

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1857.

No. III.

*Lynne
Atwater*

- ARTICLE I.—1. *A System of Practical Medicine, comprised in a series of original Dissertations.* Arranged and edited by ALEXANDER TWEEDIE, M. D., F. R. S. Vol. 2. Article, Insanity, by J. C. PRICHARD, M. D., F. R. S., etc., etc. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard. 1840.
2. *A Treatise on the Practice of Medicine.* By GEORGE B. WOOD, M. D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the University of Pennsylvania, etc., etc. Fourth Edition. In two volumes. Vol. 2. Article, Insanity. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1855.
3. *Elements of Medical Jurisprudence.* By THEODRIC ROMEYN BECK, M. D., LL.D., and JOHN B. BECK, M. D. Tenth Edition. Vol. 1. Article, Mental Alienation. Albany: Little & Co. 1850.
4. *Mind and Matter: or Physiological Inquiries, in a series of Essays, intended to illustrate the Mental Relations of the Physical Organization and the Mental Faculties.* By Sir BENJAMIN BRODIE, Bart., D. C. L., Vice-President of the Royal Society. With Additional Notes by an American Editor. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1857.

THE frequency and success with which criminal advocates plead insanity as a defence for atrocious crime, are viewed with deep concern by a large part of our people. Those who have at heart the interests of morality and religion, are of course alarmed at the apparent countenance thus given to the

and keep in check that tendency to 'shed the blood of his fellow,' which unfortunately is too common; and at the same time humanity forbids that the horrid spectacle should be permitted, of taking away the life of the insane by judicial process. Let the question put by Lord Lyndhurst be presented to every jury: *did the prisoner know, in doing the act, that he offended against the laws of God and man?** Let the following remarks of the Scotch Law Commentator† be kept in mind, and with the acknowledged mildness of our laws, and the unwillingness to convict capitally, I feel a strong conviction that no practical injustice will be done. But to aid in effecting all this, it is very necessary that the medical witness should have every facility allowed him for studying the nature of the case, and that its history should be ascertained."

W H Green

ART. II.—*An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.* By the Rev. THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, B. D. Tenth edition, revised, corrected and brought down to the present time. Vol. II. Containing the Text of the Old Testament considered, with a Treatise on Sacred Interpretation, and a brief Introduction to the Old Testament Books and the Apocrypha: by SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D. London, 1856. 8vo. pp. 1100.

HORNE'S Introduction to the Scriptures has long held a conspicuous place among the standard volumes of a good minister's library. Notwithstanding its extensive erudition, however, its sound theological views and excellent spirit, which are its strong commendation, it has acknowledged and serious deficiencies, and is much behind the present state of biblical learning, particularly in the departments of criticism and special introduction. Its author's ignorance of German debarred him from the use of the ablest treatises which have been written upon these

* To which we add, *or was he prevented by insane delusion from knowing it?*

† The substance of which appears in the previous quotation from Alison.

subjects, and of itself unfitted him for their complete and satisfactory treatment. A sense of this deficiency has led of late years to numerous translations of works of this description from the German. But aside from the fact, that the selections for this purpose were not always wisely made, and the translations were, in some instances at least, carelessly executed, the necessity which exists, can never be adequately supplied in that way. <The best of the Germans have their crotchets, which, though greatly admired at home, find little favour before the tribunal of Anglo-American common sense.> Their books, too, which are prepared for quite a different region, are not adapted to the particular exigencies of the English or American theological public. We need not foreign works translated, but native works which shall incorporate the valuable results of continental learning and research without their objectionable features, and which shall be designed expressly to meet the wants of ministers and students and readers amongst ourselves.

No small degree of satisfaction was created, consequently, by the announcement some time since, that a new edition of Horne's Introduction was in preparation by the author, in conjunction with competent scholars, familiar with the entire range of literature in their respective departments. The Evidences of Christianity and Sacred Antiquities were retained for revision by the original author; while the Sacred Criticism and Special Introduction were, in the Old Testament, committed to Dr. Davidson, and in the New, to Dr. Tregelles, by whom they have been entirely rewritten. We confess that the previous publications of Dr. Davidson, in this his chosen field, were not of a character to lead us to anticipate from his pen so masterly and satisfactory a production as we would wish to have seen, and as the importance of the subject and the necessities of our literature demanded. And, in truth, the literary blemishes of his other writings are here reproduced without abatement, his tiresome and swelling verbosity, his endless repetitiousness, his lack of condensation, clearness and precision, his pages studded with citations and his margins with learned references, while there is a painful lack of comprehensiveness and vigorous grasp of mind, so that he has furnished a congeries of materials instead of a well-compacted treatment of

his theme. While we were prepared for defects of this sort, which not only deform his books but greatly prejudice their serviceableness, while we were prepared too for occasional sneers at the illiberality and bigotry of the holders of old opinions, and for the adoption of German innovations, to the utmost extent to which it was safe to go, we did not once venture to entertain the suspicion that his departures from received and well-established views would be so serious as in point of fact they are. We feel it to be our duty to warn our readers against this book, which, coming to them in the guise of a new edition of an honoured work, is governed by a wholly different spirit, and to advise them of its dangerous character and tendency. We do not hesitate to pronounce it utterly unfit to guide the studies of any learner in the department of which it treats. Its chief effect will be to mislead, unsettle and confuse. We would almost as soon place Theodore Parker's translation of De Wette in the hands of a student as this of Davidson, without first making him aware of the status which it occupies. An open antagonist is seldom as damaging to the cause of truth as an incompetent auxiliary; the latter, by his weak show of defence, while he is perpetually vaunting the strength of the enemy, creates a distrust, especially among the uninstructed and unwary, in the cause of which he is a professed champion, greater than any actual opposition could produce.

These are grave charges; but they can be sustained by the most abundant references to the book before us. We do not propose to enter here upon a refutation of the errors it contains. That might require, instead of the few pages which we shall devote to the subject, a volume of the same formidable dimensions as Dr. Davidson's own. All that we feel called upon to do is simply to recite some of the positions taken by the writer, that the Christian public may be aware of his views, and of the sort of instruction they may expect, who commit themselves to his guidance. It will not be needful nor possible here to refer to all that we consider erroneous or ill-judged, to the numerous unfounded or unproved assertions which are put forth as if undoubted or well established, to the doubtful hypotheses which receive an undue share of credit, if not implicit or explicit sanction, to the forms of statement which even when

the substance is correct, are loose and inaccurate, to that lack of a just sense of proportion which infects our author in common with his German masters, and which leads to the improper exaltation of what is trifling, even to the obscuring or undervaluing of what is of far greater moment. Such an undertaking would involve us in endless quarrel with what we find on almost every page. We shall accordingly confine ourselves to some of the more marked and serious departures from commonly received views, and such as prepare the way for, even if they do not involve, dangerous theological consequences.

Before adducing any of the particular opinions which we reprobate, we say in the general, that our most decided objection to the book is the spirit which pervades it, and the evident leanings of the writer throughout. It is often not so much what he says, the conclusion to which he comes, or the statement he actually makes that is objectionable, as the way in which he says it. Everything is set to trembling in the balance. It would appear as though there were to him nothing solid and undoubted. Nothing is so well attested or so long established, but it must be called repeatedly in question. Everything must be approached precisely as though nothing were settled, and all were now to be examined for the first time, with no antecedent impressions as to the side on which the truth would be found to lie. In fact, it is upon this that Dr. Davidson chiefly plumes himself. This is his ideal of impartiality and freedom from prejudice. The consequence is perpetual vacillation and indecision. Half the time he does not seem to know his own mind, and the other half it is hard to resist the impression that he would go farther in his denials of received opinions than he does, if he thought it would be tolerated by those for whom he writes. He is very commonly in the attitude of those feeble folk, whose votes are always recorded as "*non liquet.*" He sides neither with one party nor the other, but after magnifying the difficulties in the way of making up a judgment, finally falls upon some medium course, which is apt to partake of the inconveniences of both and the advantages of neither.

Now we have nothing to object to the most thorough sifting of old opinions and of the grounds on which they rest. Venerable errors are not to be spared because they are venerable.

And opinions, however sacredly held, must be discarded if they can be shown to be unsound. But the edifice of Scripture must not be pulled down over our heads under pretence of examining whether the foundation be secure. A man, who comes before the public as its teacher, and who professes to have surveyed with care the whole ground on which he treads, is expected to have reached decided convictions. And he has no right to represent that as insecure, which he possesses or ought to possess the means of proving stable and firm. He has no right, under the name of impartiality, to attribute a weight to opposing arguments which they do not have. Nor may the fact that a thing has been disputed, though on flimsy grounds, (for in biblical criticism and interpretation, as elsewhere, names may be cited on behalf of any opinion however wild and extravagant) be received as an adequate apology for classing it as doubtful, or for parading those grounds as though they were really possessed of force. The natural result of all this is to make the reader feel as though the ground were sliding beneath his feet. And they who gather their views of the state of the controversy from this volume, may very naturally conclude, that if the commonly received opinions are capable of no better defence than this, they might as well be abandoned.

This disposition Dr. Davidson has in all likelihood borrowed from his German teachers, with whom it is a first principle in their hyper-criticism to eschew any historical basis. The long-accredited and unvarying tradition which settles the genuineness and integrity of the inspired foundations of our faith, more firmly than that of any relic of ancient literature, is cast aside as worthless, on the first breath of suspicion from some modern innovator. A passage, whose genuineness is authenticated by every accessible external authority, the whole array of manuscripts, versions, and early references or citations, is treated as suspected on the first vague conjecture being started of a spurious origin. The presumption is not even allowed to rest with the old until the new is proved, but the reverse. The rule is to depart from whatever is generally received as often as possible. It is unfortunate for a writer of so little independence, and who is so controlled by those to whose leadership he has addicted himself, that he has fallen precisely into such

company as this. It is De Wette, Hupfeld, Gesenius, Ewald & Co., who are his masters in criticism. And he stands as much aloof from "Hengstenberg and his party," as if he thought that their notions, being too similar to what was currently believed at home, were not worth the going to Germany to obtain.

With this is too frequently connected, we are sorry to observe, a want of becoming reverence in his treatment of the Holy Scriptures. Not that their divine origin is denied, disputed or disbelieved, but it seems to be sometimes practically overlooked, and they are dealt with as coolly and familiarly as if they were an ordinary human production. The principles of textual criticism and the laws of taste and of interpretation, are indeed to a great extent the same as applied to the sacred volume and to works merely human. But because a diamond and a lump of clay are both matter and possessed of its essential properties in common, it does not follow that a natural philosopher must handle the one with the same easy carelessness that he would the other. And we confess that the flippant readiness with which the scalpel of an unsparing criticism is applied to what has been held most sacred, and criticisms and censures are passed upon the various styles of the inspired writers, grate harshly upon us.

Saddest of all, we are constrained to add, that Dr. Davidson has given up his faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, in the ordinary and orthodox sense, as well as in some of the doctrines which they are commonly held to teach. <The Bible is not, in his esteem, a revelation from God, but merely contains such a revelation.> There is a divine and eternal essence, but this is conveyed in a human form, which is necessarily imperfect, and may therefore need correction or require to be wholly cast away. He says, pages 449, 450, "We have no reason to believe that the divine Spirit ordinarily acts upon the human mind in any other method than by uniting his influence with it, and elevating it to a higher and holier tone than it could otherwise reach. The divine Spirit does not supersede or set aside the use of the natural powers, but quickens and purifies them, so that they can see much farther and higher. This at least was commonly the case, though there are doubtless exceptions."

Page 633—"Some possessed a larger measure of the Spirit of God than others; the phenomena of the books themselves evince that inspiration had *degrees*." Page 766—"Inspiration does not exclude *individuality** or suppress the exercise of the human faculties; and therefore an unmerciful sentiment may find entrance into a canonical work. Inspiration admits of degrees and does not usually reach the extent of *absolute infallibility*. Admitting of degrees, it necessarily partakes of imperfection." Page 504—"There may be contradiction on matters of history and science without detriment to the correctness of the writers on religious and moral subjects. After an extended and careful survey of all the phenomena, we incline to this latter view. We believe that no contradiction can exist between the writers when treating of religious and moral truth. Whatever they inculcate respecting doctrine and duty is infallibly correct. So far they were under a high illumination of the Spirit, and could not err. . . . While thus maintaining the harmony of all such passages as belong to and constitute *the word of God*, we doubt if places of another kind can be every where reconciled. In regard to dates, numbers, names; historical, archæological, geographical and scientific points; we are inclined to believe that they were not infallible and may have erred." The region given up to error in this last passage, is altogether too narrow for the sweep of the principles advocated in those previously alleged. If they are once adopted, it will be found that no breast-work can be erected which will arrest them here. Pages 473, 474—"The principle of *individuality* . . . leads us while acknowledging in the apostles a real and certain inspiration whereby they become true guides to the church in respect to *general direction*, to conclude that they had a partial and incomplete inspiration. It was not full and universal, embracing all aspects and particulars of a subject; nor was it inclusive of all topics. In short, it was partial and so far imperfect. Hence their teaching was inferior to that of Jesus Christ. It was not erroneous; but it was less absolute, less free from all human ideas, less complete." On pages 476, 477, Dr. Davidson decides against a particular and in favour

* The italics in these quotations belong to Dr. Davidson.

of a universal atonement. Page 479—"Because it is said that *by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners*, (Rom. v. 19,) it does not follow that the sinfulness of that head was transferred to them or that his sin was imputed to them. They became sinners themselves from their connection with Adam. Not that Adam's sin was really reckoned theirs, and therefore they became guilty, but that Adam's sin led to *their sinning*, which personal sin rendered them guilty." Page 480—"Man is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually.' This statement professes to be founded upon and deduced from Scripture. But it is exaggerated and partially incorrect." Page 485—"From Eph. ii. 3, Calvin deduces *this doctrine of original sin*, that 'we are born with sin as serpents bring their venom from the womb.' Such a view is contrary both to the analogy of faith and to reason. The general tenor of Scripture shows man to be accountable to God. Here his responsibility is destroyed. As man is commanded to repent and believe, he has the *physical* ability to do so; ability being commensurate *with* obligation. Besides reason teaches that *sin* can only be a voluntary transgression of known law. And with this the Bible coincides. Hence sin cannot properly be predicated of infants from their very birth."

We proceed to the views which he has expressed concerning individual books of the Old Testament. Of the first three chapters of Genesis, he says, p. 576: "In deciding between the mythic view and the purely historical one, there is not much proof or argument to rest upon." He is here in his usual cloud of doubt, but evidently inclines to regard the narrative as mythical, with an historical basis. Between the first and second chapters he says, p. 595, that there are discrepancies, which "do not probably amount to actual contradictions, for several attempts, more or less successful, have been made to remove such particulars as are absolutely irreconcilable; but they evince, at the least, very considerable deviations in the second narrative from the first." Jacob's purchasing Esau's birth-right, and subsequently obtaining his father's blessing by fraud, gives occasion to the remark, p. 596: "The fact that there are

two such accounts of one and the same transaction, presenting considerable diversities, to say the least, favours the assumption that they were derived from different sources, and so incorporated into one book." One more characteristic instance of indecision, weak defence, and positive abandonment of the historical truth of the sacred narrative will suffice for Genesis: p. 603, "The taking away of Sarah at Gerar, in Gen. xx. is similar to what happened in Egypt, as related in Gen. xii. 10-19, and to the case of Isaac and Rebekah, [the spelling is Dr. Davidson's] in Gen. xxvi. 1-11. Hence it has been assumed that one and the same fact lies at the basis of the three, which has been differently moulded by tradition. Here it is replied that the same thing may have readily happened more than once in that rude age, in different places, after intervals of time, especially as the similarities of the three occurrences are far surpassed by still greater dissimilarities, and each one bears all the marks of historic truth in itself, in certain circumstances peculiar to it. Whether this be a satisfactory answer it is difficult to affirm. We believe that the case of Isaac and Rebekah cannot be held, with any degree of probability, as identical with the other two, or with either of them. It seems to us distinct and different. But in regard to the other two, it is possible that they may be different forms of one and the same event, because both happened to Sarah at no great interval of time."

A great ado is made, p. 602, over the repeated formal imposition of the name of Joshua, while on p. 597 it is admitted that the precisely similar case of the renewal of the name of Israel, Gen. xxxv. 10, presents "no difficulty or discrepancy." His justification of the retention of Egyptian symbols in the Mosaic ritual sounds like the apologies of Spencer, on the same subject. P. 583, "The wisdom of not introducing new rites and customs is obvious. The people, rude and uncultivated as they were, would have been reluctant to observe strange regulations. They adhered with pertinacity to what they had learned and seen." On p. 585 we are told that the speaking of Balaam's ass was not a literal external act, but a vision. The testimony of 2 Pet. ii. 16 to its actual occurrence, which "would be all but decisive, could the authenticity of 2d Peter be relied upon," is ruled out. When Hengstenberg's authority is quoted

for the opinion that the prediction of the star and the sceptre, Num. xxiv. 17, does not refer to Christ, Dr. Davidson seems not to have been aware that that opinion had been repudiated, in his special treatise on Balaam's life and prophecies, fifteen years ago, as well as in the recent edition of his Christology. Whether this is what it professes to be, a real prophecy of Balaam, uttered on the occasion alleged by the sacred writer, or the product of a later age, prepared on some totally different occasion, he is unable or indisposed to express an opinion. "We can only refer to the chief writers on both sides."

The Pentateuch is utterly denied to be the work of Moses, pp. 631, 632, who only wrote Deuteronomy and a few other parts. To the rest he applies the documentary hypothesis, upon which so many and such idle changes have been rung by those infected with the German *hypothesen-sucht*. There was first, one document distinguished in its earlier portions by the use of the divine name Elohim, and throughout by sundry subtle criteria which the advocates of this view have found it so difficult to state, and scarcely any two are agreed upon: this was prepared perhaps in the time of Joshua. To this succeeded another from an independent source, employing the divine name Jehovah, and written about one hundred years later, in the time of the Judges. Lastly, these were compacted together in the time of the earlier kings, by "a final writer, who retouched, added to, and variously interpolated both. Not until his day was the Pentateuch in its present state." It is surprising that a writer who feels no difficulty in admitting such wholesale jumbling and interpolation as this, should be shocked at the assumption, as "a mere subterfuge," p. 623, that the few scattered verses found in the Pentateuch, which some persons hesitate about ascribing to Moses, might have been added by Ezra or some other inspired man to whom authority was given to make such a revision; especially as he makes this very assumption himself in the case of Daniel, where it chances to suit him, p. 924, "We believe that some of these expressions are not such as are suitable in the case of Daniel himself. He would scarcely have written them. But this does not affect the general authorship of the book, as we shall see hereafter."

Pentateuch
documentary
the 21

The grounds upon which this hypothesis are here supported, are the same which have been adduced and answered hundreds of times, from the days of Astruc down. Apparent discrepancies are magnified, and their solutions pronounced unsatisfactory. Different events bearing some mutual resemblance are declared to be discordant accounts of one and the same. Vague and not very intelligible declamation is indulged in, respecting differences of style and language to be found in the books imputed to Moses. Passages are picked out, which it is alleged Moses could not have written; though it is quite consistent with the arbitrary and vacillating mode of treatment pursued, that the most difficult of all, at least as it is usually regarded (the reference, Gen. xxxvi. 31, to a king reigning over the children of Israel) is, p. 621, admitted to be susceptible of easy solution. The abundant allusions to the books of Moses, in the subsequent writers of the Old Testament, are alleged to be irrelevant. And when the New Testament cites the earlier portions of the Pentateuch, under the title of "*the book of Moses,*" or, "the general expression is employed, *Moses describeth, writeth;*" even this is not allowed to be decisive; "the name stands for the book to which it was thus popularly given." After all this, he professes, p. 633, to be as great a stickler for the authority and credibility of these books as the advocates of their Mosaic origin. And he says, p. 622, that the question between them is barely one as to "the *extent* of Moses's authorship." No one alleges that the closing verses of Deuteronomy, which record his death and burial, were written by Moses. And he merely makes the unimportant addition that Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, were not written by him either!

That there are difficulties in the books of Moses, some of which are hard to solve, we do not pretend to deny. Dating as they do from so remote a period, and one from which no collateral accounts have reached us, to throw light upon circumstances here omitted, or but summarily recorded, it is not surprising that it should be so. But the denial of their Mosaic origin does not relieve the matter, as Dr. Davidson would have us suppose. For one difficulty so escaped we would encounter a dozen new ones of greater magnitude. There is scarcely

anything of the kind more instructive than the history of German opinion on this very subject. Ever since the hypothesis of different documents composing the books of Moses was first broached, each successive advocate has been trying to tinker it into some new and more available shape, in order to rid it of the difficulties and embarrassments with which it was felt to be clogged. Now it is two documents, now three, now half a dozen, now one grievously interpolated, now a bundle of brief and disconnected fragments. However confident each writer has been of his own results, he has not been able to satisfy those who have come after him. We have no reason to believe that this sample of imported Germanism will find any more permanent market than the same quality of article has done at home. The whole thing is, in any event, the merest conjecture from first to last; though it is an interesting and an important fact that it has been found so impossible even for those to whom historical evidence is a thing of naught, to conjecture a mode in which the Pentateuch might have been composed, if Moses did not write it.

The book of Joshua is dealt with after the pattern of the books of Moses. We are told, p. 640, that "parts do not well cohere here and there. Discrepancies cannot be denied. It is even difficult to withstand the view, that there are occasional contradictions. The contents and language are of a character to show diversity of materials—the use of different and distinguishable documents." P. 642, "It is probable that the book, as we now have it, was composed in the time of Saul. An unknown writer compiled it from the Elohim and Jehovah documents, using contemporary notices besides, and interspersing his own remarks here and there." The last five chapters of Judges, forming a kind of supplement or appendix to the book, are attributed to another and a later writer than the first sixteen chapters, on the ground, p. 648, of the different and "*untheocratic*" point of view, which is taken in them. Of the books of Samuel it is said, p. 664, "Contradictory statements have been adduced; but many of them are not contradictions." "Granting that some remain, neither the inspiration of the redactor, nor the credibility of the general history is ruinously affected." On p. 668 we read of "discordant statements, repetitions, and unsuitable intercalations" in the books of

Kings. After this it will not surprise any one who knows the direction in which the current upon which our author floats is wont to set, to find him fairly stranded on the books of Chronicles. They are, of course, sadly berated; though he is so kind as to apologize for the inaccuracies of the author, p. 685, by the assumption that the sources at his disposal were not accurate, and that his vagueness and exaggerations may be imputed to his having sometimes followed tradition. "The majority of the improbabilities and fictitious circumstances attributed to him have been successfully turned aside," p. 687, but there are others "which appear to be incapable of solution on any other ground than one unfavourable to the accuracy of the writer."

The denial of the genuineness of the titles to the Psalms, p. 745, etc., and to the prophecy of Hosea, p. 942, is in itself of small consequence, except as corroborative of a general tendency. The same may be said of his adoption of Hitzig's gratuitous emendation of the title of Prov. xxx. He strangely enough says, p. 752, "There can be little doubt that the collectors of the various books [the five books of Psalms, agreeably to the divisions of the Hebrew text] were guided by a religious aim." Are we to seek the meaning of this insinuation that there can be any doubt, in what he says of Psalm 45th, and of the so-called imprecatory Psalms? P. 754, "The 45th Psalm is considered by many to be of an entirely secular character. But * * it is probable that very few secular songs were composed. Almost all were of a religious nature." That he is himself one of the "many" who think this Psalm not religious but secular, is disclosed on p. 800. "It does not follow because the sixth verse of the Psalm is quoted in the New Testament, in favour of Christ's divinity, that the Psalm is *generally descriptive* of Messiah. There is no reason for holding that it has Christ for its subject, and must be allegorically explained of his love to the Church. Modern exegesis repudiates this interpretation." This unsupported dictum is announced as though it put an end to the common orthodox view.

Offence is taken at the language of the 55th, 69th, 109th and 137th Psalms, where the inspired writer, in denouncing the righteous judgments of God upon his foes, expresses his own concurrence in their propriety and the complete absorption of

his own will in that of God, by exchanging the simple future for the imperative. Davidson, however, says, p. 761, that these petitions were certainly not prompted by a regard to religion and hatred of iniquity. Page 762—"The imprecations to which we are referring are the ebullitions of natural and unsanctified feeling." Page 763—"It is not strange that persons whose *conduct* was not always right, should have occasionally uttered *language* of corresponding character. Under peculiar circumstances of exasperation and base ingratitude, is it not conceivable that holy men should sometimes express personal feelings inconsistent with their prevailing disposition and with the spirit of true religion?" That a partially sanctified man should say or do wrong is one thing. But that a man inspired to teach religious truth and duty should, in the delivery of his message, mingle its opposite, is a wholly different thing. This is not to be escaped by saying, p. 766, that "inspiration does not necessarily nor always imply suggestion by the Spirit. It does not exclude *individuality* or suppress the exercise of the human faculties." Of course it does not. Its simple function is to secure the delivery of the message with which a man is charged, be it what it may or howsoever learned, free from all admixture of error. What then becomes of his conclusion—"Therefore an unmerciful sentiment may find entrance into a canonical work?"

Solomon, we are farther told, did not compile any portion of the book of Proverbs, nor was he the author of Ecclesiastes nor of the song which goes by his name. Of the Proverbs it is said, p. 778, "the motives presented are not of the most elevated sort; because they arise out of prudence rather than love. . . . The encouragements offered to a life of virtue are prudential, being founded on an earthly retribution. Indeed the writers appear to have had no conceptions of a future state of rewards and punishments." This censure is in the first place untrue, for a future state is in more than one passage referred to in this book; and in the second place, it is founded upon ignorance or a culpable inattention to the design of the author. That design is to show, that in the ordinary course of God's providence in this world, men's welfare is promoted by right doing, and is obstructed by sin. If this line of discussion is adhered

to, and other topics are not introduced, it is simply because this was the theme proposed; and it is one altogether worthy of a place in the sacred oracles.

Of the author of Ecclesiastes we are told, p. 789, that he "lived in the later period of the Persian government, not long after the time of Malachi." On a subsequent page, p. 986, this appears to be forgotten, and we read that Malachi was "the latest writer in the Old Testament canon." Must we here imitate Dr. Davidson's treatment of the Pentateuch and apply the documentary hypothesis to his own book?

The Song of Solomon is, p. 804, declared to be a song of human love, the allegorical interpretation of which is foreign from its true intent, and "has been put into it by the imagination of the expositor." On page 798, it is admitted that this book owes its place in the canon to its supposed allegorical character; and that it would not otherwise have been dignified with such a position. "But all the probabilities of the case are against the idea that the collectors of the canon acted by infallible inspiration in placing and arranging the books. We hold, therefore, that while the collectors of the sacred books may have put the Canticles into the Hagiographa, believing them to have an allegorical sense, we may or may not adopt their opinion respecting the object and nature of the book." On page 808, he says that divine authority and inspiration are matters which it is scarcely proper to introduce in connection with the Song of Solomon. Its being an amatory effusion, however, does not prevent its being inspired and a part of the canon. If any are so wedded to antiquated ideas as to suspect this language of self-contradiction, it is because "they entertain very inadequate notions of what such important words as canonical authority and inspiration imply." Discarding thus the allegorical interpretation, the poem is not even one of chaste wedded love; but the shocking plot of Ewald is reproduced, of an innocent country maiden tempted to sin by the king, though her virtue is finally triumphant. And one of the reasons given, p. 806, why Solomon cannot have written this Song is, that "he could scarcely have been brought to expose his shame in this public manner."

His passion for finding corruptions in the text is allowed free

play in Jeremiah, p. 881, and Ezekiel, p. 897, the proof being found in the deviations of the Septuagint. And yet such deviations in the book of Daniel, though still greater, are admitted, p. 935, to be chargeable to the Greek translator. In the chronological mistake alleged in this book, p. 907, the credit of Daniel is saved by the assumption that it was not made by him, but by a later hand. But as this later hand is, p. 934, the one to whom we owe the present form of the book and its opening chapters, we do not see how this mends the matter. The iron legs of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, p. 908, and the fourth beast of Daniel's vision, p. 909, represent not the Roman Empire, as they are usually expounded, but that of Alexander and his successors. The prophecy of the seventy weeks relates to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, instead of the coming and work of Christ. The book of Jonah contains, p. 959, a groundwork of history, but embellished by a writer who lived about the time of the Babylonish exile. Zechariah's authorship of the last six chapters of his book is denied, p. 982; and in Matth. xxvii. 9, where his name might have been expected instead of Jeremiah, our author can think of no explanation so probable as a blunder of memory on the part of the evangelist, p. 983.

Our exhibit of the views maintained in this volume, and of the scholarship which it displays, has already been sufficiently extended. It is for the Christian public to say in what esteem a work devoted to the advocacy of such sentiments shall be held. Dr. Davidson, anticipating (Preface, p. vi.) "that prejudice and ignorance would be arrayed against him," and "that he should be confronted with traditional opinions," offers as his apology for the course he has pursued, that "religion concerns the emotions more than the intellect," and that "scientific criticism has its own field, in which it may freely range," and yet faith in God's word be left intact. But a "scientific criticism" which overturns the genuineness of a large portion of the Scriptures, and unsettles confidence in the exactness of its truth, is not so harmless a thing as he would have us imagine. And the emotions are not so separable from the intellect that the errors of the latter are without prejudice to piety. Besides, the principles avowed or covertly insinuated

in this volume, will legitimately lead much farther than the extent to which they are actually pursued. There is no logical consistency in going so far as Dr. Davidson does and stopping there. It is manifestly throughout a purely subjective reason, and not the objective state of the argument, which decides for him the length to which he shall go. Another less scrupulous would, with the same principles, make greater havoc with "traditional opinions" still.

By James C. Moffat

ART. III.—*Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, nach den Zeichnungen der in den Jahren, 1842–1845, ausgeführten wissenschaftlichen Expedition*, von RICHARD LEPSIUS. Imp. folio. Berlin: 1850–1852.

THE work, of which the title is here given, is still in process of publication. It is designed to consist of ten volumes, containing more than eight hundred lithographed plates, many of them coloured, with about twenty sheets of letter press to each volume. The first two volumes are topographical, geographical, and architectural, their object being to give a view of the monuments in Egypt and Ethiopia, according to their geographical position. In the third and fourth volumes are given the historical monuments of the old monarchy, that is, down to the thirteenth dynasty, or the Hyksos invasion; in the fifth, sixth, and seventh, those of the new monarchy, or from the seventeenth dynasty onward to the time of Alexander the Great. To the eighth, are assigned the monuments of the Ptolemies and Roman Emperors; to the ninth, the Ethiopian monuments; and to the tenth, the inscriptions, Hieratic, Phœnician, Sinaic, Greek and Roman. The hieroglyphic inscriptions are included in the previous volumes. The most valuable historical monuments of the editor's original discovery have been already issued.

It is truly a magnificent work, and in some respects, eclipses all its predecessors, in the field of Egyptian antiquities. With-