

foreign power she may redress her own wrongs by her own arms, at her own discretion; she may make reprisals; she may cruise against the property of her members of the league; she may authorize captures, and make open war.

If, sir, this be our political condition, it is time the people of the United States understood it. Let us look for a moment to the practical consequences of these opinions. One State, holding an embargo law unconstitutional, may declare her opinion, and withdraw from the Union. She secedes. Another, forming and expressing the same judgment on a law laying duties on imports, may withdraw also. She secedes. And as, in her opinion, money has been taken out of the pockets of her citizens illegally, under pretence of this law, and as she has power to redress her wrongs, she may demand satisfaction; and, if refused, she may take it with a strong hand. The gentleman has himself pronounced the collection of duties, under existing laws, to be nothing but robbery. Robbers, of course, may be rightfully dispossessed of the fruits of their flagitious crimes; and, therefore, reprisals, impositions on the commerce of other States, foreign alliances against them, or open war, are all modes of redress justly open to the discretion and choice of South Carolina; for she is to judge of her own rights, and to seek satisfaction for her own wrongs, in her own way.

But, sir, a third State is of opinion, not only that these laws of impost are constitutional, but that it is the absolute duty of Congress to pass and to maintain such laws; and that, by omitting to pass and maintain them, its constitutional obligations would be grossly disregarded. She relinquished the power of protection, she might allege, and allege truly, herself, and gave it up to Congress, on the faith that Congress would exercise it. If Congress now refuse to exercise it, Congress does, as she may insist, break the condition of the grant, and thus manifestly violate the constitution; and for this violation of the Constitution, she may threaten to secede also. Virginia may secede, and hold the fortresses in the Chesapeake. The Western States may secede, and take to their own use the public lands. Louisiana may secede, if she choose, form a foreign alliance, and hold the mouth of the Mississippi. If one State may secede, ten may do so—twenty three may do so. Sir, as these secessions go on, one after another, what is to constitute the United States? Whose will be the army? Whose the navy? Who will pay the debt? Who will fulfil the public treaties? Who perform the constitutional guarantees? Who govern this District and the Territories? Who retain the public property?

Mr. President, every man must see that these are all questions which can arise only after a revolution. They presuppose the breaking up of the Government. While the constitution lasts, they are repressed; they spring up to annoy and startle us only from its grave.

The constitution does not provide for events which must be preceded by its own destruction. Secession, therefore, since it must bring these consequences with it, is revolutionary. And nullification is equally revolutionary. What is revolution? Why, sir, that is revolution, which overturns, or controls, or successfully resists the existing public authority; that which arrests the exercise of the supreme power; that which introduces new paramount authority into the rule of the State. Now, sir, this is the precise object of nullification. It attempts to supersede the supreme legislative authority. It arrests the arm of the Executive Magistrate. It interrupts the exercise of the accustomed judicial power. Under the name of an ordinance, it declares null and void, within the State, all the revenue laws of the United States.—Is not this revolutionary? Sir, so soon as this ordinance shall be carried into effect, a revolution will have commenced in South Carolina. She will have thrown off the authority which her citizens have heretofore been subject. She will have declared her own opinions and her own will to be above the laws, and above the power of those who are entrusted with their administration. If she makes good these declarations, she is revolutionized. As to her, it is as distinctly a change of the supreme power, as the American revolution of 1776. That revolution did not subvert Government in all its forms. It did not subvert local laws and municipal administrations. It only threw off the domination of a Power, claiming to be superior, and to have a right, in many important respects, to exercise legal authority. Thinking this authority to have been usurped or abused, the American colonies, now the United States, bade it defiance, and freed themselves from it by means of a revolution. But that revolution left them with their own municipal laws still, and the forms of local Government. If Carolina now shall effectually resist the laws of Congress, if she shall resist the laws of Congress, if she shall be her own judge, take her remedy into her own hands, obey the laws of the Union when she pleases, and disobey them when she pleases, she will relieve herself from a paramount power as distinctly as the American colonies did the same thing in 1776. In other words, she will achieve, as to herself, a revolution.

But, sir, while practical nullification in South Carolina would be, as to herself, actual and distinct revolution, its necessary tendency must also be to spread revolution, and to break up the constitution, as to all other States. It strikes a deadly blow at the vital principle of the whole Union. To allow State secession to the laws of Congress to be rightful and proper, to admit nullification in some States, and yet not expect to see a dismemberment of the entire Government, appears to me the wildest illusion, and the most extravagant folly. The gentleman seems

not conscious of the direction or the rapidity of his own course. The current of his opinions sweeps him along, he knows not whither. To begin with nullification, with the avowed intent, nevertheless, not to proceed to secession, dismemberment, and general revolution, is as if one were to take the plunge of Niagara, and cry out that he would stop half way down. In the one case, as in the other, the rash adventurer must go to the bottom of the dark abyss below, were it not that the abyss has no discovered bottom.

Nullification, if successful, arrests the power of the law, absolves citizens from their duty, subverts the foundation both of protection and obedience, dispenses with oaths and obligations of allegiance, and elevates another authority to supreme command. Is not this revolution? And it raises to supreme command four and twenty distinct powers, each professing to be under a General Government, and yet each setting its laws at defiance at pleasure. Is not this anarchy as well as revolution? Sir, the constitution of the United States was received as a whole, and for the whole country. It cannot stand altogether; it cannot stand in parts; and if the laws cannot be executed any where, they cannot long be executed any where. The gentleman very well knows that all duties and imposts must be uniform throughout the country. He knows that we cannot have one rule or one law for South Carolina, and another for other States. He must see, therefore, and does see, every man sees, that the only alternative is a repeal of the laws, throughout the whole Union, or their execution in Carolina as well as elsewhere. And his repeal is demanded because a single State interposes her veto, and threatens resistance! The result of the gentleman's opinions, or rather the very text of his doctrine, is, that no act of Congress can bind all the States, the constitutionality of which is not admitted by all; or, in other words, that no single State is bound, against its own dissent, by a law of impost. This is precisely the evil experienced under the old confederation, and for remedy of which this constitution was adopted. The leading object in establishing this Government, an object forced on the country by the condition of the times, and the absolute necessity of the law, was to give to Congress power to lay and collect imposts without the consent of particular States. The revolutionary debt remained unpaid; the national treasury was bankrupt; the country was destitute of credit; Congress issued its requisitions on the States, and the States neglected them; there was no power of coercion, but war; Congress could not lay imposts, or other taxes, by its own authority; the whole General Government, therefore, was little more than a name. The articles of confederation, as to purposes of revenue and finance, were nearly a dead letter. The country sought to escape from this condition, at once feeble and disgraceful, by constituting a Government which should have power, of itself, to lay duties and taxes, and to pay the public debt, and provide for the general welfare; and to lay these duties and taxes in all the States, without asking the consent of the State Governments.—This was the very power on which the new constitution was to depend for all its ability to do good; and, without it, it can be no Government, now or at any time.—Ye, sir, it is precisely against this power, so absolutely indispensable to the very being of the Government, that South Carolina directs her ordinance. She attacks the Government in its authority to raise revenue, the very main spring of the whole system; and, if she succeed, every movement of that system must inevitably cease. It is of no avail that she declares that she does not resist the law as a revenue law, but as a law for protecting manufactures. It is a revenue law; it is the very law by force of which the revenue is collected; if it be arrested in any State, the revenue ceases in that State; it is, in a word, the sole reliance of the Government for the means of maintaining itself and performing its duties.

Mr. President, the alleged right of a State to decide constitutional questions for herself necessarily leads to force, because other States must have the same right, and because different States will decide differently; and when these questions arise between States, if there be no superior power, they can be decided only by the law of force. On entering into the Union, the people of each State gave up a part of their own power to make laws for themselves, in consideration that, as to common objects, they should have a part in making laws for other States. In other words, the people of all the States agreed to create a common Government, for example, yielded the right of laying imposts in her own ports, in consideration that the new Government, in which she was to have a share, should possess the power of laying imposts in all the States. If South Carolina now refuses to submit to this power, she breaks the condition on which other States entered into the Union. She partakes of the common councils and therein assists to bind others, while she refuses to be bound herself. It makes no difference in the case whether she does all this without reason or pretext, or whether she sets up as a reason that, in her judgment, the acts complained of are unconstitutional. In the judgment of other States, they are not so. It is nothing to them that she offers some reason or some apology for her conduct, if it be one which they do not admit. It is not to be expected that any State will violate her duty without some plausible pretext. That would be too rash a defiance of the opinion of mankind. But if it be a pretext which lies in her own breast; if it be more than an opinion which she says she has formed, how can other States be satisfied with this? How can they allow her to be judge of her own obligations? Or, if she may judge of her obligations, may they not judge of their rights also? May not the twenty three enter into an opinion as well as the twenty fourth? And, if it be their right, in their own opinion, as expressed in the common council, to enforce the law against her, how is she to say that her right and her opinion are to be every thing, and their right and their opinion no thing?

[To be continued.]

To the Editor of the Eastern Shore Whig and People's Advocate.

Mr. MULLIN:—The following address was prepared in view of the fact—as intimated in the introduction—that our citizens at large are but partially acquainted with the subject. True; Temperance Societies have been in existence among us for some time—they have accomplished much good—and their officers and members deserve commendation for their exertions. But, in comparison with what has been done in other places and can be done here, we have merely made a promising commencement. Proper measures should be taken to arouse the whole community. The friends of the cause should spare no pains or expense in disseminating information in regard to its principles and progress. In the 1st No. of the "American Quarterly Temperance Magazine," which has come to hand within a few days, it is stated, that "millions of Reports, Essays, Addresses, Circulars, &c. have been published, and for the most part, gratuitously circulated among all classes." But this species of effort has been almost unknown among us. I might here suggest the propriety of adopting certain plans which have proved, elsewhere, eminently successful; but, for fear of being accused of some degree of arrogance, I leave the matter to men of more age and influence.

I have liberally availed myself of appropriate documents. This was essential to my purpose. I am principally indebted to the 4th and 5th Reports of the Parent Institution. Could a few hundreds of these reports and some thousands of the smaller circulars be distributed throughout this and the adjacent counties, they would effect incalculable good. Besides the Reports, the minor periodicals have supplied me with several interesting items. Among the authorities consulted in regard to ancient intemperance, may be mentioned, beside the Bible, "Potter's Grecian Antiquities," "Horne's Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures," and "Anthon's Corrected Lempiere," with others of similar character.

I have furnished you with a copy of the Address for publication in compliance with repeated requests, from quarters that deserve respect,—and in the hope that it may be of some advantage. Some recent information has been inserted in a few places; but I have found it almost impossible to keep pace with the constantly increasing prosperity of the cause.

T. H. S.

ADDRESS

Delivered in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Easton, before the Temperance Society of Talbot County, on the 26th day of February, 1835, by the Rev. THOMAS H. STOCKTON. Published at the solicitation of the Board of Officers of the Society.

Mr. President:—The presence of this assembly—in number, character, and influence so worthy the occasion—awakens in my heart many solemn and many pleasing reflections. I feel solemn, sir, when I think that an infatigating sin has been spreading, through all our borders, poverty, disease, imbecility of mind, impurity of heart, wickedness of conduct, misery and death. At the same time, I cannot but rejoice that the people have so generally risen up, lamenting the past, improving the present, summoning strength for the future, and evincing a resolution to continue strong exertions; until, by the help of God, the sin shall be subdued and the retributive wretchedness connected with it be no more known. In attempting, sir, to fulfil my appointment, I labour under a certain difficulty. Doubtless there are many here who, by the history of the Great Temperance Reformation, are familiarly acquainted with the history of intemperance; while, on the other hand, I have been assured that the subject has never been fully exhibited to our citizens in a public address; and that, in all probability, the majority of them have not become thoroughly acquainted with it by the more private means of illumination. To attract the attention of the first class, it is original and new; but, to the second, it is a statement of facts and arguments which, to others, may be trite and uninteresting. Under these circumstances, I shall endeavour to pursue a course corresponding with that of a man that is an household, which—in the language of our Saviour—"brings forth out of his treasure things new and old."

That we may have a general view of the subject and its most important connections, I propose to offer, in the first place, a condensed sketch of the History of Intemperance—to follow—and then conclude by presenting and enforcing such motives as may have a tendency to unite the energies of the country in vigorous promotion of the common object. In tracing the History of Intemperance it is not sufficient, in my humble opinion, that we notice its prevalence within the last few centuries. I am aware that this is the general course; but it appears to me that we shall feel it—as it must be considered in truth—not only as one of the worst of sins and the world of all others, but also as one of the oldest. It is a fact, sir, that Intemperance has been the scourge of our race from the earliest ages. Although alcohol, as a separate substance, was unknown for 5000 years, its effects have caused mourning almost from the beginning of the world.

In the Jewish Scriptures—some of which, as you all know—are the oldest writings extant,—we frequently meet with the terms wine, strong drink, mixed wine, and others of a similar character. Under these denominations may be classed the most of the intoxicating liquors known to the nations of antiquity. It may be of some importance to notice their character.

It appears that the vice was originally evil. "For some of the particulars in regard to the drinks above mentioned, I am indebted to various passages in the invaluable commentary of the late Dr. Adam Clarke:—a name revered by me with gratitude by thousands upon thousands—a name that, both for its associations, strength of mind; purity of heart; extent of learning; innocence, piety and benevolence of life; and the rendering of inestimable services to the ministry, the church, and the world. Oft-while pursuing the result of his arduous labours on earth, I rejoice at the thought of the rest and the glory he now inherits in Heaven. His "Life" written by himself, is now in press and is looked for with much interest.

merely for the pleasure of eating the grapes. In after times, it became the custom to express the juice and use it as a drink. Thus, in the vision of Pharaoh's chief butler, he is represented as pressing the clusters of ripe grapes into the cup. This was the first kind of wine. It is probable that no other was in use for several centuries. Then the wine-press was invented, and fermented wine became common. Other fruits than the grape were also employed in the manufacture, such as corn, dates, apples; and thus a variety of wines were produced. Of these, the palm-wine, or date-wine, was, perhaps, the strongest. This, from the abundance of palm trees in Judea, was very plentiful among the Jews. Some writers suppose that this species is particularly alluded to by the term "strong drink"; but others consider this a general name referring to all fermented liquors. The "mixed-wine" was an adulteration of the pure wine,—by the addition of higher and more powerful ingredients, such as honey, spices, opiates and other strong drugs." In the Song of Solomon, we read of "spiced wine." This may come under the above general description. I derived a pleasant flavour from frankincense, myrrh, calamus and other spices. In other passages, we meet with the phrase "strong wine." This denotes weak wine, such as labourers drank in the harvest field; or sour wine, similar to that in common use for the table.

The "mixed wine" of the Greeks and Romans was different from that of the Jews. Instead of being stronger than their pure wine, it was much weaker, being diluted by one, two, or three parts of water. The early Greeks were in the habit of mingling warm water with their wine; but the later and more prevalent custom among them and the Romans also, was to render it as cold as possible by the use of ice, which they preserved through the greatest heat of summer. The Persians are said to have been very fond of a mixture of meat and wine.

Who was the inventor of wine cannot be ascertained—neither can the time of its invention. The heathens ascribed the invention sometimes to their gods and sometimes to their princes. The Jewish Rabbins were of opinion that the vine was the "tree of knowledge of good and evil," the fruit of which was prohibited to Adam and Eve in Paradise. Dr. Lightfoot, one of the ablest biblical expositors of modern times, adopted the same sentiment. And, were we to regard only the evil consequences that have resulted from improper use of wine, the desire it has created for stronger—and more pernicious drinks, the opinion would not seem improvable. What else has proved so great a curse to man? Were this hypothesis established, the inference would be plausible that wine was known to the Antediluvians; for it could not be reasonable to suppose that they cultivated the grape for more than a thousand years, without thinking of expressing its juice. And, indeed, there are several intimations in their biblical history that indicate the demoralizing influence of some cause analogous to intemperance.

The first case on record of an intoxicated man is that of Noah. In the 9th ch. of Genesis, it is related that he "planted a vineyard and drank of the wine and was drunken." His drunkenness, however, in all probability, was accidental. This conclusion is favoured by the general circumstances of the case, and strengthened by the particular fact of there being no account that he was ever again in the same condition. Hence some have supposed that wine owes its origin to Noah—that he was the first who made it and proved its qualities by personal experiment. However this may have been, the case is but little doubt that a single case has passed by from the time of Noah until now in which intemperance was unknown. And there is no extravagance in the assertion, that the almost total depopulation of the globe by the deluge of water was but a slight calamity in comparison with the destruction that has since been caused by this ever flowing flood of fire.

The effects of intemperance in the days of old were similar to those witnessed in our own days. It transformed the amiable—the honorable and the wise, into the silly, the senile, and the unaccountable. And did it not, in thousands of instances, cause but little doubt, the tingling, result in death? Look at Amnion, the celebrated tonicist; his long life was disgraced by the most disgusting conduct. He was at last choked with a grape stone, and died. The memory of his vices was perpetuated by a statue in the citadel of Athens, representing him as an old drunken man, singing, with every mark of dissipation and intemperance. Look at Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse. So overjoyed was he by learning that one of his tragedies had gained a prize, that he offered a solemn sacrifice; feasted all his subjects, and drank to such excess as to cause his death. Look also, at Alexander the Great. Peculiarly blessed in natural endowments, in educational advantages—and in all the facilities necessary to the attainment of unbounded power, he made himself master of the world;—then became the slave of his own passions; then murdered, in a drunken revel, the friend to whom he owed the preservation of his life; and then perished himself, leaving the corpse of a son on the tombstone of the earth. Hebraean, another of his friends, had previously died from the same cause. Marius, the stern Roman Consul, is said to have hastened his death by intemperance; and Jovian, one of the most eminent of the same awful vice. Besides these individual instances, there might be others mentioned in which multitudes were involved in ruin. I will call up to your recollection one or two. The Scythians invaded the dominions of Cyaxares, King of Media, took possession of a part of them and retained it for nearly thirty years. The Median monarch, still being unable to expel them by force of arms, resorted to stratagem. He invited the Scythians to a feast. They came—abandoned themselves to intoxication—proved an easy prey to their foe—and lost at once their conquest and their lives. Again, when the Fidenates marched against Rome and threatened it with destruction, unless the citizens would comply with a condition which they would have scorned as long as they had life; Philo, a maid servant, devised and accomplished a successful plan of deliverance. At the head of all the female slaves, in appropriate disguise, she presented herself and her associates to the enemy; as though the matrons and their daughters had indeed obeyed the bidding. A feast was prepared—the Fidenates were soon drunk and asleep—and then the fitted torch of Philo called forth the Roman bands to a triumph.

But it is my desire, sir, to direct attention, more particularly, to the effects of ancient intemperance, as exhibited in the events and descriptions recorded by the historians and moralists of the Bible. And I make no apology for saying that I have diligently collated many passages of this part of the subject; and have endeavoured to give such an arrangement to the effects ascertained as may make some impression upon the audience now, and also subserve our purposes in a subsequent part of the address.

Among the events alluded to, notice that which occurred in the case of Noah—a disgraceful exposure to the unhalloved mockery of his own son. Look also, at the case of Lot. Having been delivered, by the angel of the Lord, from the fiery destruction of the cities of the plain, because of his righteousness, see him twice overcome in his mountain retreat, by the spell of wine, and, think, if you can endure the thought, of the unspeakable outrage that followed. Notice the account of Nabal. He had large possessions, and was therefore styled "very great"; as some men now are, for no better cause. But, under the influence of intemperance, he was churlish—and spiteful—and foolish—and stupid—and cowardly. He was blessed—as many a man of similar character now is—with a beautiful, sensible and amiable wife. By her prudence and address, he was saved from the sword of David, drawn against him in consequence of his unparalleled meanness. When he was really in danger, he knew it not;—"his heart was merry within him for he was very drunken." But when, on becoming sober, he was informed of his past peril, the fright that succeeded was petrifying to his tremulous system—"his heart died within him and he became as a stone." His end rapidly approached. In ten days, "the Lord smote Nabal that he died."

Another case, sir, is that of ELAH. He reigned over Israel two years;—and had not been a drunkard he might have reigned longer. But Zimri, the "captain of half his chariots conspired against him"—thinking, perhaps, that a drunken king might be readily dethroned. A favourable opportunity soon opened the way for the accomplishment of his design. On a certain day, while Elah was "drinking himself drunk, in the house of Arza, steward of his house in Tirzah," Zimri went in and smote him—and killed him—and reigned in his stead. I will mention yet one more case. You remember that "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." Then, being doubtless already drunk, he called for the "golden and silver vessels" which had been brought from "the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem" and he "and his princes and his wives and his concubines drank in them." That was insulting Omnipotence. But they went still farther. While they thus desecrated the sacred chalices of the true and living God, they "praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone." And now hear the strange and solemn history. "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick, upon the plaster of the wall"—"MENE—MENE—TAKEL—UPHARSIN." "In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain, and Darius the Median took the kingdom."

These, sir, were some of the effects of ancient intemperance as illustrated by Bible narratives. You perceive that they range through various degrees, from the shame of nakedness to the overthrow of an empire.

Let us now observe some more sentences descriptive of the evils occasioned by this hateful vice, furnished in other passages of the sacred writings.

1. It caused men to disgrace themselves in the streets and highways. Hence the common expression—"stagger, like a drunken man"—"read to and fro and stagger like a drunken man"—and again, "as a drunken man staggereth in his vomit"—and yet once more, in still stronger but suitable terms, "drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall and rise no more."

2. It made men careless and caused them bodily injury. I therefore proverbially—"a thorn goeth up into the hand of a drunkard"—implying such a degree of thoughtlessness that he would be as likely to grasp a thorn as a blessing. Hence, also, the following queries and answers.—"Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? Who hath contentions? Who hath tabling? Who hath wounds without cause? Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine, they that go to seek mixed wine."

3. It deceived men, and made them passionate, and foolish. Thus it is said—"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."

4. It loved men's souls. Thus it is said—"He that loveth wine shall not be rich." And again—"The drunkard shall come to poverty." And again—"Let him drink and forget his poverty"; implying that this is the general course of the poor wretch. First, he drinks;—then he becomes poor;—and then he continues to drink that he may forget his poverty, as if such a measure would raise him to his original estate, instead of sinking him, as it inevitably must, lower and yet lower.

5. It made men proud and covetous. Hence it is said—"Because he transgresseth by wine, he is a proud man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and is as death and cannot be satisfied."

6. It was associated with disobedience to parents and was doubtless one of its causes. Hence the severe regulation in the law of Moses—that a son, whose parents should declare him guilty of drunkenness and other specified vices, should be stoned to death.

7. It was connected—doubtless here also as a cause—with oppression of the poor. Hence some were stigmatized by the prophet Amos as brutish, and characterised as those "which oppress the poor, which crush the needy, which say to their masters,—Bring, and let us drink."

8. It made men disobedient to God. Therefore the prophet Isaiah complained that when the Lord had called the people to self-abasement, they acted in a way precisely the opposite of that commanded, saying—"Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die."

9. It induced men to make a mockery of the people of God. Hence the Psalmist says—"I was the song of the drunkards."

10. It induced men to yield to bribery. Hence they who were "mighty to drink wine and men of strength to mingle strong drink" were stigmatized as those "which justified the wicked for a reward, and took away the righteousness of the righteous from him."

Finally—"I sent men to hell. Hence it is said—"The four-hall hath enlarged herself and opened her mouth without measure, and their glory and their multitude and their pomp and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it."

Here, sir, you have some additional effects of ancient intemperance, and you will readily acknowledge that they correspond, if not fully, yet in a very melancholy degree with the consequences of the same sin in modern times.

To what extent the excessive use of intoxicating liquors prevailed among the masses of the people, in ancient times, I am but partially prepared to say. There are no statistical records; or if there be any, I am ignorant of them. We have already seen that some of the most distinguished men in history owed their ruin to intemperance. Many other names might be added, such as—Echylus, among the poets—Eruisus of Bythos, among kings—and Tiberius, Trajan and Verus, of the Roman Emperors. Of Tiberius, it was said, by Seneca, that he never was intoxicated but once all his life.—The explanation of which is, that from the time he took to drink to the time of his death, he was never sober. Mark

Antony is reported to have been the greatest drunkard in the Roman Empire; and to have written "a book in praise of drunkenness." Marcus, the son of Cicero, was such an abandoned inebriate, that according to Pliny, he appeared desirous of rivaling or excelling even Antony. From these conspicuous cases—and they might be multiplied almost indefinitely—we would be justified in the inference that intemperance prevailed to an awful extent among the populace; for they generally follow patrician example. If some inference may be drawn from their mythology. Several of their gods and demi-gods—as Bacchus and Silenus—were nothing more than personifications of drunkenness. Indeed, we know that drunkenness was a part of their religion. The very name of their feasts was derived from the opinion that "they were obliged, in duty to the gods, to be drunk." And the manner in which they celebrated their almost innumerable festivals—particularly the Bacchanalia—affords the most mournful evidence that the vice was general, in its lowest degrees and most loathsome associations. Men and women, like bands of ferries, "ran about the hills" with shameful gestures and frantic exclamations; and indulged, according to St. Peter's description of Gentile corruption, in every "excess of riot." Their entertainments were like a degraded "Drink, or begone" were the alternatives of the guests. It was customary to drink to gods and friends; frequently a brimming cup for every letter in the name. Drinking matches were common. In one instance, thirty persons died on the spot; striving for the prize, and soon after, six more in their tents. These facts exhibit a most deplorable state of society; and this existed among many people. Not only the Greeks and Romans, but the Egyptians, Scythians, Persians, Parthians and Germans were all addicted to drunkenness. Of the inhabitants of a town in Sicily, it was said—"The people of Leontini are always at their cups"—and the Lesbians were sunk so low that their name became a proverb indicative of the vilest dissipation.

From the general tenor of history there can be no doubt that the prosperity of ancient states was materially injured by prevalent intemperance in the use of stimulating drinks. This, in all probability, was one of the principal causes of their decline and ruin. Nearly all the founders of great empires were remarkable rather for hardihood and austerity than licentious devotion to sensual gratifications of any kind. And, as long as the severer virtues were perpetuated among the mass of any people, so long their government flourished; but, as soon as these virtues were succeeded by the unchecked reign of the baser animal desires and the pursuit in particular of inebriating pleasures, so soon the public weal began to decline; and, as long as these vices prevailed, it continued to decline, until some mightier race, fresh from nature's unlighted soil, rushed forth, with unimpaired vigour and unsoftened bravery, and established themselves, with scarcely a struggle, amidst the splendid memorials of refinement, opulence and power—all lost to their original possessors by the enervating and debasing influence of gross luxurious indulgence.

I come now, sir, to the consideration of a part of the subject more immediately connected, if not with the interests yet with the constitution of our society. I allude to modern intemperance—with reference chiefly to the introduction and use of distilled spirits.

It is stated in the Appendix to the 4th Report of the American Temperance Society, but the time is not specified—that alcohol was discovered by a Mohammedan Alchemist. I know not upon what authority the declaration rests. The discovery has been attributed, among others, to Arnaud, a physician, of Villeuve, in Provence; who flourished about the middle of the 13th century. But, let the question of its origin be decided in any way, Arnaud was certainly acquainted with its nature, and well understood some of its qualities, although he was greatly deceived in regard to others.—From his knowledge of it, however, the invention must be referred back nearly six hundred years at least. It is said that "the first ardent spirit known in Europe was made from grapes;—and that "the Genoese afterwards prepared it from grain, and sold it in small bottles, at a very high price, under the name of aqua vita, or the water of life."

At the close of the 13th century, it was introduced into Italy and Spain. A Spanish physician is said to have been the first who employed it in this way. For about three centuries, it was applied to no other purpose, and was sold only by the Apothecary.—It seems that "a liquor termed aqua vita" was known in Ireland, in the reign of Henry VIII., who decreed that there should be but one maker of it in any borough or town. This is "supposed to have been brandy." In 1556, an act of parliament was passed at Drogheda, against distilling it at all; it being described, in the language of the act, as a drink not profitable to be daily drunk and used.—"Would it not be well for more modern legislators to imitate the example of this Irish Legislature?"

In the reign of William and Mary, an act was very unwisely passed in England, "for the encouragement of distillation." Deplorable effects were immediately witnessed; and the government had to resort to counteracting measures. A long interval occurred before they proved successful. During this time, in the language of Dr. Smollett, "such a shameful degree of profligacy prevailed, that the retailers of this poisonous compound (gin) set up unnumbered houses in public, inviting the people to be drunk for the small expense of a penny, assuring them that they might be dead drunk for two pence, and have straw to lie on till they recovered, for nothing." Notwithstanding such melancholy experience of the improprity of encouraging the use of ardent spirit, the "restrictions that had been imposed on the sale of gin," were removed in 1827—and in the two succeeding years the consumption is said to have increased "twelve millions of gallons." The demand has become greater and greater, until, according to a recent statement, the quantity of distilled spirits consumed annually in Great Britain, amounts to 40,000,000 of gallons.

But we have a nearer interest in the history of intemperance in our own country; and to this branch of the subject I now invite your attention.

It appears that distilled spirits did not come into general use in this country until after the Revolution. During the Revolution, they were furnished to the soldiers by the government;—but, had as much been known then, as is now almost universally admitted to be true, and had government withheld, instead of proffering these liquors, the toils of our illustrious forefathers might have been more easily endured, and their victories have cost less time—less treasure—and less blood. I am far from designing by this to attach the slightest discredit to their character. I should blush could I think that any man has a greater veneration for their memory than my own heart feels;—or that any man prizes more highly than I the inestimable birth-right inheritance, which, under God, they so gloriously won for us all. I made the observation merely to impress upon your minds this conceded fact—that even