

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 19—July, 1894.

I.

THE MOSES OF THE CRITICS.

MOSES had gone up into the thick darkness, fire, and smoke, which covered the summit of Sinai. The people had waited in vain for his return. Days and weeks had passed, a month and more had elapsed, still there were no tidings from him, and no sign of his reappearance. "And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down from the mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him" (Ex. xxxii. 1). Their excited minds pictured him as hopelessly and forever gone; he would never be seen, nor heard from again. Thus in the imagination of the critics the Moses of the Bible has disappeared from view. And with loud acclaim they are chanting the praises of the mystic symbols E, J, D, P and R, which they have set up to fill the vacancy created by the removal of Israel's great leader. The advance of critical science has in their opinion entirely changed the aspect of affairs; and the history of that whole period must be reconstructed on a new and different basis. Let us briefly consider what the critics propose to substitute for the Moses that has been taken from us. The theme proposed is the Moses of the critics, or Moses as the critics represent him.

The Moses of the Bible is a clearly defined, conspicuous and commanding personage. Saved from threatened death in his infancy by an interposition of Providence, which secured for him a training at the court of Pharaoh without weaning his heart from his own

The ethical reasonings of the treatise, also, have peculiarities about which queries might naturally arise. Such peculiarities are to be expected in the yet undeveloped state of ethical science and of the philosophy of the will.

But we, for one, welcome this book as an evidence of that independent thought which the times demand even from those who may be the most conservatively inclined. For if the lovers of the Bible and its doctrines are to make headway against the errorists of our day, they can hope to do so only by means of thorough, fearless and honest thinking.

New York.

EDWARD JOHN HAMILTON.

Lincoln University, Chester County, Pa., Theological Department. *Inauguration of Rev. Robert Laird Stewart, A.M.*, as Professor of Pastoral Theology, Evidences of Christianity and Biblical Archæology, and of *Rev. J. Aspinwall Hodge, D.D.*, as Professor of Instruction in the English Version of the Bible, Tuesday, January 23, 1894. 8vo, pp. 48. (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott, 1894.) This is a very enheartening pamphlet, with its notices of advance in the provisions for theological instruction at Lincoln, the stirring charges to the new professors, and their admirable inaugural addresses. Both new professors, as was befitting, magnified their respective offices. Prof. Stewart spoke upon "The Place and Value of Pastoral Theology in the Curriculum of Theological Study," and spoke most instructively and helpfully, taking the broadest and highest view of the scope and function of his department. Dr. Hodge took as his theme "The Extent and Unity of Bible Study." His tracing of the *representative principle* through Church doctrine, polity and worship as a unifying principle is not only intensely interesting, but a real contribution to thought. We ought not to neglect to mention Dr. Purves' clear and forceful outline of the doctrine of the authority of Scripture, in his charge to Dr. Hodge. We conceive great hopes of Lincoln's future when we listen to its new professors talking of their several branches of instruction.—*Some Current Notions Concerning Dogmatic Theology*. Inaugural Address of Charles Marsh Mead, Ph.D., D.D., Riley Professor of Christian Theology, February 14, 1894. 8vo, pp. 21. (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Seminary Press, 1894.) Would that Prof. Mead's wise words could be engraved on the hearts of all our Christian teachers. In form, his address is a justification of the Chair of Dogmatic Theology in our seminaries; in essence it is a strong defense of dogmatic, which is as much as to say supernatural, Christianity. He posits the four objections that dogmatic theology is unpractical, not feasible, inconsistent with the constant evolution of truth, and implicative of historical and metaphysical elements unnecessary to Christianity. He shows in turn that the attempt to divorce religion from all questions of science, philosophy and history is equivalent to a total abandonment of the supernatural and a descent to the lowest plane of naturalism and rationalism; that all things cannot be surrendered to an evolutionary process of becoming, but some things *are*, and must be treated as fixed—for example, there can be no evolution of the multiplication table and as little of the fundamental facts and doctrines of the Christian revelation; that it is not only feasible but necessary to state Christian truth systematically; and that the practical effect of truth will depend on its clear apprehension and formulation, unless indeed we really believe that the less one knows about the Gospel the better he can exemplify and teach it. His unanswerable remarks on the necessity of a creed for any Church union, and the disintegrating character of all agitation for Church union on no formulated basis of belief; and his admirable remarks on the undermining effect of the present rage for "societies," exemplify the practical nature of Dr. Mead's thought.—*Darwinism*. A Lecture delivered before the Young Men's