

merely because it has been assailed so furiously and confidently, but because its statements render it peculiarly appropriate as a sort of test case. In two very carefully worked-out chapters he discusses "Genesis and Ethnic Traditions," and "Genesis and Science." Under the first head he avails himself of books as old as Bryant's, almost forgotten, but by no means useless, *Analysis of Ancient Mythology*, and as new as Professor Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures*. He shows that with regard to the deluge and other matters, these widespread traditions are "primitive, original, ancient, pure, historical." There is nothing actually novel in either the argument itself, or the method of putting it, but its re-statement in the present connection has great value. He adduces a large amount of "evidence from parallel conclusions of Genesis and Science." The whole lecture is a piece of sound reasoning, but the sections on "The Unity of Language," and "God and Divine Things," strike us as peculiarly happy and telling. Principal Cave seldom attempts to prove too much. Here we may mention an objection to the method of the entire book, peculiarly apparent, however, in these two chapters. The positive argument is put fairly and forcibly, but no attempt is made to solve or remove difficulties and objections that do not belong so much to the reasoning as to the subject-matter with which it deals. For example, with regard to "creation in Genesis and Science," and the "genealogy of races," the argument as it stands seems unanswerable—we are in the presence of genuine history. The correspondence between Genesis and universally acknowledged fact cannot be gainsaid. But, on the other hand, there are discrepancies, real or apparent, about which the lecturer is perfectly silent. The object is to demonstrate the existence of a vast amount of information, thoroughly trustworthy and indicative of supernatural communication. When this is proved the difficulties and discrepancies, however important and perplexing, must occupy a subordinate place. We do not take any exception to this principle, but we wish that it had been clearly laid down by the author himself.

When Principal Cave proceeds to "the authorship of Genesis," he perforce abandons this indifferent attitude towards rival hypotheses and plausible or reasonable objections. He advocates the Mosaic authorship, chiefly on the ground that no other writer can be suggested except at an impossibly early late date. Nothing finer than his examination of words, phrases, or tone can be desired. He decides in favour of Moses as himself the Jehovistic writer, who incorporated