

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1842.

No. II.

Samuel Miller

ART. I.—*The Life and Times of Red-Jacket, or Sa-Go-Ye-Wat-Ha ; being the sequel to the History of the Six Nations.* By William L. Stone. Svo. pp. 484. New York and London. Wiley and Putnam. 1841.

IN the volume of the Repertory for January, 1839, we took a highly favourable notice of a larger work by the same author, containing an account of the "*Life and Times of Joseph Brant*," the famous Mohawk chief. We remarked, that, under this title, Colonel Stone, while he made Brant a conspicuous and very striking figure in his narrative, had contrived to embrace a large amount of interesting and instructive matter, and, in fact, had given an entirely new history of the war which issued in American Independence. It cannot be said that the volume before us comprehends as large a portion of the history of our country as the preceding work ; but we may truly say of this, as well as of that, that the "*Life of Red Jacket*" occupies a prominent place in a large and rich narrative, which brings to our view, in a manner no less instructive than interesting, a great number of facts and characters with which the life of the celebrated Orator of the Senecas was immediately or remotely connected.

The Seneca chief and orator, popularly known by the name of *Red Jacket*, was born about the year 1750, at a place called *Old Castle*, about three miles from the town

better not attempt to minister to them. Unless we mistake, we have known missionaries thus employed, who, though, persons of excellent moral and religious character, were adapted to do little or no good,—perhaps in some cases harm—in that field of labour.

Red-Jacket died in 1830, in the 78th year of his age. For nine years after his decease, our author informs us, neither a stone, nor any other memorial marked his grave. But during the summer of 1839, an actor, connected with the New York theatre, by the name of *Placide*, while on a visit to Buffalo, determined that the place of his sepulture should no longer be undistinguished. Under his direction a subscription was set on foot, and a neat marble slab erected over the grave of the departed chief, bearing his Indian and English names, his age and the date of his death, and representing him as the friend and protector of his people.

Here we take leave of our respected author. We feel indebted to him for a truly valuable work, which we take for granted the literary public will have discernment enough to patronize. We are glad to learn from his preface, that he has in view, and hopes to accomplish the publication of two other historical works. We shall anticipate their appearance with interest, and shall be glad to meet him again in a field in which he has done so well.

The typography, and the general style of elegance in which this work is “gotten up,” are worthy of high praise. It is accompanied by a likeness of *Red-Jacket*, which we think no one can contemplate without feeling that he is looking upon the image of a very remarkable man.

By *Prof. J. Addison Alexander*

ART. II.—1. *Joannis Calvini in Librum Geneseos Commentarius. Ad editionem Amstelodamensem accuratissime exscribi curavit E. Hengstenberg. Berolini. Pars Prior, pp. 276. Pars Altera, pp. 277. 8vo. 1838.*

2. *Kommentar über die Genesis* von Dr. Friedrich Tuch, Privatdocent an der Universität zu Halle. Svo. pp. 896. Halle, 1838.

3. *A Companion to the Book of Genesis.* By Samuel H. Turner, D. D. Prof. Bib. Lit. and Interp. of Scrip. in the Theol. Sem. of the Prot. Epis. Church, and of the Hebrew Lang. and Lit. in Columbia College, New York. 8vo. pp. 405. New York and London. 1841.

4. *A Family Exposition of the Pentateuch.* By the Rev. Henry Blunt, M. A., Rector of Streatham, Surrey, Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Richmond, and formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge—Genesis—First American from first London edition: 12mo. pp. 235. Philadelphia, 1841.

If it be true, as has been said, that every generation must supply itself with books, and if this be true of sacred no less than of secular literature, it behooves the censors of the public press to watch with lively interest, both the quantity and quality of the supply which is, from time to time, afforded. When the quantity is deficient it becomes an urgent duty to incite those who are already qualified to active labour, and, where such are wanting, to create them, as it were, by inducing men of talent to qualify themselves for this peculiar kind of usefulness. When, on the other hand, the quality of such productions, whether few or many, is below the standard fixed by sound scholarship, good taste, and the necessities of the church, no efforts should be spared, upon the part of those who influence the public judgment, to supply what is deficient and correct what is erroneous, by discriminating criticism, and by continually holding up to view the highest models and severest rules, as standards of comparison. How far the course pursued by professional critics is in actual accordance with this statement of their duty, it is not for us to say. Still less are we entitled to pass judgment on the biblical and theological department of literary criticism, and least of all upon our own humble labours. We may say, however, that we have endeavoured to afford our readers the necessary means by which to form a correct notion of the gradual accessions to our stores of sacred learning. And in so doing, we have done enough, undoubtedly, to show that this important field has not of late been suffered to lie waste without attempts at cultivation. A year ago we took occasion to examine the comparative merits of three new works upon Isaiah. We have now a like duty to discharge in reference to four works upon Genesis. We are glad that this part of scripture still continues to receive attention. Its importance has been too long and too greatly underrated. We have seen, with much surprise, a disposition on the part of some who occupy themselves with sacred learning, to select as special objects of attention, those parts of scripture where the difficult and interesting questions which present themselves are almost purely of a litera-

ry nature ; where the bearing of the exposition upon doctrines, or duties, or the general meaning of the word of God, is remote or incidental ; where the most successful exegesis adds but little to the aggregate amount of knowledge, and the least successful takes but little from it. This suggestion, we are well aware, is liable to be misunderstood, as tending to encourage an irreverent discrimination between books and parts of books, equally canonical and equally inspired. To save ourselves from such an imputation, let us add that we maintain the absolute equality, in this respect, of all parts of the bible, and that we do not even mean to make allusion to a supposed distinction in the relative importance of the subjects, which are treated of in different parts. Even supposing them to be alike in this respect, and equally difficult of exposition, it is certain that there still may be a most material difference in the very nature of the difficulties which exist. In one case these may arise from an apparent inconsistency with other parts of scripture, if not with the immediate context, or from the doubtful import of the very words and phrases upon which the general meaning of the passage turns ; while in another case, the general sense is undisputed, as well as its agreement with the rest of scripture, but particular expressions are of such a nature as to furnish full employment to the most laborious critic, for an indefinite length of time. Between such cases there is certainly a difference, altogether independent of the nature of the subject, and entirely unconnected with the question of authority or inspiration. And what we speak of as surprising is that some, who feel an unaffected interest in biblical interpretation, should expend their strength upon those questions, the solution of which tends the least to throw light on the scriptures as a whole. This disposition has been greatly fostered by the example of the modern German critics, most of whom regard the scriptures as precisely on a level with the Greek and Roman classics, and are therefore naturally led to dwell upon those parts which afford most room for the display of ingenuity, refined taste, and antiquarian research. An instance is afforded by the celebrated work of Gesenius on Isaiah, which enters, with the liveliest interest, and the most minute precision, into those parts of the book which relate to the local and temporary interests of ancient nations, while those which are intrinsically of far greater moment, are treated with a superficial brevity, and

often with a negligence disgraceful to the author's reputation. This is all well enough in a professed unbeliever; but it would not look so well in a Christian interpreter, who, if he really possessed a Christian spirit, would instinctively adopt the inverse method, as Vitranga, in his great work on Isaiah, has done. What has now been said in reference to insulated passages or parts of books, is also true of whole books, and we look at the selection which a writer makes, as some imperfect indication of his spirit and his way of thinking. We are not sure, however, that these observations, however just they may be in the general, admit of a specific application to the book of Genesis, because that book contains so much that is attractive to all classes of interpreters, the grammarian, the historian, the antiquary, the geologist, the man of taste, and the devout Christian. Of all these the last we are afraid is usually most apt to undervalue the importance of the subject, not in itself considered, but comparatively. Judging of it merely by the amount of evangelical truth which it explicitly reveals, he naturally, and in one sense justly, sets it far below the subsequent and clearer revelations. But in so doing he is apt to overlook its unspeakable importance as an introduction, and to some extent a key, to those very revelations which seem so much clearer, but which owe their clearness, in great measure, to the gradual and incomplete developments of that inspired preface, which the Holy Ghost has placed at the beginning of the sacred canon. When we trace revelation backwards from its full blaze to its dawn, the latter seems obscure and unsatisfactory, and we are naturally tempted to regard it as no longer worthy of attention; but experience teaches us that by pursuing our researches in an opposite direction, we may often find the paradox verified, that what is comparatively clear may be rendered more so by the aid of what is dark. The earlier parts of revelation were not merely temporary substitutes and preparations for a permanent and final one. If they had been so they would not have been preserved as inseparable parts of the canonical scriptures, but would long since have perished with a multitude not only of uninspired writings, but of inspired communications designed to answer only temporary purposes. With such impressions of the value of this sacred book, not only on its own account, but as a means of illustration to the later scriptures, we are glad to find that the prolific press is actively employed in bringing forth, for its elucidation, things both new and old.

Of this variety a striking sample is afforded in the title of the present article. The four books named there are the productions of the great French Reformer, a German Professor, an American Professor, and an English Pastor. Calvin's book, in addition to the magic of his own name, is recommended by that of his editor, who may be regarded as his best representative among the writers of the present day. The book is printed on inferior paper and a type too small for comfortable reading; but these very circumstances bring it within the reach of a class of readers who, above all others, need to be made acquainted with the works of Calvin. We mean the German students of theology whose circumstances, for the most part, cut them off from all expensive reading, but whose education fits them to appreciate the literary worth, if nothing more, of such a writer. The cheap edition of his works on the New Testament, promoted and superintended by Tholuck, is said to have obtained an extensive circulation among German ministers and students of theology. We wish a like success to the edition of his works on the Old Testament, of which this is a specimen. It would be idle to attempt any detailed description of this commentary. Calvin is much the same in all his writings. The same laconic brevity, the same severe simplicity of style, the same clear perception of his author's drift, even where detached expressions are misunderstood, the same enlarged and elevated views of divine truth and the analogy of faith, the same collected courage in pursuing principles to their remotest consequences, the same decided and unwavering persuasion of the truth of his opinions, the same settled gravity of tone and spirit, the same awful reverence for God and revelation, and the same disposition to give every part of scripture a doctrinal or practical direction, appear in all his writings. One of his most marked characteristics, as an interpreter of scripture, is a sort of constitutional repugnance to all fanciful conceits and misplaced ingenuity, and an invincible determination to take words in their plainest and most obvious meaning. The indulgence of this feeling, or assertion of this principle, while it has certainly exalted him far above not only his contemporaries, but the majority of his successors during several centuries, has no less certainly betrayed him into some interpretations where important truth has been unconsciously sacrificed to the inexorable application of a rule which would be perfectly correct if it admitted some exceptions. But whatever may

be thought of some particular interpretations of this great Reformer, we have no doubt that the diligent perusal of his commentaries generally, and of this one in particular, besides the useful knowledge directly imparted, would exert an elevating, purifying, and expanding influence, on any mind already brought into subjection to the truth of God. A large part of this effect might be secured, no doubt, by a good translation; but the noble Roman style of the original, if duly appreciated and observed, would exert an additional influence, not to be despised, upon the reader's taste.

The second work upon the list is by a young German professor of our own day. In every thing but mental cultivation, he and Calvin may be said to be antipodes. Without a tincture of religious feeling, without any faith whatever in the divine authority of scripture, without a belief even in the possibility of prophecy or miracle, but with an unlimited and undisguised ambition to discover something new at every step, it may be readily conceived that Dr. Tuch, with all his talent and learning, which are very considerable, has produced a work having no other points of resemblance to the one which we have just described, than such as a community of subject rendered wholly unavoidable. The good points of the work are to be looked for in its literary character exclusively. His mind is lively, perspicacious, and inventive, but exhibits the same absence of capacity to reason, in the strict sense of the term, which has now become so common a defect among the partisan writers of Germany, and which may be regarded as a natural result of the incessant straining after novelty, to which the best minds of that gifted race are now habitually trained. Again and again we have observed in Tuch's performance an elaborate detail of imaginary arguments, in favor of some monstrous paradox, succeeded by the statement of objections, which the common sense of every reader feels to be conclusive, but which the author summarily sweeps away by simply saying that they certainly have no weight. And we do not hesitate to say that this description is justly applicable to a large proportion of the pretended reasonings by which the truth of scripture is attempted to be overthrown. Whatever ingenuity may be expended in the statement of reasons, the conclusion almost always rests at last upon the "feeling" of the author, which is pretty sure to lean in one direction. This abuse or destitution of all

logic we do not impute to sheer dishonesty, much less to mental imbecility, but rather to the absence of all moral sensibility in reference to truth, its sacredness, its preciousness, and the paramount obligation to receive it. It is not because the writers of this school deliberately choose to put light for darkness and darkness for light, nor because they are utterly incapable of making the distinction, but because they are so anxious to prove that to be light, which others look upon as darkness, that they catch at possibilities as sufficient to outweigh not only probabilities but certainties. If a new hypothesis but conceivable, that is enough to entitle it to preference, in opposition to the strongest reasons, and the uniform belief of many ages. "This," says Dr. Turner very justly, in speaking of some such pretended argument, "may be produced as one among many illustrations of the *logical* character of that species of criticism for which our age is distinguished. It is easier to appeal to some internal feeling beyond the understanding, than to establish plain declarations on palpable evidence."—p. 23.

As a specimen of Dr. Tuch's improvements on the discoveries of his predecessors, we may state his theory with respect to a plurality of authors, and the peculiar composition of the book. It has long been a favorite notion in Germany, that the systematic interchange of the names Jehovah and Elohim can only be explained upon the supposition of two different authors, or of two distinct sets of documents, in which these two modes of expression respectively predominated, and from which the present book of Genesis was made up as a piece of patch-work. Out of this rare discovery have sprung the documentary hypothesis, the fragmentary hypothesis, and we know not how many more hypotheses, each of which has been maintained for a time, as self-evidently true, and then exploded. The last phase of the theory, before Tuch's appearance, was that two ancient documents, distinguished by the use of these two names, were formed into the present book of Genesis by an anonymous compiler. Dr. Tuch's improvement consists in dispensing with the services of a third person, and supposing the Jehovist as he calls him, to have merely amplified and filled out the briefer composition of the older Elohist. The vast probability that a writer, so addicted to the use of one divine name as to use it always, should incorporate in his own composition a writing in which another name was employed with equal uniformity, and without the

least attempt at assimilation, would present no difficulty to the understanding of a rationalist. It will be sufficient for our present purpose to observe that the same process which enables us to strike out of the theory a third author of Genesis, may possibly admit of such extension as to do away the second also.

With respect to grammatical analysis and archaeological illustration, Tuch, as might have been expected, displays rather an advance than a recession. Philology is cultivated to so high a point, and by so many persons, and with so much emulation, in the German universities, that even ordinary writers are enabled to exhibit some improvement on their predecessors; and it ought not to be overlooked, as a consolatory fact, that the very excellence of German commentaries as to this point very often furnishes the best corrective of the monstrous errors into which they are betrayed by their theology and philosophy, falsely so called.

A distinguishing feature of this work is the unusual proportion of its space which is allotted to analysis or synoptical views of the whole book, and of its parts, in their natural connexion, with continuous discussions of all important questions growing out of that connexion. This peculiarity has probably arisen, in a great degree, from the necessity laid upon the author of evincing, as he went along, the truth of his hypothesis respecting the Jehovah and Elohim. But whatever may have been the cause of this arrangement, its effect is certainly very favourable to the clearness, completeness, and intellectual character of the whole performance. Biblical expositions, to effect their purpose, must be something more than scholia on the successive clauses of the text. They must teach the reader to survey the subject as a whole, and in its larger parts, as well as in its minor subdivisions. There is no habit of study more adverse to a correct understanding of the Bible, than the habit of confining the attention to detached expressions, without looking at the general drift, the scope, and the design of a whole passage. The writer who would analyze the scriptures for himself, must, of course, ascend from its particular expressions, to its larger combinations and the general relation of its parts; but in applying the result of such a process to the instruction of others, he can spare them a large part of the labour through which he has passed, by an inversion of the order of proceeding; by possessing the mind first with a correct view of the subject in its out-

lines, and then filling these up, by a gradual descent from generals to particulars, with the details of more minute interpretation. That this most effective and most truly scientific method is so little practised by interpreters, is owing to the fact, in many cases, that they have not themselves taken comprehensive views of what they undertake to explain, and are therefore incapable of imparting such views to the minds of others. We know indeed of nothing more decidedly indicative of truly large and masterly conceptions of the scripture in its mutual relations, than a successful application of this analytic method, and an obvious disposition to assign to it its due place in the work of exposition. The evidence however must consist in something more than the mechanical prefixing of a table of contents to a series of desultory scholia. The analysis and verbal exposition must be mutually necessary. The first must not only introduce the second, but involve it; and the second must be not a mere appendix to the first, but a minute specification of the ground on which its comprehensive statements rest. Without this combination and mutual dependence of the analytic and synthetic methods, there can be no thorough and exhausting exegesis.

Entertaining these opinions, as to the best method of interpretation, we observed, with pleasure, that Professor Turner had made analysis the very basis of his recent publication. It consists of three distinct parts, a continuous description of the book of Genesis as to its subject and contents, arranged according to its natural divisions, irrespective of the usual and arbitrary distribution into chapters. This part fills about fifty pages, while a space not quite six times as great, is occupied with notes upon particular passages, arranged in the same order, and referred to in the text of the analysis. Besides these two, which form the body of the work, some important questions of a general and preliminary nature are discussed in an Introduction of above sixty pages. The whole performance looks like the result of long and patient, but at the same time desultory labour. There is no informing spirit breathing through it and investing it with unity. The notes have the appearance of a slow accumulation during many years. The style is that of one who writes a little at a time and very slowly. The book would seem to have been written rather from a sense of duty than from any lively interest in such pursuits. The character imparted to the work by these peculiarities,

is one of great respectability, and even dignity, but not one suited to arouse the reader's faculties, excite his curiosity, or interest his feelings in the issue of the controversies which are brought before him. The work, as might have been expected, affords evidence of long familiarity with Hebrew learning, and with the best modern works upon biblical criticism and interpretation. The author's judgment, where he chooses to exercise it definitely, seems to be mature and sound. His sentiments and spirit are entirely opposed to those of German neology, with which he seems, however, to be well acquainted. Upon all points of dispute between the infidel and Christian modes of exegesis, he exhibits himself clearly on the side of truth. But while we bear this willing testimony to the correctness of his own conclusions, we are forced to qualify it in relation to the means, which he affords his readers, of arriving at the same. The great fault of the work, as to its bearing on the interests of truth, is this, that it details, with a laborious minuteness, the objections of neologists and infidels, without providing a sufficient antidote. The author seldom, and we may say never but through inadvertence, fails to record his own dissent from the objectionable doctrines which he quotes. But his attempted refutation is in many cases wholly insufficient, and in some he attempts none at all, but satisfies himself with the remark that no judicious person can adopt such an opinion, or the like. He seems, indeed, to have confounded the impression made upon his own mind by the statement of the false interpretation, (corrected as it was by adverse arguments already long familiar, or spontaneously suggested), with the impression, which would probably be made upon the mind of one possessing no such safeguard, by the exhibition of the bane without the antidote. Professor Turner may be thoroughly convinced that one of Eichhorn's specious paradoxes is a paltry figment; but we doubt whether the bare annunciation of that fact would be sufficient to produce a corresponding state of mind in every reader, especially in opposition to the plausible fallacies by which the false opinion is so frequently supported. It may indeed be said that a detailed refutation of the various opinions mentioned in the work would be not only more than they deserve, but more than it would hold. We grant it, but regard this rather as a reason for not stating the opinions, than for not refuting them. It is at least a valid objection to the minuteness of detail with which the author sometimes states them, when he has not room

or inclination to refute them with the same particularity. But even where he does attempt a formal refutation, he sometimes appears either to overrate the strength of his own arguments or to underrate the plausibility of those which he opposes. This is often clear from the coolness and indifference with which his argument seems to be conducted. Sometimes, indeed, his mind seems to be roused, as in his spirited and able vindication of the sabbath and the decalogue against Professor Palfrey. But in general, the author is too easily contented with the mere expression of his own opinion, or with a feeble statement of his reasons, while the adverse argument is frequently detailed with all the advantage which it can derive from the perverted ingenuity of those who have maintained it. We regard it as a duty of all writers on the side of truth, not to give currency to the doctrines which they look upon as false, until they have distinctly ascertained their own capacity to demonstrate that they are so. The willingness to do it if they can we take for granted; for a love of difficulties, simply for their own sake, and without any view to their removal, is a weakness, to employ the mildest term, with which we should be sorry to find any Christian theologian chargeable. Perhaps it would not be amiss, in trying to avoid the evil, to avoid, if possible the appearance of it also.

On the whole, we can commend Dr. Turner's work as a highly respectable and useful, though by no means an original performance. With the habits of patient assiduity and careful observation, which we may suppose him to possess, he can hardly fail, in subsequent editions of the book, to make it still more worthy of the public patronage and favour.

The fourth work mentioned at the head of this article is wholly different from either of the others. It is intended to be used as an aid in family devotion. It contains the text of selected passages, in the common version, with explanatory and devotional remarks. The author, an evangelical clergyman of the Church of England, already well known to the public, complains of the difficulty which he had experienced in giving to his written exposition the point and spirit of *ex tempore* remark. He recommends the latter as much better suited to arrest attention and impress the minds, especially of children and domestics, and describes his own work as intended merely to supply the place of such an exercise, in cases where the officiating person is unable or unwilling to perform it, but still anxious to make family devo-

tion still more useful than it can be when the word of God is simply read without any attempt either to explain its meaning or enforce its doctrinal and practical instructions. The want of such books, we have reason to believe, is felt by many conscientious heads of families among ourselves; but the demand is far from having called forth a commensurate supply of the thing needed. The biblical commentaries, which are most in use, are found to be deficient, for the purpose now referred to, because not prepared with any direct view to it, or rather because not entirely well suited to the end for which they were prepared. The two which have obtained the most extensive circulation among orthodox and evangelical Christians of different denominations, are considered faulty or deficient, for this purpose, in very different respects. Henry, though full of life and admirably suited to make those who read him think, is often deficient in the fundamental requisite of explanation, leaving many obscure places unexplained, or substituting a quaint play upon the words of the translation for a clear and concise statement of the sense of the original. His arrangement, too, although highly intellectual and often very skilful, is too formal and methodical for the simple services of family devotion, as now practised; and the very effervescence, both of thought and language which entitles him to be considered, next to South, the wittiest of all religious writers, affects many pious minds unpleasantly, at least so far as to make the use of Henry's exposition seem unsuited to a solemn exercise of worship. This repugnance may arise, in some degree, from the indulgence of mistaken notions as to the consistency of deep religious feeling with a cheerful spirit, and the habit of looking at all objects with a smiling countenance. If ever there were men who lived exempt from morbid melancholy in their views of truth and their religious exercises, those men were Matthew Henry and his father; and we doubt not that the study of their lives and writings would do much to substitute a cheerful piety for one of gloomy and morose austerity. But such a temper is, we fear, a rare attainment, and so long as it continues so, we cannot doubt that the exuberant vivacity and even mirthful piety of Matthew Henry will be felt by most of us to be in some degree at variance with the feelings of religious awe, which we are more or less accustomed to associate with acts of worship. This, in addition to the circumstances which we have already mentioned, seems to leave room for something more than Henry's admirable

work, as an aid in family devotion. With these faults, if they may be so called, Scott is not in the least chargeable. Neither undue formality of method, nor excessive point and quaint antithesis of style, nor any thing like undue hilarity of tone, can be discovered in his pious, faithful, and judicious work. Its defects are of an opposite description. In addition to the superficial character of many of his expositions, there is a total want of vivid animation and exciting power, which, although they may not be essential to improvement when the mind is once awake, are of the last importance in arousing its attention. These defects are very common in the evangelical and pious writers of the church of England; we mean superficial notions of the sense of scripture, and a want of spirit in its exposition. The one may arise from the continual public reading of the scriptures without note or comment, a practice which, with all its great advantages, has certainly this disadvantage, that it tends to generate the habit of confounding mere familiarity of sound with real comprehension of the sense. The other evil may be traced to the habit of regarding sermons, and all other compositions of a sacred nature, as intended merely to be read, and therefore not admitting of that pointed style and those direct addresses to the heart and conscience, which the same men would think natural in unstudied speech. If extemporaneous preaching partook more of the correctness of good writing, and if written sermons partook more of the vivacity and point of oral discourse, there would be less room for dispute as to the proper mode of preaching. We can perfectly understand the feeling with which Mr. Blunt complains of his own inability to write as he had often spoken; though we should not be equally disposed to look upon the evil as inseparable from the act of writing. The defect, of which he speaks, does undoubtedly exist in the little work before us, as well as in the kindred works of some other English writers, who are said to be animated, pointed and impressive preachers, but in whose published writings, the vivacity and point are pretty much confined to an occasional ejaculation and an excess of paragraphs beginning with the interjection *How!* The only inference which we should be disposed to draw, at present, from these facts, is that works intended for the purpose now in question, require something more in those who write them than mere piety, good judgment, and acquaintance with the subject. There is need of sensibility as well as sense. We mean a capacity to write with feeling; and with this there

should be blended a capacity to write a plain, perspicuous, and pointed style, together with a talent for familiar illustration, the whole being under the direction of a cultivated taste and sober judgment. These are high qualifications, but without them we have little hope of seeing the demand, which now exists for "family expositions," suitably supplied. In our own church there are pastors, whom we know to be diligent and successful students, not only of the English Bible, but of the original. To such men the necessities of Christian families must needs be known; and how could they turn their studies to better account, than by the careful preparation of such works as would tend at once to elevate the standard of scriptural knowledge, and to promote the practical utility of domestic worship as a means of grace? The difficulty of the task should be no obstacle, not only because our best performances are mere approximations to an ideal standard of perfection, but because experiments of this kind, once made, would exceedingly facilitate all subsequent attempts. A book prepared expressly for the use of families, would soon be introduced into a multitude of houses, and its fitness for its purpose brought to the severe test of experiment, the result of which, by means of a little correspondence and inquiry, might assist the author in correcting errors and supplying chasms, of which he had been wholly unaware. In this way the excellence of such works might be easily increased at every new edition, till they reached a height of relative perfection, quite as great as we have any present right or reason to anticipate.

We know not whether in the foregoing remarks, it is sufficiently implied, that expositions even of the most familiar kind, and those intended most exclusively for practical effect, can only be successful so far as they rest upon the basis of correct and thorough exegesis. Nothing can be more unfavourable to the successful preparation of such works, than the idea that critical and popular, or learned and familiar exposition, must be carried on apart from one another. What is the use of philological interpretation but to pave the way for practical improvement? The effects of a mere literary exegesis may be seen in Germany; those of a mere superficial pious one in England.* Let America combine the

* It is scarcely necessary to qualify this general remark by any allusion to the brilliant exceptions which undoubtedly exist, and which appear to be growing still more numerous. It is a fact however, that in England biblical learning has for many years, been in a state far below what might have been expected from the degree of perfection to which classical learning has attained.

two, by pressing erudition into the service of practical religion. Let our works of biblical learning all be seen to have a bearing upon popular improvement. Let our popular works all exhibit a profound acquaintance with the choicest fruits of critical investigation. This will save us from the opposite extremes of illiterate piety and learned irreligion.

We have now said enough, we think, to show that the four books, which we have grouped together as the subject of this article, however unlike they may be, and they could hardly have been more so, are all interesting, even in relation to the same great object. With respect to each, the most important question is, what does it contribute, directly or indirectly, to the great end of making men in general acquainted with the truth of God? So far as the intention of the authors is concerned, it is instructive to observe the very different plans on which the books are written. Mr. Blunt aims exclusively at practical edification. Dr. Turner, while he estimates the value of this object, we have no doubt, just as highly, expressly disavows any reference to it in the work before us. Dr. Tuch not only leaves religious improvement out of view, but shows that he has no more sense of its importance or correct apprehension of its nature, than the most benighted heathen. Calvin alone appears to have been led, by the combined force of his reason and his feelings, to unite the highest intellectual and spiritual operations in the same performance. We are not finding fault with Mr. Blunt or Dr. Turner for not doing likewise. There are obvious advantages in giving prominence to one of the great objects aimed at, even to the exclusion of the other. That is to say, there is an obvious convenience in devoting some books to the preliminary work of philological interpretation; and occupying others with the application of this process to its great design of practical improvement. But the fact which strikes us, and to which we ask attention, is that Calvin could not do this. The Reformers generally could not do it. They had no idea of interpreting the Bible first, and then making use of the interpretation afterwards, for purposes of practical improvement. The two ends were too intimately blended in their view, to be practically separated. This gives a character of moral elevation to the writings of that age and school, which cannot be attained by any possible amount of mere ability or learning. The peculiarity of which we speak, was not the result of a

certain method, but of a certain character and spirit. It was not because Calvin had resolved to blend profound interpretation with devotional improvement, that his commentaries wear their present aspect; but because the operations of his mind and the affections of his heart, on sacred subjects, were coincident. He did not think without feeling, as some now do; nor think first and feel afterwards as others do; he thought and felt at once, as if by one spontaneous movement. And we venture to suggest, that when the same cause operates, in the same degree, the same effects may follow. The devotional element will not then be excluded from our books of exposition for the want of room, because the same space will be large enough to hold the product of the head and of the heart, when both are held in vital union by the action of an intellect baptised with fire and the Holy Ghost. In the mean time we confess that we revert with pleasure and increasing admiration from the most successful efforts of mere intellect in our day, to these incomparable relics of an age possessed of far more learning than the present, in its ignorance, is pleased to give it credit for, and blessed with an experimental knowledge of the truth, which strikes the balance vastly in its favour. The habit of depreciating such a man as Calvin, by applauding his moral qualities at the expense of his intellect and learning, has been carried far enough. We are prone not only to exaggerate the advances which have been made in philological interpretation, but, at the same time, to forget, that in strength and perspicacity of intellect, the modern philologists are very often as far inferior to the best of the old writers, as they are in faith and holiness. A man may make a grammar or a lexicon or scholia on the sacred text, with great skill, who has very little logic, and still less judgment in his composition. It is therefore a great fallacy to take for granted that the best philologists are the best interpreters; and that a writer, who is very accurate in sifting words and phrases, but has little conception of his author's drift and no sympathy with his spirit, is, on the whole, a better guide than one who, although less exact in verbal criticism, apprehends correctly the design, the general import, and the leading sentiments of that which he interprets. Even leaving out of view the vital difference between a higher degree of pious feeling and the total want of it, and looking only at the intellectual character of both, we have no hesitation in asserting, that a far more profound

and exact knowledge of Isaiah, for example, as a whole, may be derived from Calvin's antiquated commentary than from the vaunted writings of Gesenius. Between mere learning on the one hand and vast intellectual strength upon the other, the match is an unequal one at best; but how much more when to the latter you have added the advantage of a sound faith and a Christian spirit. Let the German improvements in philology, so far as they are real, be diligently used for the defence of truth and the advancement of religion. But let us not confound superiority in grammar with superiority in intellect, or allow a rage for foreign innovations to impair our reverence, not merely for the piety, but for the mental power and achievements of such men as Martin Luther and John Calvin.

In closing this notice of the latest works on Genesis, we must not fail to mention that the new edition of Professor Bush's Notes, which we reviewed three years ago,* is now complete, and that Hengstenberg's important work on the Authenticity of the Pentateuch,† has been continued, but is still unfinished.

Raynard P. Ball

ART. III.—*Address delivered in Easton, Pennsylvania, August 18th, 1841, on the occasion of the Author's Inauguration as President of Lafayette College.* By John W. Yeomans. Svo. pp. 32. Easton. 1841.

WE have some assurance of finding our way to the old and true path in education, when, amidst the meteors and wandering stars of the literary firmament, we see pointing towards that path, a light so fixed and luminous as that which shines in this Inaugural Address. True, it contains nothing about the modern divisions of education into the Mental, the Moral, and the Physical; and as little about the greatness of our nation, the peculiarity of our institutions, the vastness of the great valley of the Mississippi, or the developement of mind. It takes for granted that if one thing in education be well done it includes all others; and the author taking also for granted that professors and mas-

* Bib. Rep. 1839, p. 271.

† Bib. Rep. 1838, p. 542.