neighboring towns and cities. Several Roman Catholic missionaries reside in a village four or five miles from Shánghái, having a residence secured to them there by the Chinese authorities.

Cold weather at Shánghái. The cold wet summer and autumn are likely to be followed by a cold winter. On the morning of the 12th ult., the mercury was below freezing point; and ice formed full half an inch thick. These frosts have given the death-blow to the cotton in this vicinity, and the crop, in many places is exceedingly slender—almost an entire failure.

Sickness. There has been a good deal of sickness among both foreigners and natives at Shánghái. Among the Chinese are some cases of the small pox. This mortality has made the natives unusually devout, and thousands and thousands are going in idolatrous processions, carrying images of their gods in state. One procession, a few days ago, was more than two hours in passing, and scores of men in it were mounted on horseback.

Died, at Amoy, Dec. 6th, Rev. JOHN LLOYD, member of the mission of the Am. Presbyterian Board, aged 35 years. We have heard of this afflictive event from the Rev. W. J. Pohlman, who has communicated some particulars concerning the sickness and death of Mr. Lloyd, and a few biographical notices of his life, labors, and character, contained in an abstract of some remarks spoken at the funeral. He was attacked with typhus fever on Wednesday, Nov. 22d, and by the first of December had apparently passed the crisis of the disease, and so far recovered his strength, that thanks were rendered to Almighty God in the public services of the Sabbath for his healing mercy, and hopes entertained that the sufferer would soon again join in them. On the next morning (4th inst.), an alarming turn of sinking and prostration came on, from which he never rallied, but continued in a state of insensibility and apparent unconsciousness until 4¼ o'clock A. M. of the 6th, when he fell asleep in Jesus, just four years after his arrival.

"The Rev. JOHN LLOYD was born in Huntingdon Co. Pennsylvania, U. S. A., Oct. 1, 1813. The first fifteen years of his life were spent at home, where he received a strict religious training, and as good an education as the district schools afforded. From his sixteenth to his twenty-first year, he acted as clerk in several establishments, and improved all his leisure hours in acquiring knowledge, reading with avidity such books as came in his way, especially

those of a historical character. The pursuits of trade were not, however, congenial to his mind, and he longed to go through a course of study. He commenced his classical studies at Jefferson college, Canonsburgh, Pa., in the spring of 1834, under the presidency of the Rev. M. Brown D. D. In the second session of his collegiate course, there was a powerful revival of religion at the institution, during which, under the ministrations of the president and others, he became a subject of renewing grace. He made a public profession of religion in March, 1835. He has often spoken of a favorite place for prayer by the side of a fallen tree in a field where he retired for communion with his God, and enjoyed many precious seasons of prayer. Between forty and fifty persons made a profession of their faith in Christ at the same time, one of whom was Rev. W. M. Lowrie, who was drowned by pirates, last year near Ningpo, and with whom our departed friend formed a most cordial and delightful intimacy, which continued through life.

"In September, 1839, Mr. Lloyd took his degree of A. B. at Jefferson college, and the next year began his studies with a private clergyman, preparatory to entering the sacred ministry. The degree of Master of Arts was conferred on him at the annual commencement in 1843. In 1841, he entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and in 1844, was licensed to preach the gospel by the Presbytery of New York; and June 22d of the same year he left his native land as a missionary to the Chinese, in the ship Cohota, and reached Macao, Oct. 22. He there met Messrs. Hepburn, Lowrie, and Cole, of the same mission; after consultation with those brethren, and those who accompanied him, it was decided that he should proceed to Amoy with Doct. Hepburn, who was then at Macao on account of his wife's health, which he accordingly did, and reached Amoy, December 6th, 1844.

"His course from that day to this is well known to us all. With earnest alacrity, he devoted his energy and time to the acquisition of this difficult language;—and now when he had nearly reached the goal he aimed at, and was becoming fluent in speaking, it pleased the Master to take him to himself:—thus teaching us, that however well qualified we may be to carry forward the Lord's work he can get along without us, and find other agents to accomplish his purposes.

"To the speaker, Mr. Lloyd was peculiarly dear as a family friend, and an endeared associate nearly all the time of his residence at Amoy. He was kind and uniform in his affections, faithful in his friendship, and equable in his temperament; firmly conscientious in respect to duty, and stable in his personal religion. He was laborious in his efforts to save the souls of the heathen, vigorous, sound and discriminating in his views of truth; in short, he may be characterized as humble, methodical, persevering, devoted and conscientious, a man much beloved, and in whose heart, grace reigned. He was permitted to bear public testimony in favor of Christ among the Chinese, for by applying himself almost exclusively to the spoken language, he made good progress, and could communicate religious truth freely to the people, with whom he was universally popular. Had he lived longer, we had much to hope for from his future labors."

The funeral ceremonies were attended by a large concourse of natives, and an address delivered to them by Rev. Mr. Young with a view to improve the solemn event. The crew of the American ship Carthage, capt. Fox, acted as bearers, and the flags were hung at half mast on the day of his death.

The following memorial from the governor-general is extracted from a late Peking Gazette, for the purpose of showing the misrepresentations of his excellency to his imperial master respecting an affair which happened last summer, and on which he ought to have better informed himself.

SU, acting governor-general, &c., memorializes for the purpose of advising in regard to an individual, who formerly contributed money in his own pro

vince in order that he might receive from government a magistracy in another department, and who relying upon his official standing has been improperly intriguing and borrowing the assistance of foreigners in order to inflict injuries upon other people. Respectfully folded in an inclosure, a memorial is herewith presented, requesting that the affair may be brought up for investigation and judgment, and that the individual mentioned may be degraded from his official rank. Looking up I implore the favor of the Imperial consideration.

I beg leave, therefore, to state in the premises, that the consul of the English nation forwarded a communication, stating that an English merchant had dealings with the firm of Sangtái, and purchased of them cassia to the amount of some tens of thousands of cattie. The vessel which contained the cassia was moored in the river near the Macao Passage. He desired, therefore, to have it removed from the vessel, and placed in the Tungfah storehouse belonging to the said firm. The said Chinese merchants sent to inform the English merchant, that there were several porters, Yáng Meitz' and others, who had contrived with false pretences to prevent the removal of the cassia. Now with reference to the various particulars, as they were related by the Chinese dealer, the request has been presented [by the English consul] that the matter may be taken up and proceeded with according to law, and orders issued prohibiting, &c., &c.

As in duty bound, therefore, having examined, I find that in the sale and transfer of goods between the Chinese and foreigners, when the goods require transporting and to be packed away in the storehouses, the management of all business of this nature is in the hands of the native merchants. The foreign traders have no trouble or concern in the matter. On what ground then does the said consul in such a sudden and unprecedented manner, and in language intolerably arrogant and haughty, demand that a proclamation should be issued; and that too, as it happened, just at the time when orders had been given for the investigation and adjustment of the difficulty? In consequence of the representation of Shau Kí, the chief district magistrate of the district of Pwányü, requesting that the said consul might have leave to make a statement of the circumstances which had already transpired, and in view likewise of the representation of the chief partner of the Sangtái firm having been sent in to the district magistrate, consequently the district magistrate, in connection with the ex-superintendent of the anchorage, Ho Kingling, and others, proceeded to make investigation and adjustment of the affair. The case then was as follows, as appears from their investigation. The firm of Sangtái having sought, but without success, to reduce the wages of the porters, resolved to hire porters of their own choice to perform the work. And this led to an altercation with Yáng Meitz' and his company. The said district magistrate and his associates having however made an earnest representation of the matter, the porters in question began of their own accord to consult about reducing the price of the portage. The chief of the said firm, Meh Fan, not yet having shown his face, an individual, reported as having purchased by contributions to the government the rank, and being designated ultimately to the office, of prefect in the province of Chehkiang, viz. Meh Kingpei, puts himself forth, saying that Meh Fan is his uterine brother, and that he himself had a concern in this business, and trusting to a malignant and contemptuous behavior, he obstinately refused to yield any compliance. There were also two foreign merchants who entered into the controversy, and united their voices in the clamor. The said district magistrate and the others having thus labored to perform their duty in admonishing, and in efforts to arrange the matter properly, although the foreign consul took no actual part in the controversy, yet that he was really leagued with the Chinese, and set them on in their base conduct is most manifest; he having in the meantime sent in a petition praying that the matter might be investigated and adjusted. As in duty bound, therefore, in view of all these circumstances, I sent an official dispatch, ordering the prefect of Kwángchau fu, Yih Táng, to transmit the orders to the said candidate for official rank, Meh Kingpei, and to associate with himself another, an expectant of the office of prefect, Tsáng Lih-ngáng, and that they in concert should make a thorough investigation, and have the matter

properly adjusted. A minute investigation having then been made and completed, afterwards, as appeared from the representation of the said officers respecting the investigation, it was found according to the statement of Meh Kingpei, that he belongs to the district Shunteh. On account of his having made contributions for repairing a fort, he was mentioned for consideration, and was honored with the rank of prefect, being designated to the province of Chehkiáng on account of his being in mourning in his native province.

His elder brother Meh Fan opened a storehouse connected with the Sangtái firm. It appears that a vessel had come from Kwángsí, where she had gone for the purpose of obtaining a cargo of cassia bark, and was anchored in the river about the Macao Passage. The English merchant came to the firm and settled the bargain by the payment of earnest money—but was prevented from getting the cassia removed from the vessel in consequence of the interposition of Yáng Meitsz' and his company, they persisting in demanding that he should hire their laborers—by this means leading to an altercation, as was still further shown. It appears then, upon investigation, that the said firm had sent to Kwángsí, and having bought up a quantity of cassia brought it to the provincial city. But it had not yet been deposited in the storehouse. Wherefore then should the English merchant proceed to make a bargain for the cassia by the payment of a sum of money, before the article had been removed, seeing that always heretofore the care and responsibility of moving goods has devolved upon the masters of shops, and the purchasers have had no occasion to trouble themselves with this business? And wherefore does the English consul in their behalf send in a communication—again bringing the subject forward, and abetting the others in their controversy? Moreover, in the communication of the English consul it was observed, "that according to the account of the affair presented by the Chinese merchant, the porters who objected to the goods being removed by the workmen belonging to the firm, still were not willing in case of any loss or injury being incurred in the removal of the cassia to be responsible for the damages." This bribing of the foreigner on the part of Meh Kingpei, as also his alleging that the porters were not willing to be accountable for the goods, are established by the most positive and reliable evidence. One by one, the several steps in this evil work have been thoroughly sifted and brought to light. The said candidate for official rank in despite of all reason, and being entirely destitute of words, refused to have anything to say or to do upon the subject, thinking no doubt to maintain his cause by his own villainy and artful representations. A petition then having been sent in requesting that a memorial should be presented for his degradation, I the governor, with the others, having taken a thorough review of the subject, find that the poor people employed in carrying burdens are accustomed by this means to obtain their living. On account of the master of the shop having sought to reduce the price of the portorage by employing laborers of his own to perform the work, there would indeed have been reason to apprehend that such a course would tend to deprive them of the means of living. That they should therefore have proceeded to an altercation, and sought to secure their end by hindering the transportation, is not to be wondered at; for it is only in accordance with the principles of justice, and the ordinary feelings of humanity. The aforesaid candidate for official rank, Meh Kingpei, formerly began the world in the capacity of a petty partner in a foreign goods shop. Originally he discharged the office of a sort of broker for market dealers. But having had the good fortune to attain to the quality of an official personage, what then must he do, but falling deeply in love with his dear self, to seek in this manner to diminish the wages for the transportation of the cassia?—thus leading to an altercation with the porters. Being, as already shown, of a base and avaricious character, he has also been found intriguing and endeavoring to bribe the foreign consul, in the first instance to put forth with seeming apprehensions his statement of the matter—and then in the second place to join his voice with the rest in creating a brawl, at the same time in a very singular and improper manner throwing contempt even upon the laws; although the said foreigner was all the while conscious that he was only availing himself of his hypocrisy to set other people by the ears—which having done, he returns

again to his usual quiet and unconcern. If the most rigorous measures are not taken against these wicked and dissolute fellows—and companies of them set themselves to imitate and surpass each other in their misconduct—and they are in haste also to stir up foreigners to combine with them in setting the laws at defiance, then as it respects the keeping the whole body of foreigners and citizens,—a magazine of such combustible materials—in any state of safety or quiet, such a state of things will at least furnish great impediments and render its accomplishment next to impossible. It is but natural and proper therefore that a memorial should be sent in for the purpose of censure, and to request that the Imperial decision touching this Meh Kingpei, having in his own province contributed money in order to purchase the official rank of prefect, may be given—and that immediate measures may be taken to degrade him, in order the more certainly to secure responsible and substantial evidence—that all the facts and circumstances may be particularly and faithfully considered—and that the case be dealt with according to the strict tenor of the law—in order that magistrates being once intrusted with office may beware of holding a secret intercourse with foreigners, or of seeking foreign aid to inflict injuries upon other people.

It appears very strange to us, familiar as we are with the leading tenets of our faith, and conversant chiefly with the usages of Christian countries, that such subjects as the following should be presented to, and receive the approval of, the ruler of a great empire. But not only such, but far more silly and idolatrous acts, are constantly done by this people and their rulers.

Sü Tsihshun, lieut.-governor of Shántung, kneeling, memorializes respecting the Dragon God of the coasts, who has greatly manifested his spiritual protection, at the same time earnestly begging for a new title to be conferred upon him in order to please the popular feeling. Your minister has found that on the Tsihyáng hill, about 30 *li* distant from the district town of Wantang in Tangchau fú, there is a temple to the *Lung Shin* or Dragon God, which is generally reported to have been built in former times; at every time of drought or flood, whenever this god was besought, he answered immediately, and if the traders and fishermen along the coasts suddenly met with winds, and with pure hearts reverently prayed to him, he never failed to turn the tempest into a calm, and preserve their sails and masts. His divine favors also fell on the marts, and the people blessed him for mercies extended to the distant villages.

Now it appears that the people and gentry of the towns and villages have unitedly petitioned, begging that a memorial be presented to the throne requesting an additional title to be conferred; moreover, the intendant of circuit and the prefect have handed in a prepared statement, and the treasurer and judge have also jointly drawn up a paper, containing the truth of the matter. I have also examined the *Tsi Fáh*, or Rules of Worship, which says, "Ability to ward off great calamity, and power to rescue from great distress, both require us to glorify the god's answer to prayers in order to recompense his divine protection." Now the efficacy of the Dragon God on the Tsihyáng hill in Wantang district has already blended with that of the gods of agriculture, and his dewy influence more than equals that of Neptune. It would be right to comply with the popular desire, and looking up I intreat a clear mandate to this effect; and if it be right, I reverently pray that a new title may be conferred in order to magnify his goodness. This will gratify thousands and myriads of people, and extend his power over the wind and rain, while perhaps it will bring the benefits of having an enduring trust for peace during hundreds of years. For this I reverently present this prepared memorial. *Reply.* The memorial is recorded.

The Opium Trade is still encouraged by the Indian government, which, by the following extract from the *Friend of India* of Aug. 24th, appears to be

making its calculations in the true spirit of traders, who look for a larger consumption by cheapening the price of their goods.

"A notification has just been published in the *Calcutta Gazette*, that the supply of opium for the season of 1848-49 will be 36,000 chests. The supply in 1846-47 was 21,469; in the season now closing it was raised to 23,705. The increase in the first year of augmentation was about 7300 chests, and that increase has now been doubled. Considered simply in a financial point of view, the experience of the past year does not appear to justify so sudden and so large an extension of the supply. When we had occasion to allude to the subject last, we offered a conjecture that the larger quantity thrown into the market would have the effect of reducing the price to Rs. 1,000 a chest; but the average of the eleven sales which have taken place up to this time has been only Rs. 850. It may therefore readily be supposed, that the present increased supply in the face of such a diminution of price, must be the result of orders for enlarging the cultivation which were issued before the effect of that increase on the price could have been known. The larger quantity now advertised for the next year, will have the effect of still farther depreciating the price of the drug; and it is much to be questioned whether even so much as Rs. 800 a chest all round, can be expected for the 36,000 chests to be brought forward in the next ten months. In this case it would appear to be the dictate of prudence to return to the system of more limited supplies. We may possibly have omitted some important element which should enter into our calculation; but if we have not, the financial result of the two years 1846-47 and 1848-49 will stand thus:—

Season of 1846-47.	{	22,650 chests, at an average of Rs. 1220, - 2,64,13,000
		Deduct cost of manufacture at 300, - - - 64,95,000
		Net profit, - - - - - 1,99,18,000
Season of 1848-49.	{	36,000 chests, at an average of Rs. 800, - 2,88,00,000
		Deduct manufacturing charges at 300 - 10,00,000
		Net profit, - - - - - 1,80,00,000

The loss will be nearly twenty lacs of rupees, independently of the odium of having assisted to drug a few more millions of the "Flowerly nation."

"If, however, government should determine not to diminish the supply, but to trust to the chances of their making up the deficiency, we may consider the price of this article as permanently reduced, for the present, to a sum ranging from Rs. 750 to Rs. 800 the chest; and the profit derived from the cultivation of the drug in the provinces of Behar and Benares will be brought in a great measure to an equality with the duty obtained from the Malwa opium, being in the one case from Rs. 450 to Rs. 500 the chest; in the other Rs. 400. It is not, therefore, probable that there will be any farther increase of the duty on the article raised in Central India. The equalization has been nearly completed by the double process of augmenting the supply from the Gangetic provinces, and doubling the duty on the Malwa drug. This reduction in the cost of the article, may also have the effect of discouraging competition in China itself. It has generally been supposed that whenever the Emperor, finding it impossible to prevent the importation of the drug into the empire, adopted the plan of legalizing the sale of it, and thereby turned into his own exchequer the revenue furnished by the opium which was now monopolized by his officers, he would at the same time legalize the cultivation of it. It was also supposed that the Chinese agriculturists would be able to raise it with so much more economy as completely to supersede all importations from India. But Doctor Impey, in his valuable treatise on Malwa opium which we recently reviewed, states that the cost of a pecul of opium of 133lbs. raised by the Chinese themselves, ranges from \$300 to \$350, and this opium is so inferior in quality, that any amount that could be produced would not be likely to affect the market in the least. Unless, therefore, there should be a very great improvement in the Chinese mode of cultivation and manipulation, the reduction of the price of opium effected by the increase of production at this Presidency in the past and the future season, will remove the risk of competition in China."

A Correspondent of the *Calcutta Englishman* says that the increased supply is owing rather to the profit it yields the cultivators, than to the desire of the Company to enlarge the sales, which are to be held monthly during the coming year. The importation of opium into China in 1849 will probably be not far from 60,000 chests, and if the exportation of the precious metals goes on as it has during the past year, not less than 20 millions of dollars will be carried to India. While such an amount of specie is drained from a country like this, where mercantile operations are carried on in precious metals, we do not see how the Chinese can be expected to purchase more and more English manufactures, setting aside the injury done to their morals, health, commerce, and industry, by the use of opium.



For use in Library only

For use in Library only

