

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 1.

APRIL, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.*

The appearance of the above named article in the Princeton Review, for January, 1861, has excited the profoundest emotions of astonishment and grief in the minds of all in the South, and many at the North, who care for the interests of our beloved Church. The standing and influence of the Biblical Repertory, as well as the character of the article itself, require us to give it our special attention. The chief end that we propose is the vindication of Southern Christians from the, no doubt honestly mistaken, yet most amazing misrepresentations of the writer. Many God-fearing men have gone heart and hand with the political movements of the Southern States, and we desire to show that in so doing they have not proved themselves to be either mad men or dishonest demagogues.

* This article comes to us from a much respected correspondent in one of the border Southern States, and we very willingly admit it to our pages, although, of course, it does not look at the subject from exactly the same point of view occupied by ourselves in these Confederate States.—Eds. So. PRES. REV.

truths. It is equally true of mathematical science, in which there are not a few propositions which are demonstrably certain, and yet, so far as reason can comprehend them, incredible, or impossible; and yet they are not only believed, but are made the foundation of other principles, and of incalculable results.

The same is true of natural science, also, in which such laws as gravitation, chemical and magnetic attraction, electricity, vegetable and animal life, etc., demand assent, while nothing is or can be known of their real nature. To carry out the principle on which Unitarianism rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, viz: That a man can not rationally believe any thing he can not understand, is both absurd and unphilosophical, and would reduce man to universal ignorance and idiocy.*



ARTICLE V.

BUNSEN ON THE BIBLE.

Bunsen's Bibelwerk. Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. In drei Abtheilungen. Von CHRISTIAN CARL JOSIAS BUNSEN. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus; 1858, 1859, 1860. Large 8vo., pp. cccxciv., 345, 826, 642.

The above is the general title of a work on the Scriptures, by the Chevalier Bunsen, designed for the people

* For to pretend to apply reason to subjects with regard to which our own short views, and even our experience, will shew us it can not be depended on, (and of such subjects he had before given, as examples, those of infinity, immensity and eternity, as ascribed to God,) this is vanity and conceit and unreasonableness.—*Butler's Anal. Pt. 1, ch. VI.*

speaking the German language, and embodying, for general use, what the distinguished author regarded as the main results of modern criticism. Germany, almost alone, he affirms, of all Christian nations, has, for nearly a hundred years, and especially since the commencement of this century, bestowed upon the Bible that thought and research which its own importance, and the love of truth, as well as the religious and moral wants of the present age, demand. The time, in his view, had now come, when the real results of Biblical Science should be submitted to the people in some intelligible form, as a precious, common treasure, which could not longer be withheld. It has been, he says, his life-long desire and labor to set the entire truth before the community of Christians, to the best of his knowledge, and in all fidelity, so that each part might contribute, systematically, to their information, and enable them to form their own individual judgments. This work the author proposed to bring forth in three divisions, the first to bear the title of the Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Covenant, translated according to the traditional text of the original, and accompanied by a popular exposition, and to embrace in its three Parts—I. The Law; II. The Prophets; III. The (didactic) Scriptures, with the Apocrypha; IV. The Scriptures of the New Covenant. The Translation of Luther, notwithstanding its high merits, is, in his view, no longer adequate. He aims to give another after the same noble model, but nearer the original text, and embodying, as far as practicable, the results of modern learning. The Second Division bears the title of *Bibelurkunden, oder Bibeltexte*, etc. The Bible Records, or The Biblical Text, historically arranged and explained. This, also, divides itself into three Parts, and embraces discussions respecting the origin and age of the original Text, and its authors and collectors. The Third Division, under the Title of *Bibelgeschichte*, or Bible History, is to comprehend, in one volume, The Everlasting Kingdom of

God and the Life of Jesus, embracing the great events and persons of the Old and New Covenant. This, also, falls into two sections: The Bible in the World-History, and the World-History in the Bible, the central point of the last being, the Life of Jesus. The whole work will be completed in eight volumes. The first two volumes of the First Division have reached us, embracing the Law, with a Prolegomena of cccxciv. pages, and the Prophets. Of the Second Division, we have received the first portion, which is numbered as the fifth volume, and contains the *Bibel-urkunden*, or Bible Records, with Essays on them, and an Atlas, prepared by the practiced hand of Dr. H. Lange, according to the latest and best authorities.

The Chevalier Bunsen has enjoyed a reputation, at home and abroad, for many years, both in the republic of letters and as the representative of Prussia at foreign courts. His early studies were chiefly philological, in which he enjoyed the instructions of Heyne and Heeren, at Göttingen, and subsequently of De Sacy and others in Oriental studies, at Paris. Having studied the Sanscrit, he conceived the idea of visiting India, but being disappointed in this, he went to Rome, became the secretary of Niebuhr, by whom his studies were in some manner directed, and whom he succeeded as minister at the Papal Court. The work which he there prepared, in connection with Platner and others, on the Antiquities of Rome, is an excellent and almost indispensable aid to him who would be acquainted with that city of ancient ruins, and would ascend to those early times in which their foundations were laid. It is specially rich in Christian antiquities, and his monograph on the ancient Basilicas is marked with an exhaustive fullness. In Rome he formed the acquaintance of Champollion the younger, and commenced with him the study of the Hieroglyphics. In 1838 he left Rome, and for many years was Prussian Ambassador at the Court of St. James, London. His attention being turned in two main directions

by these early studies, he produced two extensive works of antiquarian research, the first, "Hypolitus and his Age," which in the second edition reached to seven vols., 8vo., he having hung upon this text other broad and divergent discussions, as "The Philosophy of Language and Religion," in two octavos, and "Analecta Ante-Nicænae," three volumes more. These volumes are marked with varied but ill-digested learning, and though they breathe a pious spirit, and are penetrated with admiration for the heroic past of the Church, disclose theological leanings which were greatly regretted by the friends of evangelical truth. The same remarks apply to his "*Egypten's Stelle, in der Weltgeschichte*,"* "Egypt's Place in Universal History," which was written partly at Rome, Munich and Berne, and revised and completed at London, where he enjoyed the aid of Birch and others, as he had done of Lepsius before. The English translation, by C. H. Cottrell, Esq., the first volume of which was published in 1848, and the fourth and last during the last year (1860), were prepared, to a great degree, under the author's inspection, and are, especially in the first three books, a great improvement on the German original. He has also published, recently, a large work, "God in History," in which he has reproduced the general views which he had given summarily in the "Hypolytus," before. In 1847 he published "The Constitution of the Church of the Future," the occasion of which was the establishment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem. This half-Lutheran, half-Anglican establishment gave rise to much discussion, in which Gladstone, Dr. Arnold, and Bunsen took part. In this the German philosopher and statesman put forth many noble and just views in favor of the freedom of the congregation, as opposed to a clergy-Church, and some lofty anticipations in reference to the Church of the Future, vitiated, however, by the idea that

* Book I., published in 1843, Books II., III., in 1855.

the congregation is none other than the Christian nation, through whose chief magistrate the chief bishop is to receive his ultimate appointment; involving thus the vice of all European Church establishments, a dependence, more or less direct, of the ecclesiastical upon the civil power. His ideal of Church government would seem to have been a moderate Episcopacy, with large privileges accorded to the people. In 1856, after his retirement to his own country, he found time, amidst his labors upon the Biblical work whose title we have given, to write his "Signs of the Times," in which he took up arms against the bigotry of the old Lutheran party and Church despotism, in favor of what he regarded as religious freedom.

The author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us, leads him to rehearse several points of his personal history. He assures us that this is no accidental or recent project, but one arising out of a systematic plan and preparation for it. For fifty years the intellectual efforts of the author, he says, have been directed to investigations and thought, the conscious central point of which, for the last forty years, (from 1858,) has been more and more a work like this. No one can object to him that he approaches it without mature consideration. The convictions of a life-time, have a worth in themselves, if honorably gained, and subjected to conscientious proof; and at best, no one can do more than devote an entire life to a regular education for a scientific work. His attention, he tells us, was directed to Christ and the Scriptures by pious and experienced parents. In 1805, while at school, he read Genesis and the Gospels in the original, and the latter in Syriac in 1807, under a scholar of Michaelis. At the University, in 1808, whither he went for the study of theology, he had the good fortune, in his exegetical studies, to find in Arnold and Hartmann thorough teachers. In 1810 he applied himself to investigations in Classical Antiquities, not losing sight of Biblical research, to which he

intended to return. He rehearses the story of his seven years' academic course, begun at Marburg and pursued at Göttingen under Heyne, with Wilhelm Hey, Karl Lachmann and Friedrich Lücke as companions, substantially as we have before related; of his study of the Persian and Arabic at Paris, under the kind instructions of De Sacy, of his six years' friendly cohabitation at Rome with Niebuhr, the master of historical criticism, who frequently exhorted and encouraged him to carry out his critical labors upon the field of the Bible. He had already, in 1817, resumed his work, and made a public announcement of it at the Tricentenary of the Reformation, held that year. During the twenty-two years of his residence at Rome, he continued his Biblical researches on the central point of the whole, the life of Jesus. The first sketch of this and of the life of Paul was prepared in the years 1823—1834. He brought the whole together in the year 1835, in a complete criticism of the Gospels, the central point being the Gospel of John, as the work of an eye-witness. He then resumed the study of Genesis. In 1837 he translated the prophets Joel and Jonah, with a critical elaboration, which, in the year 1856, he allowed to be printed as a contribution to the work, "God in History." In 1842 he employed himself upon a translation of a selection of sixty Psalms, which appeared anonymously as an "Evangelical Hymn and Prayer Book," in 1846. In Rome, as well as in England, where he lived nearly fifteen years, as a man of letters and an ambassador, he had frequent occasion to know the inestimable worth and necessity of the Bible, and its use to a free people. In 1849 he finished, according to the sketch made in 1835, a complete harmony of the four Gospels, and the summer of the fatal year of 1850, he had the leisure and comfort of writing out the Life of Jesus, as he presents it to the public in his present work. In the summer of 1854, after forty years' absence from his native land, he obtained the leisure, for which he had long sought, of

bringing the present work to a termination, on which, however, he continued to bestow methodical labor, down to the period when its publication began. The experience of a long life, the fresh courage and undiminished mental vigor received from God, lead him to hope that it will be yielded to him in his gray old age to discharge the vow made in his youth. From his researches upon allied and neighboring domains, to which a translator and expounder of the Bible in this our day dare not be a stranger, he has laid before the German and English people, if he may venture thus to say, sufficient proof that he had not busied himself with this thing incidentally, as a make-shift, or from an incompetent amateurship.*

Such is the venerable author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us. The advantages he enjoyed were certainly such, in some particulars, as fall to the lot of comparatively few. And yet, for a translator of the Scriptures, and for an exegete, skillful and worthy of entire confidence, we would wish to be assured of other acquirements and convictions than this course of study and these aspirations necessarily imply. First of all, we would wish to be assured that the author relies with a simple faith on the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Saviour, as the Light of the world and the Life of men. Assured of this, we would wish to know if he holds the Scriptures as an inspired Revelation of the Will of God, an infallible rule of practice and of faith. We would value his conclusions far more, if we knew that his life had been spent in a careful study of the original Scriptures, till he had become familiar with every shade of doctrine, and every verbal idiom, than if we knew he had spent his days in decyphering the hieroglyphics of Egypt, in the baffling attempt to adjust the dynasties of Manetho, or in bringing forth the long buried writings of some ancient, almost

* Erster Halbband p. cxviii., *et seq.*

forgotten, Father of the Church, who apprehended but imperfectly those doctrines which look forth in the Scriptures with resplendent purity. Far rather would we have one trained in the believing school of the English Puritans, with the superaddition of all that is valuable in modern Biblical learning, than amid the destructive criticism of a Niebuhr, who believed in the Bible, probably, only as he did in any other book of high antiquity. Nor do we know in which department his labors were the greatest, whether in the pursuits of Biblical and antiquarian research, or in Diplomacy and Statesmanship. We give him all credit for noble aspirations, for varied and discursive learning, for a kind and genial nature, and for strong religious sensibilities, and for a hatred of all oppression; indeed, how could we withhold a just praise from one who called forth the glowing eulogies of Arnold; but not one nor all these things, of themselves, qualify one for so great and responsible a work as this distinguished scholar and diplomat has undertaken.

What were his views, for example, as to the plenary inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures? There are many expressions of the author which show, in various directions, a high valuation of the Bible as the Word of God. "Bible-Christians," says he, "have no longer to contend for the outworks, but for the very centre of the castle of their faith. Without, the unbelieving world buzzes around, and urges on with its surging violence, with its giddiness and lust for gold, while within, ferocious enemies advance from every side. Some German scholars have given forth the Gospel of testimony, the annunciation of the Word of Life, that which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, as a myth, an invention of the Gnostics. But it is an easy blindness, or a more bitter jeer, if men should now arise among ourselves, or elsewhere, who should make themselves or us believe that there could be any common Christianity more, after such an assumption. If the Gospel

of John is a myth, and no historic account, but a myth, then is there no historic Christ, and without a historic Christ is all popular faith in Christianity a delusion, all Christian profession hypocrisy or infatuation, the worship of God a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a frenzy." "Over against these views stands the assault of a priestly party, with their claim to an absolute dominion over States and over the consciences of men, and their death-struggle against liberty and science, with deadly hate against the Bible. They tear the Word of God from the hands of the people, and burn faithful translations of it as the most pernicious of books. An evidence this of unmistakable unbelief; for whoever believes in the Bible, and the Spirit which inspired it, can neither hinder its diffusion nor bar the people from its investigation."*

He proposes to treat the Bible according to the strict demands of a devout but historical criticism. And though none can object to the just words which we have now quoted, his views of what a devout or believing, yet scientific, criticism is, may be very different from ours, and what the Church of God is willing to receive. "In such a treatment," he says, "we secure ourselves as much as possible against special disappointment on the soil, and as to the results, of critical science; but we also gain thereby an invincible weapon against the prejudices of unscientific and slow-minded men, and against the oracular decisions, whether of theologians or philosophers. Biblical historic science opposes not a child-like faith in the letter of the Bible, but protects this faith, while it purges it. It attacks its three enemies, who, to a certain extent, act under the same cover, though they apparently war with each other. These are, first, flat unbelief, or the absolute denial of any connection of historical tradition with our inner life; then its opposite, often its offspring, artful, outright bigotry, and

* Erster Band, p. x.

withdrawment of the word of the Scriptures; and, finally, that systematic tyranny which adorns itself with the name of the Bible, but in fact supplants it. All these three enemies the scientific investigation of the Bible did not bring into existence, but found already. This third enemy is the worst. We allude expressly to that mechanical idea of inspiration of the mediæval clergy-Church, increasing in many regions, strengthened by the dullness and bibliolatriy of many theologians of the seventeenth century, and the ignorance of their successors in the nineteenth. Other opposers of Biblical faith incur the danger of treating the Bible as a legend, and rashly accusing it of self-contradictions. But only the mechanical idea of the Bible's inspiration makes the Bible, whether it will or nill, in historical things, a legend—in spiritual, a lie, and kills the life in both. It is necessary, throughout, in this department of Biblical inquiry to tear off from this spirit of darkness this angel-mask of faith, to wit: in the name of God's Word, and this can only be done hand in hand with true Bible-knowledge and historical criticism. And this must be done, not alone on account of the undeniable right of truth, but especially because that form of unbelief has disfigured the true evangelical faith in the Spirit of God (existing) in the Scriptures, and is now perplexing and unsettling many of the best and noblest minds.”*

This is lofty language, and has in many respects the ring of genuine coin. But base metals, in this our day, are so skilfully compounded and concealed as to pass current with any but the most practiced assayers. “This mechanical idea of inspiration has no other notion,” he says, “of the letter of the Bible, than the Hindoo has of his Vedas, the Mohammedan of his Koran, the obdurate Pharisee of his Law and Tradition, of his Thora or Masora. The Bible is to be regarded as a historical ground of faith, because

* Fünfter Band, 7-10.

it is some thing entirely different from the Vedas and Koran, and for this reason, is no Pharisaic Thora, because it assumes throughout, and plainly, the letter only as the expression of the Spirit, and the Spirit as working according to its own divine laws, upon the mind of honest, pious men, through their reason, and its conscientious application to the realities around them."

"Consider," says he, "only the contradictions of this system. According to it, the exalted heroes of faith and prophets, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, are not the objects of the working of this divine energy, but he who composed the books which tell of them. And where both coincide, as in the Apostolic epistles, it is again not the mind and heart of the man of God, which are moved by the breath of the Divine Spirit, but it is the tongue unconsciously speaking, and the finger writing involuntarily, that are the instruments God uses. That speaks, this writes what is suggested to the speaker or writer, without its proceeding from his inner life and its history. Thus they speak in languages they do not understand, and preach as God's Word that of which they know nothing. They are infallible in this speaking and writing, whether they announce their religious convictions, and speak of divine things, or of outward circumstances, things which have nothing to do with religion. The sun must go round the earth, if the passage seems to say so. 'What is written stands,' they cry, and none give themselves less trouble than they, to know what stands written. 'The letter is inspired,' that is their watch-word, and yet they make no effort to know what the letter really says!"*

Now, we do not know what this writer means by mechanical inspiration, unless he refers to the common idea of it, entertained by the truly evangelical Churches of Christendom. And he has no right to call this an assertion of

* Band, V., p. 8.

mechanical inspiration. The laws of matter are one thing. The laws of mind are another. The human agent, used by the Divine Author of the Scriptures, is a moral and intellectual agent, and not a machine, with joints and pulleys, and nothing more. The lips and fingers do not move without the writer's own intelligent guidance. The product betrays his intellectual character, bears the marks of his previous education, and is imbued with his own genius. But there is another agent, one higher and Divine, whose heavenly influence inter-penetrates all his powers, and acts upon them and in them. The product partakes of the character of both agents. The words are the words of men, and they are, at the same time, the infallible Word of God, who can not lie. The exalted heroes of faith, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, the Joshuas, the Gideons, the Davids, were moved by God to act, and directed in their action; but the writer who recorded their exploits or their errors, was also inspired to write them, and the Scripture that he thus wrote is the product of this inspiration, is itself the inspired Word of the Almighty, or is to us no infallible rule of faith and duty. Inspiration is analogous to the work of divine, efficacious grace upon the heart. In this "God does all, and we do all." And yet, it has its own specific differences. The Holy Spirit must have impelled the sacred penmen to write, must have revealed to them the truths to be recorded, or brought to their recollection what had been revealed to them before, must have been with them in the selection of that which was either already a matter of human record, or was attainable by their natural powers, and must have continued with them, aiding and guiding, till that which was to be spoken was uttered, and that which was to be written was traced on the parchment before them. It is in reference to these very Scriptures of which Bunsen, in what is now before us, chiefly speaks, that the Apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and Peter declares that

“Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved, (*φερόμενοι, borne on*) by the Holy Ghost.”

We can not make the language and the assumptions of this writer consistent with any just conception of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

His view as to the origin of Genesis, is as follows: He rejects the theory which has now but few advocates, that the account of the creation, fall, confusion of tongues, etc., is a pure fiction. The disclosures of Comparative Philology have taught us the perfect historical truth of the account of the dispersion and derivation of nations, which it gives us. He rejects the mythic hypothesis, according to which, it is a detail of distorted and very early recitals of astronomical and philosophical myths. “The mythic notion has had its sway, like an infectious disease, for two generations, and has led many intellectual and learned men to the verge of madness.” He maintains that an actual reality lies at the bottom of all that is said about the primeval world, whether it be in the territory of the *ideal*, or strictly historical. Yet, that we can not demand of the late compiler what we would of an original eye-witness. It will not only be lawful, therefore, but obligatory to distinguish between his subjective views and the objective matters of fact. This he maintains he can do without calling in question the writer’s capacity to bring in a trustworthy report. “Wherever there is an honest and pious mind, there is inspiration.” “Inspiration is in the Scriptures, because it is in the Church.” *

In Abraham we have an entirely historic character, who lived in the historic times of Asia and of Egypt, who cast off the fetters of the degrading superstition which surrounded him in Mesopotamia and Canaan, and raised himself, and mankind with him, to a consciousness of the

* Band, V., pp. 11-18.

Eternal. Migrating from the Aramæan soil, he brought with him the traditions of the region whence he came, which had been preserved in his own family, and transmitted them to his immediate descendants in Canaan, the dialect of which country he now adopted. The history of the creation is compiled from two ancient narratives. The first, in which the name of God is Elohim, is the oldest and most historic, and is from a Semitic source; the other, in which the name of God is Jehovah, is more philosophical, is used by the compiler of the book of Genesis to supplement the first, is more in the spirit of the Israelitish people, and originated probably in the times of Moses.

These traditions were at the latest written down by Moses, and in the times of Hezekiah were placed at the commencement of the narrative of the beginning of that people. The traditions of the antediluvian times were handed down by Abraham from an Aramæan source. The history of the creation is ideal, and the days of creation are not natural days, yet in the general succession of events there is a striking correspondence between it and the requirements of the nebular hypothesis of La Place, and the general results of geological research. The flood was local, confined to the central parts of Asia, which, before this catastrophe, were exceedingly fertile, though now waste. The Egyptian people passed over from the region of the Euphrates to the valley of the Nile before this event, indeed, some eleven thousand years before Christ, and retained no traditions of a deluge.* The ages of the antediluvian patriarchs are not historic, but are to be judged of according to the general method resorted to in adjusting oral traditions.

Some of the views of this writer on this and the kindred subjects of chronology are most extraordinary. Here, and in his book, "Egypt's Place in Universal History,"† he

* Band, V., pp. 19-35, 61, 62.

† Vol. IV., B. V., Part V., pp. 385-402.

considers that there is a double list of the antediluvian patriarchs. That which is commonly supposed to give the descendants of Adam through Cain, is only another form of that which gives his descendants through Seth. The latter came from an Aramæan source, the other from a Canaanitish. The so-called antediluvian generations are so many cycles, at the head of which the several persons, if persons they are, whose names are mentioned, stood as landmarks in the course of time. Very strangely, he considers the Seth of the one to be the same with the Jehovah Elohim of the other, and the Adam of one to be the same as the Enos of the other, for no other reason, that we can see, than because he has found Set as the name of a God in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and because both Adam and Enosh, in the Hebrew, are names for man, and, in his view, are here the name, not of an individual, but of mankind. So the four hundred and thirty-eight years of Arphaksad, after the flood, is simply the time of the residence of Shem's, descendants in Arapakitis, and the four hundred and thirty-three years of Selah (Mission) is the period in which the race pushed forward their settlements. Only gradually did this number pass into the date of individual persons. These things belong to the ideal, rather than to the historic, just as the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil also do. We desire to know nothing of mystic numbers, whether they be astronomical or theosophico-cabalistic. We dare not come to the honest historical inquirer with facts which oppose natural science or philosophy. We leave to dogmatic Church theologians the sorry privilege of treating the Biblical narratives as if they were fables."

Others must judge whether this, or the theory that the duration of human life was reduced after the flood, is the true one—whether this or that is most consistent with what claims to be the Word of God. As we proceed upward from our own date, till we reach the period of

Abraham, we find the generations as they now are, and find him lamenting that his days were few and evil, and reached not unto the days of the years of his fathers. An evidence, this, if these narratives are in any way historic, that old age had come on Abraham far earlier than upon the generations that preceded him. And Bunsen fully admits that this Abraham lived in the strictly historic period.

But it is necessary that we possess ourselves of the chronological system which Bunsen advocates, that we may be able to conjecture the length of way these traditions, according to his scheme, have travelled. We find him, by means of the dynasties of Manetho, which Champollion, Wilkinson, Roscellini, Seyffarth, Nolan, Osburn, Prof. Rask, and Poole, bring into consistency with the Biblical chronology, placing Menes, the first historic king, often identified with Mizraim, three thousand six hundred and twenty-three years before Christ, or one thousand three hundred and thirty-three years before the Hebrew, and six hundred and twenty-five years before the Septuagint date of the deluge. The period of hereditary kings in Lower Egypt, ascends to 5414, B. C., of elective kings to 7230, B. C., or three thousand one hundred and twenty-nine years before the Mosaic date of Adam's creation. The birth of Abraham, he places in the year, 2927 B. C. In 2900, B. C., this patriarch withdraws, with his father, Terah, to the south-western part of Mesopotamia; in 2867, B. C., he migrates to Canaan. In the last half of the same century, his venerable form was seen at the court of the Pharaohs, where he appeared as the prudent Semite, the cautious husband of the beautiful Sarai, where he beheld the massive pyramids, some of which were erected five hundred years before, and witnessed those religious rites, which must have filled him with horror. Nearly half-way between Abraham and Christ, he places Moses and the exode, dating this in the year 1320, nearly two hundred

years later than the ordinary computation, and making the interval between Abraham and Moses one thousand five hundred years, instead of the three hundred and thirty which the Scriptures seem to give.

If we are surprised at this, we may look into his "Egypt's Place in Universal History,"* and behold the *aliquid immensum infinitumque*, with which this wonderful chronologist is all the while in travail. There we shall find "that the flood of Noah can not have taken place later than about ten thousand years before Christ, and could not have taken place much earlier," and that man existed upon the earth at least ten thousand years before that, or twenty thousand years before Christ. He assumes, in the first place, contrary to the tenor of the Scriptures, that the earliest state of man was that of barbarism. From the rise of the Romance languages of Southern Europe he learns that it requires five hundred years, or fifteen generations, for new languages to be formed. Again, he argues that it requires, in like manner, long periods for the various systems of Pagan religion to arise. The chapter on this subject is a wonderful specimen of German mist, "a darkness which might be felt." The results to which he comes are these: That in the first five thousand years of the world's history Primitive Language was formed, which was spoken with a rising or falling cadence; elucidated by gesture; accompanied by pure pictorial writing; every syllable a word, every word a substantive, representable by a picture. This language was deposited in Northern China, and Sinism arose. Religious conscience was polarized. Objective worship was addressed to the firmament, and subjective worship to the souls of parents. It was the manifestation of the divine in the family. Another thousand years passed away, and words were agglutinated, polysyllables were formed by unity of word-accent, particles

* Vol. IV., 475.

came into existence, and, finally, complete parts of speech. The germ of mythology was developed, language itself leading to it; the powers of nature became personified as divine forces. In the fourteenth millenium before Christ, stem words became roots, and derived words appeared. In the thirteenth, declension and conjugation, with affixes and suffixes, came into being. The twelfth brought symbolical hieroglyphics, representatives of ideas, without any phonetic element. Eleven thousand years before Christ, the phonetic element was introduced, and the ideo-graphic character was used to express a syllable, without reference to its original meaning. This stage of language in Egypt was owing to an immigration of West-Asiatic Shemites.

Behold the theory! Adam, of which Enos is the equivalent name, is humanity, and probably no person, though he is in the New Testament always spoken of as such, the head of the first covenant, as the personal Christ is of the second. The contest between Cain and Abel is there no contest, as Bunsen represents it, between the agriculturists and the shepherds, which lasted through a long cycle, but Abel is the man of faith, seeking expiation for sin, and offering a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, who had the religion only of nature. Enoch does not mark an epoch or cycle equalling the years ascribed to him, but is a man, the seventh in descent from Adam, who prophesied of the advent of the Lord. He admits this, but affirms that, even in the times of Solomon, the original traditions about Adam, Seth, Enos, Enoch, and others, had ceased to be understood. Language, too, in this theory, is a human invention, and not a divine endowment of the first man as he came perfect from the hand of his Creator. The idea of miracle in the confusion of tongues is indignantly rejected.* It is a providential event, interrupting the civil bond which united one common people. It is to be compared with that which gave

* Bibelwerk, V., 38.

rise to the five or six Romanic tongues, by the destruction of the Roman empire in Italy, France, Spain, and Wallacia. "The miracle of the confusion of tongues is an invention or myth of the moderns." The whole proceeds from the organism of man and the principle of development of the human mind. But, even if so, why these interminable ages for the formation of existing tongues. The substantial union of idioms which gave rise to the Romanic languages, must have been accomplished in one or two generations, for men who have always spoken, though it be different tongues, must continue to speak, and contrive to be understood. "The process of handing down languages through centuries, without break or loss," says Max Müller, an authority which Bunsen was wont to respect, "is possible only among people whose history runs on in one main stream. But no nucleus of society or civilization has ever been formed in the vast Turanian wildernesses. Empires were no sooner founded than they were scattered again, like the sand-clouds of the desert; no laws, no songs, no stories outlived the age of their authors. How quickly language can change if thus left to itself, without any standard, and kept up only by the daily wants of a savage life, may be seen by the endless variety of idioms in America, or on the borders of India, Thibet, and China. There it has happened that colonies from the same village, settled in neighboring vallies, have become mutually unintelligible after one or two generations. The peculiarities of a rising family may change the whole surface of a language, and the accent of a successful Khán may leave its stamp on the grammar of all the tribes that follow him. It is when a language is once fixed by literary works of a national character, that change becomes difficult, nay, impossible, without political convulsions." * The men of barbarous nations,

* Max Müller's *Survey of Languages*, pp. 87, 88, 93, 94. On the Turanian Languages.

while their languages were yet flexible, seem to have made word-building an amusement, and a high intellectual gratification. Hence the copiousness of forms, and the highly philosophical structure, of the dialects of some barbarous nations, of which scholars were unaware till our missionaries have made them known.* The process of the dropping of forms of declension and the shortening of words, is observable in our own English tongue; and the least inflected language may disclose a more modern state than one more inflected and more apparently artificial. All these states of language are found coexisting, and it is not always easy to show which exhibit the later stages of language, the polysyllabic, the dissyllabic, or the monosyllabic tongues. The argument from language utterly fails.

If the rise of languages does not require these almost countless ages, neither does the rise of Pagan Mythologies. Religious instincts exist in all men. If they do not like to retain God in their knowledge, He gives them over to a reprobate mind. Their decadence is rapid. They are eager in seeking out many inventions, and change the glory of the incorruptible God quickly into images made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Nor does the similarity of heathen superstitions prove their rites and worship to have been historically connected. There are but a few principles on which all pagan worship rests. The worship of heroes and benefactors, the adoration of the heavenly hosts, the deification of the powers of nature, or human passions, and the fear of demons, may give rise to rites among distant nations, in one and the same age; and these religions may have surprising coincidences, without any real connection one with another. Nor does the very welcome discovery of Mr. Horner, who, in boring at the foot of the colossal statue of Rameses the Second, brought up a fragment of

* Compare the Paradigm of the Verb in Wilson's Mpongue Grammar.

pottery from the depth of thirty-nine feet below the surface, which he regarded as evidence of the existence of man thirteen thousand three hundred and seventy-one years before 1854, which Bunsen has dwelt on with evident satisfaction, both in his "Bible Work" and in the preface to his third volume on Egypt, afford grounds for any such deduction. It could have fallen into some previous excavation or fissure; it could have been entangled with some floating timber, which the continual action of the water should have worked through great depths of slime, as it does the "sawyers" of the Mississippi. Rivers do not take counsel of men. Some times their eddies scoop out deep chasms in a few hours, to be again gradually filled, and some times the waters gently wanton around some imperishable substance, sinking for it a deep recess, or wearing away a profound grave for its burial.* How are any of these alleged proofs to be compared with the uniform testimony of Christ and the Apostles, as to the infallible testimony of Moses and the Prophets?

As to the Dynasties of Manetho, a portion of them, twenty-five thousand years, are by him assigned to the rule of Gods, Demigods, and Spirits. The five thousand years of the remainder were reduced by Manetho himself, according to Syncellus, to three thousand five hundred and fifty-five. Why? unless he suspected that many of them

* See a similar alleged fact in reference to the Mississippi River, referred to in Vol. IX. of this Review, p. 257. The Nile, like the Mississippi, some times changes its course. One thousand years ago it flowed hard by the present limits of Cairo, from which it now is a mile distant. Pottery might be found, probably, twenty feet below the present surface, where the old bed once was, deposited within the last one thousand years. At Sigiul, Mr. Horner says, the auger brought up burnt bricks and pottery from a depth of forty-five and fifty feet; and at Bessouse, from the depth of fifty-nine feet. Alas, for the argument! There is no structure of burnt brick in Egypt older than the Roman domination. The bricks and the pottery must have been deposited there since the Christian Era. See *For. Quarterly*, April, 1859, p. 232.

were contemporary. If his own faith was shaken in a portion, may he not, out of that desire to exalt his own nation, of which Egypt and other ancient nations afford so many examples, have left some doubtful points still remaining. Egypt was divided from the beginning into nomes, or districts. Heptanomis, the seven districts, is one of the names of Middle Egypt. It was customary in ancient times to call the sovereigns of very limited territories, kings. The kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela, five in number, had all together a domain, now covered by the Dead Sea, which could hardly exceed forty miles in length by eight in breadth. There was a time, mentioned in Herodotus, when a Dodekarchy reigned in Egypt, one of whom, Psammeticus, subdued the rest, and became sole monarch. The idea of contemporaneous sovereigns and dynasties belongs especially to Egypt. Kings, too, were often co-regent.* How, we ask, is it possible that the knowledge of Germany should be unknown to France? And how was it possible that the Jews, an intelligent people, living now in Egypt, and always on its confines, should not know of a discrepancy between the chronology of the two nations, if such truly existed? How could Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, have permitted his countrymen to be so ignorant of what he must have himself known. Or how could he have imposed a false chronology upon them if he had desired? Especially, if a rectification of the current Hebrew chronology was attempted in the Greek version, prepared for the library of Ptolemy, why should the figures in that copy reach no higher? After reviewing the reasonings of Bun-

* This idea of contemporary dynasties was adopted by Eusebius, and is received by most modern Egyptologists. The able writer in the *Foreign Quarterly* rejects it. He puts an end, however, to the credibility of the *Manethonic Dynasties*, as handed down to us, claims that they are full of irreconcilable inconsistencies, and annihilates the entire chronological argument of Bunsen.

sen and Lepsius on the Manethonic Dynasties, Kurtz holds that, "in a scientific point of view, we are warranted in abiding by that Biblical chronology, the trustworthiness of which has not yet been shaken by any doubts cast upon it." To the same result have Rawlinson and Delitzch both arrived.

After this long, but somewhat necessary digression, we return to Bunsen's idea of the authorship of the five books of Moses. As to the materials out of which they are composed, he finds—1. Genealogical registers, or pedigrees; 2. Brief memoranda, appended to these, or detached from them; 3. Songs or hymns in commemoration of great events; and, 4. Detailed narratives. The distinction between the historian, the collections, and the documents, (or original traditions,) must, he says, be preserved throughout. There is no reason to suppose more than one real author. That is, before the author of our four first books of the Law, there was no book of Genesis, nor of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Yet this one author found before him more than one collection, both of songs and genealogies, and these collections, so far as they related to the days of Moses, are already written down. On the contrary, in relation to the ante-Mosaic period, and especially that of the origines, we find the traces of an originally oral tradition, which can only be referred to Abraham and his descendants of the next five or six generations, who have handed it down. The true author of the books could not have lived earlier than the reign of Hezekiah. The book of Deuteronomy, which Delitzch makes the oldest, is wholly post-Mosaic, and was written in the last years of Hezekiah. Such are the conclusions of Chevalier Bunsen, which he has brought no new arguments to establish, none but what Hengstenberg and Hävernick had before considered and abundantly refuted, as we have shown in an early volume of this Review.

However high the inspiration he may give to Moses himself, the facts of those early histories, according to Bunsen, were handed down, in part, by a varying and uncertain tradition, or clothed in the garb of poetry. The narrator, who lived in the reign of Hezekiah, and "who was a man of wisdom and learning," gives with unmistakable honesty what he found lying before him at that time. But whether this is to be literally received, is another question. The popular tradition represented Pharaoh as drowned in the Red Sea. But Menephtha, whom he makes to be the monarch then reigning, did not thus die, but lived ingloriously fifteen years longer. Nor did the waves stand upright as an heap on either hand. All is founded in popular error. The fact of the case was, Palestinians, or a Bedouin host, perhaps instigated by Jethro, invaded the country, and the great Sicilian vespers took place, in which Asia took her revenge on Africa. These were the messengers of the Lord, who slew all the first-born, even in the king's palace. The exode then occurred. A body of troops were dispatched to attack the retiring multitude. These perished in the waves, but Menephtha himself fled with his son, then five years of age, to Ethiopia, and returned again thirteen years afterwards." *

These declarations we can not stop to refute. We can only say that the whole of this identification rests entirely on conjecture, and only shows how slight is the author's reluctance to go directly counter to the Scriptures. If Bunsen's speculations as to chronology are at all wrong, he will not be likely to fall on the name of the monarch then ruling in Egypt. Osborn makes him to have been Sethos the Second, who was an idle and profligate prince, who suddenly disappears from history, whose name appears on the face of his tomb, which was begun, and left unfinished, by him, and whose memory was consigned to infamy and

* *Egypt's Place*, IV., 558. *Bibelwerk*, V., 141, *et seq.*

oblivion by his subjects.* A writer in a contemporary journal identifies him with Thothmes the Second, predecessor of Thothmes the Third, of whom there remain "almost auto-biographical inscriptions at Karnak," recently deciphered by Brugsch, fixing the date of his accession, and of course of the death of his predecessor, in coincidence with the period of the exode, and of the drowning of Pharaoh in the Red Sea.† Both these can not be true, but either of them is as much entitled to be received on monumental and historic grounds as that of Bunsen, and neither comes in conflict with Scripture.

The Israelites are said to have wandered forty years in the wilderness, and to have eaten manna that length of time, and our Saviour speaks of this manna as *bread from heaven*.‡ But Bunsen says the forty years was the time between the exode and the passage of the Jordan, thirty-seven or thirty-eight years of this time being spent quietly on the east-Jordanic side of Palestine. The manna was local, and for a single season, the product of the Tarfah bush, found only in the Wady Pharan, and the account of its preservation over the Sabbath, and not on other days, belongs to popular poetry.§ And yet the manna of the Tarfah or Tamarisk exudes at the puncture of an insect, does not become rancid and breed worms, may be spread like butter or honey, but can not be ground in a mill, nor pounded in a mortar, nor made into bread, like the manna of the Israelites. It is produced by the labors of "lice and chafers," and can not be the "bread from heaven," nor the "angels' food," of which the children of Israel partook.

The Apostle Peter says that Balaam was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass "speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the Prophet." But the Prussian Am-

* Monumental Hist. of Egypt, II., p. 594, *et seq.*

† British Quarterly, October, 1860.

‡ Num. 14 : 33 ; 32 : 13 ; Exod. 16 : 35 ; Neh. 9 : 21 ; John 6 : 32.

§ Bibelwerk, V., 160, 161.

bassador says this is a great mistake. The ass shied and fell under the Prophet's blows, like any other poor beast. The rest all passed in the thoughts and accusing voice of the Prophet. Paul says the Israelites did all drink of that same miraculous rock; and the idea is found in various places of Scripture. The Chevalier Bunsen says, No. The writer in Hezekiah's time honestly thought so, for so the popular tradition, five hundred years after the facts, incorrectly reported. As to the repetition of the act in Kadesh, (Numbers xx : 8, 12,) the account is obscure and perplexed; all that can be authentic is the discovery and opening of a spring situated in the rocks of Kadesh. Yet the "waters of Massah and Meribah" are echoed and reëchoed throughout the Old Testament.

In like manner he speaks of Elijah. He was the most highly gifted and holy man of the heroic age, the only one of them, indeed, whose life did not end as a tragedy. His departure was not a sun-set, but a transfiguration. Yet, not the apotheosis which is believed. The whole narrative of his life is a popular epic from beginning to end, a legend, but not a myth. The historicalness of his life and personality is, says our author, not thereby endangered. Nothing but boundless ignorance, fool-hardy hypocrisy, or weak-headed fanaticism, can demand the faith of the Church for such a miracle as a historic truth. It is evident, from the narrative, that his disciples, more than a hundred in number, had a presentiment of their master's determination to separate himself from them, without a formal adieu, never to return. Elijah had already often lived apart from them in the wilderness of Judah and Arabia, as well as under the protection of the Sidonian republic, quite alone. He had, in the heights of Horeb, seen the Eternal. There, or in some other quiet spot, he sought, renouncing all earthly strife and passion, the life of God. An animated eulogium of his beloved disciple, Elisha, on his departing master, spread among the people: 'My

Father! My Father! The chariot of Israel and horsemen thereof!' The defence, *i. e.*, and the glory and honor of thy people! Does not this truly historic expression, with the promise made to Elisha, that if he should see him when he should be taken away from him, he should receive a double portion of his spirit, shine through and explain the legend? 'And it came to pass, as they still went on and talked, that behold! there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up, by a whirlwind, into heaven.'"

But we withhold our hand from any further introduction of these exegetical feats of our learned author, as extraordinary in their boldness as they are trifling and godless in their spirit. The author himself acknowledges, in reference to this last conjecture, about the translation of Elijah, that we need some objective statements of a chronological character, to justify the view of the epic (?) records respecting that prophet, and some critical apparatus by which to subject the story of his translation to the test of a historical criticism. We agree with him. He does, in truth, need some kind of apparatus. He seems to us to be working in the very fire, and wearying himself for very vanity. If there is a supernatural revelation, it should be sustained by supernatural testimony, and may be expected to record things beyond the regular succession of natural events.

We will only here say, that the same destructive criticism which Bunsen has applied to the Pentateuch, he has also applied to the books which immediately succeed them. He says, 1. That we have contemporary records for many points of the internal and external history of the seven centuries, from Moses to the downfall of the kingdom; 2. These documents are partly historical, partly poetical—statistical notes, or songs and proverbs; 3. Some of these have been wrought over, and others retained in their original form. The last go back to the passage of the Jordan, or

even to the year 1280 B. C. ; 4. Oral tradition has been written down, some times soon after the events, some times by later collectors and the historian to whom these books owe their present form ; 5. The writer of the histories of the last times of the monarchy, can not be earlier than the second half of the captivity, yet lived before Ezra ; 6. The preceding books are earlier, but Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, bear traces of a later hand. If, now, it be inquired if these narratives in general are authentically historic, and if the authentic portion can be distinguished from that which proceeds from popular tradition, he answers in the affirmative. He says, however, that they are only in a small portion strictly historical. The chasms in the history are numerous, much which has the historic form belongs to the realm of the ideal, and we possess, for the times before the exile, only late, and, in great part, legendary accounts, and later ideas are borne over into the earlier narratives. To the inquiry, whether these different materials do not unite, in the principal points of the narrative, into a harmonious historical form, though the tradition is not exact and complete, he answers affirmatively. We can separate the authentic documentary portions, and they are more important, especially for the earliest times, than is commonly allowed. The book of Joshua is composed, 1. Of contemporary documents, being historical records, purely authentic ; 2. Of very ancient popular songs relating to isolated expeditions ; 3. Of a traditionary narrative which was reduced to writing before David. Samuel and his prophetic school wrote down, probably, these oral traditions. The final Reducteur lived in the times of the captivity, or soon after. The book of Judges has the same elements, substantially authentic, but partly historico-epic, and received its final form in the times of the later kings. The two books of Samuel are founded upon the traditions which proceeded from the school of the prophets over which he presided, but obtained their final form in the

days of Hezekiah, or soon after. He was, in some respects, a second Moses. The maintenance and restoration of the Law Moses gave, was his life-long effort. He is the preserver of the original documents, which assumed their present form four centuries and a half later. He preserved, also, the memory of the words and deeds of the old prophets, and to his school we owe the preservation, in general, of those sources whence the books of Joshua and Judges afterwards came. In his day, the Scriptures we now have did not, in any proper sense, exist. Neither the men of God of a former time composed any thing, nor Samuel himself. But the collections of the school over which he presided furnish the ground-work of the first portion of the former prophets. The two books of Kings were composed during the exile whose thirty-seventh year is named in the history of Joachim. Chronicles was written after the book of Ezra, but before the Maccabean age. The book of Ecclesiastes was written under the Persian rule. It is an open question whether the book of Daniel was written in the times of Nebuchadnezzar, or in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 169 B. C. *

We confess ourselves wearied by the greatness of the way over which this German philosopher and statesman has carried us. And lest we should, on our part, weary others, we will make no attempt to discuss the points involved in the immediately preceding statements. Though his work on the Scriptures is yet imperfect, and the part already published contains his views only on a part of the Old Testament, we can judge of the Hercules from the foot now exposed to us. With all Chevalier Bunsen's professed regard for religion, he assumes, with other Rationalists, a most scornful air towards the clergy; those, we presume, who oppose him, who wonder at his pompous intrusion into their own domain, at his contemptuous sneers at any

* Band, V., *Bibelurkunden*, pp. 475-555.

who differ with him, at his claim to immense superiority of learning, at his disposition to hustle them out of the temple of theological science, and to take possession of it himself. Shall they dare to contest these matters of chronology with this hierophant of the mysteries of Egypt, to whom the hieroglyphics yield up their secrets, and who can tell so well how many milleniums it took before a man out of a noun could manufacture a verb, and how many more it required to learn how to attach terminations of gender, number and person. How superior this mighty man to that clergy who "fabricate even historic truth, who strenuously exert themselves to destroy historical science where ever it is possible, in order to bring us back to the dark ages," whose worship is "a dogmatising Bibliolatry," who use "their Bible as a cloak for indolence and want of reflection," who, "from cowardice or superstition," maintain still the great length of the antediluvian generations, who make the Bible "the fig-leaf of ignorance and indolence." All these things it is reserved for German research to set right. They are the people! endued with the gift of clairvoyance, if not into the future, yet into the past, and the Prussian Ambassador the most clairvoyant of them all. And yet we seem to hear a mighty voice out of the whirlwind, saying to all this, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding."

We can only very briefly indicate our reasons for still entertaining the traditional faith of the Church respecting the Scriptures. With the same force of reasoning might the theory of Eichorn, that the four Gospels came gradually into existence, and were received and pronounced upon by the Church at the close of the second century, and not before, be propounded as a matter of fact, as the theory of Bunsen and his predecessors of the skeptical school has

been in reference to the books of the Old Testament. He has, however, condescended to say that the Gospel of John is no myth, no invention of the later Gnostics; that there is a historical Christ, and that if there were not, all Christian faith were a delusion, our creed hypocrisy, our worship a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a mistake. If the Christian Scriptures are indeed to be received, then are the Jewish to be received also. The quotations from the Old Testament in the New, count by hundreds; the allusions by many hundreds more. The views of Christ and the Apostles can not be mistaken. They held the men who wrote these Scriptures, and not merely the men of whom they wrote, to be inspired. The writing itself is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and is an infallible record. It is not the jotting down, however faithful, of popular tradition and legendary story, which one is to receive or not, as he pleases. But with these men, "Thus saith the Scripture," is the authoritative decision that settles all. *Ἡ γραφή λέγει*, and *τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει*, "The Scripture saith," and "The Spirit saith," are terms of equal value. Ninety of these direct quotations are from the Pentateuch, and there are one hundred references to it besides. In many of these Moses is spoken of as the author, and not simply as the one whose history is given, in the Book. "When Moses is read," says Paul; "Moses describeth the righteousness of the Law;" "We have found him of whom Moses did write." "MOSES wrote," says the Saviour, and not the compiler in Hezekiah's day, "if a man's brother die," etc. This which he thus wrote stood then, as now, at the beginning of the Scriptures. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." The Scripture thus written was *θεοπνευστος*, inspired of God; the men who wrote it were moved by the Holy Ghost, and were "in the Spirit," in his power and under his influence, which penetrated, stirred and guided the whole powers of the writer. If this is Bibliolatry, *venia sit verbo*, the Master

and the servants were Bibliolaters alike. If this was narrow Judaic superstition, mechanical inspiration, theological pharasaism, let us be content to share the reproach with Machtspruch, and the Lord and His disciples. There are two reasons why inspiration extends to the words, if it is in any respect plenary and sufficient to render the Scripture a rule to man. In the first place, in man's present state the *λόγος* of speech stands over against the *λόγος* of reason, and the suggestion of the thought brings also the word which expresses it, and the one is thus married to the other. And then, in practice, we find in a single word, oft-times, volumes of precious truth, which in our meditations we never exhaust, which would be wanting if the word was wanting, or different from what it is. This is an argument for verbal inspiration, and for closeness of translation, when translation is resorted to for popular use. If recourse may be had to rationalistic interpretation in matters of fact, so also in matters of doctrine, and "the precious things of Scripture" fade out before this destructive process.

The reason expressly given by Josephus why the Jewish writings subsequent to Artaxerxes were no part of the Canon, was, that they were uninspired, and that the succession of prophets had ceased. This was the common view of his nation, who were appointed by God as the receivers and conservators of the documents of our faith, till the time should come when they should pass over from one tribe of the family of Shem, to the tents of Ham and the dwellings of Japheth. We may take our station where we will in the Old Testament history, in the times subsequent to Moses, and the Codex of the Thora is already in existence. It regulates the worship, controls the customs, is the basis of all judicial decisions, sends its influence over social and domestic life, and is expected to control all parties, from the king on the throne to the slave that toils in the field or bears the sandals of his master. It is referred to, as to its substance, from Malachi to the times

of the Judges, and the division of Canaan itself was made by Joshua, his immediate successor, in accordance with predictions found recorded in Genesis. In the references to the Mosaic Law in this post-Mosaic literature, the expression often is shaped according to the words we now find written. In all the legislation found in these books there is nothing post-Mosaic, the brief expressions which indicate a later hand are, with the exception of Deut. xxxiv., unimportant, and are added for explanation, and added previous to the time when inspiration had ceased. The number of them, too, is diminished by a just interpretation, which rescues them from the hands of an unbelieving criticism, that dictates and will not learn, that prescribes what must be, and receives not what is. When you approach the writings of the Scriptures in a different direction, Genesis is the root of the tree of Revelation, "the anticipation," says Delitzsch, "of The Law, the Law the anticipation of the Old Testament, the Old Testament of the religion of redemption, redemption of the world of the present and its history—upon the pillars of this Book rests the edifice of our salvation, which reaches upward and forward into eternity." A meet and fitting outline and adumbration is it of the good things to come, a needed introduction to the whole system of divine revelation, without which the rest would be scarcely understood. It solves the greatest questions which lie at the foundation of all religion and all human history, and if we had it not, there would be a great chasm felt in all human knowledge. The future history of the Church and man would be like a river without a spring-head, a castle hung in the sky, without a foundation.

Whether the writer of Genesis was the first to reduce to writing the primeval history, and the story of the creation, and was informed of these things by a species of supernatural intuition akin to the prophetic, yet looking backward, or found in existence more ancient records from

patriarchal pens, is a matter not of prime importance as to the authority of this Book. It is necessary, absolutely, to this authority that the writer who penned it in the form we have it, should be inspired, not by an ordinary indwelling of the Spirit, but by that extraordinary guidance ascribed in the Scriptures to Apostles and prophets, and which operated in its highest power on the human mind of the man of Nazareth, who was also the divine author of our salvation.

Bunsen is another, added to the numerous class of German scholars, who have handled these topics of sacred history substantially in the same form. To the *document hypothesis*, broached by Ilgen in 1798, has succeeded the *fragment hypothesis* of Valer, in 1805, the *supplement hypothesis* of Tuch, in 1838, advocated also by Knobel, and to which Delitzsch, more lately, in a different spirit, and with high views of inspiration, has given a modified assent; and the *christalization hypothesis* of Ewald, as Delitzsch calls it, which supposes four authors, whose works have been incorporated by a fifth, into their present form. To these has succeeded that of Vaihinger, proposed in Herzog's *Cyclopedia*, with his three sources, the *Præ Elohist*, the *Elohist*, and the *Jehovist*, each supplementing the other.

Our space will not permit us to dwell longer on these points. An ingenious man can propound theories which it would require volumes to overthrow. If proposed with the ability and learning of a Tuch and an Ewald, they will have weight with many who will give heed to the most inconsistent fables. Learning can be lavished on theories the most baseless. It was in a book replete with knowledge that Lord Mouboddo, no mean lawyer and judge, extolled the blessings of savage over civilized life, and put forth his notion that man is only a monkey bereft of his tail.

Bunsen appears to have been a man of a genial nature,
VOL. XIV., NO. I.—17

and of generous impulses, and to have numbered many Christian men among his friends. It is the more to be regretted that his unsafe speculations, his arbitrary reasoning and his dogmatism should shake the confidence in his soundness and ingenuousness of those who revered him while living. He was social, accessible, cheerful and enthusiastic, and won the good will of many with whom he came in contact. But more and more, as the labors of his life have approached their termination, has it been perceived how far he was overstepping the boundaries of truth, and on what inadequate and fanciful grounds he was willing to confound all the records of the past. In proportion to the grief of these friends, has been the triumph of skeptical and latitudinarian men, who have solaced themselves with the accession of this new name, as they have supposed, to their own ranks. His friend, Pressensé, who acknowledges the unhappy direction his speculations have taken, says, in his defence, that "he traversed the great theological crisis of the times, and was affected by it in many of his opinions. His only desire was, as he often said, to throw a bridge between contemporary thought, tormented with many doubts, and Christianity. It mattered little to him whether the bridge stood or was broken, provided a safe passage was effected to the other bank." But there will always be those who will need to pass over, and broken bridges are in the way, and give no relief. He has, we fear, been a most unfortunate architect. The bridge of Languages has failed; the bridge of Mythologies has broken down; the bridge of the Antediluvian Generations has been found unsound; the bridge of the Manethonic Dynasties has given signs of dissolution, and is condemned by wise master-builders; the bridge of the Historical Epos is floating off; and there remains but the cloud-phantom of an inspiration, in which nothing is communicated, and nothing rendered sure, but the whole

record is blurred with harmful blots, marred with human weakness, and divested of all that was thought divine. So far as he shall be instrumental in conveying to the minds of the common people these unbelieving thoughts respecting the Word of God, his life of labor will bear evil fruit, "the grapes of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrah."

Yet, as we have ever been reluctant to say how much ignorance in the lowly may yet be compatible with salvation, so we are afraid to say how much mistake and error and vain speculation may exist in the intelligent and exalted, and God yet own them as his. There have been some words of controversy respecting the death-bed scenes of this distinguished man. Some have been unable to understand how such error of the head could coexist with such apparent piety of the heart. Some have considered that to the aspiring philosopher there might be two realms of thought, one the region of speculation, the other of emotion, and that the heart may be true when the intellect goes far astray. Others are unwilling to allow this *dichotomy* of our moral nature, and suppose that by the grace of God he was raised in his last days out of the trammels of his system, restored to the simple faith in which he was reared in childhood, and brought to exercise a humble trust in Christ as a Saviour. A more unfriendly opinion than either has also been entertained. As we have said so much in condemnation, we will, as an act of justice, permit his friend, who seems to be clothed with authority to do so, to speak of the closing hours of his long life.

M. Pressensé describes the charm of Bunsen's conversation on his last visit to Paris: "So rich, so intellectual, and so cordial, all penetrated with that religious salt whose pungent savor none can imitate," and his whole person "so full of moral youth under his crown of white hair." He speaks, also, with much tenderness of his last hours: "M. de Bunsen desired the prolongation of his existence

till he should terminate the labors he had commenced. One night he perceived that such was not the will of God, and he lifted himself from his chair, crying ‘O God, I commit my spirit into thy hands.’ He then caused all his family to approach, and said to them, ‘A great change has taken place in my thoughts, not as to my immortal soul, nor as to Christ, my only Saviour, but in regard to my body.’ Having blessed his children, and expressed his grateful affection for the faithful companion of his life, in the most touching terms, saying that he had loved in her that which is eternal, (*In dir liebte ich das Ewige,*) ‘O God!’ he cried, ‘be pleased to bless my friends! May my country be blessed, and Italy and her liberty! May Prussia, Germany, England, the entire world, be blessed! I desire every benediction to the Prince and Princess of Prussia! Gratitude for Niebuhr.’” Niebuhr had introduced M. de Bunsen into the career which he so worthily filled. After he had thanked his domestic with the truest affection, with a heavenly expression on his countenance, he thus resumed: “In spite of all my weaknesses and my sufferings, I have desired, I have sought, that which is noble here below! But my most delightful experience is to have known Jesus Christ. I quit this world without hatred to any person—no, not hatred, hate is accursed! Oh, how good to contemplate this exalted life! We know now what an obscure existence we have led on the earth. Above! Above! It is dark no longer, but brighter and brighter always! I am now in the kingdom of God. Till now it was but a foretaste. O, my God, how lovely are thy tabernacles!”

The 29th of October, as they pointed out to him the radiant sunset—“Yes,” said he, in English, “it is beautiful, the love of God is in every thing.” “May God bless you for ever,” said he, in French. “Let us part in Christ Jesus. God is life, is love, the love which wills, the will that loves,

(*Wollendes Lieben, liebendes Wollen*). *Christus recognoscitur victor, Christus est, Christus est victor.* For him to be is to conquer. There is no death with God. I see Christ and I see God through Christ." * * * * "All the rest is nothing. Christ is the Son of God, and we are the children of God only when the spirit of love which was in Christ is in us."

"Such," says Pressensé, "was the last word of this long and brilliant life. To love God in Christ is every thing, the rest is nothing. Behold the theology of the death-bed, behold the science of the Christian's last agony!"

May we trust that his spirit has now gone where there is no darkness at all; where the errors, and the ambitious, trifling, and unfruitful studies of earth are laid aside; where nothing exists but light, truth and love? "His funeral obsequies were affecting and appropriate. His coffin was borne first by his sons, then by the students of the University of Bonn, covered with garlands of flowers, after the German custom, and accompanied by all the town, with the solemn sounds of those songs of his nation, which he had loved so well. The pastor, who had administered the communion to him some days before, pronounced over his open grave the words of eternal life, and they retired, saying that Germany had lost a great citizen, science one of its most eminent representatives, and the Church a fervent Christian, who died confessing his faith in Christ." Such is the touching narrative of his last hours, given by Pressensé in the *Revue Chrétienne* of December last.