

PRINCETON COLLEGE BULLETIN.

EDITED BY THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1889.

No. 3.

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE PLAN OF STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT OF PRINCETON COLLEGE.

The subjoined tables contain the proposed revision of the course of study in the Academic Department of Princeton College as passed by vote of the Faculty and as recommended by the Curriculum

Committee of the Board of Trustees. It now awaits the action of the Board of Trustees at their session this Commencement.

In the appended tables the Arabic numbers indicate the number of exercises a week in any subject. In this paper the first part gives in tabulated form the proposed curriculum and the second part the explanation of its leading provisions.

I. THE PROPOSED PLAN OF STUDY.

FRESHMAN YEAR.

ALL REQUIRED.

I TERM.		II TERM.	
Latin	4	Latin	4
Greek	5	Greek	4
Math.	4	Math.	4
English	2	Mod. Lang.	2
		Anatomy	1
<hr/>		<hr/>	
15 hours.		15 hours.	

SOPHOMORE YEAR.

REQUIRED.

Latin	2	Latin	2
Greek	2	Greek	2
Math.	2	Math.	2
Mod. Lang.	2	English	2
History	2	Logic	2
Chemistry	2	Zool. and Bot.	2
<hr/>		<hr/>	
12 hours.		12 hours.	

ELECTIVE.

(Student to take two Electives—4 hours.)

Latin	2	Latin	2
Greek	2	Greek	2
Math.	4*	Math.	4*
French	2	French	2
German	2	German	2
<hr/>		<hr/>	
16 hours.		16 hours.	

*Excuses from the 2 hours REQUIRED Mathematics.

SUMMARIES OF PAPERS READ BEFORE
SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES.THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PEN-
TATEUCH.*By DR. W. HENRY GREEN,
PROFESSOR AT THE SEMINARY.

The relation in which the contents of the Pentateuch stand to the problems of physical and ethnological science, to history and archaeology and religious faith, makes it a question of great consequence from various points of view, whether the Pentateuch is a veritable, trustworthy record, or is a heterogeneous mass of legend and fable, from which only a modicum of truth can be doubtfully and with difficulty elicited. In the settlement of this question, the consideration of its authorship enters as an important factor: for, while its credibility is not absolutely dependent upon its Mosaic authorship, and it might be all true, though it were written by another than Moses and after his time, yet, if it really was the production of Moses, there would be in this fact the highest possible guarantee of the accuracy and truthfulness of the whole.

That the Pentateuch was the work of Moses was argued: (1.) From the traditional belief of the Jews, confirmed by the infallible testimony of our Lord, and of the inspired writers of the New Testament.

(2.) From the allusions to the Pentateuch or its contents as the book of Moses, the law of Moses or the commandments of Moses, which are to be found in every period of the Old Testament from *Malachi* to *Joshua*.

(3.) From the direct testimony of the Pentateuch itself. Of the three principal bodies of law contained in the Pentateuch, the book of the Covenant, *Ex.* 20-23, is expressly declared to have been written by Moses, *Ex.* 24: 4. So also the law of Deuteronomy, *Deut.* 31: 24. The so-called

Priest-Code or ritual law, contained in *Ex.* 25-31, 35-40, *Leviticus* and the legal portion of *Numbers*, is said in all its parts to have been communicated by the Lord to Moses. Two passages in the history are in so many terms attributed to the pen of Moses, *Ex.* 17: 14, *Num.* 33: 2. It is further obvious, from the whole plan and constitution of the Pentateuch, that its history and legislation are alike integral parts of one complete work. *Genesis* and the opening chapters of *Exodus* are plainly preliminary to the legislation that follows. The historical chapters of *Numbers* constitute the framework in which the laws are set, binding them all together and exhibiting the occasion of each separate enactment. If the legislation is, as it claims to be, Mosaic, then beyond all controversy the preparatory and connecting history must be Mosaic likewise.

(4.) The terms, in which the laws are drawn up, point unmistakably to the sojourn in the wilderness prior to the occupation of Canaan as the time and the situation, in which they were produced.

(5.) The contents of the Pentateuch are either directly alluded to or the facts of its history and the existence of its institutions implied in numerous passages in the subsequent books of the Bible.

(6.) The Pentateuch was known and its authority recognized even in the apostate kingdom of the ten tribes. Although no valid argument is yielded upon this point, as was at one time supposed, by the Samaritan Pentateuch, the fact is sufficiently attested by the narrative of the schism in *I Kings*, 12, as well as by the prophets *Hosea* and *Amos*, whose ministry was exercised in the Northern kingdom.

Objections drawn from three different quarters were then rebutted, viz., from

1. The literary character of the Pentateuch, which is said to indicate its derivation from pre-existing written sources, themselves posterior to the time of Moses.

[* Summary of an address delivered by invitation at Wellesley College, on Friday, May 17, 1889.]

2. The diversities and alleged inconsistencies of the different codes, which it is said, show that these codes belong to distinct periods and represent successive stages in the growth of the national institutions.

3. The disregard of the laws of the Pentateuch to an extent and under circumstances affirmed to be incompatible with their existence for ages after the death of Moses.

The incongruities and gratuitous assumptions involved in the denial of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal institutions were pointed out. Even though one or more paragraphs could be proved to be post-Mosaic, this would merely demonstrate that such paragraph or paragraphs could not have belonged to the Pentateuch, as it came from the pen of Moses, not that the work as a whole did not proceed from him. It is far easier to assume that some slight additions may here and there have been made to the text, than to set aside the multiplied proofs that the Pentateuch was the production of the great legislator.

THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

By ALEXANDER T. ORMOND,
PROFESSOR OF MENTAL SCIENCE AND LOGIC.

It is only in the present century and since Hegel that the history of philosophy has been treated in a competent manner and with true historic insight. The most important of its questions arise in connection with its scope, method and relations to other philosophic disciplines.

Philosophy arose historically as an effort of the human reason to explain the world, including man, in its ultimate principles and as a totality. This attempt according as the dominant idea was that of unity, causality or substance, has resulted in the conception of philosophy as *Scientia Scientiarum*, Rational Theology or Metaphy-

sical Ontology. Most philosophical systems may be classed under these three rubrics.

The method of the history of philosophy is founded on the conception of its phenomena as constituting a developing series. The idea of the series is fundamental. Its historical treatment falls into the following stages (1) the fixation of the series or the determination of its contents, (2) the exposition of the systems and schools constituting the series and (3) the interpretation of the series as a whole. The first two stages are preliminary, involving the critical examination of materials and the exposition of the doctrines of individuals and schools. The historian's task proper, begins with the attempt to explain the series as a whole. The leading inquiries here are into the origins of the various national philosophies, their development and their correlations in a world movement. The philosopher here becomes primarily a historian and the terms he deals with are no longer merely systems and schools of thought, but a historic evolution of thought, comprising periods of development, punctuated by points of transition where confluences of streams occur, producing great epochs in the historic evolution of philosophy. There are three typical methods which may be followed in treating the phenomena of this evolution; the dialectical, the physical, and the individual. The dialectical method fixes almost exclusive attention on internal causes and especially on what has been styled the inner dialectic of reason, its tendency to unfold logically in accordance with its own laws. The physical method, on the contrary, emphasizes environing circumstances, laying especial stress on physical conditions and tending strongly toward a mechanical style of explanation. The individual method loses sight, to a great extent, of both internal and external forces of a general character