

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1860.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The Elements of Political Science*. In two Books. Book I. On Method. Book II. On Doctrine. By PATRICK EDWARD DOVE. Author of the *Theory of Human Progression*. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter, 1854.

THIS publication is not a very recent one; but it is quite new to us, and we have read it with considerable interest. The author is evidently a conscientious and religious man, and, we may add, a ready writer. He expresses very well what he clearly thinks, and his courage, in presenting his views, is much more obvious than his skill in ordering his thoughts, or his patience in reflecting on their correctness. We regard his book as a very useful study for those who wish to classify their ideas on many difficult portions of the form and substance of political philosophy; not, however, because of what is true in the book, for that is very simple; but because of the mental skill which may be obtained by seeking out and exposing to one's self its abounding logical vices, and its philosophical and political heresies. We cannot undertake to point these out in detail, for that can be more profitably done by each reader for himself; and our task can be much more acceptably performed by limiting ourselves chiefly to the fundamental conception of the whole work, its aprioral and abstract deductive method.

ART. V.—*Primeval Period of Sacred History.*

IN former numbers of this journal,* we have had occasion to present what we believe to be the most correct, though not perhaps the most familiar, view of the Old Testament history in general, and of the structure and immediate purpose of the first book in particular. The last of the two articles referred to, enters, at some length, into the patriarchal history, prefixing a mere sketch of the foregoing narrative, to which, or rather to a part of which, we now propose to call the attention of our readers somewhat more minutely, recapitulating only so much of our previous and more laconic summary as may serve to render what we say intelligible.

The unity of Genesis being once established or assumed, as well as its preliminary, introductory relation to what follows, it may be divided, in accordance with the view already taken of the history as a whole, by making the call of Abraham a line of demarcation. The first eleven chapters will then be an introduction to the patriarchal history, which occupies the remainder of the book. And this introductory design or character may be observed, not only in this whole division, (chapters i.—xi.,) but in the mutual relation of its minor parts. Thus the history of Noah and his sons would not have been complete without that of the flood; and this could not be understood without a knowledge of the previous corruption; and this again could only be explained by going back to the fall; and that implies a previous condition from which man fell; and that previous condition is the one in which he was created; and the origin of man is but a part of the whole work of creation, with which this primeval history begins. There is something more in the connection which has now been pointed out than simple chronological succession. This view of the design and purpose of the history, and of its several parts, is not without its use, as a key to the

* See *Biblical Repertory* for July 1854, page 284; and for January 1855, page 24.

interpretation. It teaches us, at least, not to look for that which the historian did not mean to give, and not to judge either the truth or the completeness of the narrative by an unfair standard. If, for instance, the creation of the world is here recorded, not for its own sake, not even to satisfy a reasonable curiosity, much less to answer the demands of physical science, but for a moral purpose, that of tracing back the history of man to its commencement, this very view of its design precludes a large class of objections which have been made to the cosmogony of Scripture, namely, all those founded on the fact, that the form of the description is rather popular than scientific.

Another striking fact in this part of the history is that we have two distinct accounts of the creation, one comprising the first chapter and three verses of the second, the other filling the remainder of the second. Between these accounts there are two very obvious diversities, one of form, and one of matter. The material difference is, that while the first briefly records the formation of the first man, in its proper place, as a part of the general creation, the other seems to be designed to amplify this portion of the narrative and make it more particular, in order to prepare the way for what ensues, by distinctly recording the formation of woman, and describing the position in which man was placed. The difference of form is, that while the second and more definite account is simple and prosaic, there is something rhythmical and strophical in the arrangement of the first, as marked by the periodical recurrence of the formula, "it was evening, it was morning, the first day," etc. As metrical arrangements of this sort are commonly supposed to have originated in mnemonical contrivances, designed to aid the memory in retaining compositions of some length, especially before the art of writing was invented or in common use, it is not impossible, though insusceptible of proof, that this cosmogony is older than the time of Moses, perhaps as old as that of Adam, handed down by tradition, as much longer passages, and even entire books, have been in other cases, and at last incorporated, by divine authority, in this most ancient history, or perhaps prefixed to it as a kind of text or theme, like the genealogy of Christ at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel.

This last hypothesis enables us the better to account for two distinct cosmogonies, by supposing that Moses, having introduced the old traditional account, proceeds to comment on it, as an introduction to the history of redemption. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that this hypothesis of older documents embodied in the history is altogether different from that of subsequent interpolations, and preserves intact the inspiration and canonical authority of the whole book, while it greatly increases the prestige of antiquity in certain parts. It ought however to be looked upon rather as a pleasing speculation, than a necessary inference or certain fact.

The poetical character ascribed by this hypothesis to the first cosmogony in Genesis, has reference merely to the metrical or rhythmical arrangement of the narrative, and not to any thing fictitious or imaginative in its substance. On the contrary, the simple, unadorned, historical recital of events in this most ancient of all histories, when taken in connection and comparison with the monstrous combinations and inventions of all other cosmogonies, without exception, is among the strongest proofs of authenticity. The further we go back in tracing ethnic traditions of the origin of all things, the more childish and incredible, the more contradictory of one another and themselves, do they become; whereas the very oldest of the Jewish Scriptures, the relative antiquity of which, whatever be their absolute or actual date, cannot be reasonably questioned, furnish not only specimens but models of coherent, natural, self-evidencing, self-explaining history.

As our design is not minute interpretation, nor the solution of specific difficulties, but the suggestion of more general views which may conduce to both, no further notice will be taken of the scientific difficulties urged against the biblical cosmogony, than to remind the reader that the truth of Scripture, as a whole, does not rest upon the vindication of particular parts, any more than man's belief in his existence is dependent on his capacity to solve the metaphysical objections which may be urged against it. On the contrary, the proofs of its divine authority are so convincing as to justify us in withholding our assent to the most plausible objections, founded on specific difficulties, even where we cannot satisfactorily solve them. This

right becomes a duty, when there is a method of solution even possible, to which the benefit of every doubt ought to be given; much more when we are at liberty to choose from a plurality of such solutions. It is not even indispensable to make the choice, in order to confirm our faith in the entire revelation, of which the disputed passage forms a part. It is enough to know that there are solutions of the difficulty, any one of which is more probable than the supposition of an error or a falsehood. A striking illustration is afforded by the geological objection to the narrative in Genesis. Even admitting the results of geological investigation to be certain, with respect to the age of the earth, nothing can be more unreasonable than to deny the inspiration of the narrative, so long as both the witnesses may be harmonized by modifying the meaning of the verb *create*, so as to make it presuppose a previous formation out of nothing; or by assuming an indefinite interval between the first and second verse of Genesis; or by distinguishing the demiurgic days, as periods of great length, from the natural *νυχθημερον*; or by supposing a creation *statu quo*, analogous to man and other animals in their maturity. However improbable any one of these hypotheses may be considered, it cannot possibly be so improbable as that of a gross error, much more of a deliberate deception, in a book which is proved to be from God by such abundant, various, and cumulative evidence. How much less rational is this last supposition, when the very facts assumed in the dispute are far from being certain, or at least admit of very different explanations! It is not necessary, therefore, to go through the whole inquiry for ourselves, or even to adopt implicitly the positive conclusions reached by others upon all these intricate and doubtful points, in order to justify a steadfast adherence to the biblical account of the creation as a true one.

What is called the astronomical objection to the scriptural account of the creation is still less entitled to impair our faith, because philosophers themselves are not agreed as to the nature of light, and among their many theories there is more than one that may be reconciled with what is said in Genesis, as to the creation of light upon the first day, and of the sun and moon upon the fourth. Let science understand itself, and its ex-

pounders come to an agreement with each other, before either shall presume to charge the word of God with ignorance or error, even as to scientific matters.

All that is here intended to be urged upon this subject, is the right and duty of all those whose minds are satisfied with the positive evidence in favour of the Scriptures as a revelation, to prefer any mode of solving scientific difficulties, not intrinsically absurd or impossible, to the irrational conclusion that a book so attested can teach falsehood, simply because it does not agree with our view of scientific facts and principles.

The account of man's original condition is not only very simple and historical in form, but very brief in compass, being plainly intended, not to gratify a morbid curiosity, but merely to introduce and make intelligible the account that follows of the great apostasy. The image of God, in which man was created; his dominion over the inferior creation; the simple but inexorable test of his obedience; the prospect of immortal life as its reward; the possibility of learning by experience the distinction between moral good and evil; the institution of the Sabbath, and of marriage; and the absence of that shame which has its origin in sin; these are the main points of the narrative, and all of them are stated in the most laconic manner, without explanatory amplification, even where the enigmatical expression might seem to require it, as in the case of the two trees—that of life, and that of the knowledge of good and evil. Upon one particular of this original condition, on the other hand, the history does dwell with a minuteness which at first sight may seem unaccountable; to wit, the place of man's primeval residence. The precise situation of the garden of Eden is as much a mystery, and as much a subject of dispute as ever. The latest and most learned dissertations on the subject contain little more than an enumeration of the various solutions which have been proposed, together with a tacit or express admission, that no one of them is wholly satisfactory. These hypotheses have now become so numerous, that a full exhibition of them, if it were practicable, could have no effect but that of perplexing and confounding. Nothing more will be attempted here than to classify the theories, according to their principle, in which way they may all be reduced to

three great classes. I. Those which deny the literal historical character of the description. II. Those which regard it as a literal description of a state of things no longer in existence. III. Those which suppose it to refer to boundaries and landmarks, which may still be traced and ascertained.

The theories of the first class are chiefly of two kinds; those which regard the passage as a sort of philosophical myth, in which certain facts, as to the origin and progress of mankind, are set forth under the disguise of topographical description; and those assuming it to be a fanciful poetical picture, in which real and familiar facts are blended with fictitious ones, as in the old Greek fables of the Happy Islands and the Garden of the Hesperides. All these hypotheses suppose a previous denial of the truth and inspiration of the record, and are therefore entitled to no further notice.

The second general hypothesis proceeds upon the supposition that the flood made such changes in the surface of the earth as to render this description no longer applicable. This view has the advantage, or at least the convenience, of rendering all investigation needless. The objection to it, independent of all scientific difficulties, is that it affords no reason for the description being introduced at all, and still less for its being expressed in terms belonging to postdiluvian geography.

By far the greatest number of these theories fall under the third head, and assume that the description is, or was meant to be, a literal account of places still in existence. They also coincide in taking as their starting-point the identity of the third and fourth rivers with the Tigris and Euphrates; the latter being only a Greek modification of the Hebrew name, and the former a demonstrable, though much less obvious derivative of *Hiddekel*. The only question, therefore, is in reference to Gihon and the Pison, and to the mutual relation of the four, as fixing the position and extent of Eden. The expression *eastward*, (Gen. ii. 8,) is so vague as to throw little light upon the subject, and is commonly admitted to mean east of the meridian under which the book was written.

The difficulty of the problem is enhanced by the fact, that the two remaining names of rivers are significant of *overflow* or *outburst*, and might therefore be applied to various streams, as

one of them actually is in Arabic geography; while, on the other hand, the names of countries joined with them are variably and loosely employed elsewhere. The innumerable combinations which have grown out of the attempt to ascertain these vague particulars, may be reduced to two great classes; those which assume the tract described to be a small part of Asia; and those which make it co-extensive with a large portion of the surface of the earth, or of the eastern hemisphere. The usual course of theorists has been to determine this point *a priori*, and then seek for the Pison, and the Gihon, Cush and Havilah, either near together or in distant regions, as may best agree with this foregone conclusion.

Each of these general assumptions may be plausibly defended from the context and from usage. In favour of the first, is the admitted fact, that the third and fourth rivers are the Tigris and Euphrates; and as these are never very far apart throughout their course, it is alleged to be improbable that the other names denote streams more remote from these or from each other. In favour of the second, is the fact that *Cush* (as given in the margin of the English Bible, in the text translated *Ethiopia*,) however variably or doubtfully applied, always elsewhere signifies a land much further to the south than the one watered by the Tigris and Euphrates, to include which the two remaining rivers must be sought at a considerable distance. On the first of these grounds, the Pison and the Gihon have been identified with the Phasis, the Oxus, the Araxes, and other streams in Eastern Asia; on the other, with the Nile, the Ganges, the Indus, and the Danube. Ancient tradition, as recorded by Josephus and the Christian fathers, is decidedly in favour of the wider hypothesis, towards which the course of modern speculation seems to be now tending, after having long inclined in the opposite direction.

The description of Havilah, as abounding in gold, bdellium, and the onyx-stone, may seem to give a clew to the precise locality intended, but has not, in point of fact, served to reconcile discordant opinions, as the meaning of the last two words is doubtful, and more than one country, far and near, might be described as producing gold and precious stones.

Besides the doubt which overhangs the names of these two

ivers, and the bounds which they encompass, no small difficulty has arisen from the four streams being not called "rivers" but "heads," into which one river was divided "thence," i. e. on leaving Eden or the garden. The difficulty here is twofold; first, in the expression, and especially the strange use of the word "heads"; then, in the thing itself, to wit, the representation of one river as becoming four, which seems directly to reverse the ordinary course of nature. Among the numberless attempts which have been made to solve this enigma, there is none more ingenious than that of Calvin, who supposes the one river of Eden to be the Tigris and Euphrates *after their junction*, while the "four heads" are the two streams above that point, and the two into which they again diverge before they reach the sea. The objections to this explanation are, that it puts the two unimportant arms of the united river on a level with the two great streams of the Tigris and Euphrates; that it takes the verb *went* (or more exactly, *going*) *out*, in two different senses; and that it leaves the unusual term "heads" as mysterious as ever.

If it be worth while to add one more to the many vain attempts which have been made to solve this riddle, it may be suggested as a possibility, though far from certain, that "went out," or "going out," refers not at all to the natural course of the stream downwards, but to the ideal line of its direction when traced upwards; as if it had been said, "Follow this stream up, and you will find it branching off in the direction of four sources." The Pison and Gihon would then denote the two main tributaries of the Tigris and Euphrates respectively. The sense thus put upon the verb may not be obvious or justified by usage, but it is easily deducible from it, and is not double, as in Calvin's explanation, while, on the other hand, the noun (*heads*) has its usual and proper geographical meaning.

To this unsatisfactory but faithful view of the disputed question, in all its darkness and confusion, may be added a suggestion with respect to the simultaneous meagreness and fulness of this singular description. That these should be the only geographical details which have survived the flood, and that al-

though brief they should be so circumstantial and minute, is a very striking fact in itself, and rendered more so by the singular collocation of the passage, as a kind of parenthesis between the ninth and fifteenth verses, as if this account of the river were in some way necessary to explain the connection of what follows with what goes before. However dubious this connection may be, to suppose that the choice of topics in a history so brief and pregnant was made at random and without design, is, if not irreverent, at variance with analogy, and with the view already taken of the book, as an explanatory introduction to the law of Moses and the history of Israel. In this relation of the Antediluvian Annals to the later Scriptures, the solution of the question now before us is no doubt to be sought, and will be ultimately found.

The next great subject of primeval history is the Fall, which is recorded, with some particularity, in the third chapter of Genesis. According to the plan which we have hitherto pursued, we shall confine ourselves to general suggestions as to the relation which this great event sustains to the whole history, without going into questions of minute interpretation. The first suggestion which we make is, that the narrative is evidently not an allegory but a history, and intended to be literally understood; because there is nothing to intimate the contrary; because it is preceded and followed by plain history, unless the whole book must be viewed as allegorical; because if this part may be so explained away, there is no part that may not be; and because the later Scriptures and especially the books of the New Testament, refer to Adam's fall as an actual occurrence.*

This historical character of the passage requires us to believe, that a literal serpent was the visible agent in seducing Eve; but not that it was the responsible prime agent. Reason itself would have led to the conclusion, that the serpent was the organ of a wicked spirit; and accordingly we find the two ideas often blended by the later inspired writers.†

* E. g. Job xxxi. 33, Hosea vi. 7, Isaiah xliii. 27, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, Rom. v. 12, etc.

† See, for example, John viii. 44, 2 Cor. xi. 3, Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2.

In like manner, the divine denunciation, although terminating really upon the spiritual agent, is clothed in the garb of a curse upon the more irrational and animal instrument, in which indeed it was fulfilled symbolically, whether we assume, with some, that the relative position of the serpent in the animal creation was now lowered; or with others that this relative position underwent no physical or outward change, but was judicially invested with a humiliating punitive significance, in which case the natural repugnance of the human to the serpentine genus must be recognized as one of the most striking tokens of fearful retribution.*

Our next suggestion has respect to the mode of the temptation, as to which there are two points worthy of attention; first, the artful duplicity of the Satanic assurance, which keeps the word of promise to the ear, but breaks it to the hope. In one sense, but not the one which they attached to the expressions, our first parents did not die, but were enlightened in the knowledge of moral good and evil, and became as gods unto themselves, emancipated from that childlike dependence on their Maker which belonged to their primeval state. But this change, far from rendering them happy, was itself their misery and ruin.

The other salient point in the mode of the temptation, is the threefold aspect under which the bait was offered to the woman, corresponding to the threefold temptation of our Saviour, Matt. iv. 3—9, to John's trichotomy of worldly lusts, 1 John ii. 16, and, as some imagine, to the various temptations incident to different periods in the life of man, and in the history of nations.

But by far the most important part connected with this great apostasy is the first promise of a Saviour, included in the very curse pronounced upon the tempter, and significantly called in later times the *protevangelium* (or *embryo gospel*.) It predicts a hereditary warfare between two great parties, to be waged throughout a course of ages, and diversified by

* These arguments against the allegorical interpretation of the passage will be found more fully and most ably stated in Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. i. pp. 5—18, ed. 1854.

many fluctuations, each of the belligerents obtaining temporary partial advantages, till one should become finally triumphant, and destroy the other. The descriptive terms applied to the two parties admit both of a wider and a narrower interpretation, or rather there are three distinct gradations, all of which are verified by the event. The "seed of the woman," in the widest sense, is the whole human race, as opposed to evil spirits; in the narrowest sense, it is Christ, the Head and Representative of redeemed humanity, as opposed to Satan, or the Prince of Devils. But between these two there is an intermediate sense of much importance to the first interpretation of the later history, which indeed derives its whole complexion from it. According to this third view, which is really involved in both the others, and therefore perfectly consistent with them, these figurative terms denote two great divisions in humanity itself; those akin to devils in their character and destiny, and thence, by a familiar oriental idiom, called the "seed of the serpent;" and those who, through Divine grace, should escape from this infernal parentage and doom, by faith in the promised "Seed of the woman," and may therefore, as his spiritual brethren, be distinguished by a wider application of the same expressive phrase. Into these two classes the apostasy divided the whole race, and in their mutual relations we may trace, not only the most vivid exhibition of the deadly and protracted warfare here foretold, but also the great furrow which the ploughshare of God's righteousness and mercy was to run throughout the whole extent of human history, determining its character, and furnishing its primary division into two great antagonistic but inseparable portions.