

## ARTICLE IX.

## CRITICAL NOTES.

## THREE NOTABLE BOOKS BY CONSERVATIVE SCHOLARS.

THE opening of the nineteenth century witnessed the culmination of a remarkable irruption of freaks into the realms of philosophy, science, and criticism. Agnostic philosophers, materialistic evolutionists, and destructive critics so monopolized the thought of Christian civilization as to produce a general paralysis of the higher activities of the soul. But error is sure to overstep the bounds of reason, and call forth the activities of able champions of the truth. In the three volumes mentioned below,<sup>1</sup> we have the ripe product of three of the best-equipped scholars of the age, defending, with a scholarship that is unsurpassed, the main positions respecting God, man, nature, and revelation, upon which Christianity has rested from time immemorial.

Dr. Lindsay's previous publications are too well known to need any attempt at estimation on our part. In this volume he brings the entire range of his great learning to bear upon the philosophical theories that have had currency from time to time. In eleven chapters he deals exhaustively of Foundations of Idealism: Laws of Logic and Psychology; The God of Theistic Idealism; The Metaphysics of Creation; The Metaphysics of Time and of Eternity; History and Provi-

<sup>1</sup> A Philosophical System of Theistic Idealism. By James Lindsay, D.D. 8vo. Pp. xiii, 530. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1917.

Creation Ex Nihilo: The Physical Universe a Finite and Temporal Entity. By L. Franklin Gruber. With a Foreword by G. Frederick Wright. 12mo. Pp. 316. Boston: The Gorham Press; Toronto: The Copp Clark Company, Ltd. 1917. \$1.50, net.

Studies in the Book of Daniel: A Discussion of the Historical Questions. By Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 402. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1917. \$3.50, net.

dence in Theistic Idealism; The Philosophy of Nature; The Philosophy of Science; The Philosophy of Art; Freedom in Theistic Idealism; The Moral Order, and the Spiritual World, in Theistic Idealism; and Immortality in Theistic Idealism. A full index of fourteen pages enables the reader to study any particular subject with ease.

It is interesting to observe in the work both of Dr. Lindsay and of Dr. Gruber how modern materialism approximates a system of pure idealism. In resolving "solid matter" into its constituent elements, it is first melted into a fluid and then resolved into a gas and finally regarded as a mere center of electrical activity, and the atoms are reduced to such small dimensions that if they do not become "nothing" they are "next to nothing," and are made to present the phenomena of solidity by motions of infinite velocity. But with all this speculation, the objective reality of nature remains as distinct as ever,—the product of a creative fiat. The attempt to substitute evolution for creation does not help matters. In the words of Dr. Lindsay, "Nothing is more fatuous and blind than the frequent moral failure to see that evolution can be no substitute for a Creator. For evolution is only history, . . . Evolution begins with the existent, and if the historical evolution of the world . . . has been discovered, that is not to say that its Cause or causes have been found, or that its movement, activity, change, may not be referred to the Absolute. . . . The creation which we know is creative evolution, the ceaseless procession of the Divine Energy" (pp. 144, 145). But he would differentiate "theistic idealism" from the current doctrine of the divine immanence (at least in its extreme forms). "It is the distinctively theistic position that, though God is immanent in the world of nature, God is not nature, any more than nature is God" (p. 105). In the existence of man's intellectual capacities and free will we have the absolute demonstration that the creation is not a mere emanation of a blind pantheistic force. "Theistic idealism does not succumb to the biologic tendencies of those recent vitalistic philosophies, . . . whereby mind is made a helpless cripple,

unable to transcend Nature, or embrace and scrutinize life in the whole" (p. 274). Again, "There is no science of Nature which is not teleological; . . . in Darwinism utility and purpose came into view as working principles of primary significance. It is the wider teleology, based on evolution, which to-day reigns, and I have already shown what this implies. The general process of Nature suggests purpose and intelligence, and the uniformity of Nature represents something deeper, to theistic idealism, than mere passionless expression of law" (p. 318). The chapters on "Freedom in Theistic Idealism" and "Immortality in Theistic Idealism" are especially thorough and helpful.

In Dr. Gruber's work, substantially the same conclusions are reached from an elaborate and masterly survey of the facts and speculations of modern science, of which he has a remarkably accurate and comprehensive knowledge. Dr. Gruber has not, like Dr. Lindsay, been long known to the public by his writings; but this work in itself is sufficient to establish his reputation. Though neither of these writers seems to have been familiar with the remarkable essay of the late Dr. Asa Gray on Darwinian Teleology, both have arrived at substantially the same result in regarding Darwinism as not a destruction of the doctrine of final causes, but a noteworthy enlargement of it. Their general conclusion may be summarized as follows:

The men of science properly deal only with secondary causes from observation of which they draw conclusions of more or less probability with reference to conditions both past and future. Their investigations never lead them to ultimate facts. It is still as true as ever that, however much you may lengthen the chain of natural causes, you cannot reach the ultimate link that fastens it to its permanent support.

With regard to the ultimate source of the universe of secondary causes, only three suppositions are possible: (1) that the self-existent eternal cause was spiritual and personal; (2) that it was material; and (3) that both spiritual and material essences were self-existent and eternal. The man of science

who assumes that the self-existent cause of all things was material, instead of simplifying the mystery of existence has gratuitously multiplied it; for, out of purely material force, he must develop personality and design—qualities that do not inhere in material particles and forces. If, on the other hand, he assumes the self-existence of both spiritual and material essences, he has made a gratuitous supposition which makes his mystery threefold; for it involves the mystery of the union of the two independent, self-existent, ultimate causes; whereas the theist unifies the mystery (which is a scientific process), and finds in secondary causes (which on examination seem to be more and more spiritual) the handiwork of the Creator—too complicated, indeed, for us to fully understand, but whose nature can be easily apprehended by faith. In these secondary causes we can clearly “find God,” though we cannot by any means “find him out.”

It is gratifying in these times of ephemeral publications to get hold of a treatise which goes to the bottom of the matter, which is not content with mere generalities but ferrets out all the ambiguities, fallacies, and non-sequiturs of atheism, materialism, monism, and agnosticism and brings them to the test of the most recent and most reasonable scientific conceptions of the universe. The author is specially strong in the use of the facts which demonstrate the finite and temporal character of the universe and the evidences of design apparent both in organic and inorganic nature. The work displays profound and most complete knowledge of the latest theories of astronomy, chemistry, physics, and biology.

The third volume under consideration is of a different nature, but equally important. So persistent, during the last quarter of a century, have been the confident assertions of the destructive critics that the Book of Daniel was a production of the Maccabean era, that these statements have been incorporated as demonstrated fact into much of the Sunday-school literature in the lessons recently circulated. For several years fragmentary discussions of the subject have been appearing from the pen of Dr. Wilson, who is the able suc-

cessor of the late Dr. William Henry Green, but only now are the complete results of his prolonged studies being brought within reach of the reading public. This volume, however, is only the beginning, treating only of the historical evidence. It is to be followed by a second, discussing the objections made against the book on the ground of philological assumptions, and by a third volume, discussing Daniel's relation to the canon of the Old Testament. In the present volume no less than a hundred and eighty works bearing upon the subject are cited, and all the facts are presented necessary to form correct opinions concerning no less than eighteen disputed points, such as doubts concerning Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, argument from silence, Nebuchadnezzar's madness, the Chaldeans, Daniel and the wise men. The destructive critics must now cease their claims to have all modern scholarship on their side, and must get down to details and wrestle with a champion of their own caliber.

#### A CRITICISM OF THE HUNTINGTON PALIMPSEST.

IN the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January and April, 1917, my friend Canon Christopher Wordsworth in a thoughtful review of the text of the newly-found Palimpsest makes the suggestion that it represents a paraphrase or targum of the original text. Without closing inquiry or pronouncing definitely on the documentary evidence, Canon Wordsworth says:—

"To one, like myself, brought up and accustomed to recognize the Church as a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, and accustomed in either of our current English versions [A.V. and R.V.] interpreted by the Creeds and Liturgy, as we have them in the providence of God, to find a sufficient presentment of the Divine Gospel message, the impression left by a perusal of three Gospel lections from the Huntington Palimpsest, probably suggests such a question as the following: 'Can this text be the production of a Christian orthodox teacher, familiar himself with some Old-Latin text in character approximate to the Corbey MS., only in his zeal to deliver the message in a form suited, as he believed, to witness for the Catholic faith against the tide of threatening heresy, he freely *targums* it, regardless of the letter?'"

The answer to this suggestion is as follows:—

1. At the end of St. John's Gospel we find these words: "Here endeth the Gospel according to John, a Disciple of the Lord Jesus. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, beginneth the Acts of the Disciples." So likewise at the end of St. James there is the subscription, "Here endeth the Epistle of James, a Disciple of the Lord Jesus. Beginneth the Epistle of Peter, a Disciple of the Lord Jesus." (There is only one Epistle of Peter found in the Palimpsest.) It is unbelievable that a Christian would palm off *his own meditations* as the Gospel (or as the Epistle) of a Disciple who saw the glory of the Son of God. Heretics in the first three centuries invented many books of pseudo-Scripture and attributed them to Disciples of Christ; but no *orthodox* Christian follower of the God of truth and love could be guilty of such forgery.

2. The support here and there given to the Palimpsest text not only by Beatus but also by Irish texts, and also by such venerable MSS. as the Codex Veronensis of the late *fourth* century, preclude the possibility of its being a one-man text that first saw the light in the dark ages in Spain. If the Palimpsest had been invented instead of copied when it was prepared in the ninth century, it could not have been retroactive and have thrown back some of its choicest readings (such as St. Luke xv. 30, "this son of the devil"; St. John xii. 19, "one that hath the devil") into Irish texts that were copied at Armagh in Ireland under ecclesiastical supervision from ancient Irish scripts. Neither could it have thrown back its readings into the writings of Beatus, who wrote his Commentary in the *preceding* century. Neither could it have thrown back some of its readings into the second century to agree with Irenæus and Tatian. A forger has to be practically omniscient to succeed in the fierce historical light that now beats on all documents. The Palimpsest says that after St. Peter cut off the ear of Malchus (the Palimpsest says it was the ear of Judas) our Lord said, "Forgive him." Is this forgery? Why then is it supported by the Codex Veronensis, the earliest extant Latin MS. of the Gospels? To a patient

observer a straw may indicate the direction of a stream, and other straws confirm it.

3. Canon Wordsworth suggests that some hypothetical "orthodox Christian teacher" may have *targumed* the Gospels to stop the general flood of Arianism, Macedonianism, and Eunomianism — Judaistic religions which sought to extinguish the glory of the Holy Spirit and the glory of the Son of God, and to set Judaism again on its legs.

My suggestion is that exactly the reverse happened, and that this general flood *did* overwhelm the Christian documents and substituted Judaized Christian documents in their place. The teaching of the Trinity (witnessed to by the second-century "Odes of Solomon") was not read *into* the Gospels, but read *out*. The Liturgies from the beginning preserved it; but the Gospel documents in the first three centuries *nearly* lost it.

As to the fact that both Canon Wordsworth and myself were taught by our spiritual teachers "to recognize the church as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ," this declaration cannot absolve us from making a full inquiry into the facts of the case. We are learning to-day to verify our references, and to accept no tradition without the strictest examination. If we discover that the East was deluged with heretical works and "Logia of Jesus" from the very birth of Christianity, we cannot shut our eyes to the possibility of St. Jerome's version having been rendered impure by these corrupted currents that culminated in the Judaized Greek philosophy schools of Alexandria. And if St. Jerome's Greek text had previously been corrupted (as Bede concluded), then all Versions that depend on St. Jerome's text are corrupted; and there is still a search to be made for the original words of the Gospel.

E. S. BUCHANAN.

*New York City.*

THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.<sup>1</sup>

READERS of this Review will be familiar with the inroads made during recent years into the critical position on the Old Testament, especially on the Pentateuch. So serious have these been that Principal Sir George Adam Smith has been compelled to admit that questions are still open which were thought to have been settled twenty years ago. And now comes another examination of the problem by a thoroughly competent writer. First, a word or two as to his qualifications. He is the grandson of the great Hebrew scholar, Dr. Alexander McCaul; the son of parents both of whom were well versed in Jewish matters; himself born in the Holy Land, and brought into touch thereby with Oriental life from childhood; and for years past a student and teacher of the Old Testament. These facts will show his exceptional advantages, and the present work is the outcome of many years' thorough study.

The purpose is stated to be "An Examination of the Higher Critical Theory as to the Composite Nature of the Pentateuch." It consists of two main parts, the first examining the Evidence and the second stating Objections to critical methods and results. The book opens with a careful statement of the question at issue. Critics are agreed that the composite nature of the Pentateuch is one of the "assured results" of modern scholarship, the dates covering over five hundred years. But at the outset Mr. Finn reminds his readers that so complicated a theory as is put forth by criticism must be based on the clearest evidence, especially as there is no trace of the existence of a single one of these various authors and documents. Indeed, the critical view is "a theory upon a theory." Even the most conservative writer would be ready to admit the possibility of several sources without denying the Mosaic origin, for while "it is one thing

<sup>1</sup>The Unity of the Pentateuch. By the Rev. A. H. Finn, with Preface by the Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. 8vo. pp. vi, 536. London: Marshall Brothers and The Bible League. 1917. 10s. 6d., net.



to show that the Pentateuch can be resolved into separate documents; it is another thing to show that these documents must belong to the periods to which they have been assigned" (p. 4). Then comes the inquiry whether the evidence bears out the critical contention; and it is rightly urged that the *onus* of proof rests on the critics, because not only are they attacking long-established beliefs, but they are maintaining that their view is the only one compatible with the facts (p. 4). Each critical point is thereupon subjected to a thorough examination, starting with the usage of the Divine names, which has always been the basis of the Higher Criticism, and, though Sir George Adam Smith has frankly admitted that this is too precarious a matter from which to determine a distinction of authorship, it is still used as an essential feature of the critical position. Mr. Finn has no difficulty in showing that the variations of the Divine names so far from affording proof of diversity of authorship "rather point to unity of design" (p. 15). A favorite argument with the critical school is that of "duplicate narratives"; and these are thoroughly discussed by Mr. Finn, and shown to be no duplicates at all, but distinct stories, full of subtle touches, natural, consistent, and unobtrusive (p. 31).

It is impossible in this notice to follow all the questions discussed, for there are fifty-three chapters, with conclusion and three appendixes. It must suffice to state that Mr. Finn deals most ably with the leading features of the critical position about the Narratives from the Creation to Joshua, and shows that the critical contentions on these are "not proven."

From the Narratives the author turns to the Evidence of the Laws; and, again, each point alleged by the Higher Criticism is patiently and fully considered, and its baselessness is indicated. The Laws are first compared with one another and then compared with the History. On the Decalogue Mr. Finn remarks that the critics are not agreed as to its age and original form, Dr. Driver favoring a view that most of the commandments can be referred to the Mosaic age, while Dr. McNeile comes to a very different conclusion (p. 213).

Some years ago, Dr. Burney of Oxford, a pupil of Dr. Driver, argued strongly in favor of the Mosaic character of the Ten Commandments, and on this Dr. James Hastings, of *The Expository Times*, made the significant admission, that, "if the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses or from the age of Moses, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned." This candid confession proves that, if monotheism comes from the time of Moses instead of from the time of Amos, there is a difference of about one thousand years. After a thorough comparison of the Laws with the History, Mr. Finn rightly draws the conclusion that the reasons given by criticism for assigning late dates to the sources and for maintaining the precise sequence of the Laws are far from convincing, and yet that, "unless both of these are satisfactorily established independently of the History, the critical contentions fall to the ground" (p. 328).

Part II. opens by pointing out that, if the evidence does not compel a belief in the critical theory, but is at least patient of a different interpretation, we are at liberty to consider the objections which tend to make that theory improbable. If the evidence in favor of the theory were beyond question, improbabilities would have no weight; but if the evidence be even ambiguous, then improbabilities are rightly to be considered. Then follows a statement of the main Objections to the alleged results of criticism. Two preliminary objections are the novelty of the theory and its complexity; and it is shown that a theory which has to be altered, modified, amended, and elaborated, in order to account for its phenomena, "is thereby rendered open to grave suspicion" (p. 333). Other objections include references to the analysis of other books, the nature of the method employed, and the critical treatment of the text. On these Mr. Finn rightly comments to the effect that any method which so often resorts to various forms of modification of the text without sufficient justification cannot be regarded as a sound and reliable way of dealing with the material (p. 340). Then, too, it is shown that

the critical arguments are often based on slender evidence, on silence, and on mere assertion, and that a theory with such supports cannot command unhesitating acquiescence (p. 357). Perhaps among the most practically important chapters are those dealing with "The Critical Spirit and Temper" and "Prejudice," on the latter of which it is well said that even critics have not been wholly unbiased in their estimate of the evidence. They have disregarded the Divine element and they have been influenced by certain views of inspiration and development. In other words, they have been influenced by a theory formed irrespective of the facts, and on this account cannot be acquitted of prejudice (p. 399). Other Objections deal with "Assured Results" and "Agreement of Critics," and much is pointed out in disproof of both positions. Not the least valuable chapters discuss, in turn, "Pious Fraud" and "Evolution." In view of the fact that the Pentateuch is intended to represent the Divine religion, it is difficult, not to say impossible, to see how any true ethical standard can be looked for from documents of the character predicted by criticism of Deuteronomy. Here are Mr. Finn's words:—

"The writer of Deuteronomy, whoever he was, distinctly and repeatedly asserts that the discourses were uttered by Moses. . . . The writer further asserts that Moses did write at least some portion of the book. [Driver and others justify this by saying that this kind of thing was customary with ancient writers, and Mr. Finn replies that this does not affect the morality of asserting what they knew to be untrue]. . . . If the promoters of a company put forth a glowing prospectus, knowing it to be inaccurate, and thereby the public is deceived and suffers loss, they will not be held blameless because they plead, 'We did not mean to take anybody in; we thought that everybody knew that the statements in a prospectus are not to be taken literally.' Thousands upon thousands have been misled into believing that Deuteronomy indeed contains the farewell addresses of Moses, the final form of the Divine revelation. Can those who in the first instance put forth the misleading statements, knowing full well that they were not strictly true, be held altogether blameless? . . . Can the writers who explicitly affirm that the things they are writing were delivered to Moses in the wilderness by God Himself, and this with a wealth of circumstantial detail to heighten the impression that they were so delivered,

can these be acquitted of deliberate deceit? or rather ought we not to say, of impudent and blasphemous forgery?"

Mr. Finn aptly expresses the opinion that if the critical view is correct, since fraud is always fraud, the adjective "pious" seems inappropriate (p. 464). The chapter dealing with Evolution is of supreme importance, because with many critical scholars this is the main argument adopted. Yet it is shown beyond all question that the critical position is not an evolution, but a revolution, and that the traditional view is manifestly truer to the idea of progressive revelation (p. 469).

Another striking chapter deals with the critical assertion that the new view does away with many objections to the Old Testament, and Mr. Finn well points out that the objections are indeed met, but only "by surrendering the points at issue" (p. 471). For when the history is said to be false, the morality false, and the science false, this certainly relieves the reader of "a multitude of difficulties." But the relief is very much the same as that experienced by the traveler "when he has handed over his valuables to a highwayman" (p. 471). The forcible conclusion of this chapter is that those who are attracted by the idea that criticism removes "a multitude of difficulties" should consider whether it does not involve more and greater difficulties than it relieves.

Mr. Finn's conclusion is that the new movement does not rest upon the recognition of facts, that its methods are unsound, and that its results are invalid. Further, that the traditional belief is at least as compatible with the evidence as the critical view, and even in many instances more in accordance with the evidence. It is, therefore, not surprising that his closing words claim both the possibility and the reasonableness of the conclusion that the critics are assuredly wrong in their position (p. 502).

From all this, which is only a mere summary of the main contentions, the thoroughness of the work will be seen. Those who have been accustomed to face in detail the critical arguments will easily recognize the completeness with which the subject is discussed and, in particular, such vital points of the

critical theory as the three Codes, the question of D, the problem of the Tabernacle, and the stages of the critical theory. So far as my reading goes, I entirely indorse Dr. St. Clair Tisdall's remark that the author does not leave a single argument unanswered.

In ability and spirit Mr. Finn's work is a fit successor to Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament," and is a fresh proof that conservative scholarship can more than hold its own against the critical position, which is so often and so unfairly claimed to represent "modern scholarship." It is a book for constant use in study and, in particular, for the careful attention of ministers and theological students.

It is a helpful reminder of what we have been learning during the last three years, that the German intellect, as shown in commerce and politics, is not by any means the supreme force which the critics have tried to get people to believe during the last half-century. Since Germany has failed so deplorably in regard to earthly and human matters, we have no right to think that she can be more successful in connection with the Bible and things spiritual, which require something far other than the dry light of intellect. There is perhaps nothing more impressive in certain realms of British and American scholarship than this virtual and sometimes literal dependence on German scholarship in regard to things Biblical. It may be questioned whether a single Old Testament scholar in England, Scotland, the United States, and Canada has produced anything original in the way of criticism. All the critical views current to-day are adaptations and modifications of views "made in Germany." This is not said for the sake of prejudice, but only to show, in the light of current events, that those of us who were "old-fashioned" enough to question and oppose German scholarship long before the war, have been amply confirmed in our contention by what has happened since 1914. It is much to be hoped that Mr. Finn's book will help forward the cause of independence of Germany among our younger scholars.

Another matter of supreme importance is that we have

already learned the impossibility of stopping short with the Old Testament, for the same critical principles and methods are being applied to the New Testament and still more to the Person of our Lord Himself. Wellhausen, who has apparently given over writing on the Old Testament, is now dealing with the Gospels; and his treatment of Matthew, Luke, and John, together with his view of Christ, shows the essential naturalistic and rationalistic position which his treatment of the Old Testament has all along revealed. Those who think that we can keep the New Testament and our Saviour sacrosanct, while allowing the fullest liberty, not to say license, in regard to the criticism of the Old Testament, are occupying an utterly impossible position. This is not said to prevent the proper use of criticism, but we have a right to call attention to the bias against the supernatural, which actuates a good deal of Biblical criticism in Germany and elsewhere.

Several years ago, at a certain Congress of Higher Critics and advanced thinkers, a well-known American professor was invited to take part in the discussion. He said that he desired to make no mistake about their views, and reading five or six propositions about the Bible and its teachings, he asked if these correctly represented their position. Being assured that they did, he held up a book and told his hearers the propositions he had read were extracts from Paine's "Age of Reason." It is said that consternation reigned for a time in the Congress, and earnest appeals and efforts were made to keep the incident out of the papers. It is, of course, necessary and right to distinguish between naturalistic scholars and those who accept the supernatural Incarnation; but while the latter see no incompatibility between their position and a belief in the Divine authority of the Old Testament, it cannot be said that they give any definite assurance of the foundation on which they themselves rest and ask us to rest. Indeed, the extremes to which many critics have gone may be said to be the logical outcome of the principles with which even moderate criticism starts. Mr. Paget Wilkes, in his book "Missionary Joys in Japan," actually says that the moderate critics there are the

most dangerous, because they claim that their position, as believers in a Divine revelation, differentiates them from others who do not take this line. For our part, we want to be shown the solid and logical halting place of these moderate critics; for, while they themselves are doubtless thoroughly grounded in the Christian faith, the serious matter of their disciples who have no such experience makes the question altogether different, and it is hardly surprising if, as both Orr and Mr. Finn point out, stricter logic carries to its legitimate conclusion what has been urged upon these disciples by those who think they can accept the literal and historical principles of naturalism and yet maintain a belief in the supernatural element in the Bible.

Meanwhile, conservative scholarship is satisfied that, until Robertson, Möller, Whitelaw, Orr, Wiener, Kyle, and now Mr. Finn (to say nothing of other writers) are answered, it can rest content. Indeed, the fact that books by these writers, most of which have been before the public for years, are still practically unanswered, is a proof that they are unanswerable.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

*Toronto, Ont.*