

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 5.—JULY, 1888.

I. THE CONTRA-NATURAL CHARACTER OF THE MIRACLE.

NONE but the maintainers of a rigid process of evolution, enforced by a law of blind, immanent necessity, would deny that man has degenerated from his primitive condition. He has fallen from the estate of holiness and happiness in which he was created into one of sin and misery. That being admitted, it is obvious that the scheme of religion which he originally possessed is now utterly inadequate to his wants. The law which it contained as a rule of action has been violated, and its condemning sentence renders impossible an acceptable obedience to its requirements. So far as that scheme of religion is concerned man is doomed.

On the supposition that God the Moral Ruler were willing to reveal to sinful man another scheme, not merely legal but redemptive, as a directory of faith, a guide of life and a basis of hope, it would be just, if not indispensable, that its credentials should be so clear as to admit of no reasonable doubt. They ought to be not so much deductions from speculative premises however apparently well-founded, as phenomenal facts easily apprehended by consciousness, or immediate and necessary inferences from those facts, and therefore of equal validity with the original data themselves: the concrete results of observation and experience, or good because logical consequences from them. While the revelation itself is to be proved, its proofs ought to be as nearly as possible autopistic.

The Evidences of Christianity are treated in a brief summary in the remainder of this year. The senior student who has gone over all these courses is already in possession of all the evidences, gathered in detail, and there is really no necessity for anything more than a mere summing up with the help of a popular text-book.

7. The writer's *ideal* of this Bible course is to make it the *unifying course of all sound learning*. He would make it touch human thought and action at every point. He would traverse every domain of earthly knowledge for confirmation and illustration of Divine truth. He would make God's Word unify all history, illustrate every science, answer all heresies, confirm all that is good, and furnish a key to the Babel of human voices and speculations, and, above all, give a solid basis for faith from creation to final redemption, from Eden to the New Jerusalem.

This is the ideal. "Who is sufficient for these things?" The *ideal teacher* of such a course begins with a thorough knowledge of all Scripture, so as to compare Scripture with Scripture; then a practical knowledge of the original tongues of the Bible; then a mastery of the whole field of Biblical literature, and skill to discern withal; then an ample store of universal knowledge, and then strong common-sense to enable him at the same time to instruct the simple and excite new interest in the most gifted. You nor I will ever realize this ideal, but we may reach after it more and more.

J. B. SHEARER.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1888.

At the hour of 11 A. M., on Thursday, May 17, we saw a large audience assembled in the roomy Franklin Street Church, Baltimore, with the pastor, Dr. W. U. Murkland, in the pulpit, Dr. G. B. Strickler's calm, smoothly-shaven face on the right, and Dr. William Adams' black eyes glowing on the left. A new, and, as it proved, a finely-toned organ threw up its lofty pipes in the rear of the pulpit. As these pipes were painted in soft olive greens, with only here and there a touch of gold and warm brown tints, the eye had some relief from the Sahara of buff that covered the walls of the church. The windows, however, were decidedly tasteful, and a very pretty one in the northeast corner, designed by Dr. Murkland, perpetuates the memory of Dr. Plumer, a former pastor of the church.

After the usual preliminary services, including an excellent prayer by Dr. Adams, Dr. Strickler, the retiring moderator, took for his text John xv. 5, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," and proceeded to dis-

cuss the mystical union of Christ and the church. This doctrine is most precious to all believers and was ably and scripturally presented by the preacher. Dr. Strickler showed himself to be a clear thinker and a ready speaker. In his style, perhaps the most noteworthy feature was the directness of aim in his words to express his thoughts, with a commendable absence of the "ambitious" element.

After the closing hymn, Dr. Murkland delivered a graceful address of welcome, closing with a graphic description of his experience in climbing high up into a church spire in Antwerp, wherein he left below him first the rumble and roar of the busy streets, and then the chiming of the bells in the tower, so that there was nothing now above him but heaven.

The moderator took his seat, the roll was called, and the election of a new moderator was in order. The venerable Dr. William Brown nominated Dr. J. J. Bullock, of the Presbytery of Maryland. Rev. S. I. Reid, of Arkansas, nominated Dr. S. A. King, of Texas. Rev. F. J. Brooke, of Lexington Presbytery, Va., nominated Dr. J. R. Graham, of Winchester, Va. The merits of the respective candidates were set forth by their advocates; two of them tried in vain to withdraw their names. The three cast their individual votes and retired from the room; and then the roll was called, and each man cried out his choice. We had expected a ballot instead of a *viva voce* vote. The result was that Dr. Bullock was elected by a considerable majority over both the others combined, which was well, perhaps, considering the age of Dr. Bullock and his having been pastor of the very church in which the Assembly was sitting.

This may be a proper place to say that there was much geniality, and indeed no little pleasantry, on the floor of the Assembly, and we were not all reminded of a gloomy conclave of inquisitors seeking to destroy Galileo Galilei. For instance, when sundry speakers were extolling their favorite candidates for the moderatorship, some of them seemed to think that the time of making of puns had come. A language in which punning is impossible is a great philological *desideratum*, and we have looked wistfully toward Volapuk in this regard. But since our linguistic needs are infinite, or well nigh so, and language is finite, one word must ever bear two or more meanings, and there is no help for us. It is, on the other hand, due to the brethren who favored us on this occasion to state that, in point of sedateness, we might say even lugubriousness, their puns were unrivalled and beyond all praise.

Dr. Bullock has a distinguished presence, presided with ability, urbanity, and firmness, and his rulings were sustained with a single exception. Even in this he decided in strict accordance with the old Book. The question was demanded on a substitute. In former days we said "the previous question"; and when this was seconded it cut off all debate, all substitutes, all amendments that had not been accepted, and brought the "main question" to a vote. The main question was the original motion, together with any amendments that had been accepted by the mover and his second, or had been approved by the house. Dr. Bullock's ruling was in agreement with this; but on appeal from his decision it was held that, by more recent parliamentary practice, the question could be called on a substitute, and if the substitute was negatived, the original motion, with its amendments, might be still further discussed.

REUNION.

Dr. H. M. Smith, of New Orleans, then gained the floor to offer this resolution :

Resolved, That the report of the Committee of Inquiry be adopted, and their fidelity and diligence be commended. The Assembly expresses its hearty gratification at the spirit of christian courtesy that has marked the sessions of these committees; at the same time it appears, from the facts now laid before us, that there has been no change in the relative attitude of the two bodies on questions of fundamental importance. In view of this, and of the decided opposition of some of our Presbyteries, which we judge to represent the prevalent sentiment of our people, we are constrained to believe that the further agitation of the pending question of organic union would interrupt the harmony and usefulness of our beloved church as a church of Christ. With sincere and fraternal regards, therefore, for our brethren of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and with the hope that we may be blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ, and with a hope of all things practicable, there may be coöperation and harmony between us in the service of our common Lord and Master, this Assembly deems it inexpedient to prosecute the subject further, and the committee is hereby discharged.

Dr. Smith, after reading this resolution, moved that it be made the order of the day for Friday morning, and the whole matter disposed of. It was judged by the Assembly that this action would be precipitate; but on motion of Dr. H. G. Hill, of North Carolina, the report of the Committee of Conference (or Inquiry) was made the first order for Friday morning.

Accordingly, after the announcement of the committees and the reference of various overtures to the proper committees, and brief state-

ments of the subject-matter of overtures not yet referred, Dr. Strickler presented the report of the Committee of Conference with the committee of the Northern Assembly. Dr. Smith then offered his resolution.

Rev. S. M. Neel, of the Presbytery of Louisville, thought the action proposed premature, discourteous to the Northern Assembly, hasty, and not likely to produce harmony among ourselves. Another member proposed the raising of a special committee. Another said that this question was coming: it was like Banquo's ghost, in that it would not down. He respected the fathers of the church, but if they did not get out of the way they would be run over. (It is presumed that it was not meant that they would be run over by Banquo's ghost, but by the car of . . . progress.) He had been a soldier, but had laid aside resentment and hatred.

Dr. William Brown thought the action would be "previous." He agreed with Mr. Neel on this point. It ought to be referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, which had been carefully selected from various parts of the church; and it would be unusual and hardly courteous to take the matter out of their hands.

Dr. Campbell, of St. Joseph, Mo., preferred a special committee, consisting of two members, viz., a minister and an elder, from each Synod. The Committee on Bills and Overtures already had their hands too full of business.

Dr. Smoot moved, as a substitute for everything proposed, that the papers be referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, and they be instructed to report at their earliest convenience; and this was adopted.

Instead of being the first important matter settled, however, it was the last. The committee reported on the 10th day, Monday, May 28th, in the afternoon session.

The report was in substance—

1st. That the obstacles to organic union had not been to any considerable extent removed by the conference of the two committees appointed by the Northern and Southern Assemblies; that it is best for us to remain a distinct member of the body of which Christ is the head.

2nd. That our thanks were due to our own committee, and that the committee be now discharged.

3rd. That we reciprocate the kind sentiments of our Northern brethren, and desire to forget dissensions and to follow after all things pure, lovely and of good report.

4th, That we appoint a committee to confer with a similar committee of the Northern Church, if one shall be appointed by them, on coöperation in christian work at home and abroad, so far as may be practicable; our committee to report to the next Assembly.

The paper was taken up *seriatim*.

Rev. R. C. Reed moved to amend by saying that the obstacles have not been entirely removed. This was warmly discussed, but finally voted down.

Dr. Burkhead hoped that reunion would soon be effected, and offered a substitute that a committee of inquiry or conference be appointed to see if the obstacles could not be removed. This was supported by Dr. Campbell, of Missouri, but was lost.

The consideration of the report was resumed on Tuesday morning, at 10 o'clock. Dr. Campbell, of Missouri, offered as a substitute the appointment of a committee, consisting of three ministers and two ruling elders, to confer again with the Northern Assembly. We saw no substantial difference between this substitute and that of Dr. Burkhead, which had been negatived on Monday afternoon, and hence we regarded this part of the discussion as out of order. But we did not raise the point of order.

The substitute was lost by over 70 noes to (we believe) 49 ayes.

From the stenographic reports in the Baltimore daily papers and the *Christian Observer* of Louisville, supplemented by our private notes, we had intended to give a synopsis of the discussion, but it would take too much space in the QUARTERLY.

The report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures at last came to a vote *seriatim*. After mentioning the various papers on reunion that had been placed in their hands, the committee recommended the adoption of the following paper:

“1. After a careful consideration of the report of our Committee of Inquiry, we are unable to discover that the obstacles to organic union heretofore existing between the Northern and Southern General Assemblies have to any considerable extent been removed; therefore, in view of all the interests involved, we continue established in the conviction that the cause of truth and righteousness, as well as the peace and prosperity of our beloved Zion, will be best promoted by remaining as we have been, a distinct member of that one body, the church of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme and ever-living Head.”

This clause was carried by 63 ayes to 55 noes. The majority would probably have been larger but for some objection to the phrase “the cause of truth and righteousness.”

The second clause, commending and discharging the Committee of Inquiry, passed without opposition.

The third clause expressed appreciation of the generous and munificent hospitality of our Northern brethren in the matter of the Centennial celebration, joy in the vast and precious heritage of Presbyterian truth and order held by us in common with others, and a desire to forget, as far as possible, all past dissensions; and closed by the exhortation: "Let us walk by the same rule; let us mind the same thing, trusting that if in anything we be otherwise minded, God will reveal even this unto us." Carried, with only one dissenting voice, which caused some amusement.

The fourth clause recommended the appointment of a Committee of Coöperation in work at home and abroad. Dr. R. S. Campbell, of Missouri, offered a substitute expressing gratification at learning that the Northern Assembly had continued its Committee of Conference with us; frankly confessing the belief that the time for organic union is not yet; and recommending that the Southern Assembly continue its committee as a committee of *conference* and enlarge its numbers. This was lost by the very close vote of 60 to 62. At this point, the time being 1:10 P. M., the train to leave at 2, the writer was constrained to retire from the house. From a daily paper we learn that a vote on the paper offered by the Committee of Bills and Overtures was taken by ayes and noes; whereupon it appears that there were 88 ayes and 40 noes.

S. A. King, T. C. Whaling, R. K. Smoot, J. W. Storey, J. F. Thompson and L. C. Mills had leave to enter on the records their reason for voting no on the paper as a whole, containing these words:

" . . . While we approved of most of the recommendations of the paper, we could not vote for the adoption of the report as a whole because it provides for a Committee of Conference with a view to coöperation, which, in the judgment of the Northern Assembly, as expressed in their action appointing a similar committee, can be most efficiently prosecuted only as the result of the organic union of the two churches."

On the whole matter of organic union we offer the following suggestions to the readers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY:

1st, Every family, commonwealth and kingdom ought to manage its own affairs. The early Norman kings of England held a claim of sovereignty over a large part of France; but, after so long a time, and after much bloodshed, England had to be content with ruling England, and France, for better or for worse, ruled France. So, also, England

has ceased to rule the United States of America, and her control of Canadian affairs has been greatly curtailed. God has not intended the world to be one great empire.

The same principles apply to the church in large measure. The churches in foreign lands must be taught to stand on their own feet and take care of their own interests. It will not do for men in one land to legislate for men in another. It will not do for men in one section to control the men of another section in matters in which the inhabitants of the one section are not specially affected by the legislation, civil or ecclesiastical, while those of the other section are vitally concerned. The Southern Presbyterian Church has now its autonomy. If history and human experience have taught anything, they have taught that it is unwise to place one's self in the power of other people. At present there may be an abundance of kind feeling; but there is no need of shutting our eyes on the past.

2nd. The argument based on the duty of loving our brethren has been very zealously pressed, but it is inconclusive. Of course it is our duty to love our brethren of the North, many of whom are most worthy of our christian affection. So we are to love our neighbors, but it is not our duty to live in the same house with them. This would not promote peace and charity. We are to love brethren of non-Presbyterian churches also, but not to dissolve our own ecclesiastical organization. Would there be more love if we were all in one vast church? I trow not. There are too many causes of dissension, too many matters about which we disagree,—at all events for the present. In former years the New School reproached the Old School for want of love, because they would no longer affiliate with the Congregationalists. But time taught the New School better. Let us listen to TIME.

3rd. The oft-adduced argument from John xvii. is based on a papistical exegesis. Bellarmine himself would have been pleased with some of the remarks of honored brethren on the floor of the Assembly. That the church in all lands should be one organism, and thus that the world of the ungodly should know that Christ is sent from the Father, and that the world cannot perceive the spiritual unity of the church, but only its external—or, as the current phrase goes, organic union—is sound old Roman Catholicism. Brethren ought to be careful how they express themselves in the heat of debate, lest they give aid and countenance to the pope and his cardinals.

In opposition to this Romish exegesis it was excellently said that the Presbyterian Church is not one denomination, but a family of de-

nominations. Or we may liken it to different regiments in a *corps d'armée*, each bearing aloft its bonnie blue flag, and all marching on to battle and to victory.

4th, It is pleasant to be assured that the Boys in Grey, who bore Confederate swords and muskets for four long years, have ceased from the animosities of the war. But it is very unjust to imply that all who take a different view as to the wisest and safest policy of the church of to-day are animated by a spirit of hatred and revenge. God forbid that this should be so! If any one minister or elder of our beloved church cherishes malign sentiments toward our Northern brethren, may the Holy Ghost renew a right spirit within him. May he lay aside all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies, and all evil-speaking.

5th, We once asked that famous surgeon, Dr. B. W. Dudley, of Lexington, Ky., which of the European medical schools he had liked best while a student abroad. He replied that he thought he had received benefit from all his teachers, but most of all from Dr. Abernethy of Guy's Hospital, London, whose great apothegm was that there was no general disease of the system that might not manifest itself locally, and no local disease that might not manifest itself generally. Let us learn wisdom from this sagacious man. Any false doctrine of any part of the re-united church might most readily, by our system of church government, come before us for adjudication. We have enough to contend with in our own body without importing diseases from the North; and they have enough without importing from us. It would be bad for any part of our land to be subject to the pulmonary complaints of the North, and also to the malaria and yellow fever of the South.

6th, Before our church takes any further steps toward organic reunion, everybody ought to know what course the Northern Assembly pursued toward the church in Kentucky after the formation of the Southern Presbyterian Church. The "Declaration and Testimony" paper contained some very sound doctrine, but spoke, we always thought, with unseemly asperity of the Northern Assembly. We will now quote from Rev. Dr. Miles Saunders, the careful and accurate historian of Transylvania Presbytery:

"The General Assembly met in St. Louis, in May, 1866, and in its organization refused seats to the commissioners of Louisville Presbytery, on the ground that the Presbytery had adopted the 'Declaration and Testimony,' and that the commissioners were signers of the same. It condemned the 'Declaration and Testimony' as a slander upon the church (Minutes, p. 473). It summoned the signers to appear at the bar of the next Assembly, to answer for what they had done in this

matter (Minutes, p. 473). It forbade them to sit as members of any church court higher than the session, and ordered resolution 4 (page 473): "That if any Presbytery shall disregard this action of the General Assembly and at any meeting shall enroll as entitled to a seat or seats in the body one or more of the persons designated in the preceding resolutions and summoned to appear before the next Assembly, then that Presbytery shall *ipso facto* be dissolved" (page 474)."

As Dr. Saunders' full sketch was sent on to the stated clerk of our Assembly in May, 1888, and is on file with him, and a part of it has been published recently, we need add only that some members of Presbytery felt that they could not be the executioners of the Assembly without violating ordination vows; and, by this ecclesiastical "Alien and Sedition Law," they were thrust out of Transylvania Presbytery.

Do we, then, propose to wave "the bloody shirt?" Not at all. Let the dead past bury its dead. It certainly was extraordinary and melancholy to see some of the truest, staunchest, most orthodox and most attached adherents of the Presbyterian Church thrust out in this way. Madness ruled the hour.

Our point is this: The Northern Assembly never has—so far as we are advised—disallowed its claim of the right to act in this violent and unconstitutional manner. Would we be safe in the proposed union, with five votes to our one? We would very kindly and respectfully call the attention of our Northern brethren to this matter. The discussion and the votes in the Baltimore Assembly showed that organic reunion had a no inconsiderable following. Now, is the Northern Church going to act in the near future so as to convince us that our fears are well-founded? Is it going to maintain its long silence on this subject, and thus leave us shut up to the belief that it holds fast to its claim of the right to *ipso facto* ministers of the church, whenever it shall see fit to do so?

On our way home we fell in, between Baltimore and Washington, with a leading minister of the Northern Church, formerly a New School man, who gave it as his conviction that the New School Assembly never would have taken that action of the Old School Assembly of 1866. What has the reunited Northern Church to say on the subject? If nothing, then how unwise it would be for the Southern Presbyterian Church, under a great clamor about charity, to bolt into a union with an overshadowing body! Marry in haste, and repent at leisure.

7th, By a novel, and, as we firmly believe, untenable decision, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Walnut Street Church case, has bound itself to sustain, in all questions involving property, the findings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The court

refuses to go behind the returns. It examines our church government so far as to learn that we have a last court of appellate jurisdiction; then closes the book and refuses to entertain any question concerning the constitutionality of the edicts of the Assembly. It cannot understand our church government, forsooth, as well as our Assemblies do. This is a return to mediævelism. The church hands recusants over to the civil authorities; and the civil authorities enforce the church's decrees. We do not think that fifty years will elapse before the state will see how it has humiliated itself in thus assuming the *rôle* of a Jack Cade. For the present, it has made it more or less dangerous to be a Presbyterian. The decision, unwittingly of course, is in favor of extreme independency. Are you about to build a church, or to endow a college or theological seminary? Be very guarded about the charter, and the property rights, or else some Assembly will figure in the case, and you may lose all you have invested. One of the speakers referred to the Danville Theological Seminary; he had been told by Northern brethren that the South had no equitable rights in that endowment. Now, that seminary was originally founded as a distinctively Southern institution, in the South, and for the South. A large part of the money was contributed by Southern men. To-day they have no control of a single dollar of its funds. The same is true of Centre College. After all the greetings, the hurrahs, the rising votes, the doxologies, the immense enthusiasms of our Northern Assemblies, the sad and painful fact remains, that, in language attributed to one of the leading men of the Northern Synod of Kentucky, "one-third of the Presbyterians of Kentucky hold every dollar of those endowments." He is reported to have said on the floor of his Synod that this was "very strange." We agree with him. We have no bitterness in the case. But we are mystified. Can any one wonder that some of us feel unwilling to advise our Southern people to enter into a partnership involving these perils? What would the Assembly of the Organic Union Church require us to do? No man can foretell. If we should feel constrained to disobey, out we go; and away go our painfully gathered endowments, our churches, our glebes. Alas! Alas!

OUR BROTHER IN BLACK.

We played with him in childhood; we sometimes take him kindly by the hand to-day. We help him on occasion. We have rescued six millions from fetichism, cannibalism, and voodooism. In Kentucky every dollar of taxes paid by our brother in black is devoted to the edu-

cation of his children. The expenses^m of state and municipal governments fall on the whites exclusively. We have preached to our brother in black the same sweet gospel which saves ourselves. We would willingly do so again, but he does not often give us the chance. In fact, he does not relish our staid style of oratory, and would rather be off to himself. Yet we wish him well, and hope to rejoice with him in heaven. But he is not welcome to our bed and board. We do not desire him for a son-in-law; we do not wish him to call on our daughters in a social way; and we are not willing that our grandchildren shall be mulattoes.

We believe that the race instinct has been divinely implanted in order to prevent the confusion of the blood of races remote from each other, and especially of the Caucasian and the Negro. If all this is sinful, let our fall and spring Presbyteries memorialize the next Assembly at Chattanooga in 1889 to hold a day of fasting and prayer and confession of sin in this regard. And by all means let us invite the Northern Assembly, if not to feast, at least to fast and pray with us; for we apprehend that they are about "as deep in the mud as we are in the mire." We saw three or four of the colored brethren in the ranks between which we marched up to Overbrook, near Philadelphia, and about the same number at the reception in the Academy of Fine Arts, in the "Presbyterian Jam," as some one facetiously styled the concourse; three or four amid hundreds,

Rari nantes in gurgite vasto.

We saw only one white man pay them the slightest attention. He was a returned missionary from China by whom we happened to get a seat. He spoke pleasantly to a brother in black, who turned aside from the throng and stood at the end of the sofa. There was no sitting-room for him. The writer of this article then addressed a few questions to said brother concerning his location and the size of his Presbytery, and would have said more, but either the rush of the throng swept him away, or he allowed himself to be borne off by it.

We have tried negro suffrage in the South, and have found it, as we expected, to be a farce; and we do not care to introduce it into our church courts. If this be ecclesiastical treason, make the most of it.

THE FUTURE OF THE QUESTION.

The discussion disclosed the existence in the Southern Assembly of a Right, a Left, and a Centre, to the last of which the writer adheres.

We shall look with great interest to the course pursued by our Northern brethren in coming years. If they wish to win over the Left to the Centre, the Centre to the Right, and the Right into still closer fraternity, they ought by this time to know how to do it. But if they shall seize and hold endowments, if they shall stint the missionaries in their own border-places and send men and money South to where they will most hamper and distress us, if they shall tamper with ill-paid Southern preachers in the Indian Territory or elsewhere, if they shall alienate the black man of the South from the white man of the South, then for one we say, *God help the Right!* But may a gracious heaven preserve the Presbyterian Church North from this untoward policy; for we are taught of God to love one another, and we hope better things of them, though we thus speak.

THE WOODROW CASE.

This case came up by a complaint of Dr. James Woodrow against the Synod of Georgia, of which he is a member. The examination of the case was greatly facilitated by two pamphlets furnished by Dr. Woodrow himself, and containing the record and evidence, an address on evolution, delivered May 7, 1884, before the Alumni Association of the Columbia Theological Seminary, a speech before the Synod of South Carolina, October 27th and 28th, 1884, and sundry articles from the *Southern Presbyterian*, of which he is the editor; also the argument of said complainant which he read before the Assembly.

The case was referred to the Judicial Committee, of which the writer was a member; and it thus became our duty to ascertain whether the complaint was regularly and properly brought.

A conjecture having arisen that there might be some informality in prosecuting the complaint before this Assembly, it was freely said in the committee that we ought to waive all mere informalities and have the case come to trial. The supposed irregularity finally crystallized into these two points:

1st, By Article 268 of the Book of Order: "Notice of complaint shall be given in the same form and time as notice of appeal." By Article 263: "An appellant shall be considered as abandoning his appeal if he do not appear before the appellate court by the second day of its meeting next ensuing the date of his notice of appeal, unless it shall appear that he was prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it."

2nd, Before the Assembly of 1887 had received any notification

from Dr. Woodrow, the Committee on Records of the Synod of Georgia had reported that said records had been examined, and were approved, and the report had been adopted by the Assembly. This was on the third day of the sessions of the Assembly of 1887. On the same day, but at a later hour, Dr. Woodrow's letter was read to the Assembly, notifying them that, owing to the condition of his health, as evidenced by the written statement of his physician, he was providentially debarred from seasonably prosecuting his complaint.

The final result was that majority and a minority reports were presented, as follows:

MAJORITY REPORT.—Your Judicial Committee to which was referred the complaint of Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., against the "Synod of Georgia," respectfully report that they have examined said complaint and the papers therein referred to, and find that while the complaint was not presented by the second day of the General Assembly of 1887, yet your committee are of the opinion that the complainant has brought himself within the exception as provided by Chap. XIII., Sec. III., Par. 9, of our Rules of Discipline, by showing that he was prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it. Your committee recommend that said complaint be heard in the order prescribed by our Rules of Discipline, as follows:

1. Hear the record of the case.
2. Hear the complainant.
3. Hear the respondent by its representative.
4. Hear the complainant again.
5. Consider and decide the case.

Signed, J. D. Burkhead, L. G. Barbour, A. A. James, James Hemphill, J. J. White, R. T. Simpson, S. P. Dendy, J. J. Davis, S. P. Greene, J. F. Crowe.

MINORITY REPORT.—The undersigned members of the Judicial Committee to which was referred the complaint with accompanying papers of Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., *vs.* the Synod of Georgia, would report that, having examined the same, and failing to agree with the majority, respectfully beg leave to submit the following minority report:

It is clear from the papers submitted that the complainant failed to lodge his complaint with the clerk of the higher court before the close of the second day of its sessions, as required by Chap. XIII., Sec. III., (260) Par. 6, Book of Church Order, and that, having thus failed to regularly prosecute his complaint, the last Assembly had a right to presume that the complainant had abandoned his complaint, and that Assembly having examined and approved the minutes of the Synod of Georgia, the undersigned members of the committee are of the opinion that the case is barred, and recommend that the complaint be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted. Samuel A. King, A. H. Barkley, B. W. Powell.

In regard to the first point made by the minority, it is plain that we should not confound two distinct things, the appearing of the com-

plainant before the court, either in person or by writing, and his notification that he has been prevented by the providence of God from seasonably prosecuting it. The former must take place by the second day of the meeting of the court next ensuing the date of his notice of appeal (or complaint); but the latter is not so restricted, and the Book of Church Order is judicious in not restricting the time of the notification. It may be well for the complainant, *if he can*, to notify the ensuing Assembly by the second day of its sessions, that he is providentially prevented from prosecuting his complaint; and a complainant ought of course to show due diligence in the matter, and not to leave church courts in needless uncertainty as to the course he intends to pursue. But providential hindrances know no law. A sudden illness, a miscarriage in the mails, a score of unforeseen accidents may retard the delivery of a communication. Hence our book takes a wise course in not fixing any time by or before which a church court shall be notified of the complainant's inability to appear. While it is *extra litem*, it may be stated that Dr. Woodrow's notification was mailed in time to reach the Assembly by the second day, and was delayed to the third day by causes unknown to the Judicial Committee.

Touching the second point, it should be borne in mind that the Committee on Synodical Records is limited to the records which are delivered to it for examination; that the Synod of Georgia, against which the complaint was made, sat in November, 1886; that Dr. Woodrow's notice of complaint was duly made and entered; that on November 20, 1886, he sent his complaint to the stated clerk of Synod, and that nothing subsequent to this could possibly come before the Committee on Records of the Synod of Georgia appointed by the Assembly of 1887. That committee had nothing whatever to do with the questions whether the complaint did or did not appear on the second day of the sessions of May, 1887; whether he was or was not providentially hindered, or, in fine, whether he were still in the church militant or had entered into the church triumphant. These questions might come before the Assembly, but not before a Committee on Records. The Assembly of 1888, therefore, acted strictly according to law in entertaining Dr. Woodrow's complaint.

The case came originally before the Presbytery of Augusta, Ga., August 16, 1886, at which an indictment of Rev. William Adams, D. D., against Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., dated April 17, 1886, was read in open court. This indictment contained two charges:

1st. That the said James Woodrow "did teach and promulgate that the body of Adam was probably the product of evolution from the body of some lower animal.

"2nd, That the said James Woodrow, in the publications and speeches referred to, did teach and promulgate opinions which are of a dangerous tendency, and which are calculated to unsettle the mind of the church respecting the accuracy and authority of the Holy Scriptures as an infallible rule of faith, in that he did teach and promulgate the opinion that the body of Adam was probably not made or created of the dust of the ground, as is universally understood by the church to be the declaration of the Word of God, but of organic matter preëxisting in the body of a brute." (Record and Evidence, p. 1.) Dr. Woodrow answered: "I am not guilty." (R. and E., p. 2.)

On the first specification nine votes were given to sustain the indictment, and fourteen not to sustain. On the second specification six voted to sustain and seventeen not to sustain. Dr. Adams gave notice that he would complain of this verdict to the Synod of Georgia. The complaint of Dr. Adams came before the Synod at Sparta, Ga., at the meeting of November 10-13, 1886, and was sustained by 49 votes as against 15 not to sustain, and 2 to sustain in part. The committee to prepare a minute reported "that the complaint be sustained for the reason that the finding and judgment of the Presbytery are contrary to the evidence and the law, in that the evidence before the Presbytery showed that the belief of the said defendant, James Woodrow, D. D., as to the origin of the body of Adam, was contrary to the Word of God as interpreted in the standards of the church; and it is ordered that the said verdict and judgment of the Presbytery is hereby annulled." This minute was adopted, whereupon the Rev. Dr. Woodrow gave notice that he would complain to the General Assembly of the Synod's action in the case. (R. and E. *passim*.)

We have been thus minutely exact in the foregoing statements in order that the action of the Assembly may be clearly understood, and may be seen to be absolutely final and conclusive of the case. After the adoption of the report of the majority of the Judicial Committee by the Assembly, it was moved that one hour be allowed to Dr. Woodrow for the opening speech, then one hour each to the Synod of Georgia's representatives, Drs. Adams and Strickler, (Elder J. A. Billups, the third appointee of the Synod of Georgia, being absent,) and one hour to Dr. Woodrow for the closing argument. Dr. Woodrow stated that he would need four hours, a part of the time to be used by his counsel. (He selected Judge Heiskell, of Memphis, Tenn.) The writer moved that Dr. Woodrow's request be granted. This was amended by

allowing the respondents also four hours, and then passed unanimously.

At the end of Dr. Woodrow's first two hours he seemed not to have finished what he had to say, and was allowed to proceed, no limit being assigned. On Friday night, May 25th, the argument was closed by Dr. Woodrow, and the roll was called, each member being allowed three minutes to express his views. When the clerk, taking the Synods alphabetically, had gone through the Synod of Kentucky it was voted to postpone the call of the other Synods until Saturday morning, May 26th. After the three-minute speeches were all delivered, the roll was called, and at 1:20 p. m. it was announced that thirty-four had voted to sustain, two to sustain in part, and one hundred and nine not to sustain Dr. Woodrow's complaint.

The committee appointed to bring in a paper expressing the judgment of the Assembly in the case of James Woodrow, D. D., against the Synod of Georgia, recommended the following as the judgment therein :

Whereas, The Presbytery of Augusta did find Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., not guilty of the charge preferred against him by the Rev. William Adams, D. D., wherein he was charged with preaching and formulating opinions and doctrines in conflict with the sacred Scriptures, as interpreted in our standards, the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly; that he did, on divers occasions mentioned in said charges, teach and promulgate that the body of Adam was probably the product of evolution from the body of some lower animal; and,

Whereas, The Synod of Georgia did, upon the complaint of Rev. William Adams, D. D., annul said action of the Presbytery of Augusta, which judgment of the Synod of Georgia is brought to this General Assembly by the complaint of the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D. ;

Now, therefore, it is the judgment of this General Assembly that Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God of the dust of the ground, without any natural, animal parentage of any kind. The wisdom of God prompted him to reveal the fact, while the inscrutable mode of his action therein he has not revealed. While, therefore, the church does not propose to touch, handle or conclude any question of science which belongs to God's kingdom of nature, she must by her divine constitution see that these questions are not thrust upon her to break the silence of Scripture and supplement it by any scientific hypothesis concerning the mode of God's being or acts in creation, which are inscrutable to us. It is, therefore, ordered that this complaint in this case be not sustained, and the judgment of the Synod of Georgia be, and the same is hereby in all things affirmed.

WILLIAM BROWN,	J. R. GRAHAM,
R. K. SMOOT,	S. P. GREENE,
C. A. BRIDEWELL,	A. B. CURRY.

Mr. Charles Hammond, of the Presbytery and Synod of Missouri, offered the following substitute:

Inasmuch as the action of the Synod of Georgia could not, and was not, intended to annul the verdict of the Presbytery of Augusta, by which Dr. Woodrow was acquitted of heresy, the decision of this Assembly does not affect the ministerial character or ecclesiastical standing of the complainant.

This Assembly being forbidden by the constitution of the church to handle or conclude anything but that which is ecclesiastical, does not pronounce on the scientific hypothesis which Dr. Woodrow holds as probably true, but solemnly judges that the interpretation of the scriptural account of the creation of man's body in accordance with such hypothesis is contrary to the standards of the church.

A sharp debate followed, and the vote being on the adoption of the substitute, it was lost. The report of the committee was then adopted.

THE PROTEST OF MR. WHALING.

Rev. T. C. Whaling then arose, and, advancing to a position in front of the moderator's desk, read his protest, as follows:

We whose names are undersigned do enter our solemn protest against the decision of the General Assembly refusing to sustain the complaint of the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., against the Synod of Georgia, for the following reasons:

1. The second specification in this indictment is expressly excluded by the constitution of our church, inasmuch as "nothing ought to be considered by any court as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture as interpreted in the standards."

2. In the view of your protestants the Holy Bible does not reveal the form of the matter out of which, the time in which, or the mode by which, God created the body of Adam, and therefore the hypothesis of evolution as believed by Dr. Woodrow cannot be regarded in conflict with the teachings of the sacred Scriptures.

The Westminster standards simply reproduce, without interpretation, the statements of the Scriptures in reference to the creation of Adam's body, and as the views of the complainant are not in conflict with the statements of the Scriptures, so neither can they be with the teachings of the standards.

The action of the Assembly in refusing to sustain this complaint is equivalent to pronouncing as certainly false the theory of evolution as applied by Dr. Woodrow to Adam's body, which is a purely scientific question, entirely foreign to the legitimate sphere of ecclesiastical action. Your protestants, therefore, are unwilling that this General Assembly should express any opinion whatever respecting the hypothesis of evolution or any other scientific question.

T. C. Whaling, C. W. Heiskell, J. O. Lindsay, J. J. Davis, F. J. Brooke, R. Adams, J. W. Montgomery, J. O. Varnadoe, H. Wilson, G. T. Goetchius, W. N. Dickey, S. M. Neel, J. P. Fitzgerald, C. W. Robinson, J. W. Kennedy, T. B. Fraser.

The protest has sixteen signatures—about one-half the vote (thirty-four) received by Dr. Woodrow. And thus this vexed question has—

for one year, at any rate—passed beyond the consideration of the General Assembly.

REMARKS ON THE WOODROW CASE.

Every opportunity was furnished Dr. Woodrow to make good his complaint. He was not charged with heresy, but with holding and promulgating a false and dangerous opinion as to the origin of Adam's body. He was treated with kindness and consideration, and it was stated on the floor of the Assembly after his departure that he had left Baltimore with kind feelings towards the Assembly. His standing as a minister of the gospel remains intact.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS—(*Three-Minute Speeches.*)

A very few, certainly *one* member, expressed a belief in evolution. Some thought the Bible was silent on the subject.

Some, that we ought not to cast a stigma on Dr. Woodrow.

Some revered the man, but could not adopt his teaching.

Some had no definite opinion as to whether the Bible did or did not condemn the evolution of Adam's body from some lower animal. We took notes of various opinions as uttered on the floor, but space forbids a prolix account.

The great majority held that the doctrine of the complainant was contrary to the Word of God, as interpreted in the standards of our church.

EVOLUTION IN GENERAL.

The scientific doctrine of the evolution of the various species of the lower animals by descent with modification, was not considered by the Assembly. We have room for only the briefest statement of some possible beliefs on the subject.

1st, That matter is eternal, and there is no extra mundane, personal God; that matter is endued with force, and contains in itself the potency of life and the germs of the cosmos; that this blind force acts along the lines of least resistance; that thus one species is transmuted into another in long succession; that this transmutation is gradual, and often exhibits itself by the appearance of rudimentary organs in one species, useless to that species, but developed into complete and useful organs in a succeeding species; that man is the latest product of this process, in whom force attains to consciousness and articulate utterance. This is materialistic pantheism.

2nd, That there is a personal God, who created one or more living cells, and left the forces of matter, including this new life-force, to work out their own results.

3rd, That God so started the machinery of the universe, or in some way so guides it, as to accomplish his own ends.

4th, That God may have intervened from time to time during the ages, but that such intervention is to be regarded as extraordinary, viewed with suspicion, and not admitted if we have not irresistible proof thereof.

5th, That God did certainly intervene twice, viz.: in giving a human soul to the body of Adam, and in making Eve's body out of Adam's, according to the scriptural account; but alleged previous "miraculous" interpositions are to be narrowly watched.

6th, That God has often intervened, viz.: in the production of new species, and especially of the human species. This has until recently been the exclusive theistic view, the later theistic views being relapses toward that of material pantheism. Thus Agassiz, though not a christian, pronounces the transmutation of species "a gratuitous assumption." Of the various types of lizards he says: "Having studied the facts most thoroughly, I find in them a direct proof of the creation of all these species." Again: "I find it impossible to attribute the biological phenomena which have been and still are going on upon the surface of our globe to the simple action of physical forces. I believe they are due in their entirety as well as individually to the direct intervention of a creative power, acting freely and in an autonomic way." He held also that organized beings were geographically distributed by "the direct intervention of a creative power."

Surely christian men need not stumble at the idea of the direct creation of Adam when they believe that Christ created or made out of previously existing matter, but without means or loss of time, enough bread and fish to feed five thousand men, and again four thousand men, besides women and children; also that he will at the last day reconstitute the bodies of the countless millions of the dead. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Of course infidels mock at all this, but believers receive it reverently and joyfully; and if thousands of millions of bodies shall be made while the trumpet is sounding, why scruple at the production of the one human body of Adam without any descent with modification from the body of a beast?

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE EVOLUTION OF ADAM'S BODY BY DESCENT
WITH MODIFICATION.

We may not say that an *individual* holds all the consequences that legitimately flow from his tenets; but any *theory* is responsible for all just inferences that are rightly deducible from it. To object to this is idle. We all not only may, but must, and habitually do, act on this principle in the formation and maintenance of our opinions, and in the practical conduct of life. If Adam was descended from a lower animal, it must have been by birth, and from a viviparous mammal. Then he was not born in lawful wedlock, but was the spawn of brute coition—august man, the image of God, the Son of God!

Unless we fly to some wild trichotomy, Adam consisted of soul and body. When was the soul introduced into the body? Surely before his birth. His soul was pure and holy, the abode of the Holy Spirit; and thus the first earthly temple of the Holy Ghost was the abdomen of a beast!

Let us contrast with these horrible thoughts the pure and tender accounts given by the evangelists of the conception and birth of the second Adam, echoed by the early church in the formula hallowed by ten times ten thousand lips:

“Conceived of the Holy Ghost and
Born of the Virgin Mary;”

and again in the church's shout of joy: “Thou art the King of glory, O Christ; thou art the everlasting Son of the Father. When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst humble thyself to be born of a virgin”—words that we can hardly repeat without tears of love and wonder; for we worship thee, God of the manger and the cross, and all the bells of heaven rang when thou wast born! But if we are to accept this hypothesis as to Adam's body, we must say or sing that he was

Conceived of a male brute and
Born of a female brute,

that he might be our federal head and representative, and on the human side the progenitor of the Lord of glory!

Woe is me! On what times are we fallen?

While we find the fossil remains of the iguanodon, the pterodactyl, the ichthyosaurus and other saurians, the deinotherium and other theria, and many living specimens of chimpanzees, gorillas, etc., the link between Adam and the ape tribe is still missing. No *habeas cor-*

pus has been able to bring him, alive or dead, body or bone, into court. The scientific eye now looks to Africa, and to some other remote and geologically unexplored regions, where the missing link or his remains may lurk. Why did he demise, and yet the gorilla survive?

And the papyrus, or cylinder, or cuneiform inscription on a tablet is yet to seek which shall tell us how the babe Adam was suckled from the *distenta ubera* of his primate dam, and was dandled in her paws; how he honored his dam, and, if he ever met the gentleman, his sire too, so that his days were long in the land; how he grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and the anthropoids; how he acquired the habit of talking to himself from lack of human fellowship, and how, after long tutelage in a holy course of life, he sinned and fell, and thus sin entered into the world, and all our mortal woes! Can the church of God accept this hypothesis? Never. L. G. BARBOUR.

THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

THE opening of the Centennial Assembly at Philadelphia, on the 17th of May, 1888, was an imposing ceremony. The vast body formed at Horticultural Hall and marched in procession to the First Church. The able sermon of the retiring moderator was addressed to a great audience, composed of the commissioners and an overflowing multitude.

On re-assembling in the afternoon there arose an interesting contest for moderator. Many felt that the position should be given to Dr. McCosh as the crowning honor to one of the most illustrious of Presbyterians. But the choice fell on Dr. Charles L. Thompson, of Kansas City, who vindicated its wisdom by his conduct of the office.

Five hundred and twenty-two members were enrolled. This large number had two results: greater impulse was added by the weight and enthusiasm of the multitude; but, on the other hand, the value of the body as a deliberative assembly was injuriously affected. It became evident that the number must be reduced, or else that all business must be first considered in committees.

The general work of the church was found to be in a highly prosperous state. The Boards of Missions, (Home and Foreign), of Education, of Aid to Colleges, of Publication and others have made most encouraging progress. The Sabbath-school Missionary department of the Board of Publication showed marked development. In addition to its regular missionaries, more than sixty students from the Theo-

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 6.—OCTOBER, 1888.

I. THE PENTATEUCHAL STORY OF CREATION.

IN the opening portion of the Book of Genesis we have a history of creation which claims to be a direct revelation from God. Geology aims to give us a history of creation gathered from a careful study of the structure of the earth itself, especially the study of its fossils—those “medals of creation,” as they have been aptly termed—in which many things respecting the order of creation are written for our learning.

These two histories ought to be in perfect harmony the one with the other. The books of revelation and of nature, where they cover the same ground, ought to agree. And yet, as a matter of fact, and as these two records are often interpreted, so great is their apparent discrepancy as to lead Prof. Huxley to write:

“My belief is, and long has been, that the Pentateuchal story of creation is simply a myth. I suppose it to be a hypothesis respecting the origin of the universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge of the nature of things, and therefore assumed to be true. As such I hold it to be not only an interesting, but a venerable monument of a stage in the mental progress of mankind, . . . and to possess neither more nor less scientific importance than the cosmogonies of the Egyptians and Babylonians.”—*Order of Creation*, page 147.

Such discrepancies as are alleged in this case are, I believe, apparent, not real, and may be owing either to a misinterpretation of the Pentateuchal story of creation, or to a misreading of the

which, on scientific principles, cannot be believed until it finds its place under the domain of natural law, it carries an assumption against all religion. Without the miracle no religion can exist. It is fundamental to the very conception of that subject, that it is a personal communication between God and man, and we cannot conceive of any intelligent communication with a being who is outside of our sphere of being without transcending the limits of nature. Any amount of critical and learned lore is invited to examine the trustworthiness of a thing which has been so much imitated as the miracle. But no amount of human lore can divest religion, as a subject, of its most essential element, the miracle. Actual miracles have ceased. Recorded miracles remain. Without the recorded miracle adequately attested, it could never be demonstrated to the present generation, or to any generation, that God ever existed.

D. E. FRIERSON.

Anderson, S. C.

NOTE.—THE SOUTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

The statement in my article on the late Southern General Assembly in Baltimore, that Dr. H. M. Smith, of New Orleans, offered his resolution on the Reunion Question on Thursday, May 17th, is obviously incorrect. He offered at that time a resolution "to fix an order of the day for Friday . . . to consider the report of the Committee of Inquiry, and receive from the different Presbyteries their overtures on the subject of Organic Union." This is Dr. Smith's statement in the *Southwestern Presbyterian* of July 19th, and we cordially adopt it in place of our own. It was on Friday morning, May 18th, after the presentation of the report by Dr. Strickler, that Dr. Smith offered his resolution. (See PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for July 1888, pp. 288-'9.)

The sentence on p. 287, "Instead of being the first important matter settled, however, it was the last," was intended merely to furnish an historical statement of what actually occurred, viz.: that the Assembly did not finish up the reunion business on that 19th of May. It seemed desirable to the reviewer, however, to go on and complete the account of that matter. Hence we read next, "The committee reported on the tenth day, Monday, May 28th, in the afternoon," etc., etc.

Our article was written under the press and stress of our resumed duties as professor and also secretary of faculty, and the cry of the printers of the QUARTERLY for "copy." It is unnecessary to add that the mistake was wholly unintentional.

L. G. BARBOUR.

Richmond, Ky.