

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 16—October, 1893.

I.

DR. BRIGGS' HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE HEXATEUCH EXAMINED.

IN the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1883, Dr. Briggs published "A Critical Study of the History of the Higher Criticism with Special Reference to the Pentateuch." This is now reprinted in a volume, with a few additions and such verbal corrections as his subsequent change of attitude has rendered necessary, under the title of *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*.* In this amended form it may consequently be regarded as presenting the carefully considered views of the author corrected up to date.

There is an obvious distinction between the Higher Criticism *de jure* and the Higher Criticism *de facto*; and these may differ widely from each other. Critical investigations may be rightly conducted and lead to correct conclusions; or they may be based on wrong principles, follow wrong methods, and lead to false conclusions. Dr. Briggs tells us (*Presbyterian Review* for 1881, p. 578) that "Biblical criticism is represented by two antagonistic parties—evangelical critics and rationalistic critics." And he claims to have shown (*Presbyterian Review* for, 1883, p. 70) that "evangelical Biblical criticism was based on the formal principle of Protestantism, the divine authority of the Scriptures, over against ecclesiastical

* *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D. 8vo, pp. 259. The Preface states that "ten years ago the author undertook to write a little book upon the Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, and at that time he advanced some distance in its preparation. But on reflection he turned aside from it, with the opinion that the times were not yet ripe for it." Now "he presents to the public the result of his studies so far as they have gone."

CHAMBERS' ENCYCLOPÆDIA. A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge. New Edition. Vols. i-x. Large 8vo. London and Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1888-1892.

"The advantages of a good encyclopædia are obvious," says Prof. Joseph H. Thayer, of Harvard Divinity School, in his recently published address, *Books and Their Use*: "it is a small library in itself—a library, moreover, written for the most part by specialists; and by its copious bibliographical references putting one on the track of the principal works relating to any subject which he may wish to study more in detail." Similarly, Dr. Philip Schaff, in his *Theological Propædæutic*: "A good alphabetical Cyclopædia is a necessity for every educated man (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, Chambers, Johnson, Appleton, Pierre Larousse, Brockhaus, Meyer, Ersch and Gruber)." Both of these writers have earned the right to give advice; theologians themselves of unusual breadth and accuracy of scholarship, they are giving hints to theologians in the making and to the working ministry, as to how they may best and with least expenditure of time, labor and money keep abreast of the ever-broadening field of knowledge. A good Encyclopædia, every one of us must have.

This settled, and we have another question very pressingly before us: Which Encyclopædia is the best? It is not without significance that in Dr. Schaff's list the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and *Chambers* stand together at the beginning. They are respectively the best Encyclopædia, each of its class. For there are two radically different conceptions of the Encyclopædia in a formal point of view; and these two great works represent the two conceptions. An Encyclopædia is, in any form, a general survey of the sciences and arts, a summary of general knowledge, a stock-taking in all departments of information. But the mode of presentation may be determined more by a desire to secure formal completeness in scientific statement, or more by a desire to render the several departments of knowledge thoroughly accessible. In the former case we get a series of elaborate and exhaustive treatises, brought together in alphabetical order; and the best example of this type of Encyclopædia is the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. In the latter case the various masses of systematic knowledge are broken up to as great a degree as is consistent with the clear explanation of the separate fragments; and the best example accessible of this type of Encyclopædia is the new *Chambers*. Which of the two is preferred, will, therefore, be rationally determined by the purpose of the student. If he desires to acquire a series of treatises on the main branches of knowledge, by mastering which he may obtain a comprehensive survey of the circle of sciences, he will provide himself with the *Britannica*. If he desires to place at his elbow a comprehensive Dictionary of Knowledge, to which he can turn as need arises, and which is easy to consult and trustworthy in its information, he will provide himself with the new *Chambers*. An Encyclopædia like the *Britannica* possesses little advantage over a series of separate treatises: its alphabet is not extensive enough, and its articles are too extensive, for ordinary consultation. He that possesses it will not find that all his wants are provided for; he still needs the new *Chambers* for general use, while he keeps the *Britannica* for his more leisurely investigation. Not only, then, must every educated man have an Encyclopædia, but every educated man needs an Encyclopædia of the type of *Chambers*.

Chambers' Encyclopædia, in the original edition, was an epoch-making book; it was begun in 1859 and completed in 1868. Having served its generation for twenty years more, a completely new edition was begun in 1888 and

completed within five years, under the competent editorship of Mr. David Patrick, who has gathered to his aid almost a thousand helpers. The new edition is brought fully up to date and is a marvel of compressed and accessible information. There is of course a slip here and there: such as referring those who desire to know more about Dr. Charles Hodge to a life which has not yet appeared, by Dr. Francis L. Patton (misspelled Patten). And there is now and then something left to be desired, as for example that the Biblical Articles, in general, should have been written by men with a little less undue reverence for a temporary phase of German criticism and a little more appreciation of English work on the subject. But these are but specks on a fair surface. The new *Chambers* remains an indispensable *vade-mecum* for every educated man.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

Buddhism, Primitive and Present, in Magadha and in Ceylon. By Reginald Stephen Copleston, D.D., Bishop of Colombo, President of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. 8vo, pp. xv, 501. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892.) Bishop Copleston's thorough and extended account of that stock of Buddhism which has been established and continued in Ceylon, will be welcomed by every student of the world's religions. It is learned, judicious and fresh, with the freshness that belongs only to original contributions to knowledge. Not that it has anything startlingly revolutionary or even novel to offer. The conclusions, historical and philosophical and ethical alike, are practically those which have been reached by the best previous investigators in this field, such as Profs. Oldenberg and Rhys Davids. And not, even, that they have been reached in the independence that means ignorance of the work of such previous students. But that they are the careful results of an independent and diligent student on the ground, who has explored the sources for himself and gives his findings with due regard to all that has been said on the subject before. The book is divided into four parts. In the first, which is introductory, the subject is defined, the relation of Ceylonese Buddhism to the original stock developed, and a general historical sketch given. The second part treats of Buddhism in Magadha. The third, of Buddhism in Ceylon. While the fourth is an exposition of the present state of Buddhism in Ceylon. It is in the latter part of the volume that Bishop Copleston's work is of most importance. His long residence in Ceylon and his excellent opportunities for learning the facts, make him here our first authority. He tells us that it is on the side of the legends and cosmogony that Buddhistic teaching has most drifted in Ceylon: the moral system of the Pitakas, with the dreary theory of human life on which it rests, has held its ground and been little altered by time. But as little has it leavened the life of the community. The most prominent trait of Buddhistic morals is pity; we hear, in the stories, of the Lord Buddha in one of his incarnations meeting a starving tiger, and freely giving himself to satisfy the beast's hunger. What a telling picture Sir Edwin Arnold makes of this scene! But even in this central matter the practical effect has been little. Here are characteristic incidents:

"An Englishman, driving out from Colombo towards a town some twenty miles distant, came up with a little crowd around a woman, who had been knocked down by a bullock. As any Englishman would have done, he put her in his carriage, with one or two of her companions to support her, and had her taken slowly towards her home, which was a mile further on, himself following on foot. He was shocked by hearing one of the women say, 'This must be a god; no man would do this.' . . . In case of an accident, it is often impossible to persuade a bystander to help. A man may lie by the roadside and entreat passer-by after passer-by to help him out of the sun into the shade, and not one will stop" (p. 481).

And in general:

"I am painfully aware, as I write this, how little Christian conduct often corresponds to Chris-