

blood is Mr. Hunter; and the mere adoption of the opinion by Mr. Hunter, would entitle it to the utmost respect from me, who find the most ardent and independent love of truth, and the genuine stamp of profound genius in every passage of his works. The freedom of the blood from putrefaction while circulating, and its inability to coagulate after death from arsenic, electricity, and lightning, may, like its inability to coagulate when mixed with bile, be simply chemical phenomena, independent of vitality. But its inability to coagulate after death from anger or a blow on the stomach, which deprive the muscles likewise of their usual stiffness; its accelerated coagulation by means of heat, perhaps its diminished coagulation by the admixture of opium; its earlier putridity when drawn from old, than from young, persons; its freezing like eggs, frogs, snails, &c., more readily when once previously frozen (which may be supposed to have exhausted its powers); its directly becoming the solid organised substance of our bodies, while the food requires various intermediate changes, before it is capable of affording nutriment; the organisation (probably to a great degree independent of the neighbouring parts) of lymph effused from the blood; and, finally, the formation of the genital fluids, one, at least, of which must be allowed by all, to be alive, from the blood itself, do appear to me, very strong arguments in favour of the life of the blood.”

Let us now see whether the sacred volume itself does not further support this doctrine of the vitality of the blood. With reference to the passage before us, in which, for the first time, it is apparently taught, we have already stated that we do not think the correctness of the rendering we have adopted can be disputed on grammatical grounds, and Abarbanel has, here, evidently, adopted his interpretation, an erroneous one as we conceive, from not having paid due attention to the accentuation and division of the proposition; but to which, on other occasions, he attaches great importance.† Were there a disjunctive accent after the words “benafsho” (with its life,) then his interpretation would hold good; but, as it is a connective, it is, so far as accentuation has weight, plainly untenable; while the commentaries above referred to, and to which we may also add the Targum of Onkelos, are clearly correct. But prior to entering upon an examination of the other passages

\* “Blumenbach’s Institutions of Physiology,” translated by Dr. Elliotson, Sect. vi. Notes p. p., 43, 44. Dr. Hunter’s arguments may be found in an abridged form in Dr. A. Clark’s Commentary on Levit. xvii. ii., and Encyc. Perth, art. *Blood*.

† It may be known to most of our readers that the Hebrew language possesses an all but perfect system of rhetorical accentuation, known as the Masoretic. The accents which are also musical, are capable of dividing a sentence into the smallest propositions, and may be considered as consisting of two classes, disjunctives and connectives. With the system, however, as presented in the Psalms and some other of the sacred writings, no one is fully conversant.