

*anim ad chi quando?* In view of all this, the critical student will feel that this novel interpretation of the passage cannot be founded on so erroneous a philological basis. A similar instance of arbitrariness is the rendering of Gen. vi. 3, by "while he is also flesh," or "when he is still flesh"—for which, despite fair promises, not a particle of evidence is offered. These specimens suffice to show that, however able and excellent in many respects our author's philological remarks they are not to be implicitly followed, especially when a controverted passage is in question.

The estimate which readers will form of the notes, as contra-distinguished from the philological remarks, will vary with the theological views which they may have adopted. All, however, will agree that condensation would have been possible and desirable, and that many passages of fine writing might safely have been struck out, as well as repeated lucubrations over the prejudices of others, and asseverations of personal independence. A thoughtful, learned and really independent commentator impresses such convictions on the mind of his readers without having recourse to what to some may appear self-confidence and laudation of one's wares. A sentence or two will explain the general views of Dr. Kalisch on the Book of Genesis. He holds that on many subjects, such as the account of the Creation, of the Deluge, &c., Genesis cannot be reconciled with the results of modern scientific investigation. He goes further, and in opposition to many able scholars (such as the late Hugh Miller) declares it an "ignominious retreat" to assert "that the Bible never endeavours to teach that which the human mind is by itself able to discover; that it therefore in no way intended to give information on the origin of the world, since the natural sciences could by due exertion, without extraneous aid, furnish the necessary knowledge." Notwithstanding this, many, we believe, will continue to hold the opinion that the Book of Genesis was *not* designed to teach natural science, and that the provinces of theology and geology are quite distinct, and ought to be separately and independently followed. Nor are we prepared to admit that in other respects Dr. Kalisch's statements are so irrefragable as he seems to suppose. His general principle is, that while in its *form* Genesis partakes of the errors current among Eastern nations—sometimes through the ignorance of the writer, at others designedly—the *ideas* which it embodies are spiritual and divine. It will be evident that such a view must lead to forced interpretations (as in the history of the Fall,) nor, we suspect, will it prove satisfactory or appear consistent either to those who believe in, or to those who reject the idea of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

We are almost sorry to find so many exceptions, the more so, as we have carried from the perusal of this Commentary a high opinion of the learning and ability of its author. Every page bears trace of extensive and careful research—the Hebrew lore of the writer is profound and on the whole accurate—his acquaintanceship with classical writers and with ancient history, literature and manners wide, and his statements are decided and frank. Despite its drawbacks, the volume deserves to find a place in every theological library; and in the interest of critical study we express the hope of again meeting Dr. Kalisch in similar fields of investigation.—*Athenæum*.

THE SERVICE OF THE HOUSE OF GOD, ACCORDING TO THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By the Rev. WM. LISTON REDGORTON. *Edinburgh*: Paton & Ritchie. *Montreal*: B. Dawson & Son.

This book professes to be intended for those who are necessarily detained from the public worship of God. It is not a book simply of directions for conducting