

Notices of Books.

PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM. By the Rev. D. C. Simpson, M.A. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. H. E. Ryle, C.V.O., D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Higher Criticism has of late been subjected to so rigorous and hostile examination at the hands of Dahse, Wiener, Naville, Orr, and others, that rejoinders by its advocates must be expected. The volume before us, originated by a suggestion of the late Dr. Driver, and issued with the commendation of the Dean of Westminster, is of this controversial character, but largely evades the true nature of the contest.

One effect of this literary cannonade is visible in the preparedness of the advanced critics, as represented by Mr. Simpson, to abandon, as soon as they can find another entrenchment, the contention that the early books of the Bible may be divided into component parts of different date and authorship in accordance with the use which is made of the Divine titles. Astruc's hypothesis, we are informed, does not constitute a "base" or "foundation" of the critical view; was a "sorry guide" as long as it stood virtually alone; "might hold good as a reliable criterion in Gen. i.-xix., . . . failed to reveal the distinction of authorship *within* the sections in chaps. xx.-l."; and "fails after Ex. vi. 3 as a real clue in any true sense of the word." Indignation is frequently expressed that the critics should be regarded as deeming this test to be one of supreme importance. Yet with a singular pertinacity they continue to label their ultimate sources J and E, and lose no opportunity of insisting that no adverse comment has affected the position. To say the least, this particular contention is in danger of being shipwrecked on the rocks of textual criticism. The first principles of this science have not been adequately discussed or finally settled. The onus of proof that their text is the purest lies upon those who seek to build upon it elaborate theories of the origin, with consequential bearing upon the historicity, of the narratives. The relegation of this subject to an Appendix, with a brief and inadequate discussion, is not satisfactory. Apart from the question of the Divine titles, the condition of the text is of vital concern to every argument in support of the documentary theories.

The crucial point is not whether the author of the Pentateuch in its present shape used anterior sources, but whether it is possible to separate these sources in such a manner that we can safely hypothecate for each an independent existence and assign to it a provisional date. So conservative a writer as Dr. Orr admits that, if JE and P are now divisible, P is the later in date. But his position is not fairly represented by the statement that, "with regard to the relative ages of P and the non-priestly source, Dr. Orr, who is far from accepting the critical hypothesis in its entirety, writes, 'it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later than JE, for whose narratives, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the framework.'" For Dr. Orr explicitly denies the possibility of separating the sources. "In so far as a documentary hypothesis is to be accepted at all, it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later

than JE, for whose narrative, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the 'framework.' In agreement with Graf, however, we do not suppose that *at any period* it ever formed a separate, independent writing." Dr. Orr admits certain peculiarities of style, and concedes that they "justify the critic in distinguishing a P hand in Genesis from that of JE." But he is far from thinking that they demonstrate this result; they do not lead up to the critical theories, and only after acceptance of these theories on other grounds could they be esteemed as confirmatory. The issue remains as to the divisibility of the sources.

Further evidence in support of the critics is found in "(1) diversity of style, phraseology, and language; (2) diversity in the representation of facts; and (3) diversity of theological, general, and mental attitude." In the argument care is requisite to avoid a circular type of reasoning, which is worse than inconclusive. Many of the illustrations adduced by Mr. Simpson have little force. The word "kind" occurs ten times in Gen. i, and seven times in vi. 9-22. This fact is quite without value unless and until it is shown that the word could have been frequently used in the intervening section, but that another was preferred. "Male and female" in Gen. vi. 19, vii. 16, is in the Hebrew *zāḥār ūneḳēbāh*, but in vii. 2, *'ish we'ishtō*. But it remains to be proved that the same author may not use two different expressions. Amongst ourselves many would endeavour to do so. The apparent repetitions, variations, and inconsistencies, require explanation, and are variously accounted for. Their dialectic value lies in their number, which must not, therefore, be needlessly increased. "It is urged, and rightly so, that the representation in different parts of the narrative varies. Thus, in chap. xliii., when the brothers report to their father their interview with Joseph, they do not say that Joseph charged them with being spies, but merely that he asked them whether they had a brother (vers. 6, 7; cf. xliv. 17); whereas in chap. xlii. it is narrated that Joseph's brethren were definitely accused of being spies, and that they themselves volunteered the information, not specifically sought, that they had a younger brother (vers. 7-13, 30-32)." The "variations" give to the story a truly human touch. Do men never modify a story against themselves? Were the brethren of all men the least likely to have recourse to such a subterfuge? We cannot here examine all Mr. Simpson's instances. We admit that there are peculiarities of style and of representation of facts. Some are explicable; for others an inexact copyist is an easier suggestion than an incompetent redactor. But still difficulties remain. They are due to a diversity of subject-matter. History and prophecy, moral and ceremonial law, are intermingled in the Pentateuch. Both brevity and prolixity characterize the narratives. At times God is contemplated as the Absolute, at others in His covenant relationship to man or to Israel. Here we study human nature, there ethical principle—the sin of man, the moral requirement of God.

The higher critic imagines that, through the guidance of phrase and vocabulary, of attitude and representation, he has been enabled to discover the alternations of subject; thence division of authorship is easy. His opponent maintains that the differences of topic and treatment are obvious to every reader, that they are naturally accompanied by some divergencies

of style and language, but that unity of authorship is not substantially impaired. Which approaches the books in the right manner? This is the real issue, and we do not find that Mr. Simpson discusses it. Either side has its own difficulties. But for the solution of the modern problem controversialists must fix their attention upon the exact point where the dispute arises. The higher critic in pursuit of one method of investigation appears to be often unconsciously guided by the other. E. ABBEY TINDALL.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

This is a comprehensive and well written book, and forms a valuable addition to Mr. Scott's Library of Historic Theology. We desire to emphasize this at the outset, and to bespeak for the book careful reading and study. No one can fail to derive much profit from it, whether he be an amateur in theology or a more advanced student. But having said this, we are constrained to say that we found ourselves in constant disagreement with the author, and marked a good many passages with a query. It is impossible to allude to all of these; a selection must be made.

But first, here is a summary account of the contents of the book: Chapters I. and II. deal with our Lord's conceptions of the Kingdom, the Church, and the Twelve. III. to VI. are mainly on the teaching of the rest of the New Testament on the same subjects. VII. to X. and XII. examine the views of Clement, Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine on the Church. XI. is an extremely important chapter on the development of the Christian ministry. XIII. to XVIII. are on Eastern, Roman, and Gallican conceptions of Catholicism. One remark may be made here. Dr. Simpson's account of Catholic conceptions of the Church is no doubt complete if one accepts his argument and interpretations and the definition they imply. But it will be noticed that the conception of the Church held by the Reformers and implied in the Articles is ruled out as non-Catholic. "For all who believe in the existence of a Holy Catholic Church in the traditional meaning of the name—that is to say, as a Visible Institution, an organic community here on earth—the ultimate alternative must inevitably be between the Episcopal and the Papal conception." No doubt our Reformers valued and held firmly to their episcopacy; but they would not have used the word "inevitably" even of the visible Church, and they also believed that the true Church was otherwise defined.

The quotation just given is from the conclusion. It is the natural result of all the preceding argument, and the fallacies of that argument are responsible for it. On page 26 Dr. Simpson breaks a lance with Dr. Hort's "Christian Ecclesia." Hort, alluding to the fact that only Apostles were present at the Eucharist, wrote that since the whole Church appropriated the Eucharist as its own, "the twelve sat that evening as representatives of the *Ecclesia* at large. They were disciples more than they were Apostles." Dr. Simpson will have it that "the Eucharist was intended for the Apostolic order alone; in the sense, that is, that it was entrusted to their keeping, and that they were the only agents in its administration." The *Ecclesia* only shared it as recipients. Now, Hort's is surely the fairer deduction from the passage. Our author's is read into it, and we discover the reason when we

come to page 30. There we read: "In three distinct ways Christ determined beforehand the character which His disciples were to assume in history, a form of incorporation, a form for the social worship among members only, a form of organization in the distinction between Apostles and disciples. These may all be considered as, in a sense, elementary; but potentially they included and determined the subsequent development. They show us the institutional character of Christ's work." The point to be observed here is the distinction asserted between Apostles and disciples. No doubt such a distinction existed in the evangelistic sphere. The Apostles were a body of men who had been specially selected and trained that they might take the lead in preaching Jesus and the Resurrection. But this distinction does not apply so readily when it comes to the question of Church organization. We still hold with Hort that there is "no trace in Scripture of a formal commission of authority for government (to the Apostles) from Christ Himself" ("Ecclesia," p. 84). Bishop Gore, and now Dr. Simpson, contest Hort's conclusion, but we cannot feel that it has been shaken.

The institutional ideas which Dr. Simpson has found in Christ he proceeds to find also in St. Paul and St. John. St. Paul "clearly did not regard union with Christ as the means of acquiring union with the Church. He did not consider the Church as the creation of individuals already in union with Christ. To St. Paul union with the Church is the medium of union with Christ." In support of this is alleged St. Paul's institutional training in Rabbism, and his argument about the Jews as a nation in Rom. xi. The latter is quite beside the point; and as to the former, Dr. Simpson ought to know that Christian teachers took up, not the Law, which is institutional, but the Prophets, who formed a Church within the nation, a non-institutional body within the institutional; a body whose members were a unity because of their common faith in their teacher. And we may further ask whether this institutional interpretation of St. Paul can possibly be harmonized with his teaching on salvation by personal faith. The argument about St. John is ingenious, but hardly ingenuous. "That they may also be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Now, says Dr. Simpson, you must have a visible reality to be an evidence to the world; therefore the Church is institutional. It is open to remark that mutual love might be and was good evidence to the heathen of the day. But a reference to St. John xvii. 21 shows that the full text is: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." The unity of the Church is to be similar to the unity of the Trinity. Does Dr. Simpson suppose that this is institutional?

We can only refer further to Chapter XI. on the ministry. This simply accepts and summarizes what Mr. C. H. Turner has recently been writing in the "Cambridge Mediæval History" and in his "Studies in Early Church History." Mr. Turner's work is confessedly an attempt to restate the doctrine of Apostolical Succession in view of the heavy fire of historical research. It requires an article to itself. But its salient point is this: In the early Church there was a hierarchy of presbyters and deacons, and a hierarchy of Apostles, prophets, and teachers. In due time they coalesced,

so that the Bishop is the successor both of the Presbyter-Bishop and of the Apostle; and the fusion was made easy because both elements were hierarchical. The obvious criticism is that the members of the charismatic or non-local ministry, Apostles, prophets, teachers, were not hierarchical. They were not in well-defined grades. Function had not hardened into office, and one man might well discharge all three functions. To talk of a charismatic hierarchy is an anachronism.

It is thus apparent how profoundly, and at all points, the book provokes criticism. But we are grateful to the author for having written it, and cannot end without saying again that it deserves and will amply repay careful study.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

THE UNIVERSAL BIBLE DICTIONARY. Edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., assisted by the Rev. Canon Lukyn Williams, D.D. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The ever-increasing stream of big-volume dictionaries which this generation is finding so valuable is likely to flow past very large numbers of non-expert Bible students and class teachers who are able neither to buy nor to understand the larger works. What are you to give such to help them intelligently to understand what they read and do? Many of the small cheap Bible dictionaries are out of date and quite unsatisfactory. Here is a 3s. 6d. book with 4,500 articles on over 500 pages which really meets the need. The text of the Bible, the books of the Bible, the history of the Bible, the doctrines of the Bible, are all dealt with, and sometimes at good length. Everything is carefully proved by exact Scriptural references, which indeed provide one of the features of the book. Problems of authorship are not avoided, arguments fairly summarizing all sides being given for the reader to choose from himself. There is a strong leaning to the more conservative point of view, and a qualified verbal inspiration is maintained; but the possibility of a later authorship for parts of, *e.g.*, Isaiah and Daniel is not denied. Doctrinal questions are explained in such articles as those on "Justification" and "Regeneration," while under the heading of "Lord's Supper," there are careful explanations of "This is," "This do," and "We have an Altar." The life and ministry of our Lord is given in the form of a tabular harmony of the four Gospels, an extremely useful piece of work, as also is the complete table of the parallel Kings of Israel and Judah. It seems as though nothing which the ordinary reader of the Bible will want to know has been omitted, and the editor and those who have helped him are to be congratulated on so useful a work. Among the contributors are Professor Green, Professor Griffith Thomas, Principal Guy Warman, and Canon Lukyn Williams.

THE PRAYERS OF ST. PAUL. By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 2s. net.

This is one of Messrs. Clark's "Short Course" series, meant to give scholarly but practical expositions for teachers and others. The volume is marked by all Dr. Thomas's characteristics, spiritual insight, lucidity of analysis, and careful study of words. Perhaps he will pardon us for saying that we are glad to see less alliteration than usual! The writer heard the

substance of most of these nine studies given several years ago as a course of addresses, and can bear testimony to their helpfulness.

THE CHRISTIAN SANCTION OF WAR. By Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1d.

In his clear and incisive style, Dr. Wace shows that war is justifiable, providing that the object is to punish injustice, and not to gratify ambition or pride. Passing from the question of war in general to the present war in particular, the Dean conclusively shows that we may have a clear conscience. If there exists anywhere an Englishman whose mind is not made up on this point, this sermon will surely convince him.

THE REGENERATION OF NEW CHINA. By Nelson Bitton. Price 2s. net.

THE NEW LIFE OF CHINA. By Rev. E. W. Wallace, B.D. Price 1s. net. *Church Missionary Society*, Salisbury Square, E.C.

Two fascinating and important works on the China of to-day. Of the first—which has an introduction by the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne Cecil—the Rev. W. E. Soothill, Principal-Elect of the University for Central China, says: "The book should be read by every missionary to and in China, by every member of our missionary committees, not least by their respective secretaries, and be studied by every missionary circle." It is a complete review of the present situation, and a powerful plea for the evangelization of "this most worthy people, whose present need is so urgent, and whose future importance for the history of the world is so incalculably great." The second volume covers much ground. It is pleasantly written, and, like Mr. Bitton's book, is full of excellent illustrations—in fact, the general get-up leaves nothing to be desired in either case, and entitles these books to rank with more pretentious works.

SEED SCATTERED BROADCAST: INCIDENTS IN A CAMP HOSPITAL. By S. McBeth. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

The reissue of this record of work and witness among the wounded and sick in the American Civil War is opportune at a time when many, at home and abroad, are ministering among those who have been the victims of the war now raging. It contains accounts of conversations with men with all kinds of difficulties. Their perplexities are dealt with in a sympathetic, sane, scriptural, convincing way.

ROADMAKING FOR THE KING. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. and 2s. net.

The story of a "Mission" at Hammersmith, carried on by a capable and devoted woman, Sister Lizzie. We do not profess to be in love with undenominational efforts of this kind. It seems a pity, when there are so many Churches and Chapels, that the promoters should not be able to associate themselves with some organized body of Christians instead of forming what is apt to look like a new sect. The fact that there is a Sunday morning "service for worship" suggests "brethrenism," though there is no mention of the "breaking of bread." Apart from this, the book, which is attractively got up and in its second edition, tells of the triumphs of redeeming grace, over which we rejoice with Sister Lizzie, whatever her opinions may be!