

COLUMBIA
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AND
THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH

A STUDY IN CHURCH HISTORY, PRESBYTERIAN POLITY,
MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE, AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT



WM. CHILDS ROBINSON, A.M., TH.D., D.D.
PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND POLITY
COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV

4070

.C7946

R6

16611

Copyright, 1931, by Wm. C. Robinson

John Bulow Campbell Library
Columbia Theological Seminary
Decatur, Ga. 30031

TO MY FATHER

DAVID WALLACE ROBINSON, ESQ.

A lifelong representative of those Presbyterian Elders and Deacons whose gifts of time, means, business and professional abilities have made possible the institutions of our Church.

FOREWORD

The substance of this book was presented as a thesis to the Faculty of the Theological School in Harvard University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology, in April, 1928.

The matter has been slightly revised, and references to a few more recent works have been inserted.

The Board of Directors of Columbia Theological Seminary has endorsed the work and approve its publication at this time by the author.

Having been presented at the Centennial of the Seminary in May, 1928, and now being issued the centennial year of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, this volume might not improperly be designated the Columbia Centennial History.

Decatur, Georgia,

August, 1931.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION—THE GENESIS OF COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	9
Early Interest in Theological Education in the Southeast	10
“The Classical, Scientific and Theological Seminary of the South”	11
“The Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia”	12
Location, 13; The Faculty, 14; New England’s Contributions, 16; Support, 21; The Charter, 23.	
“Columbia Theological Seminary”	24
COLUMBIA SEMINARY AND THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN INTEGRATION	25
The Ideal of a Southern Presbyterian Zion	26
The Organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church .	46
The Perpetuation of the Southern Presbyterian Church .	54
COLUMBIA SEMINARY AND THE POLITY OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH	68
The Polity of James Henley Thornwell, the Structural Lines of the Southern Presbyterian Church	69
The Ruling Elder, 71; The Analogy of the Presbyterian System, 78; The Headship of Christ, 81.	
The Diaconate, a Thornwellian Principle Elaborated by Dr. J. L. Girardeau	85
The Book of Church Order of the Southern Assembly . .	89
The Form of Government, 90; The Rules of Discipline, 94.	
Thornwell’s Doctrine of the Sacraments	97
The Lord’s Supper—The Doctrine of John Calvin . .	97
Baptism, Its Matter and Its Form	101

COLUMBIA SEMINARY AND THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE OF THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH	106
The Missionary Spirit of the Founders	107
The Society of Missionary Inquiry	108
The Southern Board of Foreign Missions	110
Church Extension	116
Colored Evangelization	122
"The Chalmers of the Disruption," Dr. J. Leighton Wilson	134
A Notable Succession	140
Social Service	143

COLUMBIA SEMINARY AND THE THOUGHT OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Contributions of the Seminary to the Thought of the Church	148
Publications—Periodicals, 148; Reviews, 149; Books, 151. .	
Library and Lectureship, 153.	
Thinkers—Educators, 156; Moderators, 158.	
Contributions in Special Spheres of Thought	158
Interpretation, 159; Natural Science in Connection with Revealed Religion, 168; Philosophy, 193; Theol- ogy, ¹ 209.	

BIBLIOGRAPHY	229
------------------------	-----

INTRODUCTION

THE GENESIS OF COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

EARLY INTEREST IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHEAST.

"THE CLASSICAL, SCIENTIFIC AND THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE SOUTH."

"THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA."

Location.

The Faculty.

New England's Contributions.

Support.

The Charter.

"COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY."

"Almighty God had called us . . . to light up another sun which shall throw further west the light of the Gospel."—Address of Board of Directors.

EARLY INTEREST IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The earliest record of a definite interest in a Theological Seminary in the South is preserved by Dr. John S. Wilson in his *Necrology*. This interest was expressed by the Presbytery of Hopewell, Georgia. In 1817, the Presbytery declared its obligation and purpose to establish a Theological School in this part of the world for the training of men for the Gospel Ministry, and appointed, in the next two years, two Committees on the subject. The death of Dr. Robert Finley, President of Athens College, a prominent member of the Committee; and a disagreement over location, indefinitely postponed the plans.¹

As a kind of poetic justice, this Presbytery, which showed the first interest in the subject, was the Presbytery which, eleven years later, was called on to furnish the first professor to the Seminary and in whose bounds the Seminary had its first, even though temporary, location.²

In the same State in which the idea of a Southern Theological Seminary was born, was born also the man who, first as Theological Professor, began the execution of that idea. This man, Dr. Thomas Goulding, described himself as "the first Presbyterian³ preacher born in the State of Georgia since the foundation of the world."⁴

Following the failure of the Hopewell enterprise, the interest and financial support of the Presbyterians of the Carolinas and Georgia was turned to the needs of the Theological Seminary established by the General Assembly at Princeton, New Jersey. Dr. George Howe declares that \$43,039.00 was raised and paid the Princeton institution within the bounds of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.⁵

¹John S. Wilson, D.D., *Necrology*. The Dead of the Synod of Georgia, pp. 21-23.

²James Stacy, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Georgia*, p. 278.

³NOTE: However, Dr. Howe states that Dr. Isaac Grier of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was born in Georgia, 1776, *Semi-Centennial of C. T. S.*, p. 132.

⁴A. White, *Southern Presbyterian Leaders*, p. 223, Obituary notices Wilson, *Necrology*, p. 141.

⁵George Howe, *History of the Presbyterian Church in S. C.*, Vol. II, p. 413. *MS. Min. of Faculty*, Vol. II, p. 2. *MS. Min. Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I, p. 184, etc.

“THE CLASSICAL, SCIENTIFIC AND THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE
SOUTH”

Under this ambitious title, the Presbytery of South Carolina at its forty-ninth session, April 1, 1824, re-launched the project of a Southern Seminary.⁶

The Archives of the Seminary begin with meetings of the Board of the aforementioned Seminary, April 10 and November 23, 1826.⁷

A Retrospect, adopted by the Board in 1841, declares that the impelling motives in this action, seventeen years earlier, were a desire to raise up a qualified and native ministry to supply the destitute places, and to preside over the extant churches; and to provide an institution free from the skeptical influences which then pervaded the College of the State.⁸

The address of the Board to the public declares that, “Andover and Princeton have already told us what part Theological Seminaries are destined to play in the illumination and reformation of the present age.” It calls on men “to assume some eminence of moral and scientific height; and trace the rays of light these institutions are shooting into the darkest corners of the earth” . . . “to feel as though Almighty God had called us . . . to light up another sun which shall throw further west the light of the Gospel.”⁹

From the mounting wings of vision it was necessary to return and tread the realities of life’s dusty highway. There had to be a wider base and a narrower project ere any real structure could be erected. By appropriate actions on the part of the Presbytery of South Carolina and the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, the project was commended and taken over by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.¹⁰

A constitution of the Literary and Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia was published in Charleston, 1826, and is preserved in the Archives.¹¹ In the same year Charleston Union Presbytery undertook the endowment of a Professorship

⁶MS. *Min. of Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I, p. 123.

⁷*Archives*, Vol. I, page 1-5.

⁸*Seminary Archives*, Vol. II, p. 638.

⁹MS. *Min. of the Faculty*, Vol. II, p. 10.

¹⁰MS. *Min. of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 123, 124 and p. 135, 136.

¹¹*Archives*, Vol. I, page 9.

of Sacred Literature and Biblical Criticism. Under the leadership of Rev. R. B. Cater, as financial agent, \$28,937.00 was subscribed, and \$4,765.00 collected for the institution.

The plan was still large, and opposition to the literary department, by Charleston friends of the College of South Carolina, was manifested. At the 1827 meeting of the Board, held in Charleston, this opposition crystallized in a request to Synod to change the plan of the institution and go forward in the establishment of a "Theological Seminary."¹²

"THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AND GEORGIA"

The institution, in this form, dates its commencement from the resolutions presented by the Board of Trustees of the Literary and Theological Seminary of the South, to the Synod meeting in its sixteenth session in Charleston, South Carolina, Saturday, December 15, 1827.

The resolutions read, in part:

"*Resolution.* 1st. That it be recommended to the Synod so to alter the Constitution of the contemplated Seminary as to make it simply a Theological Seminary. The Board recommend this, among other reasons, for the following: 1st. They think, by thus simplifying the plan of the institution, its concerns can be managed with more ease, and much greater advantage. 2nd. This change will remove all ground for the objections now extensively made against the institution that it will interfere with Literary Institutions now existing within the bounds of the Synod. 3rd. The Board thinks this change will have a tendency to unite the feelings and efforts of all portions of the Church under the care of the Synod in this important enterprise."—The minutes show: "The foregoing Resolutions were adopted without a dissenting voice."¹³

The Constitution of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia as adopted December, 1829, begins:

¹²MSS. *Min. of the Board*, Vol. I, p. 183-4. *Archives*, Vol. I, 195 ff. MSS. *Min. of the Faculty*, Vol. II, p. 16.

¹³^bOn account of his religious views, Presbyterian attacks were made upon President Thomas Cooper of the College of South Carolina, both in 1822-23 and 1831-32. During the intervening period Cooper was supported by the radical states' rights party for political reasons. In this year, 1827, he urged South Carolina to calculate the value of the Union. Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, pp. 260, 350, 294, 307, etc.

¹³MS. *Min. of Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I, pp. 183-184.

"Aware of the superior claims of the present age to an enlightened ministry, the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia has resolved to establish an institution of sacred learning, to be called 'The Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.'"

The Synod is declared to be the source of the institution's powers and the center of its control, with the responsibility for appointing the Professors of the Seminary. A Board of Directors is ordained and its members elected by Synod to carry on the business of the Seminary, to inaugurate the Professors, and "to inspect their conduct and doctrines." There are explicit regulations governing professors, students, studies, library, and the funds of the Seminary.¹⁴

This change was somewhat a return to the first idea broached by Hopewell Presbytery. The change alienated some of the original friends, particularly Mr. Cater, who was obligated to notify the donors and allow them to recall their pledges if they so desired. This fact, the expenses of the agents, and certain bad loans, forced the institution to begin the solicitation of funds *de novo*.

Location

The Presbytery of South Carolina, October 3, 1829, released the Synod from an earlier pledge to locate the Seminary in the Pendleton District of that Presbytery.¹⁵ For a while Winnsboro, South Carolina, was regarded as the appropriate site for the Seminary; but in December, 1829, the committee on location settled on Columbia, South Carolina, as the place for the institution. Columbia, at that time, was regarded as the center of the Synod; the place in which was concentrated the most wealth, literary advantages, and moral force; and at which the influence of the Seminary could be brought to bear on the largest number of immortal beings. Mr. I. K. Douglas of this committee declared that the fact that infidel principles were emanating from the College of South Carolina in Columbia,¹⁶ was a powerful argument in favor of the institution's being placed there. "I am not an advocate for shutting up candidates for the ministry in

¹⁴MS. Min. Synod, Vol. I, pp. 247-256.

¹⁵Rescript of Min. signed by Hugh Dickson, S. C. preserved in *Archives*, Vol. I, MS. Min. Synod of S. C. and Ga., Vol. I, pp. 236-237.

¹⁶Dr. Thomas Cooper, at this time President of the College of South Carolina, was one of America's earliest philosophers of materialism (Cooper, *Sketch of Controversy on Materialism*, Eng., 1787), a thoroughgoing utilitarian (*Introductory Lecture to a Course on Law*, Columbia, 1834), and from the standpoint of historic Christianity, an infidel (*A Summary of Unitarian Arguments, A Letter to*

a convent or a cave; and if young men cannot withstand temptations in early life, I fear that there is but little hope that they will bear the burden and the heat of the day, which awaits them in after life.”¹⁷

The Seminary owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Wm. A. Blanding, a public spirited citizen of Columbia, who raised funds and purchased the property on which the Seminary was located in Columbia. Mr. Blanding reports subscriptions from the citizens of Columbia, of every Christian denomination, in order to “establish a Southern Theological School.”¹⁸

Mr. Blanding, with the consent of the contributors, conveyed the deed to the Board, which had been elected by the Synod.¹⁹

The home, with surrounding buildings, purchased by Mr. Blanding from Mrs. Hall, was sufficient for the Seminary’s primary needs. In the decade 1850 to 1860, Simons Hall and Law Hall were built with gifts from Mrs. Eliza L. Simons, and Mrs. Agnes Law, *et al.*²⁰ This environment continued to be home for the Seminary for almost a hundred years. The Columbia plant covered a block in the heart of the city, bounded by Taylor, Blanding, Pickens and Henderson Streets. It was a seven minutes’ walk to the University of South Carolina, where the students were privileged to sharpen their mental and disputative faculties. Just across Blanding Street was eventually established a Presbyterian College for women,—a safeguard against the cultivation of the intellectual, at the expense of the aesthetic side of life. On the campus, there was ample space for tennis courts and other forms of outdoor exercise.

The Faculty

More vital than location, equipment, or environment for the inauguration of the institution, was the question of the personnel of the faculty—especially if the dictum be true that an able professor on one end of a log and student on the other constitute a college.

The first reference to a professor is in the voluminous correspondence of Rev. R. B. Cater to Wm. A. McDowell, July 12, 1827. He says

Any Member of Congress, Malone, *Public Life of Thomas Cooper*, pp. 19, 83, 261, etc.)

¹⁷MS. *Min. of Synod*, Vol. I, pp. 230-237. *Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 724, 385. Letters of I. K. Douglas and J. T. Davies, 5-20-29, and 3-8-29. *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 385.

¹⁸W. A. Blanding to the Board of Directors, Columbia, 11-27-30. *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 591. MS. *Min. of Synod*, Vol. I, pp. 283, 351.

¹⁹*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 3, 8, 11, 629, 929, 894.

²⁰*Semi-Centennial*, pp. 144, 5.

that on the election of the first professor depends whether or not the efforts shall be a success. He pleads that the Board may not be "influenced by sectional, but by Christian feeling." He declares to McDowell, "you are *the man*. For: First, you are one in whom the South has confidence and will allay the sectional feelings into which our Church unfortunately stands divided; secondly, your mode and manner of preaching is in accord with the *Genius of the South*; thirdly, your mind is young enough to admit of improvement." In addition to McDowell, Cater wanted as professor of languages, a Southern man who had graduated at some Northern College.²¹

McDowell was elected some years later, 1832, but declined the election and returned North.²²

Rev. Francis Cummins, its retiring Chairman, in a letter, January 31, 1829, warned the Board that, "very considerable theological and biblical, as well as popular reputation, should attach to your first professor."²³

Dr. Ezra Fisk of Goshen, New York, was the first man approached on the subject of a call to the Seminary. The committee desired to strengthen the Southern ministry by securing this strong man from the North. Dr. Fisk did not encourage the committee, and the matter was dropped.²⁴

At its 1828 meeting the Synod adopted the revised Constitution as presented by the Board, elected a Board of Directors for the re-constituted institution, and resolved to put the Seminary into immediate action. To do this, it elected Dr. Thomas Goulding, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Lexington, Georgia, as the first professor of Theology. The birthday of the Seminary may therefore be dated as December 15, 1828.²⁵

Five students were gathered under Dr. Goulding's instruction the first year. This year, he carried on his work at Lexington, Georgia. In January, 1830, he and his students were moved to Columbia. The inauguration of Professor Goulding took place in the Presby-

²¹ *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 227.

²² *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1123.

²³ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 29.

²⁴ *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 42. Dr. E. Fisk to Drs. Palmer and McDowell, pp. 12, 20, 28.

²⁵ *MS. Min. of Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I, pp. 210, 224.

terian Church in Columbia, March 17, 1830.²⁶ & ^{26a} The inaugural sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. McDowell, from 2 Corinthians 1:24, while Rev. Dr. Palmer, Chairman of the Board, inducted Dr. Goulding into office. Letters by Mr. Wm. Law and by Dr. Goulding testify to the zeal, devotedness to the cause, and high character of this professor.²⁷

In an effort to adequately man the faculty of the Seminary, the Synod in 1830 elected Dr. Moses Waddell, the best known teacher in the South; but Dr. Waddell declined the appointment.

New England's Contributions

However, the next effort was more successful, and the same opening year in Columbia saw the beginning of a life union between Columbia Theological Seminary and one of the choicest spirits which New England has produced. Dr. George Howe gave to the Seminary fifty-two years and three months of service.²⁸ He sprang from the Howes, Goulds, Leeds, and Dwights of New England. He traced his descent to the Revolution and to the first settlers at Plymouth Rock. George Howe was born in Dedham, Massachusetts, November 6, 1802; graduated at the age of twenty, from Middlebury College, Vermont; and in 1825 from Andover Theological Seminary. He was Abbot Resident in Andover 1825-7, and thereafter Phillips Professor, in Dartmouth. Two of his classmates in Andover, Rev. Aaron Foster and Rev. J. C. Stiles, discovered him on a visit he was making to the South for his health, and commended his sterling worth to the Board and Synod. He preached before the Synod in 1830 and thereby convinced even the most dubious of his worth and faith. The Synod elected Mr. Howe instructor of languages for the year 1830, and promoted him to the Professorship of Biblical Literature in 1831.²⁹ In connection with this promotion, the students of Dr. Howe volunteered this endorsement of him:—"Six months' tutelage

²⁶MS. *Min. of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 266.

^{26a}An old painting of Dr. Goulding entitles him the "First President" of the Seminary.

²⁷*Archives*, Vol. I, Letters of Wm. Law, 11-24-30. Letter of Dr. Goulding, 1-7-30, p. 733. Report of Professor Goulding, 12-1-30.

²⁸*Semi-Centennial*, p. 392.

²⁹*Southern Presbyterian Leaders*, p. 255. *Andover Theol. Seminary General Catalogue*, Boston, 1908, pp. 82, 83, 87, 98, 705. *Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 741, etc. MS. *Minutes of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 295. Biographical note by Dr. Girardeau in Howe's *History of the Presbyterian Church in S. C.*, Vol. II. *Semi-Centennial of C. T. S.*, p. 390.

under him has deeply impressed our minds with a sense of his intrinsic excellence as a man and his decided qualifications for this responsible calling." They commend his piety, talents, and Christian enterprise; and characterize him as "a decided and able champion of the cause of truth."³⁰ The Board's Committee on this professorship, Dr. Wm. A. McDowell and Dr. M. Waddell, having examined Mr. Howe, as to his doctrinal views, declared him "in all respects peculiarly qualified to fill the professorship of Biblical Literature."³¹

Professor Howe was almost immediately made librarian, and his interest in books so stirred the interest of the Synod that, as early as 1833, they declared "we have a valuable library."³² This made Columbia Seminary the safe depository of valuable manuscript records, and enabled the Librarian to preserve the record of the history of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina to 1850.

The first regular Seminary curriculum was organized in 1831, after Mr. Howe's work began. The instruction of the year previous was propaedeutic.³³ The influence of Dr. Howe in the ordering of the original schedule of classes was certainly great—there being only two professors. Considering that of the two only Howe had had the privilege of a regular Seminary course, and carefully reading the hints found here and there in the Archives, one is convinced that the predominant influence in starting the Seminary "in the appropriate form of a theological school"³⁴ must be accorded Professor Howe.

This naturally suggests the question of the model, or models, for the first plan of study. The earliest Archive reference is in a letter, of Mr. J. T. Davies to Dr. B. M. Palmer, dated March 18, 1829. Mr. Davies says, "I presume the course of studies will be prescribed—As to this I presume the plan of the Princeton Seminary, prescribed and sanctioned as it is by the highest judicatory of our Church, will furnish the model or at least the general directory."³⁵ Surveying the whole story of Columbia Seminary after a century, the assertion is warranted that the hopes of this early supporter have been fully realized in the closeness with which the Princeton school has been

³⁰*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 889.

³¹*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 741.

³²*MS. Min. Synod*, Vol. I, p. 354.

³³Howe's Retrospect of 1841—*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 640.

³⁴Quoted from Howe *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 737.

³⁵*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 76.

followed. But, in Professor Howe's original plan, another Seminary seems to have been the more prominent model; namely, Andover Theological Seminary. In his own department, Howe used Dr Moses Stuart's translations and treatises as his guide.³⁶ The earliest reference to a theological text book is a statement, in Dr. Goulding's report, that "the members of the Middle Class have studied Christian Theology according to the arrangement of subjects in Doctor Woods' Course."³⁷ The reference, evidently, is to Dr. Leonard Woods of Andover. In the report of the Board of Directors to the Synod, in December, 1833, occurs the first reference to lectures on homiletics, as follows: "As considerable solicitude was manifested by the Professors and students for Dr. Porter, President of the Theological Seminary at Andover, who was in this state last winter and spring, to deliver in the Seminary a course of Lectures on Sacred Rhetoric, the Executive Committee accordingly tendered to him a respectful invitation to deliver the aforesaid course of Lectures, which he did to the great benefit and satisfaction of the Professors."³⁸

In other ways, also, the Seminary drew upon Puritan New England. The obituary of Dr. Goulding traces the large number of ministers (of which he was one), furnished by the Church of Midway, Liberty County, Georgia, to "the influence of one little colony of Puritans that made its way hither—from Dorchester, Mass." Goulding received his academic and a legal education in Wolcott and in New Haven, Connecticut.³⁹

In 1833 Dr. Aaron W. Leland was called from the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church of Charleston, South Carolina, to be Professor of Theology in the Seminary. Dr. Leland was born in Massachusetts in 1787, a lineal descendant of many illustrious Puritans of that name. He graduated from Williams College in 1808 and shortly thereafter removed to Charleston, South Carolina. His service to the Seminary is thus described by Dr. R. C. Reed: "He served the Seminary with unflagging zeal and to the eminent satisfaction of his friends for thirty years. He was magnificently endowed with natural gifts, both of body and mind. His vigorous powers of thought, his vivid imagination, his fervid emotional nature, his

³⁶*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 73.

³⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 80.

³⁸*MS. Min. of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 351.

³⁹*Necrology*, p. 140. *Semi-Centennial*, p. 181.

splendid voice and majestic form combined to place him in the front rank of pulpit orators. In addition to the service which Dr. Leland rendered the Seminary in the class-room, he did much to put it on a solid financial foundation."⁴⁰

Further New England influence is to be seen in Dr. John S. Wilson's statement concerning the early efforts of Hopewell Presbytery to establish a Seminary. He prefaces this statement with a reference to five young men, most of them graduates of Middlebury College, Vermont, who placed themselves under the care of that Presbytery.⁴¹ In the catalogue of students in 1833, we find that alumni of the following Northern colleges are present: Franklin, Amherst, Union, Yale, Andover Seminary. The early appeals for funds were made to Congregational as well as Presbyterian Churches in and around Charleston.⁴² The first man listed in the first meeting of the Board of Directors, which is recorded in their minute book, is that of B. M. Palmer, Sr., who was pastor of the Circular Congregational Church of Charleston.⁴³ &⁴⁴ This illustrious family later furnished to the Seminary Dr. B. M. Palmer, Jr. William Palmer, the ancestor of both these leaders, came to Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1621.⁴⁵ Facts like these, in the founding of the Seminary, led Dr. R. C. Reed of Columbia in his *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World* to note, among the advantages accruing from the Plan of Union of 1801, the fact that most (eight) of the Presbyterian Theological Seminaries were founded during this period; and that the Plan of Union contributed "in no small degree" to this progress.⁴⁶ Columbia Theological Seminary in its first professors, its first

⁴⁰R. C. Reed in *Bulletin Columbia Theol. Seminary*, Columbia, S. C., 1922, p. 9. cf. *Semi-Centennial*—Memorial of A. W. Leland by J. Bardwell, p. 205-209. Rev. Mr. Frank Estes reports an old photograph of Dr. Leland in possession of his great-great-grand-daughter, Mrs. R. S. Williams of Orangeburg, S. C., inscribed: "Aaron Whitney Leland, D.D., LL.D., President Columbia Theological Seminary for years."

⁴¹*Necrology*, p. 21.

⁴²cf. Action of Board of Directors, 11-30-31. MS. *Minutes of Bd.*, Vol. I, p. 63.

⁴³NOTE: Under the leadership of Dr. Palmer the Congregational Association of South Carolina had dissolved in 1822 to merge with the Presbyterians of Charleston in the Charleston Union Presbytery.

⁴⁴MSS. *Records of the Congregational Assn. of S. C.*, 1801-1822, pp. 131, 132.

⁴⁵MS. *Min. of the Board*, Vol. I, p. 1. White, *S. P. L.*, p. 359. *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, Vol. I, 1847, p. 124.

⁴⁶Reed, R. C., *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World*, Phila., 1905, reprint of 1917, p. 255.

student body, the candidates for the ministry whose presence inspired Hopewell Presbytery to first broach the subject of a theological school, owes a debt of gratitude to New England Puritanism, and to the older educational institutions there founded, particularly Andover Theological Seminary. While the predominant element in the Presbyterian Church in the Southeast has been Scotch-Irish,⁴⁷ this study shows that Puritanism has had a commendable part in the planting and nurturing of Presbyterianism in this section.

However, the very largeness of the Andover-New England contribution threatened to become the Seminary's undoing. Andover was founded by a union of the old Calvinists with the Hopkinsians on a platform of avowed toleration. Dr. Leonard Woods was a mild Hopkinsian with a tolerant attitude toward the old Calvinism.

The Southern Seminary was also supported by men who sympathized with the New England views, or who were at least tolerant of such views; e. g., Dr. B. M. Palmer (the elder). The *Archives* preserve a letter of James Cummins to Bayard E. Hand, Esq., of Charleston, a member of the Seminary Board, in which the writer expresses a preference for teachers in the Seminary holding certain views which at that time were characteristic of New England Calvinism; e. g., natural ability and unlimited atonement.⁴⁸

Two of Dr. Goulding's first students were separated from Hopewell Presbytery in 1839 because of their New School sympathies.⁴⁹ A few years before this whisperings of unsoundness in the Seminary faculty began to be heard.⁵⁰ Charges appeared in the *Times and Gazette* published by Mr. S. Weir, a member of the Presbyterian Church of Columbia. These charges were vigorously denied by the Session of that Church. But the professors asked the Board to examine the charges against themselves.⁵¹

In October, 1835, the Session of the Church in Cheraw had adopted vigorous resolutions favoring the election of a professor in the Seminary noted for his zeal in striving to root out the destructive heresies which had crept into the Church. The origin of the Cheraw attack upon New Schoolism is to be found in the preaching of Rev.

⁴⁷Cf. Howe, *Hist. of Pres. Church in S. C.*

⁴⁸*Archives*, Vol. I, letter dated 3-18-1829.

⁴⁹Stacy *History of Presbyterian Church in Georgia*, p. 189.

⁵⁰*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1159.

⁵¹*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 395, 405. *Minutes of the Board*, Vol. II, p. 149.

Mr. Uriah Powers, stated supply of the church from about 1826 to 1834. Though for a while under New School influence, Powers developed a pronounced opposition to it. His mantle in Cheraw descended upon Elder (later pastor) J. C. Coit, who is credited by Dr. Thornton Whaling with prosecuting the charges against the Seminary faculty.⁵²

The following prompt and vigorous action by the Board preserved the good name of the Seminary and saved the Southeast to Old School Presbyterianism:

“The Board having heard that rumors were circulating unfavorable to the soundness of the Professors, and having had submitted to them certain published pieces, charging them with unsoundness in the faith, and bringing other serious charges against them—they have felt themselves called upon, in faithfulness to the Professors and in discharge of their duty to the Seminary, to institute an inquiry into this matter; and as, in their view the best mode of obtaining satisfaction in this matter, they invited a personal interview with the Professors. In this interview, which was protracted, the Board used great plainness and candor with the Professors, and the result has been an entire conviction on the part of the Board that our Professors are sound in the faith, that they receive our standards in their plain and obvious import and in their instructions will conscientiously adhere to our excellent standards. Under this conviction they are prepared unhesitatingly to recommend the Seminary and its Professors to the continued and increased affections and confidence of the Church.”⁵³

In the great eruption of the following year, the members and former members of the faculty voted consistently in support of the Old School in the General Assembly, the Synod, and (as far as can be ascertained) in the Presbyteries.

Support

The plans for financing the infant institution were many and various. Financial agents, generally pastors devoting part time to this work, were employed. Chief among these were Rev. Richard B. Cater, Mr. Abram Blanding, for the purpose of collecting funds for the Columbia plant, Dr. Wm. A. McDowell, Mr. E. White for the Charleston Union professorship. Dr. McDowell was, for the primal

⁵²Howe's *History*, Vol. II, pp. 354, 485-489.

⁵³*Minutes of Board*, 11-28-1836, Vol. I, p. 153.

years, Secretary of the Board. He was pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Charleston, a publicist, and, in 1833, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly.⁵⁴ In December, 1832, Dr. McDowell was called by Synod to give up his pastorate and devote his whole time to the Seminary, as professor and as financial agent. Professor Howe urgently pressed upon McDowell the acceptance of the call. "Come and make us live," he plead.⁵⁵ Dr. McDowell gave as one of his reasons for declining, "In the present awful crisis—everything in our state is at this moment in a state of agitation. All is uncertainty—I fear God's purpose is to scourge rather than bless us at the present moment—to embark such an undertaking (i. e. the raising of a large endowment) is appalling. In this situation I cannot materially help you by accepting your appointment."⁵⁶

A year later there is a letter from Dr. McDowell resigning as secretary of the Board, because he has taken up work in the North. Concerning the Seminary he writes, "In the prosperity of that much loved Seminary I do feel a deep interest—with its prosperity and success I am persuaded the most important interests of our Southern Zion are very closely connected, if not identified. And I should be grieved, indeed it would pain me at my heart, to hear that anything should occur to darken the prospects or check the prosperity of that all important institution. And if one, who loves the institution—and who has labored with his brethren for years to get it under way and carry it forward, might be permitted to use the freedom with brethren whom he tenderly loves. . . . I would say to the Board . . . Brethren watch over our Seminary, be united in your councils. . . . Let no sectional feeling have influence with you. 'United you stand, divided you fall.'"⁵⁷

The early hopes were that three professorships might be endowed, one by Charleston Union Presbytery, embracing Congregational as well as Presbyterian ministers of Charleston, another by Georgia, and a third by Northern funds. On the first substantial subscriptions were received from the Legares, Palmers, Gildersleeve and Mikells and others of Charleston, and, the largest subscriptions, from the Seabrooks of Edisto Island. After about eighteen thousand had

⁵⁴*Minutes of Assembly*, 1833.

⁵⁵*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 69.

⁵⁶*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 36.

⁵⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 149.

been raised in the neighborhood of Charleston, the last ten thousand of this endowment was given by a gentleman of Columbia.⁵⁸ The Georgia funds were smaller and came in more slowly. Rev. Chas. C. Jones reported a check of \$5,000.00 from the legacy of Maj. Andrew Maybank.⁵⁹ Funds for the Northern Professorship were difficult to secure, but after some time through the services of Dr. Howe and others \$12,052.00 were realized.⁶⁰

With the coming of Dr. Leland to the Seminary in 1833, the financial affairs of the Seminary took on a continually brightening hue.

The Charter

In 1832, the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia authorized the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary to apply to the Legislature of South Carolina, at their next meeting, for an Act of Incorporation, and to take such steps as were necessary to secure such an act.⁶¹ The Minutes of the Board for 1833 narrate the acceptance of a committee report on this subject, as follows: "That the Legislature of the State of South Carolina did on the 20th day of December, 1832, pass an act entitled 'An Act to incorporate certain societies,' in which the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia is declared to be a body corporate and politic—that the said Board is also declared by the act aforesaid to have succession of officers and members to be chosen according to their own by-laws; and shall have power to make by-laws, not repugnant to the laws of the land—to have, keep, and use a common seal, to have and enjoy every right incident to incorporation—possess property of amount not exceeding \$200,000.00."⁶²

⁵⁸ *Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 27, 212, 279, 261, 589, etc.

⁵⁹ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 340. *MSS. Min. of Synod of S. C.*, p. 396.

⁶⁰ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 315. *Semi-Centennial*, p. 150.

⁶¹ *MS. Min. Synod*, Vol. I, p. 326.

⁶² *Acts and Resolutions of the Gen'l Assembly of S. C. for 1832*, pp. 44-48. *Statutes of S. C.*, VIII, 376. *MS. Min. of Board*, Vol. I, pp. 89, 90. Printed *Min. of Synod for 1833*, Appendix No. II, p. 52. *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 740.

As the Old Synod was divided the charter was, from time to time, amended to include additional controlling Synods.⁶³ When plans were made for the removal from Columbia to Atlanta the charter was amended to make the name of the institution, "Columbia Theological Seminary"; and the controlling Synods, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi.⁶⁴

Thus with the turn of a century's service the rejuvenating efficacy of a new and more ample environment was offered the time-honored institution. Under the presidency of the late Dr. Richard T. Gillespie, Columbia was successfully relocated in the center of her constituency. The generosity of the Presbyterians of Greater Atlanta provided a fifty-seven acre campus on the sylvan hills of Decatur, two modern buildings of Collegiate Gothic architecture, and four faculty homes. Campbell Hall, the imposing administration and academic building, was "erected in loving tribute to a devoted, consecrated Christian mother, Virginia Orme Campbell." It bears the inspiring legend, "There is no higher calling on earth than that of the Christian ministry."

⁶³*Statutes of South Carolina*, Vol. VII, p. 347; Vol. XV, p. 855; Vol. XVII, pp. 328-329.

⁶⁴Original shows: Given December 7, 1925; sealed with the seal of the State of South Carolina, and signed by W. P. Blackwell, Secretary of State; entered in *Corporation Book A*, p. 513, Clerk of Court of Richland County, South Carolina.

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AND
THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN INTEGRATION

THE IDEAL OF A SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN ZION.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE PERPETUATION OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

“And gave him to be the head over all things to the Church which is his Body”—Eph. 1:22, 23, text of sermon by Dr. B. M. Palmer at opening of the first Southern Presbyterian Assembly—Minutes 1861, p. 61.

THE IDEAL OF A SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN ZION

The Archives and other manuscript records, preserved by Columbia Theological Seminary, point to an earlier dating of ecclesiastical sectional consciousness than that sometimes given. These records do not support the view that, "up to this time (1831) there appears no sign of any sectional division in the church on this subject, neither was there any sectional division." Nor do the records of the Southeastern Presbyteries and Synods, as preserved by Columbia Seminary professors, agree with that construction of history which would make the "Southern View" of slavery a "sudden and immense moral revolution," a "novel dogma," emanating, about 1833, from the Reverend James Smylie of Mississippi.¹

References might be made to the monumental work of Rev. A. J. and Sir R. W. Carlyle, *History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, Vol. I-IV, for the view of the fathers on slavery, which was substantially reaffirmed in Columbia Seminary. But, confining the attention to American Church History, Dr. Howe of Columbia has preserved at least two records of earlier discussions of this question; and at least one statement of the "Southern View" of slavery, as early as the eighteenth century. On the occasion of the ordination of Mr. James Gilleland to the Bradaway Church, Pendleton district, South Carolina, a remonstrance against his ordination was presented on the ground that he had preached against the government and against slavery. Mr. Gilleland acknowledged the second charge to be true.² At the meeting of the Synod of the Carolinas, 1796, Mr. Gilleland memorialized Synod, "stating his conscientious difficulties in receiving the advice of the Presbytery of South Carolina, which had enjoined upon him to be silent in the pulpit on the subject of the emancipation of the Africans, which injunction Mr. Gilleland declares to be, in his apprehension, contrary to the counsel of God." Synod sustained Presbytery, and urged Mr. Gilleland to content himself with private endeavors to open the way for emancipation, since "to preach publicly against slavery in present circumstances, and to lay down as the duty of every one to liberate those who are under their care, is what would lead to disorder, and open the way

¹Dr. Leonard W. Bacon, *American Church History*, pp. 277, 278.

²MS. *Min. Presbytery of S. C.*, 1785-1799, pp. 91, 92.

to confusion." In 1805, Mr. Gilleland removed to Ohio on account of his disagreement.³

More definitely, Dr. Howe has preserved a letter of Dr. J. R. Witherspoon of Greensboro, Alabama, concerning the ministry of Rev. Thomas Reese, D.D.—a native of Pennsylvania, but pastor of Salem, Hopewell, and Carmel Churches in South Carolina—who died 1796, and was buried in the graveyard at Old Stone Church near the village of Pendleton, South Carolina. In this letter an interesting incident is cited to show the conspicuous place Dr. Reese held in the esteem of his brethren. "As a proof of the deference paid to his talents by his brethren in religious assemblies, he was selected by some leading men of the Presbytery of South Carolina on a certain occasion to repel the charges brought by the Rev. W. C. Davis, in a discourse preached before that body, in which he (Davis) denounced all his fellow Christians who owned slaves. This reply of Dr. Reese met the entire approbation of the Presbytery, and greatly mortified Davis, this early *advocate* of abolition, in 1794. It is an able argument on the subject of slavery, and shows how early this vexed question had been introduced into the Southern Church. It is still extant, and in the possession of his quondam pupil."⁴

Howe also records the objections of South Carolina Presbytery to the action of the Synod of the Carolinas in favor of emancipation, in 1799-1800, which opposition delayed and nullified the definite plan for the gradual elimination of slavery there propounded.⁵

A Southern consciousness is traceable as early as the genesis of the Seminary. The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in discussing the plan of the Presbytery of South Carolina for establishing a theological school, declares that "the distance of our General Assembly's Seminary (Princeton) from our region," and "the difference of habits and feelings on many subjects from those formed and entertained among ourselves and other circumstances that need not now be particularly detailed appear to the Synod fully to justify, and in some degree to require, that a vigorous and steady effort

³Howe, *History of the Pres. Church in S. C.*, Vol. I, pp. 634-635.

⁴Letter of Dr. J. R. Witherspoon dated Brookland, near Greensboro, Ala., 6th Sept., 1851, preserved by Howe, *History Pres. Church in S. C.*, Vol. I, p. 639. MSS. *Min. Pres. of S. C.* show Presbytery opened with sermon by Rev. W. C. Davis, April 14, 1795, text Joshua 7:10-13.

⁵Howe, Vol. II, p. 172.

should be made toward an establishment of this institution within our bounds." The Synod, "regarding it of vital importance to the Southern Church," approved the plan.⁶

There are numerous references in the letters of the late twenties (when the Archives first begin) and in the opening thirties to "our Southern Church."⁷

Rev. R. B. Cater, in 1827 (the year in which Cooper "calculated the value of the Union")⁸ expresses deepest concern over the spirit of sectionalism, hoping that the election of a professor may be "influenced not by *sectional*, but by *Christian* feeling." Regarding this election as the most important crisis the institution will ever be called upon to witness, he seeks one "whose disposition and feelings and manners will tend to allay the feelings of the two parties, Southern and Northern, into which our Church unfortunately stands divided."⁹

Nor can the use of the word South in the name of the institution be ignored. A review of the original movement to establish a seminary, written in 1825 or 1826, gives the following as one of the reasons for this action: "In a government founded upon the principles which support the government of the United States knowledge and religion are of primary importance. Without the one, the benefits of a constitution founded in wisdom are lost. Intrigue supplants real merit, stamps its unhallowed foot upon the dearest rights of the people and leaves anarchy to complete what ignorance had only begun." A member of the Seminary faculty reviewing these early records (some of which had just been lost by fire) declares: "It was from reflections of this kind, heightened by the peculiar situation of our Southern country, that the Presbytery of South Carolina, in the Spring of 1824, resolved to establish" this institution.¹⁰

The subscription lists printed in 1825 carry the name of the "*Literary and Theological Seminary of the South.*" The Constitution, printed in 1826, carries the word *South* in large capitals. From

⁶MS. *Min. of Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I, pp. 123-124.

⁷E. g. R. B. Cater to Thos. Napier, 4-28-28. *Archives* I, p. 44.

⁸Malone, p. 307 ff. quoting speech of July 2, 1827.

⁹*Archives* I, p. 227. Cater to McDowell, 7-13-27.

¹⁰*Minutes of Faculty*, Vol. II. p. 4.

1830, when the Archives are somewhat fuller, there are frequent expressions of "Our Southern Zion."¹¹ ¹² ¹³

In 1833 Dr. McDowell, the retiring secretary of the Board, in a kind of valedictory letter urges: "Let no sectional feeling have influence with you."¹⁴

The Board declared that 1832 was a crisis year and expressed the hope that all the members of the Synod would feel "this is a subject of vital importance to the interest of our Southern Zion."¹⁵

A comment on the election of Dr. Leland by S. L. Davis in 1834 "trusts that the institution may continually increase in usefulness to our Southern Zion."¹⁶

Dr. Abram Blanding declared that the subscriptions for the plant in Columbia were made by men, most of whom had no connection with the Presbyterian Church; and that their object was the establishment "of a Southern Theological School."¹⁷

These several references come from different groups, and from men representing different viewpoints. In the list are preachers and leaders in the Synod; the Board itself; the student body; business men; Dr. Wm. A. McDowell and others familiar with the sentiment of the times both North and South.

Certain conclusions force themselves on the mind from these references. There was, in the period of the organization of the Seminary (1824-1833), in South Carolina and Georgia¹⁸ a consciousness of an ideal Southern Presbyterian unity and solidarity. There was, on the part of far-seeing leaders, a realization that this ideal unity meant an ecclesiastical sectionalism; and a fear and apprehension that this sectional spirit embittered by ignorance might lead to grave social, political, and religious calamities. Further, one hope in the founding of the seminary was that by fostering education and religion the

¹¹*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 622, date 3-5-1830. Vol. II, p. 147, date 11-25-33.

¹²*Our Whole Southern Zion*, Vol. II, p. 33. 12-18-22.

¹³"The very best interests of our Southern Zion," Vol. II, p. 63, 2-24-32.

¹⁴*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 147.

¹⁵*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1123.

¹⁶*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 181.

¹⁷*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 591.

¹⁸And perhaps more widely, e. g. Dr. John R. Rice of Virginia wrote the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia 11-19-1829 in reference to a union with Union Theological Seminary (Va.) in order that both efforts might be united to build up a seminary for the South which "needs an institution equal to any in the United States." *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 51.

dangers arising from an ignorant or irreligious sectionalism might be allayed. It is a tribute to the statesman-like vision of these founders that the first man considered for a professorship was a New York pastor and that, of the first three professors, two were Massachusetts born and the other of New England Puritan descent—that they even went to Andover, “the focus of the anti-slavery agitation” of the twenties,¹⁹ for the most noteworthy of their early professors. Every year of the nullification strife in South Carolina saw the election of a son or a grandson of New England to a chair in Columbia Theological Seminary.

This ideal sense of Southern Presbyterian solidarity soon found expression in the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia. In 1833 Dr. Wm. S. Plumer of the Synod of Chesapeake addressed the body at length on the subject of Foreign Missions; and Rev. Mr. Fairchild, Agent from the Western Board of Foreign Missions, presented the interests of that board. The matter was placed in the hands of a large committee and the recommendations of this committee were adopted. Instead of supporting the Western Board, a *Southern* Board of Foreign Missions was formed by and under the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.²⁰

In the next year, Synod “Resolved unanimously, That in the opinion of this Synod, Abolition Societies and the principle upon which they are formed in the United States are inconsistent with the best interests of the slaves, the right of slave holders, and the great principles of our political institutions.”²¹

In the 1836 Minutes, the question of a Southern ecclesiastical separation is twice, and perhaps thrice, alluded to, in each case in the review of the acts of the General Assembly. Synod declares:

“So long as petitions and memorials, denouncing as the enemies of God and man the ministers and members of the Church who hold slaves, are suffered to be introduced or agitated in the meetings of the Assembly, so long will there be just cause of complaint, as such a course inevitably tends to the dissolution of those bands by which the Church is united together by a common faith.” Synod “imperiously demands”—“that

¹⁹L. Bacon, p. 271.

²⁰Manuscript *Minutes of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 344-358.

²¹MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 403.

the Assembly declare 'the Church has no authority to legislate on this subject.' ”²²

Synod further resolved to request the Presbyteries to instruct their Commissioners to the General Assembly to vote upon “no proposition in relation to the institution of Domestic Slavery, unless it be in favour of the truth that it is a civil institution upon which the Judicatories of the Church have no right to legislate”; and to instruct them further “to withdraw from the Assembly should that body take any action which in their opinion asserts the right of Legislation upon that subject.”

On occasion of the renewal of the question of supporting the Western Missionary Society, the Synod declined to change its support of its own child, the Southern Board of Foreign Missions, since, among other reasons, “it is not yet absolutely certain that the whole South may not be required to act independently in this cause.”²³

At the Synod of 1837, resolutions were introduced endorsing the actions of “the Old School” majority in the Assembly of that year. During the discussion, one of the delegates, Col. Rockwell, offered the following substitute, viz:

“Whereas the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, during its Sessions of 1818, did by its act of that year affirm, among other things, that slavery is a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature, and utterly inconsistent with the laws of God, and totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ.

“And whereas it is authoritatively declared by said Act of the General Assembly that if it shall ever happen that a Christian professor in our communion shall () a slave, who is also in communion and good standing in our Church, contrary to his or her will or inclination, it ought immediately to claim the particular attention of the judicatory . . . to be followed without delay by a suspension of the offender from all the privileges of the Church till he repent and make all the reparation in his power to the injured party.

“And whereas this act is put forth as a full expression of the views of the Assembly in regard to slavery, spread upon its records, published in its digest, and now stands unmodified and unrepealed and regarded as of permanent authority in the Church.

²²MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 480.

²³MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, pp. 483, 485

"And whereas the foregoing views of the Assembly are not in accord with the sentiments of this Synod, and if sanctioned or tolerated by the Southern Church would involve consequences not to be contemplated but with horror . . .

"Be it resolved, that in view of our present relations to the Assembly upon this important subject this Synod will take no action upon the recent measures of that body, either of approval or disapproval, until it shall be officially informed that the above recited act of 1818 has been rescinded and annulled; and until the General Assembly shall adopt the views on this subject which the Synod has affirmed, viz: that the relation of Master and Slave is a civil and domestic institution, and one in which no Judicatory of the Church has the right or power to legislate."²⁴

Elder Rockwell is reported as voting against three of the recommendations in the report of Committee of Synod, endorsing action of Assembly of 1837.²⁵

The resolutions of Rockwell were lost; but Synod declared it regarded the action of General Assembly of 1818 on Slavery as without authority and void.²⁶

The following year similar proposals were made. During the consideration of a report endorsing the actions of the General Assembly of 1838 the following minute occurs:

"Mr. I. S. K. Legare then moved to postpone the consideration of the report, for the purpose of taking up a substitute, which he submitted, and is as follows, viz:

"Whereas the spirit of Religion and the cause of our Redeemer require that his Church should be pure, peaceable, and united, and whereas that branch of it with which we are connected has become contentious and divided, and whereas each division claims to be the true Presbyterian Church; and whereas the Gen'l Assembly of neither sympathizes with this Synod in its peculiar interests on the subject of slavery, and whereas the majority of both refuse to repeal the Act of 1818, which declares every slaveholder to live "in open violation of the most sacred laws of Heaven, and requires him to promote the abolition of every slave in his own possession and through the world—therefore, Resolved that the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia will no longer consent to take any part in this foreign and

²⁴MS. *Min.*, Vol. II, p. 6.

²⁵*Ibid*, pp. 15, 16, 18.

²⁶Vol. II, p. 19.

unhappy contention of the Presbyterian Church, which has already introduced somewhat of discord and division into the bosom of our once peaceful and happy Southern Church.

“Resolved 2, That this Synod will and hereby do declare itself to be an independent Synod.

“Resolved 3, That in doing this they act from a conscientious sense of duty to themselves, to the inhabitants of the states within their bounds, and to the great Head of the Church, the Lord, our Redeemer.”²⁷

Mr. Legare's motion was lost and immediately thereafter the “Old School” Assembly of 1838 was recognized by the Synod. Mr. Legare voted against this resolution. (Ibid).

A study of these meetings of Synod sheds an interesting light on the question of whether or not there was a cabal between the Old School men of the North and the slaveholders of the South—a charge which was made at least as early as July, 1837. In the Charleston Observer of July 8th, 1837, there is a discussion of this charge under the caption, “the Excluded Synods and Abolition.” The editor of the Observer evidently thinks that “Abolitionism” is a grievous fault, a manifestation of radicalism and anarchism; but not to be seriously considered as the cause of the exclusion of the Western Synods.²⁸

The question of slavery was brought up in South Carolina Synod by those opposed to supporting the Old School position, i. e. by those who sympathized with the New School. The ideal of a Southern Presbyterian Church was used by the opponents of the Old School party as a tool to prevent endorsement of and allegiance to the Old School Assembly of 1837. Slave solidarity—Southern unity—was to be preferred to doctrinal definiteness. This plan was defeated by the Old School majority in the Synod.

On the other hand the view of the Synod in regard to slavery was clarified and defined. It was clear to the members of Synod and to their delegates in the General Assembly that only by regarding slavery as a domestic and civil matter, *not a subject for ecclesiastical legislation*, could the organic union of the Southern and Northern parts of the Presbyterian Church be preserved.

²⁷MS. *Min. of Synod*, Vol. II, pp. 41, 42.

²⁸The Charleston (S. C.) *Observer* in Seminary Files.

The presence of a sectional threat of disunion and division was revealed at this time—made by the New School minority, to prevent endorsement of the Old School Assemblies of 1837 and 1838. Only on the basis of avoidance of the question of slavery in ecclesiastical legislation could a Southern Presbyterian rupture be prevented. The New School men would probably not have acceded to this “imperious demand.” It may be said that, while the Presbyterian split of 1837 was not caused by a cabal of Old School and Slavery men, still that split, by removing the men who would never have agreed to leave slavery out of ecclesiastical legislation, did much to prevent the organization of a Southern Presbyterian Church in the thirties.

Another factor in the delay of this sectional organization was the influence of Columbia Theological Seminary. This moderating influence was manifested in several ways. The first which meets the eye may be designated, *Institutionalism*. It is the general sense of an administrator that the external success of an institution depends on its avoidance of conflicts. It needs all parties and views in its support.

When a Synod is deeply concerned and anxious about a fondling institution, that fact acts as a deterrent to controversy and schism. In the midst of the nullification controversy, which threatened to invade the Church, there is a letter which expresses this Institutionalism. And yet this letter, taken in connection with earlier expressions of desire to keep sectionalism out of the Church, taken also in connection with the fact that New England men were being inducted into the Seminary while hatred of New England was being preached by every South Carolina politician, must be regarded as an effort to express a sense of the strict spirituality of the Church and its separateness from political questions. Without the intellectual clarity, without the doctrinal perspicuity of 1861, this letter strives to express the same ideal which was to be enshrined in the Southern Presbyterian Church. Dr. Nathan Hoyt, a prominent Georgia pastor, wrote under date of December 5, 1833, to the moderator of the Synod meeting at Columbia, South Carolina.

Hoyt declares “the present meeting of Synod” is “the most important in the last seven years.” He adds: “Many of the Christians in Georgia, who love peace, are anxious for the results, and I believe

that *some* of them are fervently praying for you. I am on safe ground when I say that throughout the up-country of Georgia everything like *controversy* in our Church is deeply deprecated by our brethren . . . I do sincerely hope that no third professor will be elected at this time unless it can be done in a spirit of real harmony and brotherly love. If the controversies which have arisen of late are not happily terminated by this meeting of Synod, I solemnly fear that very little can be done for our Seminary, at least in the upper part of this State." As a result of these things he has only ten, instead of a hundred dollars, to report as contributed to the Seminary. He prays that the great Head of the Church may preside over and guide the Synod in the "way of *peace, love and well-doing*."²⁹

In this connection, there is an instructive contrast between the narratives of religion of the Synods of 1832 and 1833. In the former the fear is expressed that the work of God is allowed to suffer because of "the indulgence of undue participation in political contentions"; and members are exhorted "to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," and at the same time "to render unto God the things that are God's."³⁰

On the other hand the Synod of 1833 bespeaks a fear of controversies; but a meeting which proved a feast of fellowship and "the warm hand of friendship, expressing the friendship of more than a brother's love. Envy and jealousy have been banished—strife has ceased ere it was matured—dissensions have not been known—the Lord has been with us and the mountains have flowed down at His presence."³¹

In reference to the election of a third professor, to which Dr. Hoyt refers, it should be noted that this Synod of a nullification year elected Dr. A. W. Leland, a native of Massachusetts, its professor of theology, thus banishing sectional consideration from its councils.

Another influence exerted in and through the Seminary, tending away from a bigoted kind of sectionalism, was the influence of men of wide culture and acquaintance on the early Board of Directors. Dr. Wm. A. McDowell, Moderator of the Assembly in 1833 and

²⁹*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 113.

³⁰*MS. Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 331.

³¹*MS. Min.*, Vol. I, p. 376.

for some years thereafter Secretary of Assembly's Board of Missions, had too wide a range of work and experience to breathe the air of provincialism. Dr. McDowell's earnest warnings against sectionalism in a letter to the Board have been quoted—probably his spoken words were more vigorous and frank than anything he wrote. The same may be said of Dr. B. M. Palmer (Sr.) of the Circular Church of Charleston. It is to men of this type that we must attribute the willingness to choose Northern men for the professorships in the Seminary. For several years this Seminary, in the hotbed of Nullification and Secession, was presided over entirely by natives of Massachusetts—Dr. Howe and Dr. Leland. And in the Northern extraction, training, and experience of several of the first professors there can be seen an influence tending to allay the bitterness of sectionalism. One example of a real New England saint—such as Dr. George Howe—would outweigh many charges ignorantly hurled at the character of the religion of that section.

Further, the temperament of these early professors seems to have been irenic rather than polemic. So much was this the case that it seems to have caused suspicion of unsoundness on the part of the professors. In an early report, which seems to date from the year 1836, Drs. Leland and Howe make complaint that some of their brethren desire to see this institution extinguished. "For how else can we explain their whisperings of our unsoundness in the faith, and of our being unworthy of confidence? . . . Some will not be satisfied until we enter deeply into the agitating questions of party . . . until we cause the discordant notes of theological warfare to issue from these walls where that quiet should reign in which alone the studies of the institution can be successfully pursued. We have thus far felt that we have something more important to do."³²

In the period between the Old School-New School split of 1837 and the Southern split of 1861, a great influence in opposing a Southern separation proceeded from the Seminary in the person and work of Dr. James H. Thornwell. Mr. Thornwell was ordained in June, 1835. He thus entered the Synod at the time when the demand for a Southern Church was being made; and when the conditions under which the Synod would remain in affiliation with Northern Presbyterians were being clarified—namely, that domestic

³²*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1160.

servitude be treated as a civil institution, over which the judicatories of the Church had no right to legislate. In 1838, Mr. Thornwell was elected to the Board of Directors of the Seminary; and immediately rose to a position of leadership in Seminary councils. As a Director, as a Professor, and later President of the College (now University) of South Carolina, located near the Seminary, as preacher in the Presbyterian Church of Columbia, finally, as Professor in the Seminary, Dr. Thornwell was the dominating personality in the councils of the Seminary in this period.³³

This period in our political history was one of increasing sectional bitterness. The growing political disparateness was reflected in the ecclesiastical splits of the Methodist, Baptist, New School Presbyterian, and other ecclesiastical bodies. The sense of isolation is seen in an appeal issued by the Columbia Seminary Board of Directors signed, among others, by Thornwell, in 1845. This printed circular reads, in part:

"For obvious reasons our ministry must be supplied from among ourselves. We cannot expect them from other and unfriendly regions. The times are full of omen, and we of the South must become more independent and more united. We have a common cause, common duties and dangers. The wide savannahs of the West and extreme Southwest call for ministers." But Americanism is still strong in the Directors. They close this appeal for support to the Seminary with these words: "And finally, we commend it (the Seminary) to the patriot, with whom we aim for our country's good, and to every Christian, and above all to our Lord and Head, in whose hands are the hearts of the children of men."³⁴

Due response to this appeal was laid before the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia in the form of a declaration of the Synod of Alabama expressing great confidence in and warm attachment to this Seminary of our Southern Zion.³⁵

Two years earlier the catalogue appeals to "Southern Presbyterians who regard this institution as a fountain whose waters are to refresh and gladden our churches and fertilize our waste places."³⁶

³³Cf. Palmer—*Life and Letters of Thornwell*.

³⁴*Archives* II, p. 394—Printed Columbia, December, 1845.

³⁵*Minutes Synod of S. C.* 1846, printed by Johnson, Columbia, S. C., 1847, p. 10.

³⁶*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 164—Catalogue of 1843.

The consciousness of Southern solidarity is seen in an incidental allusion by Dr. Howe in the professors' report of 1841. In a historical retrospect he justifies the feebleness of the Seminary by reference to "the spiritual weakness of the Southern Presbyterian Church."³⁷

In 1846 Dr. Howe, in the report of the professors, lamenting the fact that all candidates in the supporting Synods are not attending Columbia Seminary, declares, "it is a wrong done to our Southern Zion, which has made such efforts to found this institution and whose interests are so connected with it."³⁸

In this period is seen the same or an increasing sense of Southern Presbyterian solidarity, and a consciousness that other regions are "unfriendly." But Dr. Thornwell, the leader of the Seminary's thinking, was a *Union* man. His friend, follower, and professorial colleague, Dr. B. M. Palmer, Jr., declares that Thornwell loved the Union with a passion almost rising to idolatry. He finds the key to Thornwell's attitude, both before and amid the sectional war, in an early letter in which Thornwell contrasts "an American spirit" with "a Yankee spirit." As long as the government was administered in the American or national spirit, he clung to the Union with almost religious devotion.³⁹

As a young man just out of college, Thornwell had conspicuously planted himself against South Carolina's policy of nullification. His series of essays in the public press of this time unfortunately are not available. Thus even in politics, as in philosophy and religion, the young graduate was the antithesis of the President of his alma mater. For Dr. Cooper has been well characterized as "the schoolmaster of (radical) states' rights," "the high priest of nullification," "the (first) prophet of secession." In earlier life Cooper was a Jacobin.⁴⁰

At the second great threat of Southern division, 1849-1851, Thornwell again opposed the idea of secession to which South Carolina was strongly inclined. In the *Southern Presbyterian Review* of January, 1851, he wrote: "We have always associated the idea of a high and glorious vocation with the planting of this Republic.

³⁷ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 641.

³⁸ *Minutes Synod of S. C.* for 1847, p. 25.

³⁹ Palmer, *Life of Thornwell*, pp. 482, 483.

⁴⁰ Palmer, pp. 82, 93. Malone, pp. 34, 281, 294, 307, etc.

We have thought that we could trace the finger of God in every stage of its history. We have looked upon it as destined to be a blessing to mankind. Placed between Europe and Asia, in the very center of the earth, with the two great oceans of the world acknowledging its dominion; entering upon its career at the very period of the history of the world most eminently adapted to accelerate its progress and to diffuse its influence, it seems to us to be commissioned from the skies as the apostle of civilization, liberty, and Christianity to all the race of man. We cannot relinquish the idea of this lofty mission: WE HAVE BEEN CALLED to it; and if in our folly and wickedness we refuse to walk worthily of it, we may righteously expect, in addition to the ordinary disasters of revolution, the extraordinary retributions of God. Ours will be no common punishment, as it will be no common sin, if, instead of obeying the command which requires us to be a blessing to the world, we exhaust our resources and waste our advantage in biting and devouring each other. We cannot sympathize with the light and flippant tone in which the question of the value of the Union is too often approached, as if it were a mere question of ordinary politics. To our minds it is the most serious, solemn, and momentous that can be asked in connection with the earthly interests of man. To dissolve this Union is to jeopard all that our fathers gained, and to cover in midnight darkness the prospects and destiny of our posterity. We tremble at the thought." He plead with the South not to destroy the government simply because that government had been perverted; but to seek instead to restore the Constitution to its supremacy. "To our minds the dissolution of the Union is the last desperate remedy for the disorders of the government. We cannot justify that until all other probable expedients have failed." He plead for endeavors to rectify the government instead of endeavors to overthrow it. "As long as our voice can be heard we shall endeavor to avert (this) calamity."⁴¹

To a similar effect he wrote in March, 1851, to his friend, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge: "When I trace the successive steps of our national history, I behold at every point the finger of the Lord. I cannot persuade myself that we are now to be abandoned to our

⁴¹*Southern Pres. Review*, Jan., 1851. Palmer, *Life of Thornwell*, Appendix No. 1.

follies and permitted to make shipwreck of our glorious inheritance. —South Carolina, however, seems bent upon secession. The excitement is prodigious. Men from whom one would have expected better things are fanning the flame, and urging the people on to the most desperate measures. From the beginning I have opposed, according as I had opportunity, all revolutionary measures. Things look gloomy enough. You cannot imagine how the matter preys upon my spirits. It is the unceasing burden of my prayers.”⁴²

A letter of a year earlier (March, 1850) to a former colleague is also preserved by Dr. Palmer. Here Dr. Thornwell writes:

“I can well and heartily sympathize with you in your despondency in regard to the condition of the country. The times are indeed portentous. The prospect of disunion is one which I cannot contemplate without absolute horror. A peaceful dissolution is utterly impossible. And a war between the States of this confederacy would, in my opinion, be the bloodiest, most ferocious, and cruel in the annals of history . . . I have hardly been able to sleep in consequence of the deep conviction with which I am oppressed of the evils that threaten us; and my increasing prayer is that God would interfere for our relief. Vain in this crisis is the help of man. I agree with you that every believer in Jesus Christ is most solemnly warned by the times to wrestle with the Angel of the Covenant in behalf of our bleeding country. The interests of the Saviour’s kingdom are too intimately connected with the permanence and prosperity of this great confederacy to allow any disciple to be a calm spectator of passing scenes.”⁴³

Indeed, so precious was the Union, so abhorrent disunion, that Thornwell, while in Europe (1860), made up his mind to move immediately upon his return for the gradual emancipation of the negro as the only measure that would give peace to the country, by taking away the external cause of irritation. But on his return the die was cast!⁴⁴

Dr. J. B. Adger also followed his father in 1831 and 1850 in supporting the Union Party.⁴⁵

The influence of this great lover of the Union (Dr. Thornwell), and the influence of the Seminary with which his name has ever

⁴²Palmer, p. 477.

⁴³Palmer, pp. 477, 478.

⁴⁴So Palmer, *ibid.*, 483.

⁴⁵*Autobiography*, pp. 82, 201, 202.

since been indissolubly yoked, must be reckoned among the weighty factors preventing the split of the Old School Church. In the thirties, that movement was feared by Cater, McDowell, and Hoyt; and broached by Colonel Rockwell and Mr. Legare. Through the forties, as the ecclesiastical ties of one after another of the denominational bodies snapped asunder at the Mason-Dixon Line, the Old School Presbyterian Church remained united. For, in the very hotbed of secession, there was a mind as vigorous and a personality as dynamic as that of Calhoun himself—James H. Thornwell—and a small but steady stream of influence trickling from Columbia Seminary to allay the passions of sectionalism. These two—the man and the institution—acting as one, were constantly calling to patience, Christian long-suffering and forbearance, to peaceful methods for improving strained relations.

Moreover, during this period Dr. Thornwell had tremendous influence in the Old School Assembly, and led that Assembly in the only direction by which the ecclesiastical fellowship could have been preserved. Dr. A. M. Fraser, Pastor Emeritus First Presbyterian Church of Staunton, Virginia, attributes the action of the Assembly of 1845 to Thornwell. He writes: "Accordingly, in the Cincinnati Assembly where he (Thornwell) was a commanding influence, though not a member of the committee on slavery, he was consulted by that committee and prepared the report which it presented and which the Assembly adopted and which fixed the attitude of the Church towards slavery for years to come."⁴⁶

The statement is documented, in substance, by a letter from Thornwell to his wife, May 19, 1845. Thornwell there says:

"The question of slavery has been before the house, and referred to a special committee of seven. Though not a member of the committee, I have been consulted on the subject, and have drawn up a paper, which I think the committee and the Assembly will substantially adopt; and, if they do, abolitionism will be killed in the Presbyterian Church, at least for the present."⁴⁷

⁴⁶Thornwell, *Centennial Addresses before Synod of S. C.*, 1912, Band and White Printers, Spartanburg, S. C., p. 35.

⁴⁷Palmer—*Life and Letters of Thornwell*, p. 286.

The salient points of this decision are a repetition of the views declared in the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1836, 1837.

"The Church of Christ is a spiritual body, whose jurisdiction extends only to the religious faith and moral conduct of her members. She cannot legislate where Christ has not legislated, nor make terms of membership which he has not made."

"The Assembly simply intend to say that, since Christ and his inspired Apostles did not make the holding of slaves a bar to communion, we, as a court of Christ, have no authority to do so; since they did not attempt to remove it from the Church by legislation, we have no authority to legislate on the subject. We feel constrained, further, to say that, however desirable it may be to ameliorate the condition of the slaves in the Southern and Western States or to remove slavery from our country, these objects, we are fully persuaded, can never be secured by ecclesiastical legislation. Much less can they be attained by those indiscriminate denunciations against slaveholders . . . which have, to so great an extent, characterized the movements of modern abolitionists." The proper method of ameliorating slave conditions is declared to be the teaching, to both master and slave, of the *doctrine of the gospel and the duties* there enjoined.⁴⁸

Through the decade of the fifties the union policy was maintained. Thornwell, writing in the Southern Presbyterian Review of January, 1851, said:

"God grant that our country may be saved—that the North and the South may be brought to meet in harmony and peace, upon the common ground of our glorious Constitution."

He closed with an earnest plea to South Carolina not to secede. Such a step "under the present circumstances of our country is recommended by not a single consideration, that we are able to discover, of wisdom, patriotism or honour."⁴⁹

Dr. B. M. Palmer, in a speech in the Assembly of 1858, declared:

"I believe the Church is panting for union, in spite of all the forebodings and the warnings which our fathers have given in this Assembly. I am glad that I am young . . . I hope to live

⁴⁸*Minutes General Assembly of Pres. Church*, Philadelphia, 1845, Vol. XI, pp. 16-18.

⁴⁹Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. IV, pp. 446, 450.

to see the day when prejudice will be thrown aside . . . when all the branches of the Presbyterian Church finally will come together . . . and form one united society.”⁵⁰

Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, the devoted friend of Dr. Thornwell, avowed: “As to abolition, the world has periodical periods of madness” . . . “The conviction which has always swayed this Assembly is gaining ground, that ministers in their sacred capacity as ministers have nothing to do with matters apart from the doctrines of salvation.”⁵¹

Dr. Howe summarizes this Assembly, “The circumstances and place of its assembling, the harmony of its counsels, the prevailing unity of its views on all subjects of general interest, the patriotic and conservative influences which prevailed in all its proceedings, notwithstanding its members were convened from every section of this Union. . . . Even the outward political world has been attracted by our oneness and our conservatism, and has not been silent in its auguries of good to our common country . . . over this wide domain.”⁵¹ Even in January, 1860, he hoped that there would not be dismemberment of the Union; and to that end urged a strict adherence to the letter of the Constitution.⁵²

The attitude of the Seminary towards ecclesiastical schism, on sectional grounds, seems to have been maintained down to the very moment when the sword was unsheathed between the States and when “the Spring Resolutions” were adopted in the Old School Assembly. In 1860 Dr. Thornwell was ready to move for gradual emancipation in the interest of preserving the Union. In the same year, Dr. John B. Adger, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Seminary, led the opposition to a move in South Carolina Synod to divide the Church. Synod met in the Glebe St. Church, Charleston, November 28th, 1860. On November 29, Rev. W. B. Yates of Charleston Presbytery introduced the following preamble and resolutions:

“Whereas, that fanaticism, which has so completely controlled public sentiment at the North as to cause the election of *Abraham Lincoln*, the exponent of hostility to our social institutions; and, as we have reason to believe, this sentiment is

⁵⁰As reported by G. Howe, *Southern Pres. Review*, Vol. XI, p. 278.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, pp. 326, 343.

⁵²*Southern Pres. Review*, Jan. 1860.

openly or covertly entertained in a greater or less degree, by all of the ecclesiastical bodies at the North; and whereas the Act of 1818 (which makes it the duty of all members of the Presbyterian Church to use all efforts for the abolition of slavery) still remains upon the statute book of the Old School Presbyterian General Assembly, and they have refused to repeal it; Believing, as we do, that fidelity to the South requires us to dissolve all connection with the Northern portion of the Presbyterian Church, therefore be it

1. Resolved, That the period has arrived when it becomes the duty of every Minister and Elder, South, to let his position be known.

2. Resolved, That fidelity to the South requires us to sever all connection with the Northern portion of the General Assembly.

3. Resolved, That we recommend to all Presbyteries connected with this Synod to take steps to dissolve their connection with the General Assembly.

4. Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to correspond with Synods and Presbyteries, South, with the view of forming a Southern Assembly.

5. Resolved, That we still cherish fraternal feelings towards all those brethren who have ever stood up firmly for the rights of the South."

Mr. Yates moved reference of the foregoing to a special Committee.

Dr. Adger moved that they be laid on the table. Dr. Adger's motion prevailed, seventy-seven to twenty-one.⁵³

Later in the Synod, Dr. Adger reported for a Committee of nine on the duty of Synod towards our Churches, in reference to the existing condition of our country:

"This Synod is one of thirty-three which compose the old school Presbyterian Church in this country. From our brethren of the whole Church annually assembled we have received nothing but justice and courtesy. The Act of 1818 was adopted by the South of that day as well as by the North, and has since been virtually rescinded. Our General Assembly in 1845, at Cincinnati, took action with almost entire unanimity, which has been acceptable to the South, inasmuch as it declared that they had no authority to make any laws on the subject of slavery not found in the word of God; and which has resulted

⁵³*Min. of Synod of S. C.*, 1860, p. 8. Printed Charleston, Evans & Cogswell, 1861.

in a harmony of the whole Church on this subject, unbroken in the least degree to the present time.

“It is not for us to inaugurate, as a Synod, any movement towards a separation from the Northern branch of our Church. This is not the time for such a movement, which would be in advance of the action of the State. Nor are we the proper body to take such a step. It can only begin in the Church sessions, where Presbyterian sovereignty lies, and must issue forth through the Presbyteries.

“With regard to the political duties of our Churches, as composed of citizens of this Commonwealth, the Synod of South Carolina is not called upon as a Synod, even in the present extremity, to give advice or instructions. Political intermeddling by professed Ministers of the Gospel, and especially by bodies of professed Ministers, has been fraught with evil for many years to our country, and has contributed perhaps more than any other cause to bring the country to its present condition. This Synod, composed of Ministers and Ruling Elders should not now be found imitating the bad example so often set by ecclesiastical bodies at the North.

“But there is now a great and solemn question before the people of this state, affecting its very life and being; and that question has, of course, its religious aspects and relations, upon which this body is perfectly competent to speak, and if its deliverance thereupon should have a political bearing, that is a result for which we cannot be held responsible. There is involved at this immediate juncture a duty to God, who gave us our rights; a duty to our ancestors, whose blood and sufferings procured them for us; a duty to our children, whose precious inheritance we may not waste or defile; and a duty to our very slaves, whom men that know them not, nor care for them as we do, would take from our protection. The Synod has no hesitation, therefore, in expressing the belief that the people of South Carolina are now solemnly called on to imitate their revolutionary forefathers, and stand up for their rights. We have a humble abiding confidence that the God whose truth we represent in this conflict will be with us, and exhorting our Churches and people to put their trust in God, and go forward in the solemn path of duty which his Providence opens before them, we, Ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, in Synod assembled, would give them our benediction, and the assurance that we shall fervently and sincerely implore for them the care and protection of

Almighty God." On motion of Mr. M. E. Queen this was adopted.⁵⁴

It is somewhat hard to follow Dr. Adger's reasoning in this paper and in his defense thereof. He disavowed and condemned political intermeddling, and denied the right of Synod to instruct the citizens in their ordinary political duties; but held "that the great and solemn question before the State, whether she would give up her inheritance of freeman, and her being and life had a religious bearing and involved duty to God."⁵⁵

Whether or not he drew the line between political and ecclesiastical matters, certainly his resolutions are to be preferred by every lover of ecclesiastical unity to those of Mr. Yates.

If in the midst of ecclesiastical schisms and political turmoil, Mr. McCormick, the inventor of the reaper and founder of McCormick Seminary, was right in speaking of the Old School Church and the Democratic party as "the two hoops which held the Union together," then a measure of credit for the continuance of the Union from 1832-1860 must be accorded to Thornwell and Columbia Seminary, the influence of which was vital in holding together one of these two hoops—the Old School General Assembly.⁵⁶

ORGANIZATION OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

While Dr. Adger was able to block the Yates Resolutions dividing the Church as late as the Synod of 1860, his more moderate substitute evinces the fact that "The Presbyterians of the South were in full political sympathy with the movement for dismembering the general government. Their sympathy was actively assisting in this disintegrating work."⁵⁷

Dr. Bean, in a recently published *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, has exhaustively gathered the data on this subject from the ecclesiastical courts of South Carolina. He avows that, "in refusing to send commissioners to the General Assembly, the withholding of funds, the endorsement of the Southern

⁵⁴*Synod of S. C. Minutes*, 1860, p. 29. *MS. Min. of Synod of S. C.*, pp. 141, 142, one exception to approval by Wm. C. Backus, Moderator.

⁵⁵*Southern Presbyterian Review*, July, 1861, p. 335 ff.

⁵⁶For McCormick's statement Thompson, *Presbyterians*, p. 151 in *American Church History Series*, Vol. VI, Scribners, N. Y., 1900.

⁵⁷Reed, *History of Presby. Churches*, p. 271.

Confederacy and the giving of thanks for the manifest favor of God upon the councils and arms of the Confederate States of America," the South Carolina ecclesiastical bodies had virtually withdrawn from the Old School Assembly before the Assembly's meeting in 1861.⁵⁸

The actions of the Synod and Presbyteries of South Carolina certainly show a spirit of alienation and an acknowledgment that civil conditions have interrupted regular ecclesiastical relations. But before deciding with Dr. Bean⁵⁹ that this irregular state of affairs constitutes a permanent division and a new ecclesiastical organization the question arises, "How did Southern leaders regard ecclesiastical conditions and relations in July, 1861?" The records of the Society of Missionary Inquiry show that the question, Resolved that the separation of the Presbyterian Church in these "once United States" North and South would be beneficial to the cause of Christ viewed in the light of reason, was seriously debated in the early months of 1861. It was, therefore, a debatable question at that time in Columbia Theological Seminary.⁶⁰ There is a very interesting article on the General Assembly of 1861 in the Southern Presbyterian Review of 1861 by Dr. J. B. Adger of Columbia Seminary. Dr. Adger begins this article, "We still acknowledge ourselves to be, in one sense, members of the body which is called the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. This title is now, indeed, a *misnomer*, for the United States of America have ceased to be united, and have become two distinct, separate, and, alas! hostile governments. The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, of course, in fact no longer one Church, but two. And yet the separation will not, we suppose, be formally made until the regular fall sessions of our Presbyteries and Synods." "Our own impressions were, at first, favorable to no immediate action towards formal separation."⁶¹

Further on, Adger speaks of the division of feeling between the two parts. "Now the question arises, what is it that both *will* soon, and *ought* soon, to divide this Church? Is it these mutual feelings of alienation? Do they, can they, justify actual separation, or the setting up a new and distinct Presbyterian organization? We have

⁵⁸*Pres. Church in S. C. Since 1850*, p. 79.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 59-102.

⁶⁰*MS. Record of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, 1855-1880*, p. 272.

⁶¹S. P. R., 1861, pp. 396, 346.

no hesitation in answering No! Such feelings as produce unjust and unkind legislation, and such feelings, too, as it produces, ought to be controlled and corrected. They form no justification of schism."⁶²

What, then, does Adger regard as necessitating such action? "What is it, that *must* and *ought* to divide the Presbyterian Church, Old School? It is the division of the country into two separate nations. No external Church organization of a spiritual Church can properly perform its spiritual functions within the limits of two distinct nations. And the more hostile they become, the more impossible will it be for one Church to work in the bounds of both." In a spiritual Church "there must be identity, in some good degree, of moral judgments, feelings and sympathies, or the unity is broken" . . . "Differences of political organization, therefore, must divide such (free) Churches."⁶³

This same reason for a separate organization is repeated as the second reason for separation in the address by the Southern General Assembly to all the churches of Jesus Christ, written by Dr. J. H. Thornwell, a colleague of Dr. Adger in Columbia Seminary. Referring to the practice of Protestant Churches in following national lines, the address declares: "If it is desirable that each nation should contain a separate and an independent Church, the Presbyteries of these Confederate States need no apology for bowing to the decree of Providence, which, in withdrawing their country from the government of the United States, has at the same time determined that they should withdraw from the Church of their fathers."⁶⁴

Dr. Adger views "the Spring Resolutions" of the 1861 Assembly primarily in the light of their relation to a Southern Presbyterian's loyalty to his chosen government. "Were it not, therefore, that the 'loyalty resolutions' of the Assembly must necessarily affect our position towards our own government, we would say, unhesitatingly, that they do not render necessary any division of the Church."

He is constrained to yield to "the general and clamorous call from so many parts of the South for a Convention to assemble, without unnecessary delay, and take steps for organizing a separate South-

⁶²*Southern Pres. Review*, July, 1861, p. 341, 296, 346.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 343, 344.

⁶⁴*Minutes of Southern Assembly*, 1861, p. 52 ff.

ern Church," declaring, "it does appear to us that, having been put into a false position both by the Assembly and by our own Commissioners, we must not delay at all to set ourselves right."⁶⁵ Dr. R. E. Thompson shows that political or civil pressure, brought to bear on Northern Presbyterians, resulted in the so-called Spring Resolutions⁶⁶ (better Spring-Anderson-Edwards Resolutions *Minutes of the General Assembly of 1861*, p. 329); and political pressure, national division, new nation lines, hostile armies did play their part in the separation and re-organization of Southern Presbyterians. Ere passing this subject by, it should be noted that the ecclesiastical division of the Old School Church followed rather than preceded; and was in part caused by, and not a cause of, the sectional rupture. Even the Democratic Party—one of McCormick's "hoops"—was broken before the nation; but the breaking of the barrel (the Union) broke the last hoop, the Old School Church.

The other cause of the permanent division of Southern Presbyterians was the collapse of that ideal of the strict demarcation of the sphere of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which dominated the Old School Church from the time of its organization until the passage of the "Spring Resolutions" in 1861.^{66a} Dr. Charles Hodge and others protested against the resolutions, "because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church." . . . "The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the Church has no right to make anything a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the Church."⁶⁷

Objection was not merely to the Resolutions *per se*, but to the Resolutions as representing the collapse (in the Old School Assembly) of that strict *laissez faire* doctrine of ecclesiastical bodies in political matters which was enunciated in the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in 1836 and 1837, and in the Old School Assemblies of

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, 342, 346.

⁶⁶*Minutes of General Assembly 1861*, pp. 329-331. In part: "This General Assembly do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligations to promote and perpetuate the integrity of these United States and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution—with unabated loyalty."

^{66a}Thompson, *Presbyterians*, pp. 150, 151.

⁶⁷*Minutes General Assembly 1861*, pp. 339, 340.

1845 and 1848. Dr. J. H. Thornwell, a personal embodiment of the doctrine that "the Church is exclusively a spiritual organization," urged this argument first in the address of the Southern Assembly, in the Reasons for separate organization adopted by the Synod of South Carolina in 1861, and in a valedictory letter he wrote to be sent the "Northern" Assembly. He says:

"The course of the last Assembly, at Philadelphia, conclusively shows that, if we should remain together, the political questions which divide us as citizens will be obtruded on our Church Courts and discussed by Christian Ministers and Elders with all the acrimony, bitterness, and rancour with which such questions are usually discussed by men of the world. Our Assembly would present a mournful spectacle of strife and debate.

"The only conceivable condition, therefore, upon which the Church of the North and the South could remain together as one body with any prospect of success is the vigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from the halls of debate. This is what ought always to be done. The provinces of Church and State are perfectly distinct, and one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. . . . The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined in its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter."⁶⁸

"The Old Assembly has transcended its jurisdiction by authoritatively settling a political question."⁶⁹

"We have withdrawn, first, because we are persuaded that, if we remain together, our harmony is likely to be disturbed by the introduction of our political differences into our Church Courts."⁷⁰

Rev. James A. Lyon, D.D., of Columbus, Mississippi, writing in the Southern Presbyterian Review of the Southern General Assembly of 1861, declares that the Southern disaffected Presbyterians would have been slow to take the necessary steps to a separate organization. "But those 'Spring Resolutions,' so unnecessary, in fact, so much in defiance of all sound wisdom, so contrary to wise policy (according to man's wisdom), and in open violation of the Constitution of the Church, God, as it would seem, permitted to be discussed with such

⁶⁸*Minutes Southern Assembly*, 1861, pp. 5, 52.

⁶⁹Reasons for separate organization Thornwell Col. Wr., Vol. IV, p. 439.

⁷⁰Valedictory Letter Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 465.

⁷¹*Southern Pres. Rev.*, Jan. 1862, p. 619.

an *animus* and passed by such a majority, for the sole purpose of making an instantaneous unit of the Southern Churches.”⁷¹

Dr. P. M. Palmer, Jr., an alumnus and sometime professor in Columbia, quotes the action of his own Presbytery (New Orleans) as typical of the attitude of most Presbyteries: “*Resolved*, That in view of the unconstitutional, Erastian, tyrannical, and *virtually excinding act*, of the late General Assembly . . . we do hereby . . . declare . . . our connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States to be dissolved.”⁷² Dr. Palmer preached the opening sermon of the Southern Assembly in Augusta (Dec. 4, 1861) from the text Eph. 1:22, 23. He declared that the mission of the re-organized Church is “to lift throughout the world our testimony for this headship of Christ. The convocation of this Assembly is part of this testimony. But a little while since it was attempted, in the most august court of our Church, to place the crown of our Lord upon the head of Caesar . . . to bind that body which is Christ’s fullness to the chariot in which Caesar rides. . . . the voice went up throughout our land in indignant remonstrance against the usurpation, in solemn protest against the sacrilege. And now this parliament of the Lord’s freemen solemnly declares that, by the terms of her great charter, none but Jesus may be King in Zion. Once more, in this distant age and in the ends of the earth, the Church must declare for the supremacy of her Head, and fling out the consecrated ensign with the old inscription, ‘For Christ and His Crown.’ ”⁷³

An additional reason mentioned by Thornwell in *The Address* is the antagonism engendered over the question of slavery, and the conviction that only a Church free from control of those hostile to slavery will be trusted by slaveholders to minister to the spiritual needs of the slave population. “We cannot give up these millions of souls” for the sake of an empty shadow of outward unity.⁷⁴

The reasons, then, for the separation and the re-organization of the Southern Presbyterians, as found in the representative utterances of Columbia Seminary leaders made at the time, were: first, national disparateness; secondly, the collapse in the Old School Assembly of the ideal of a Church with an exclusively spiritual mission—the

⁷²Palmer, *Life of Thornwell*, p. 502.

⁷³*Minutes of Southern Assembly*, 1861, p. 71.

⁷⁴*Address of the Southern Assembly, Minutes*, 1861, p. 55.

ideal of Thornwell, Cater, McDowell, Hoyt and Palmer; thirdly, the spiritual interests of the slave population.

If called upon to evaluate the different reasons, the writer would emphasize the political agitation and pressure and the national division as the principal cause of disaffection, of the interruption of regular relations, and of the separation of the Presbyterians of the seceding states. While to the second cause—the collapse of the ideal of the spirituality of the Church, manifest in “the Spring Resolutions”—he would attribute the primary importance for that unanimity and immediacy of action by these separated Presbyterians in the formation of a Southern Presbyterian Church, by which the disaffection crystallized, the separation was made permanent, and the new ecclesiastical organization was born. That the opinion of these Seminary leaders fairly represents the view of the Church at its organization is made evident by the conspicuous part taken by Columbia Seminary men in this Augusta Assembly, December 4, 1861. The facts, carefully collated by Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters, are:⁷⁵

“Of the fifty-two Ministerial Commissioners who were present, honored by the Presbyteries as men worthy to be entrusted with the responsibility of deciding whether, as a Church, we were to be, and what, as a Church, we were to be, thirteen were alumni or honorary alumni of this Seminary; six were alumni of our sister Seminary in Virginia; and the remainder, apparently, were not Seminary graduates, or were the alumni of institutions outside of our bounds. The alumni of this institution came from the following Synods, viz: Synod of Alabama, G. W. Boggs; Synod of Arkansas, John I. Boozer; Synod of Georgia, J. E. DuBose, C. C. Jones, D.D., J. R. Wilson, D.D., LL.D.; Synod of Mississippi, W. C. Emerson, B. M. Palmer, D.D., LL.D.; Synod of South Carolina, J. H. Thornwell, D.D., LL.D., A. W. Leland, D.D., J. L. Wilson, D.D., D. E. Frierson, D.D., J. B. Adger, D.D., D. McN. Turner, D.D.”

Among the elders present were Chancellor Job Johnston of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, a former member of the Board

⁷⁵*Columbia Theol. Seminary, A Retrospect Involving a Responsibility*, 1901, Wm. M. McPheeters, pp. 26, 27 cf. *Minutes of General Assembly* (C. S. A.), 1861.

of Directors of the Seminary, and Hon. T. C. Perrin, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Seminary.

“The selection of a suitable presiding officer for that first Assembly was a matter of no small importance. The man occupying that position on that occasion must needs be one capable, not only of commanding the respect and confidence of his brethren, but of the entire Church of God. Upon him also, more than upon any one else, would devolve the responsibility of guiding and shaping the action of the body that had placed him at the helm. We all know upon whom the choice of his brethren fell; nor has there ever been a moment since when the Church repented that choice, or failed to be proud that when the emergency arose she had, in Benjamin M. Palmer, a son worthy to meet it.

“The new-born Church received her name on the motion of J. H. Thornwell, D.D., which motion was seconded by A. W. Leland, D.D. The committees through whom the Assembly was to carry on its business were also appointed on motion of Dr. Thornwell. He was, himself, chairman of the committee which drew up for our Church her Magna Charta—‘The Address to the Churches of Jesus Christ Throughout the World.’ Associated with him on this committee were C. C. Jones, D.D., of Georgia, and John I. Boozer, of Arkansas. Dr. Thornwell was also an influential member of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. Indeed, it is but history to add that to him, probably more than to any other single individual, our Church owes most of what is distinctive in her principles and her polity. To him we are largely indebted for the Book of Church Order, under which our Courts at present administer the business of our Church. ‘The Letter on the Religious Instruction of the Colored People,’ issued by the Augusta Assembly, was the masterly product of C. C. Jones, D.D., of Georgia, who was also chairman of the Committee of Home Missions. The venerable D. McN. Turner, D.D., who continued his labors until over eighty years of age, and has only comparatively recently gone to his reward, was Clerk of the Assembly. The Standing Committee on Foreign Missions appointed by that Assembly consisted of J. L. Wilson, D.D., Jas. Woodrow, D.D., James H. Thornwell, D.D., George Howe, D.D., F. P. Mullally, D.D., A. A. Porter, D.D., and J. B. Adger, D.D., all alumni or honorary alumni of this Seminary.

"So much for the relation of Columbia Seminary to our beginnings as a Church."

Of interest as showing the whole-heartedness with which Columbia Seminary espoused the cause of a Southern Presbyterian Church in 1861 and the leadership accorded the institution in that movement, there may be noted a proposal by Dr. Thornwell in the South Carolina Synod of 1861. Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolution: "Resolved, that this Synod, the Synod of Georgia and that of Alabama concurring, transfer to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America the Theological Seminary of the Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, etc." The motion was referred to the Board of Directors;⁷⁶ and was regularly acted upon and the transfer consummated by appropriate action at the General Assembly of 1863.⁷⁷

THE PERPETUATION OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

A further phase of the Seminary and the Southern Presbyterian Church deals with the relation of the Southern Church to its former associates in the Northern Church. In 1869 and '70 the question of reunion was broached by the Northern Assemblies. The reply of the Southern Church was submitted by Dr. B. M. Palmer, Jr., as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence. It presents four difficulties in the way of cordial correspondence between the two bodies:—

1. The political utterances of the Northern Assemblies. "We believe it to be solemnly incumbent upon the Northern Presbyterian Church . . . to purge itself of this error, and, by public proclamation of the truth, to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus Christ as the alone King of Zion." The Southern Church will continue to maintain the independence and spirituality of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth.

2. Doctrinal inclusiveness. The union of the Old and New School Assemblies North "involved a total surrender of all the great testimonies of the Church for the fundamental doctrines of grace." "The united Assembly stands of necessity upon an allowed latitude of interpretation of the standards, and must come at length to embrace

⁷⁶*Minutes Synod of S. C.*, 1861, p. 32.

⁷⁷*Minutes Assembly* 1863, pp. 142, 143.

nearly all shades of doctrinal belief. Of these falling testimonies we are now the sole surviving heirs.”⁷⁸

3. The excision of Presbyterians of Kentucky and Missouri under “the Gurley *ipso facto* resolutions.”

4. Injurious accusations preferred against the Southern Presbyterian Church by Northern Assemblies.⁷⁹

It has been along these lines, marked out by a son of old Columbia, that the question of closer relations to the Northern Presbyterian Church has been considered.

The fourth difficulty was pressed by Southern delegates, particularly Dr. B. M. Palmer, in the conversations held by representatives of the two Assemblies in 1874.⁸⁰

The respective Assemblies passed reciprocal resolutions in 1882, withdrawing all offensive utterances of past Assemblies; but this full expression was later “explained” by the moderator of the Northern Assembly as not referring to charges concerning loyalty and rebellion. On this basis fraternal relations were reestablished between the two Churches.⁸¹

Objections to the Resolution of the Northern Moderator, Dr. Herick Johnson, which “did not modify but explained” the Concurrent Resolutions, were voiced by two Columbia spokesmen. Dr. Wm. E. Boggs, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity, affirms that this explanation was hurriedly accepted by a tired Southern Assembly; that its meaning is an enigma—the riddle of the sphinx; and that the Southern Church should have demanded further light on its meaning before exchanging delegates. But he is inclined to think that the Northern Assembly regrets the Johnson resolution of explanation and is as much grieved thereby as is the Southern Church, and he expects the Northern brethren to do the handsome and generous thing of withdrawing the explanation.⁸²

⁷⁸NOTE: This reunion was protested against in October, 1868, in a book review of Baird's History as (if it should occur) furnishing a reason against a North-South Reunion—*Southern Pres. Review*, Oct., 1868, p. 607

⁷⁹*Minutes Southern General Assembly*, 1870, pp. 529, 530.

⁸⁰Reed, *History*, p. 282.

⁸¹*Minutes of Southern Assembly*, 1882, pp. 531, 541, 542, 552, 553. *Minutes of General Assembly* (U. S. A.), 1882, pp. 50, 66, 83, 84, 102, 103.

⁸²W. E. Boggs, The General Assembly of 1882, in *Southern Pres. Review* July, 1882, pp. 569-590.

Dr. B. M. Palmer (Jr.) goes further in his opposition to fraternal delegates, on the basis of Dr. Johnson's explanation. He declares that the two Assemblies are not one on the question of "the relations subsisting between the Church and the State." But, by making a treaty of peace that imports these deliverances on loyalty and rebellion into the agreement, the Southern Church is giving up her position. "When we allow these political declarations to be imported into the treaty between us as in part the basis of reconciliation, what becomes of our testimony against these political deliverances?"⁸³

Dr. R. C. Reed, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity (1898-1925), thus paraphrases the "Herrick Johnson Rider." "'We do not declare our regret for nor our withdrawal of those expressions of our Assemblies which charged you with being traitors and rebels.' Surely this was *modifying* with a vengeance!"⁸⁴

The establishment of fraternal relations with the Northern Assembly was also feared as a step in the direction of organic⁸⁵ union. Through the courtesy of his grandson, the Reverend John Blackburn the use of manuscript notes of Dr. J. L. Girardeau, professor in Columbia Seminary 1876-1895, are available. In these papers there is an outline of an address by Dr. Girardeau, given at a conference in the Seminary Chapel in 1884. The outline is entitled "Question of Organic Union with Northern Presbyterian Church." Dr. Girardeau affirms "that organic union will not approach us directly, but will come through one (or both) of two ways: i. e. coöperation, which was the reason inciting to fraternal relations; and local assemblies."

In 1904, the Northern Assembly removed all aspersions and charges, of any and every kind, upon the Christian character of the Southern Church. The fourth of Palmer's difficulties in the way of closer relations was thereby completely removed.

Meanwhile, the Northern and Southern Assemblies had enjoyed a fraternal celebration (1888) of the Centennial of the life of the Assembly; and, after hearing the Report of a Committee of Inquiry into the views of the Northern Assembly, the Southern Assembly de-

⁸³Palmer, *Fraternal Relations*—*Sou. Pres. Review*, April, 1883, p. 328.

⁸⁴Reed *History of the Southern Pres. Church*, publ. in *Presbyterian Standard*, Charlotte, N. C., Oct. 24-Nov. 21, 1923.

⁸⁵Girardeau in *Sou. Pres. Review*, 1882, p. 575.

cided to appoint a Committee on fraternal coöperation in Christian work.⁸⁶ But just at this time, 1889, the Revision controversy took place in the Northern Assembly. The Girardeau notes show that this dampened the Southern desire for unity. In a review of Dr. Briggs' "*Whither?*" Dr. Girardeau declares himself at variance with most of Dr. Briggs' views. In an address dated November 22, 1889, Girardeau characterized the demand for revision as evidence of "The Doctrinal Defection in the American Presbyterian Church." He found in this demand proof that the Old School—New School Union was a doctrinal compromise, the effects of which "are now coming out."

Dr. James Woodrow, sometime Perkins Professor of Natural Science in connection with Revelation in the Seminary, in an article of April 26, 1889, entitled "*Are We Agreed?*" acknowledges that, while there were Southern New School men as doctrinally lax as Northern New School men, the *proportion* of them was smaller. "And it is further true that, while we are very far from being able to claim spotlessness, there has always prevailed, and there now prevails, a jealous regard for doctrinal soundness in the South in a far higher degree than in the North. . . . Our people rightly dread as most deadly any departure from the faith once delivered to the saints."⁸⁷

On April 19th, Dr. Woodrow quotes Dr. Briggs' view on *verbal* inspiration as published in the *Homiletic Review* (January) as "showing in the Northern Assembly indifference to fundamental truth."⁸⁸

Dr. R. C. Reed of Columbia Seminary, in writing his *History of the Presbyterian Church of the World*, gave his view of the Union between the Cumberland Church and the Northern Assembly (1904). "These statements made it clear that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was favorable to union, on the ground that the revised confession and the brief statement contained a modified form of Calvinism in substantial accord with that held by the Cumberland Church. In other words, the Cumberland Church was ready to unite with the Northern Church on the basis of the latter's standards, because these

⁸⁶*Southern Pres. Assembly*, 1888, pp. 412, 422, 456.

⁸⁷*Dr. James Woodrow*, by M. W. Woodrow, pp. 598-599.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, p. 594.

standards had come to be substantially identical with its own." Dr. Reed also added, in his copy sent for publication to the Presbyterian Board of Publication, that in his judgment the aforesaid union showed that the Northern Church preferred external enlargement to doctrinal purity. This last statement was changed by Dr. Roberts, stated Clerk of the Northern Assembly, before publication, into an innocuous platitude, and so reads in the printed copies of Dr. Reed's book.⁸⁹ & ⁹⁰

In a short *History of the Southern Presbyterian Church*, published in the *Presbyterian Standard* of Charlotte, North Carolina, October 24-November 21, 1923, Dr. Reed, from the standpoint of Columbia Seminary, categorically answers the question "Why should we (the Southern Presbyterian Church) not go back to our mother?"

1. "Because the mother Church (the Old School Church) no longer exists.

2. "The Church of which that Old School Church is now a component part is a Church practically without a creed." The Church professes one creed, but has two standards (Old School and New School) for testing orthodoxy.

3. "The Cumberland Union of 1905 opened a still wider door into the ministry, so that it is hardly too much to say that this great, doubly united Church stands for no clearly defined system of truth."

4. "The Northern Church is travelling in the direction of Broad-Churchism, and soon the denial of doctrines hitherto held to be distinctive of Evangelical Christianity will be tolerated.

5. "The Northern Assembly practices the doctrines of the Spring Resolutions . . . "the doctrine that the church owes allegiance to the civil government and must render support to the government."⁹¹

According to Dr. Thomas Cary Johnson, Dr. Palmer "never ceased to believe that the Head of the Church had laid on his communion the burden of testifying to the Church's non-political character, and of standing for sound and certain Calvinism."⁹²

⁸⁹Reed *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World*, p. 267.

⁹⁰NOTE: Dr. Reed stated to his classes in Columbia Seminary that this change was made, without his consent, by his friend, Dr. Roberts.

⁹¹As published in Pamphlet, pp. 21, 22.

⁹²Johnson, B. M. Palmer, p. 546.

The second difficulty urged by Dr. Palmer in 1870—*doctrinal inclusiveness*—is a difficulty of increasing magnitude in the minds of leaders of Columbia Seminary to the organic union of the Northern and Southern Churches. The New School Union of 1869-70; the Revision Question of 1889; the Cumberland Union of 1904; the Auburn affirmation of 1923;⁹³ the latitude taken by New York Presbytery in ordaining ministers;⁹⁴ the failure of the Assembly of 1927 to judicially rebuke this latitude;⁹⁵ the ideal of "an inclusive church" avowed by Northern leaders,⁹⁶ are to Columbia Seminary like so many stones in a vast pyramid of difficulty in the way of organic union.

Palmer's other great objection—the relations between church and state—were still pressed by Dr. Reed in 1923, *supra*.

Dr. Woodrow acknowledges that the church courts of the South do not have a perfect record on this subject, "although there was an honest endeavor, even in the midst of the most intense war excitement, to avoid whatever is inconsistent with the distinction, established by our Saviour, between the things of God and the things of Caesar." But he points to the declaration of the Southern Assembly of 1876 disavowing all such incidental allusions⁹⁷ as the reestablishment of the ideal of the strictly spiritual function of the Church—the principle of "the non-secular and non-political character of Christ's kingdom."⁹⁸

To any one at all familiar with the intensity of South Carolina politics, the wonder is not that Dr. R. E. Thompson finds allusions of a political nature in the narratives of Religion of the Southern As-

⁹³An affirmation designed to safeguard the Unity and Liberty of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Auburn, N. Y., 1923. This document, signed by over twelve hundred "Northern Presbyterian" ministers and elders, declares that the acceptance of none of the following doctrines are essential to ordination in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., i. e.: the Virgin Birth of Christ, His bodily resurrection, His miracles, the inerrancy of Scripture, that Christ offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and reconcile us to God.

⁹⁴*Minutes Assembly U. S. A.*, 1925, pp. 32, 37, 83-88, 207. *A Plain Statement of Conditions in New York Presbytery*, James E. Bennett, N. Y., 1925.

⁹⁵*Minutes U. S. A.*, 1927, p. 188. Cf. Action of 1928 Assembly in allowing Synod of N. Y. to vote in appeal vs. Synod of N. Y. This irregular vote dismissed another alleged case of doctrinal latitude.

⁹⁶*Minutes U. S. A. Assembly*, 1920, pp. 98, 117-122.

⁹⁷*Minutes Southern Assembly 1876*, p. 233.

⁹⁸*Dr. Jas. Woodrow*, p. 596, April 26, 1889.

semblies of the war period,⁹⁹ nor that Dr. Bean finds them in the narratives of Religion of the Presbyteries of South Carolina during the war;¹⁰⁰ the marvel is that the ideal is so far maintained as to keep these matters so generally out of the direct action, and to confine them to narratives dealing with the state of religion and of life.

So steadfastly has this ideal been held by Columbia Seminary that the institution may be said to be an embodiment of the principle of the spirituality of the Church. The founders of the Seminary prayed for an institution that should be separate from sectional politics; and in the heat of nullification hatred of New England, in 1831, 1832 and 1833, the Seminary elected Massachusetts men as her professors. In 1836 and 1837 this ideal was written into the life of the controlling Synod. In the forties, Thornwell of Columbia wrote it into the Old School Assembly. In 1861 Thornwell and Palmer wrote it into the Magna Charta of the Southern Assembly. Small wonder, then, that Palmer should maintain that the ideal had been realized, even during the war. He endorses the Assembly's declaration of 1870: "Our records may be searched in vain for a single act of aggression, or a single unfriendly declaration against the Northern Church." But he rejoices the more that in 1876, six years before the Concurrent Resolution, the Southern Assembly had disavowed any and all declarations of a political nature—declaring that it "does not recognize such as forming any part of the well-considered, authoritative teaching or testimony of our Church."¹⁰¹

Dr. Henry A. White, of Columbia Seminary, thus characterizes the attitude of the Southern Church toward her ideal of the non-political character of the Church, even under the stain of war. Though their members come direct to the Assembly from war and camps, "Political measures are not formulated, nor even discussed in the sessions of the General Assembly." "At no time during the struggle, however, does the Assembly declare that it is the religious duty of its members to fight for the Confederacy, nor does the Assembly adopt any rule whatsoever to require an examination of a man's political sentiments as a preliminary to his admission as a Church member."¹⁰² There doubtlessly are, here and there, in the statements of Columbia

⁹⁹Thompson, *Presbyterians*, p. 158.

¹⁰⁰*Pres. Church in S. C. Since 1850*, pp. 90-115.

¹⁰¹Palmer, *Sou. Pres. Rev.*, April, 1883, p. 319 ff.

¹⁰²White, *Sou. Pres. Leaders*, pp. 345, 347.

Seminary leaders, glorifications of history—exchanging the ideal for the actual—but even so the history of ideals is history. It need not be claimed that Columbia Seminary has attained the ideal of the spirituality of the Church, but that the institution for a century has consistently pursued that ideal. Nor that the principle of non-participation of the Church in the political or secular has, in every case, been lived up to by the ecclesiastical Courts in which the Seminary has had a voice; but that this has been maintained with such consistency as to fairly entitle it to be regarded as the working principle of these bodies.

It is not evident that this is either the ideal or the working principle of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America. The difference between this Assembly and the Old School Assembly, from which the bulk of the Southern Assembly separated, can be distinctly seen by comparing the Baltimore (Old School) Assembly of 1848 with the Baltimore (U. S. A.) Assembly of 1926. Dr. Thornwell led the former in declining to *instruct* its members to support or unite with *The American Temperance Union*; because, "The Church of Jesus Christ is a spiritual body. . . . It is hence beside the province of the Church to render its courts, which God ordains for spiritual purposes, subsidiary to the schemes of any organization founded in the human will and liable to all its changes and caprices."¹⁰³

In the Baltimore Assembly of 1926 there were three groups, The Fundamentalist or Conservative Group; the Mediating or Pacifist Group; the anti-Fundamentalist Group—so named as including those who were Liberal and those who, for other reasons, were opposed to the Fundamentalist. Each of these groups, through its spokesmen, condemned this doctrine of the non-participation by the church in political or secular matters. The anti-Fundamentalist spoke first on this subject. They kept the daily papers, before and during the Assembly,¹⁰⁴ alive with charges against a Princeton Seminary Conservative, because he had taken the ground that New Brunswick Presbytery, being a Church Court, ought not to endorse the Volstead Act. The Mediating Group was represented by Moderator Thompson.

¹⁰³*Minutes* (O. S.) 1848, p. 58.

¹⁰⁴NOTE: The writer was reading *The Baltimore Sun* and the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*.

On taking his chair, the Moderator not only pledged his loyalty to the Presbyterian Constitution, but specifically and particularly pledged his loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America—thus, from the Southern viewpoint, again binding the Church to the chariot of Caesar. Ex-Moderator Clarence E. Macartney was regarded as the spokesman of the Fundamentalists. In the course of a historical address delivered by him to this Assembly, he re-endorsed “the Spring Resolutions” of the Assembly of 1861; and maintained that these Resolutions were justified by the whole course of Presbyterian history.¹⁰⁵ Dr. Henry A. White, of Columbia Theological Seminary, who was to have represented the Southern Church, was detained in Richmond by sickness; and, therefore, no answer was made at the time to this speech.¹⁰⁶ It is not within the province of this paper to declare that the principle of non-participation in state or political matters is a sufficient one to prevent the union of the Southern Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. It is adjudged the task of the historian to say that in recent years the two bodies have shown different ideals on this subject.

For the sake of completeness two lesser objections to organic union urged by Columbia men must be touched in passing. Dr. Woodrow discusses and endorses an objection to union presented by Dr. B. M. Palmer, namely, the race problem. This is characterized as “*an insuperable barrier*.” Woodrow fears ecclesiastical unity will lead to negro social equality, ecclesiastical subjection to the negro majority—perhaps even amalgamation. He says “people at the South of different origin and blood and creed do not all mix together any better than they do in Boston itself”; and that every ecclesiastical body has “a right to choose whom it will receive into its membership.”¹⁰⁷

The reply of the Northern Assembly’s Committee on Closer Relations, that that body would favor preserving “the present boundaries

¹⁰⁵*Minutes of U. S. A. Assembly of 1926*, as far as applicable, p. 19, 154.

¹⁰⁶A more recent example of the attitude of the U. S. A. Church toward secular things is to be seen in the endorsement of a particular candidate for the presidency by Moderator H. K. Walker and by the Bd. of Xn. Education, 1928.

¹⁰⁷*Jas. Woodrow*, Aug. 25, 1887, pp. 583, 584; Dec. 22, p. 590; Jan. 5, 1888, p. 592.

and constituencies of the Presbyteries and Synods of both Churches," allayed the fears of Southern leaders on this subject.¹⁰⁸

About ten years ago Columbia Seminary was opened with an address on this subject of organic union by Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters. The new approach to the subject there presented was that the Southern Church had been providentially brought into independent existence; that she had justified her independent organic life on the field of history; that the leading and blessing of God could be seen in her life (through these dealings in providence and grace). Ought she then dissolve that independent organic life without a definite evidence of His leadership in the movement? For the Southern Church to resolve this organism into another was, in effect, to commit suicide, without, of course, the moral blame attaching to suicide.¹⁰⁹

But when organic union seemed impossible, or undesirable, the other plan, which Dr. Girardeau had foreseen as a step in the direction of organic unity, namely, local assemblies or federation, was advocated by a Columbia leader. Dr. Thornton Whaling, the President of Columbia Theological Seminary (1911-1921) was for several years on the Southern Church's ad-Interim Committee on Closer Relations.¹¹⁰ In this position he warmly advocated Federal Union. A digest of his reasons, sent by Dr. Whaling for the purpose of this history, follows:

WHY THE SOUTHERN CHURCH PREFERS FEDERAL UNION,

By Thornton Whaling, D.D., President, Columbia
Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.

"The Southern Presbyterian Church has expressed a preference for Federal Union rather than for Organic Union, and it is earnestly desired that our brethren of the U. S. A. Church should understand the reasons for this preference. If human testimony can be believed, seventy-five per-cent of our ministers and Church officers prefer Federal rather than Organic Union, and I beg the privilege of assigning some of the reasons for this widespread preference.

¹⁰⁸Letter of Jos. T. Smith, Feb. 2, 1888, *Minutes Sou. Pres. Assembly*, 1888, p. 461.

¹⁰⁹Cf. Action of Assembly of 1865, p. 358; 1882, p. 567; *Alexander's Digest*, pp. 1028-1029.

¹¹⁰*Minutes* 1920, p. 178, cf. *Alexander's Digest*, 1922, pp. 1003-1014.

"First, Federal Union is Catholic, while Organic Union is provincial. There are ten or twelve other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in our country with hundreds and hundreds of thousands of members, and any plan of union ought to take them into view.

"Federal Union contemplates the integration of these great Churches into a Federal Assembly, and is, therefore, broad in its vision and amply wide in its scope.

"Organic Union, on the other hand, is so provincial that it leaves altogether out of view those other ten great historic Churches, and narrows its scope to a union of only two Churches in the great brotherhood of more than a dozen. It is too narrow, provincial and petty, contrasted with the catholicity, breadth and scope of Federal Union.

"Second, Federal Union is tolerant, while Organic Union savors of bigotry.

"Federal Union recognizes each of the other ten or more Churches as legitimate types of Presbyterianism, wrought out of Providence of God, under the guidance of divine spirit. It believes that each one of them is as fully entitled to continual existence as any of the others. It finds a method by which, without annihilating their identity or destroying their autonomy, they can combine in one great Federal Union, while preserving the historic and traditional types to which they are committed, under the leadership of the great Head of the Church.

"Organic Union, on the other hand, regards one Church, and that (it) is true the largest Presbyterian Church numerically in the United States, but still only one type of Presbyterianism, as the exclusive, legitimate, and normal type, in conformity with which the others must finally reduce themselves. Without the use of harsh language, the distinctive Church policy certainly savors of narrowness, intolerance and bigotry.

"Third, Federal Union is forward-looking, while Organic Union is backward-looking.

"Federal Union, based on the principles of representation and federation, is the key to the future, according to the statement of great statesmen like Lloyd George and Clemenceau and others. Illustrations of its operations are manifested all around the world, and

notably in the Imperial Federal Republic of the United States. The League of Nations is a partial effort to the realizing, in international life, of this same principle. The eyes of Federal Union are fixed upon the future, in the confident faith that civil and ecclesiastical politics of life are to find the bond of unions in the practical application of these great principles.

"Organic Union, on the other hand, looks to the past, emphasizing ideas that were shimmered in 1861, and speaks loudly and emphatically about a National Church. Of course, National Churches are anachronisms. They are out of date in the twentieth century and are destined never to be in date in any subsequent period. The effort to knit sundered bonds might result in a kind of patch-work like the old crazy-quilt, but cannot give you a life organism, animated by one organic principle, as Federal Union proposes.

"Fourth, Federal Union is possible while Organic Union is impossible.

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States is ready for Federal Union and other Presbyterian Churches have indicated a willingness for such a combination. When a plan is discovered which allows brethren of all of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches to retain their distinctive principle in doctrine, government, administration and ritual, they will find no sufficient reason to decline entering into it. The Southern Church stands in readiness to enter, heartily and enthusiastically, into such a combination.

"On the other hand, Organic Union, requiring not only the Southern Church but all of the other Churches to surrender everything which they regard as distinctive and peculiar, is certain to encounter an antagonism which will make it impossible of realization in our day. Disintegration and disorganization of the Churches must be the prelude and condition which alone will make consolidation possible.

"It is a distress to many minds to find that the statesmanship of the greatest Presbyterian Church in the United States is not equal to the task of seeing that consolidation is impossible, and that real and true Federation is the key to the wise union of all of the branches of our common Presbyterianism. We love the U. S. A. Church; we do not wish to destroy it as a type of Presbyterianism, but we are not willing that it should be the only type and that all of the other

Churches consent to surrender their autonomy and be re-made again after the fashion of even the great U. S. A. Church."

While at Columbia, President Whaling advocated union along such lines of federation as the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance suggests—the giving of ecclesiastical authority to such an organization. In this way he hoped to bring together what he characterized as "the long surrendered, the too-long divided Churches of our American Presbyterianism."¹¹¹

The views of Dr. Reed, *supra*, represent Columbia Seminary's attitude as recently as that attitude has been defined.

The chief grounds for the perpetuation of the Southern Presbyterian Church, as revealed by this survey, are:—first, that the Southern Church holds to the principle of the strict spirituality of the Church, its non-participation, as a Church, in the political or the secular; while the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., still maintains the principle of the "Spring Resolutions"; secondly, the Southern Church has aimed at Confessional consistency, while "the U. S. A. Church" has been travelling in the direction of doctrinal inclusiveness. Southern leaders have felt that a union of the two bodies would result in the continual clashing of divergent principles, and promote discord rather than harmony. The differences between the two bodies in the field of Church polity will be dealt with in the next chapter. The perpetuation of the Southern Presbyterian Church is guarded by a legal seal. The Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States provides that full organic union and consolidation with any other ecclesiastical body can only be effected by the approval of two General Assemblies and the consent of three-fourths of the Presbyteries; and that this paragraph can only be amended by the same vote.¹¹²

In 1928, conversations concerning union were in progress between the Southern Presbyterian Church and the United Presbyterian Church. The Seminary was represented on the Southern Committee by its Chairman, Dr. S. L. Morris—an alumnus of the institution.¹¹³

¹¹¹Addresses before the Chicago Presbyterian Social Union 1913, cf. *Alexander's Digest* 1922, pp. 1003, 1014, etc. Minutes 1920, p. 178. Minutes, 1931.

¹¹²*The Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, Revised Edition, Richmond, 1925, Section 162.

¹¹³*Minutes Assembly* (U. S.) 1927, pp. 9, 28, 41.

Looking at this question, a question with many angles, from the one angle which has been central in this chapter, such a union could prove a safeguard for the Southern Presbyterian principle of the spirituality of the Church. The fathers of the Seminary regarded the sectional spirit as the antithesis of the non-secular spirit. To them, a *Southern* Presbyterian Church maintaining the strict spirituality of the Church would have been a paradox. The missionary work of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, by making the Church to some extent an international Church, has probably saved it from the danger inherent in the fact that it is a sectional Church—the danger of developing a sectional consciousness, of identifying the Church with the secular, political, or provincial aims and purposes of the section. But should a union be consummated on the principle of the sole Headship of Christ in His Church and the strictly spiritual character of the Church, such a union, by making the Church national rather than Southern, would more adequately safeguard the outstanding principle of the Southern Church from the danger inherent in a sectional institution.

*“In Christ there is no East nor West
In Him no South nor North.*

* * * *

*All Christly souls are one in Him
Thro’out the whole wide earth.”*

John Oxenham, 1908. Hymn 375,
The Presbyterian Hymnal, Richmond, 1927.

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AND

THE POLITY OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

THE POLITY OF JAMES HENLEY THORNWELL, THE STRUCTURAL LINES
OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Ruling Elder.

The Analogy of the Presbyterian System.

The Headship of Christ.

THE DIACONATE, A THORNWELLIAN PRINCIPLE ELABORATED BY DR.
J. L. GIRARDEAU.

THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER OF THE SOUTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The Form of Government.

The Rules of Discipline.

THORNWELL'S DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The Lord's Supper—The Doctrine of John Calvin.

Baptism—Its Matter and Its Form.

"We are not ashamed to confess that we are intensely Presbyterian." Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ by Assembly of 1861, presented by Dr. Thornwell. Minutes, p. 60.

"A catholic love for all his true people, and unshaken confidence in the divine right of the Presbyterian system: these are things which should never, by us, be disjoined." J. L. Girardeau, Historical Address before Synod of S. C. p. 78-79

THE POLITY OF JAMES H. THORNWELL

“Hyper-hyper-hyper High Church Presbyterianism”—Charles Hodge.

In the matter of Presbyterian Polity, as well as in matters of doctrine, Dr. Thornwell was a supporter of Dr. R. J. Breckenridge. Several of his most important articles on this subject are commentaries on similar articles by Breckenridge. The polity which they advocated was developed in connection with practical questions at issue in the Old School Presbyterian Church. Breckenridge, as quoted by Thornwell, maintains that Presbyterian principles of polity were complicated by the Plan of Union with Congregationalists; and that, while the paramount issue which split the Presbyterian fold in 1837 was not governmental, yet it was polity alone which made the Plan of Union unconstitutional and the Synods organized under the plan illegal. Writing in 1843, Breckenridge justifies the radical excision on the ground of polity. Because of a lack of presbyters in the constitution of these synods, he declares that the assembly of 1837 was right in annulling the Plan of Union as unconstitutional.² This gives the setting of this question in the minds of Breckenridge and Thornwell.

Dr. J. L. Girardeau, one of Dr. Thornwell's successors in the development of polity at Columbia, declared that Thornwell also felt that the principles of pure Presbyterian polity were not maintained with sufficient clearness by the Westminster Divines, owing to the several polities represented in that Assembly.³ These views left Dr. Thornwell untrammelled by any set system of polity, and allowed him freedom to study the polity of the early Christian Church for himself. There is ample evidence that he used his wide learning to gather from the Fathers the earliest polity extant. He speaks of giving the Apostolic Fathers a careful perusal;⁴ and his articles abound in references to them, to the Canons, to the Councils, to the early Greek and Latin Fathers in the originals.⁵ In view of this study it will be interesting to notice, in passing, wherein Thornwell

¹*Thornwell Coll. Writings*, Vol. IV, p. 228.

²*Thornwell*, Vol. IV, p. 49, 55, 56.

³Girardeau in *S. P. R.*, Vol. XXXII, p. 5.

⁴*Thornwell*, Vol. IV, note 1, p. 114.

⁵Notes, pp. 119, 120, 121, etc.

has been supported in particular points by more recent studies in Church Government.⁶

Thornwell's interest was not primarily academic. His discussions of polity were waged over practical questions decided in the Old School General Assemblies, particularly those of 1843 and 1860; and then re-decided for Southern Presbyterians after their separation from the Old School Assembly. That is, the principles for which Breckenridge and Thornwell contended in the Old School Assembly were not completely victorious there; but they have become the great structural lines along which the Southern Church has been organized. In the heat of the debate of 1860 Thornwell disavowed any purpose to split the Church over the differences in polity between himself and Dr. Hodge.⁷ And when the Presbyterian Church South was organized it adopted the Old Constitution of the mother Church.⁸ But by overtures, by revisions of the book of Church Order, by adopting the Book of Discipline formulated by Thornwell for the Old School Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States has become in a large measure the embodiment of the Thornwellian Polity. Alexander's Digest 1922 (p. 103) gives a typical way in which this change has taken place. In 1843 the General Assembly decided that the presence of elders was not necessary to constitute a quorum of a regular Presbytery.⁹ Breckenridge and Thornwell wrote vigorously against this view.¹⁰ After the Southern secession, Thornwell's home Synod (South Carolina) overtured the Southern Assembly in regard to the necessity for the presence of a ruling elder. In 1871 the question was again raised by the review of the minutes of Synod of South Carolina. Alexander adds a note that, "The new book of Church Order provides (paragraph 4) that the presence of at least one ruling elder is necessary to a quorum of Presbytery."

⁶NOTE: Lack of space forbids a treatment of the not less radical differences between Thornwell's views and those of more recent students. E. g., Thornwell's views of the *jus divinum* of the Church's constitution would probably be characterized by Harnack. Sohm and other scholars hereafter mentioned as Catholicism in contra-distinction from primitive Christianity. Cf. Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church*, N. Y., 1910, pp. 3, 4, 232, 245, 253; note Sohm's Theory, pp. 177, 183.

⁷Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 233.

⁸Alexander's Digest, 1922, p. 1.

⁹Minutes of General Assembly of 1843. pp. 190, 196, 198, 199, 203.

¹⁰Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 43, ff p. 115, ff, etc.

The principles as enunciated were as much Breckenridge's as Thornwell's; but as embodied in the Southern Church they were Thornwell's. Breckenridge stayed with the old Church. Thornwell guided the shaping of the new. His work was enshrined in his pupils and fellow professors in Columbia Seminary, in the Synod of South Carolina, and finally in the whole Southern Church. Today his name is one to "conjure" with in Southern Presbyterian Polity. For example, Dr. Thomas Cary Johnson, of Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, Virginia), stops in his discussion of Calvin's Contribution to Church Polity to mention one other of the occasional successors of Calvin in the field of polity. He mentions James Henley Thornwell.¹¹

The Ruling Elder

The particular practical issues which directed Thornwell's attention to Presbyterian polity were two decisions by the "Old School" Assembly of 1843. These declared that elders were not necessary to constitute a quorum of Presbytery; and that they were not entitled to lay hands on Ministers of the Word in ordination.¹² These decisions were understood by Thornwell to imperil the whole authority and position of the Ruling Elder. He began a careful study of this subject, and as a result enunciated principles that go to the foundation of the question of the place, position, and meaning of the office of Ruling Elder, "of the whole analogy of Presbyterian polity," and the headship of Christ in and over His Church.

The corner stone in Thornwell's polity is the office of the eldership. His declaration of the identity of the primitive presbyter and bishop¹³ has received the endorsement of a wide circle of Anglican scholars, following the publication of Bishop Lightfoot's *Essay on the Christian Ministry* in 1868.¹⁴ This school is frank to acknowledge that the episcopate developed out of the presbyterate by elevation, rather than out of the apostolate by localization (p. 196). Among those who follow Lightfoot's views may be mentioned: Dr.

¹¹*Calvin Memorial Addresses*, Pres. Committee of Publ., Richmond, Va., 1909, p. 87. Cf. Eugene Daniel—*Church Polity and Worship*, pp. 152, 3 in *Memorial Volume of West. Assembly*—Pres. Comm. of Publ., Richmond, 1897.

¹²*Minutes* of 1843, pp. 190, 196, 199-201, 178, 181, 182, 183. Cf. Moffatt, James, *The Presbyterian Churches*, N. Y., 1928, pp. 115-116.

¹³*Works*, Vol. IV, p. 132.

¹⁴Dissertation published with St. Paul's Epistle to Philippians by J. B. Lightfoot, 1915, Macmillan, p. 181.

H. M. Gwatkins, *Early Church History*; Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, *Essay on Christian Ministry* in Swete, *Early History of the Church and the Ministry*; Dr. Edwin Muller, Cambridge Episcopal Theological School. Of the liberal school, Dr. F. Loofs, accepting the late dating of Acts and the Pastorals, still holds to the identity of the two offices;¹⁵ and Dr. George La Piana presents a similar view in his Lectures on *The History of Christian Institutions*.

Dr. Thornwell made the presbyter the first and fundamental permanent officer.¹⁶ Mgr. Pierre Batiffol, a French Roman Catholic scholar, in *Primitive Catholicism* holds that the Church began under an initially intended government (pages 36-96, 149); that the Church was saved by a power representing Jesus (p. 150); that these presbyters are "the earliest permanent ecclesiastical function which history records" (p. 151); that Paul's final instructions to Timothy imply that on the death of Timothy this delegate and disciple is to be replaced only by the presbyterium (1 Tim, 4:14) of every church (pp. 117, 118); that these presbyters are at the head of the local church to govern and instruct it (p. 117).¹⁷ Dr. Moffatt quotes similar views from Prof. Emil Metzner, *Die Verfassung der Kirche in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten* (p. 142).¹⁸

Canon Streeter's hypothesis that there was no one form of government in the early Church is really based on the phenomena that elders are not mentioned in the important corporate act taken by the great Church at Antioch (Acts 13: 1 ff.). The position of Streeter is valid against Dr. Hodge's conception of presbyters. If the presbyter was primarily a teacher (or preacher), why is he not named among those who were leading the worship in Antioch? But the objection will not stand against the Thornwellian polity. Antioch recognized elders as the proper governing and administrative officers in her several contacts with the Jerusalem Church (Acts 11:30; 15), and her missionaries elected elders to govern the Gentile churches (Acts 14:23). Any argument *e silentio* is precarious. But, if Streeter insists on an inference concerning the government at Antioch,

¹⁵T. M. Lindsay—*The Church and the Ministry*—presents Loof's views as given in *Studien und Kritiken* for 1890, p. 375.

¹⁶Works, Vol. IV, p. 532.

¹⁷Batiffol—*Primitive Catholicism*, Longmans, Green & Co, 1911, cf. Gore—*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, Scribners, N. Y., 1924, pp. 13, 42, 51, 139 (note), 140, 143.

¹⁸Moffatt—*The Pres. Churches*, p. 13.

it is more reasonable to infer from Antioch's regular recognition of elders in her contacts with other churches that there were elders governing and administering the Antiochian Church than to infer the contrary. Dr. F. J. A. Hort is, therefore, on safer ground than Canon Streeter.¹⁹

In sifting out the question of the eldership, Thornwell took the position "that Pastor, Bishop and Presbyter are different names of precisely the same office."²⁰ He holds that the Ruling Elder is fundamentally the Presbyter of Scripture (p. 104). The view of his opponent seems to have been that the Presbyter of Scripture is represented by the Presbyterian Preacher, and therefore a *jus divinum presbyterii* can only be plead for the Preacher (p. 107, 108, etc.).²¹

Thornwell tries to go to the bottom of the matter. He shows that Presbyter and Preacher were not originally interchangeable terms. That in the synagogue the Presbyter was a ruler, tho not a preacher (p. 117). He holds that the same was true in the early church; "that presbyter as a title of office means a ruler and nothing more than a ruler." "The eldership as such never includes teaching; this is always a superadded function" (p. 119). An examination of the correlated terms Pastor or Shepherd, Bishop, Rulers (Rectors), etc., is made in the Septuagint, classical Greek, the New Testament, the Fathers, the Jewish usage. Thornwell holds that Ambrose is right (commenting on Ephesians IV p. 118) in making Pastor the synonym of Ruler. He maintains that Bishop means what its English transliteration implies, "overseer." Thornwell holds that *episkopoi* was originally the Greek usage for the Hebrew, *zekenim*, with a connotation and significance from the Attic Civil administration, *overseers* (p. 124-131). Thornwell's view, that the synagogue presbyter was not a preacher, but a ruler; and that the synagogue had influence on the Christian practices seems to be generally held by recent authorities on the subject of Judaism.²² Dr. Hatch in the Bampton Lectures

¹⁹Cf. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, pp. 78-80; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 90-91.

²⁰Coll. Writings, Vol. IV, p. 110.

²¹Hodge, Charles, *Church Polity*, pp. 265, 276. Thornwell, pp. 107, 108, etc.

²²Easton, B.S., *A Study of the Presbyterate*, *The Churchman*, May 2, 1931, pp. 10-11. Gwatkins, H. M. in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, 301 cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, pp. 285, 289, 305; Harnack, *Law and Constitution*, note p. 191; Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Churches*, pp. 57-62, 67.

distinguishes the Bishop and the Elder; but he agrees with Thornwell, to this extent: he regards them both as more nearly rulers than preachers. He regards the Elder as the guardian of discipline and conduct (p. 56), and the Bishop as the business and financial administrator (p. 36, 46). Bishop Lightfoot, in his *Essays on the Christian Ministry*, declares that government was probably the first conception of the presbyter's office (p. 194).

Professor Burton Scott Easton, another Episcopal scholar, holds that the Jewish presbyter was ordained to rule, and as a presbyter had nothing to do with the actual conduct of Israel's worship. Further, that the Christian conception of the presbyterate paralleled the Jewish at every point; so that the only blessing sought for the newly ordained presbyter was the grace of counsel that he might "rule."²³

Even Princeton's New Testament department seems to have swung from Hodge to Thornwell's view. Purves declares that "the eldership was not primarily a teaching office. Its functions were chiefly disciplinary and executive."²⁴

The whole Harnackian emphasis on the itinerant ministry tends to put the presbyter, as of the local ministry, *primarily* in the place of a ruler and not of a preacher. In one place Thornwell seems to have foreshadowed Harnack's view of the *Lehrgabe*²⁵ as the special possession of the General Ministry. He says "that Presbyters as such were not entitled to preach, nor Preachers as such entitled to rule, would seem to be an obvious conclusion from the marked difference which the Apostle repeatedly makes between the gift of teaching and the gift of government. Rulers and Teachers are different endowments with which the ascending Saviour furnished the church, and no ingenuity of criticism can fasten the same signification upon such terms as *doctrine* and *government*. The miraculous gifts, too, which according to Paul (1 Cor. XIII, 8) were speedily to cease—the gifts of prophecy, tongues, and knowledge—all had evident reference to the function of teaching. *The extraordinary officers who possessed these functions were certainly Teachers*; and yet, from the fact that they did not continue to adorn the church beyond the age

²³The Churchman, May 2, 1931, pp. 10-11.

²⁴Purves, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 94.

²⁵Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church*, pp. 23, 24, 25, 58, 59.

of the Apostles, it may be safely inferred that they were not Presbyters."²⁶

Such a statement logically brings up the question of the relation of the Minister of the Word to the Ruling Elder. Thornwell's doctrine is that a Presbyterian Preacher has a right to rule *qua* presbyter, not *qua* preacher.²⁷ The form of government denominates the Preacher a Presbyter, since it is "his duty . . . to govern well in the house of God." He shares with the Ruling Elder the term Presbyter in that both are appointed to rule (p. 105). As a minister of the Word, the rulers of the Church have oversight over the Preacher, and he has oversight over no one (except himself). His duty is to declare the whole counsel of God, and the duty of the rulers of the church is to take care that he does this. It is only *qua* Presbyter that the Preacher has rule and oversight (p. 113). Therefore Thornwell holds "that all church authority is vested exclusively in the hands of Elders (Presbyters of both kinds ruling only, and ruling plus teaching), and the right of bearing rule in the house of God is the distinctive peculiarity of their office." Further, "that all Presbyters or Elders are equal and, when convened in ecclesiastical courts, are entitled to the exercise of the same rights and privileges." "The right of rule pertains to Ministers of the Gospel, not as Preachers but as Elders" (p. 132). He holds that both ministers of the Word and Ruling Elders are representatives of the people, elected by them—their "chosen rulers."

Thornwell then understands the Preacher to be one species of the genus Presbyter. He adduces 1 Tim. 5:17 as "THE NEGATIVE INSTANCE" to show that Presbyter and Preacher are not interchangeable terms (p. 106, 107).

Commenting on the same text Hort affirms: "The distinction implies with tolerable certainty that teaching was not a universal function of the Elders of Ephesus."²⁸

The specific difference which marks out the species Preacher from that species of Presbyter which only rules is the lawful authority to preach. *Presbyter* means simply a ruler, and the office of Preacher a function superadded to the Presbyterate. The Preacher in the

²⁶Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 118.

²⁷*Ibid*, p. 113.

²⁸*The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 196.

primitive church was selected from the consistory, and in the age of Ignatius was distinguished from the Presbyters by title of Bishop; it was owing to accidental circumstances that the Presbyters ever came to be Preachers. "I can trace in Ignatius the Constitution of our own church."²⁹ It was the specific duty of every Presbyter to rule; but there was nothing in the nature of that office to prevent the individual who filled it from adding to its duties the function of public instruction. 1 Tim. 5:17 shows that some elders did in fact preach. However, "the eldership, as such, never includes teaching: this is always a superadded function, and it is not in consequence of his Presbyterian authority that an Elder preaches." For obvious reasons, the Elder who preaches would always be the Moderator, or president of the council of his brethren. All originally were equally Bishops of the Church, but in the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles Bishop generally became restricted to the Presbyter who preached (p. 118, 119)—i. e. because he always presided over the Presbytery. "He differed from his brethren in nothing but the authority to preach and administer the sacraments; the dispensation of the sacraments being, in fact, only a symbolic method of preaching, and, therefore, an exclusive function of the Preacher's office. Filling this double function the preaching Presbyter received double honor, a double share in the affections of the people, the high distinction of a permanent presidency." Thornwell cites letters of Ignatius, Polycarp, Cyprian, and the Apostolic Constitutions to show that preaching was the characteristic distinction of him who received the special appellation of Bishop (p. 120 with notes).

This question of the elevation of the episcopate out of the presbyterate is one of the most difficult questions in Church polity. Lindsay quotes Dr. Loofs as declaring "that we just do not know how the threefold ministry rose out of the twofold."³⁰ However, much of recent scholarship would agree that Thornwell was very near the mark when he attributed to the superadded gifts of the Ministry of the Word (*Lehrgabe*), to the administration of the sacraments, to the permanent presidency of the parochial board of the elders, the explanation of the elevation of the Bishop above his peers. It has been noted that Thornwell remarked on the extraordinary ministry's pos-

²⁹Coll. Writings IV.

³⁰Lindsay, p. 376.

sessing the gift of teaching without being rulers. In one place he also seems to have had a passing glimpse at the connection between the work of Preacher and Deacon. "The Preacher shares, in common with the Deacon, the title of Minister, because both are appointed to a service, and he shares, in common with the Ruling Elder, the title of Presbyter, since both are appointed to rule" (p. 105). By widening the horizon, increasing the background, modern scholarship has shown the significance of these fleeting glimpses and filled in the picture. Hatch has pointed out the significance of that eleemosynary service in which both the President and the Deacons shared, and the part which the administration of this work had in the origin of the office of Bishop.³¹ Dr. Harnack has shown that in time the Bishop took over from the extraordinary or "charismatic" ministry a "superadded function"—the gift of teaching.³² In his careful studies in the *History of Christian Institutions*, Dr. George La Piana has shown that the local officers early had a certain vital spiritual function—the right to administer the sacraments. A doctrine of redemption is expressed in the sacramental rites. In the absence of the itinerant ministry the duty of administering the sacraments fell to the presbyters, and in particular to their president. Ignatius attributed the right to supervise the administration solely to the Bishop. The spiritual power of the Bishop is thus allied with the administration of the sacraments.³³

The suggestions of the Lightfoot school (Lightfoot p. 199) that the personal prestige and influence of individual leading Presbyters such as James, Ignatius and Polycarp ought also be taken into any compendium of the situation or situations;³⁴ as well as such factors as the inexperience of the membership; the need for unified control and uniformity of worship, and the dangers from persecution and speculation which the Church was facing.³⁵

In regard to the Ministry of the Word, Thornwell holds this office to be the immediate call of God. Men should not be urged to go into

³¹*The Organization of the Early Churches*, pp. 26-55.

³²*Law and Constitution*, p. 92.

³³Lectures on *History of Christian Institutions*—Harvard University Session 1926-1927.

³⁴This development was neither the same nor simultaneous in different parts of the Church.

³⁵NOTE: Dr. La. Piana attributes to the desire for the simultaneous observance of Easter the carrying through of a real episcopal authority in Rome by Bishop Victor—*History of Christian Institutions*.

the Ministry, merely because they can give no reason for not doing so. They ought not to go in at all unless they have the best possible reason for doing so—a definite consciousness that the Ministry is God's call to them—God's will for their lives. "The grand and ultimate fact is the call of God." The proofs of this call are: (1) the inward testimony of a man's own conscience; (2) the approbation of the Christian people manifested through the call of some particular congregation; (3) the authorization of a divinely constituted spiritual court, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.³⁶

The Analogy of the Presbyterian System

Dr. Thornwell holds that the cardinal and the distinctive principle of our polity is the government of the Church by free representative assemblies. "Ours is a government, not by Presbyters, but by Presbyteries." It is not in the hands of individual officers but in the hands of officers chosen by the people, judicially convened.³⁷

Further, he maintains that our government embodies that principle of checks and balances which is expressed in the bicameral character of modern legislative assemblies (p. 63, 64). Without having two chambers, the Presbyterian Courts observe the same principle by having, in one court and council, two classes of representatives. "The Ministers are a check upon the Elders, and the Elders are a check upon the Ministers, and the higher (courts) are checks upon the lower courts. The object of the check is to promote the discovery of truth by bringing different views and different modes of thought into collision—by securing certainty of full and free discussion (p. 63)." A government solely in the hands of the Ministers creates a privileged class and *the people* lose their place in its government. A government, exclusively in the hands of the Ruling Elders, would lean too much to popular will (p. 64). The ministerial habits of retirement, study, meditation on abstract and general principles, furnish the check which the Ruling Elders need. The double representative discourages equally ecclesiastical despotism and popular passion. These two principles Thornwell calls the analogy of our system (p. 67).

³⁶Thornwell, IV, *The Call of the Minister*, p. 11-42.

³⁷Vol. IV, p. 62.

His description of a Commonwealth in the State is an exact picture, in its essential features, of Presbyterian government in the Church (p. 62). But Thornwell is very careful to define wherein that parallel, picture, or analogy lies. If the essential principle of American state polity be, as Lincoln defined it at Gettysburg, "government of the people, for the people, by the people,"³⁸ Thornwell would deny the parallel in church polity. He carefully distinguishes the representative in his definition from the delegate (p. 98). The delegate is the *locum tenens* of his principal (p. 99). The definition of representative is radically and essentially different therefrom. He is a confidential agent, pursuing the dictates of his own understanding and bound to act in conformity with his own convictions of right (pp. 99-100). He deliberates and acts for his constituency; but upon his own personal responsibility, regardless of their temporary whims or caprices. Burke manifested the true ideal of a representative when he declared to the electors of Bristol, "I did not obey your instructions; no! I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interests against your opinions, with a constancy that became me." (Quoted page 100). Representative government differs from a pure democracy, in being essentially a limitation upon the people. The people choose representatives because it is not safe for them to rule themselves. The people form a constitution to prevent the accumulation of too much power in their own hands. This constitution is the immediate source of all power to all the representatives chosen under it. They are to obey it rather than the will of those who elected them (p. 100). "The representatives possess powers and discharge functions to which their constituents as a mass can lay no claim." In the Church the representative government is not, as in the State, even ultimately the creature of the people; it is the direct appointment of Christ and the powers and duties of ecclesiastical representatives are prescribed and defined in the Word of God, the real constitution of the Church" (p. 101).³⁹ The people were never given any right to exercise jurisdiction or to administer discipline. They have no right to appear in Session or Presbytery. "The business of the people is to elect the men who give sufficient

³⁸The first two of these phrases were used by Dr. Thomas Cooper in 1794. Cooper was a bitter opponent of Burke. Malone, pp. 77, 49.

³⁹Similarly Moffatt for Godet, Gillespie, and himself. *The Presbyterian Churches*, N. Y., 1928, pp. 22, 23.

evidence that they are fitted by the Spirit to fill the offices which Christ had appointed" (p. 101). These men represent the people in the sense that they are the choice of the people—their chosen rulers. They are not the tools of the people. They are to administer the laws of the Saviour; and to receive no authoritative instructions but those which have proceeded from the throne of God (p. 101). Thus Thornwell denies that the rights, powers, and authority of the Ruling Elders are in any sense delegated from the people (p. 132). By government by representative assemblies he does not mean democracy.

In Thornwell's analogy, then, church power is conceived as *in actu primo* in the Church (p. 97). But this primary power simply vests the priesthood of believers with the choice of rules (p. 98, p. 138). Thornwell does not mean by power *in actu primo* that the membership confers authority on the officer holder. He means that office holders are in the body of the Church, and thus that all power is potentially in the Church. The extent of the power of members consists in their election of their chosen rulers. But power *in actu secundo*, i. e. in its exercise, is in the hands of office holders (p. 97). The part of the people is more the duty of choosing the men who give sufficient evidence that they are fitted by the Spirit to fill the offices Christ has appointed. They are "called by Christ through the free choice of the people" (p. 138). The endeavor of the people is not that their opinions be maintained by their officers, but that God's will be done (p. 163). Their selection of their officers is, fundamentally, a ratification of God's choice as He has manifested that choice in spiritual gifts. The fact that the people are allowed to make this choice is more a manifestation of God's confidence in them than of their inherent powers.

Starting from different presuppositions, and studying the subject purely as a historical problem, a group of modern scholars have arrived at positions similar to Dr. Thornwell on this point. Sohm's theory as presented by Dr. Harnack is that "election (by the people) is nothing but a testimony to the presence of the charismata; i. e. election simply confirms and makes plain to everyone the choice really brought about by God."⁴⁰

⁴⁰*The Constitution and Law of the Church*, pp. 197, cf. 209 note, 224, 226, cf. Harnack (*ibid*), p. 241.

Dr. George La Piana points out that, as the matter lay in the consciousness of the Church, the government of the Church was not a *democracy*; but a *pneumatocracy*—not a government by the people, but a government by “the Spirit.” This government lacked the fundamental requirement of democracy, namely *the delegation of powers* from the people to their officers. In a democracy the ultimate source of authority is in the people. They delegate their authority to chosen individuals, which act is a real investiture of authority to govern. But, according to the theology of the Christian Church, authority is religious; the Spirit ruled the Church; officers received their authority from above.⁴¹

That the people are privileged to discern and to declare those whom God has chosen is a certain seal to the priesthood of believers; not democracy’s right to name her spokesmen. Elders are representatives of the people, but delegates of God (p. 138). Their choice⁴² is not so much a citizen’s rule as it is a Christian’s obedience to God’s will; not only a right, but also duty; not so much a power as a privilege. As a balance, however, it is emphatically stated that every officer is a minister, given by God, to minister to the Church. The officers exist for the Church—not the Church for the officers (p. 19).^{42b}

The Headship of Christ

It will be seen that in this analogy Thornwell is most zealous for the place and authority of Christ. To say the least, it was a proper Providence that, in the organization of that communion which embodies Thornwell’s polity, the distinctive slogan was declared to be the Headship of Christ.

In the organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church this slogan had primary reference to the disentanglement of the Church from political matters—the non-secularization of the Church. And in this primary matter it should be said that Thornwell was no opportunist. His positions in regard to the Church’s keeping free from matters of State and other secular movements were maintained

⁴¹Lectures on the *History of Christian Institutions*, Harvard University Session 1926-1927.

⁴²Cf. Alexander’s *Digest*, Revised 1922, p. 102, section 222.

^{42b}Cf. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, Vol. V, Lausanne, 1917, pp. 156-163.

previously to 1861 on the floor of the Old School Assembly, as has been shown.⁴³

Dr. Palmer, in his *Life and Letters of Thornwell*, narrates Thornwell's opposition to a paper introduced into the 1859 Assembly commending the African colonization scheme. Sitting next to Thornwell, Palmer aroused him from a doze and whispered the occasion to him. Thornwell presented his views as follows: "The Church is exclusively a *spiritual* organization, and possesses only a *spiritual* power. Her business is with the salvation of men; and she has no mission to care for the things or to become entangled with the kingdom and policy of this world." Our beloved Zion stands "the beauty of the land"; because the only voice she utters is the Word of God; because no word is heard in her councils but His. "Let our Church lend herself, in the name of the Lord and in her own proper sphere, to her own mission, and her enemies will never rejoice over trophies won from her. The salt that is to save this country is the Church of Christ, a church that does not mix up with any political Party or any issue aside from her direct mission."⁴⁴ The same principles are maintained at length in his article on the Relation of the Church to Slavery, published in his *Collected Writings* p. 381 ff; and first written as a report to the Synod of S. C. 1851.

Whatever may be thought of Thornwell's position in regard to the relation of Church and State, he must be credited with consistency therein. When Thornwell led the Southern Presbyterians in a new organization as a protest against the Old Assembly's decree of loyalty to the Washington government, he was simply acting according to his stated convictions—and convictions which he had helped write into the legislative acts of former Old School Assemblies.⁴⁵

The Headship of Christ receives repeated and emphatic statement in the polity of James Henley Thornwell.^{45b}

First, the sole Headship and Kingship of Christ is set over against any allegiance due by the Church to any State or government. The Southern organization flung again to the breezes the Blue Banner with the inscription "For Christ's Crown and Covenant." "The

⁴³*Minutes of General Assembly Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.*, Vol. XII, 1848, pp. 58, 59. *Minutes of General Assembly* 1845, pp. 16, 17, 18.

⁴⁴Palmer, *Life and Letters of James H. Thornwell*, p. 437, cf. *Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. IV, pp. 472-478.

⁴⁵Assembly 1845, *Minutes*, pp. 16-18; Assembly 1848, *Minutes*, pp. 58-59.

^{45b}Cf. Doumergue, "Toujours la Christocratie," p. 38.

Church and the State" are as planets moving in different orbits and unless each is confined to its own track the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as a collision of different spheres in the world of matter."⁴⁶

√ Secondly, the material principle, answering to this formal principle, is the *spirituality* of the Church. She is to recognize the headship of Christ by confining her sphere of labour to those things which He has commissioned her to do, i. e. preach the gospel of free salvation through His atonement; edify His body—the Church; witness for the truth; take order for the extension of the Kingdom into all the world. She is to have no connection with political or moral voluntary societies.⁴⁷

{ Thirdly, the Headship of Christ is maintained by the proclamation of the Scriptures as the only and *sufficient rule of faith and practice*. The Bible is the law of the Church. The Church is to declare and minister Christ's law. She can make no requirement binding the conscience of men without a scriptural *warrant*, explicit or implied (p. 163). The Christian presbyters should legislate only in the sense in which the Jewish presbyters legislated—"they interpreted the Law of God."⁴⁸

{ Fourthly, the Headship of Christ is recognized in the endeavor to ascertain and conform to *de pure divino* church polity. The Scriptures are made the Constitution of the Church. Thornwell maintains that the polity of the Church in its regulative and in its constitutive principles is there revealed (p. 252). He professes to find there his organic and his architectonic principles; and to confine the discretionary power to "the circumstantialia of commanded things" (p. 259). Beyond this he held, with Dr. Cunningham of Edinburgh, that nothing should be introduced into the government and worship of the Church, unless a positive warrant for it could be found in Scripture (p. 249). On this ground Thornwell contended against the Board organization of the "Old School" Church, and advocated Executive Committees in lieu thereof. Committees he held were circumstances common to parliamentary bodies and indispensa-

⁴⁶Thornwell, IV, p. 449.

⁴⁷*Ibid*, pp. 472-478.

⁴⁸Easton, *The Churchman*, May 2, 1931, p. 10.

ble to their orderly and efficient conduct of business. Boards, as then organized, he considered unwarranted.⁴⁹

"The Church in all her operations, both at home and abroad, must act not *indirectly* through great Boards which can never meet, and which constitute only a barrier between her and her work, but directly through Executive Committees small enough to meet often and actually to do what is committed to them."⁵⁰

This Thornwellian doctrine resulted in the modification of the Boards in the Old School Assembly;⁵¹ and in the substitution of Executive Committees, directly accountable to the General Assembly, for Church Boards in the Southern Presbyterian Assembly.⁵²

Fifthly, the doctrine of the Headship of Christ in Presbyterian Polity was given a vitality, which is sometimes lacking, by the recognition that all the officers of the Church in their positions, rights, powers, authority, empowering gifts, equipment, are the immediate appointment and institution of Christ.⁵³ The chosen rulers are those whom He has called, and equipped with His Holy Spirit and given to the Church to minister unto her. They are delegates of Christ—not delegates of the people. This capstone rounds out the polity, putting in a vital touch by giving each officer the loftiest sense of his high calling in Christ.

Dr. J. B. Adger, in his article entitled *Memorial of James Henley Thornwell, D.D., LL. D.*, names nine particular positions of Dr. Thornwell on Polity.^{54a} All of these nine have been covered in our previous discussion, except the following:

"4. That the deacon is not to be connected with the lowest church court merely, but may be employed by the upper courts to keep the charge of all their pecuniary and other secular affairs."

"7. That giving of our substance is an act of worship to Almighty God."

"8. In respect to church discipline, etc."

⁴⁹Vol. IV, p. 237.

⁵⁰Adger, *Memorial to J. H. Thornwell, Semi-Centennial*, p. 192.

⁵¹*Minutes of Assembly of 1860*, p. 46. Thornwell. Vol. IV, p. 239.

⁵²*Alexander's Digest*, Revised 1922, p. 169. The Southern Assembly of 1927 modified this direct mode of action by its new Assembly's Work Committee, *Minutes 1927*, pp. 28, 32, 134. The dissolution of "The Committee of Forty-four" by the Assembly of 1931 was a return to Thornwell's principle.

⁵³Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 132.

⁵⁴*Semi-Centennial of C. T. S.*, p. 192.

"9. I may add that Dr. Thornwell held distinctly to Calvin's peculiar doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of Baptism, and that he showed indisputably that the Church of Rome has corrupted the one as well as the other" (pp. 192, 193).

Of these four, the mere statement of that one numbered seven would seem to be sufficient, while the one numbered eight will be taken up in the study of the Book of Discipline. The two questions of the diaconate and the sacraments remain to be discussed. These subjects of Thornwellian Polity have to be studied mainly from the writings of his colleagues and disciples, Drs. Girardeau and Adger; since Thornwell's views on these subjects have not been fully elaborated in his own writings.^{54b}

THE DIACONATE, A THORNWELLIAN PRINCIPLE ELABORATED BY
DR. J. L. GIRARDEAU.

Dr. Girardeau develops the doctrine of the diaconate in a series of articles published in the Southern Presbyterian Review from 1879. to 1881.⁵⁵ In the first article the relation to the presbyterate is defined.⁵⁶ Dr. Girardeau starts with the assumptions that the office of deacon was instituted by Christ (p. 2); that it is perpetual; that its function is not preaching, but distribution; that its ends are temporal in contra-distinction from spiritual; that election is by the people (p. 2); that ordination thereto is by the congregational presbytery with prayer and the imposition of hands (p. 3). He holds that the presbyterate and diaconate are the two orders of the ministry; that the one terminates on persons and the other on ecclesiastical goods; the one has to do with the cure of souls, the other with the care of the bodies (pp. 4, 5). He maintains, at length, that the higher office does not regularly include the lower office (p. 5 ff). Among the inferences from this position are: that the Minister of the Word is not *ex-officio* moderator of the board of deacons; that the Deacon's Courts are invalid; that where the proper duties of deacons are to be discharged the deacon ought to be assigned to their performance and not the presbyter (pp. 24, 25).

The Scope of the Deacon's Functions is dealt with in a second article. The primary work of the deacon is the care of the poor;

^{54b}Cf. However on the Diaconate. *Thornwell's Coll. Writings*, Vol. IV, pp. 154, 155, 199, 200, 201.

⁵⁵Vol. XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

⁵⁶Vol. XXX, p. 1-31.

construed as the poor of the church, Christian strangers, the poor of the world (pp. 117, 137).⁵⁷

Not only the care of the poor but "the management of all ecclesiastical goods and property ought to be committed to the deacons, as officers of Christ's appointment" (p. 137). This position is argued on the basis of "certain great undisputed principles" (138), to-wit: that Christ is the sole Prophet whose instructions the Church is to obey; that He has left none of the real wants of the Church unsupplied; that she has a temporal as well as a spiritual side; that without warrant from His word no office can be introduced into the Church (p. 138). Thus, reasoning from the analogy of the deacon's office as related to the temporal relief of the poor, contemplating its very genius and spirit, he holds it to be a legitimate inference that whatever other functions of a temporal character are to be performed for the benefit of the Church should be imposed likewise upon him who was designated and known as the temporal officer (p. 142). Dr. Girardeau's case for committing all the temporalities to the deacons can be strengthened by the consideration that the care for the poor and the strangers almost covered "the temporalities" of the early church.⁵⁸

Inferences from this conclusion are that the appointment of trustees (other than the ordained deacons) is unwarranted (p. 139). Deacons ought to be used to collect benevolent offerings of the congregation; both those regularly given at the Church worship, and those collected from individual donors, e. g. for the support of a Theological Seminary (pp. 153-155).

A third article stresses *The Importance of the Office of Deacon*. Girardeau affirms that, in the discussion of the Board question in the Old School Assembly, "Dr. Thornwell took very strong ground in regard to the employment of deacons in connection with the executive agencies charged with the prosecution of the benevolent enterprises of the church."⁵⁹

The importance of the office in meeting the needs of the poor is magnified. "Jesus still walks in this vale of tears as personated by

⁵⁷Vol. XXXI, pp. 117-160.

⁵⁸Cf. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Churches*. Bampton Lectures of 1880, pp. 32-36. Fifth Ed. London, 1895. "Charity was of the essence of the Christian Associations. The eleemosynary element was very prominent," p. 36.

⁵⁹S. P. R. Vol. XXXII, p. 6.

Cf. Doumergue, p. 62. The need of the poor is a function in alienable from the Church.

His poor and needy brethren" (p. 8). Those shod with the sandals of diaconal service are urged to hasten their charities (p. 10). "The rich and the poor are harmonized upon the diaconate. It is the divinely erected breakwater against the irruption of agrarianism, communism, and every kind of leveling theory, against the 'peace and order of the Christian commonwealth'" (p. 11).

The purpose of the article is that the office should not be limited to this primary function. They should see to the support of the ministry (p. 28); promote benevolent enterprises and institutions, e. g. Foreign Missions (p. 20); and their functions ought not to be confined to a single congregation.⁶⁰ The deacon, as an officer of the church, ought to be used by the higher courts to care for the temporal interests of the Church at large (p. 191). This position is argued from Scriptures (pp. 191-195); from the analogy of the Presbyterian System (pp. 195-199); from "the actual practice of our Church" (pp. 199-203); from testimonies from R. J. Breckenridge and J. H. Thornwell.⁶¹

The summation of the discussion on the diaconate includes the doctrine that deacons ought to perform all diaconal functions; that boards of trustees, having ecclesiastical business of a purely financial character to manage, should consist only of deacons, e. g.—the Board of Trustees of the General Assembly, of the Committee of Education, of Publication, of Home and Foreign Missions; that deacons should perform the diaconal functions of executive committees of Synods and Presbyteries, and of Boards of Directors of theological seminaries.⁶²

Dr. Girardeau made a strong effort to give a worthwhile place and work to an office which, as Dr. George La Piana has well said, has seldom been regarded in any branch of the Christian Church as of permanent importance. Girardeau closes one of his articles with a touching appeal to the Great Exemplar:

"It is a striking fact that the Lord Jesus, in His sojourn on earth, did not occupy the outward seat of the ruler—He condescended to appear as a prisoner at the bar of the eldership of His own visible Church. But, as the great Deacon of Israel, He declared that He

⁶⁰Vol. XXXI, p. 191.

⁶¹*Collected Writings*, Vol. IV, pp. 154, 155, 199, 200, 201, 204, 206.

⁶²*S. P. R.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 208-209. Cf. Palmer, *Life of Thornwell*, p. 230.

came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; and illustrated the noble unselfishness of that utterance by the untiring dispensation of healing to the suffering bodies of men. Having closed His wondrous mission of beneficence to the poor diseased body, it is affecting to contemplate Him, entitled, as He was, to the submission and homage of a prostrate universe, bearing a towel and a basin, the symbols of a servant. Him, before Whom every knee shall bow in heaven, earth and hell, bending His knee and washing His disciples' feet. In the discharge of their peculiar duties it will be glory to deacons to walk in His footsteps, and imitate His example of compassionate ministration to the temporal wants of men."⁶³

A comparison of the *Book of Church Order* of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. with the *Book of Church Order* of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., shows that the labors of Dr. Girardeau in reference to the diaconate have not been in vain. The care of all the temporalities of the Church, collecting and distributing funds, care of the property, as well as the care of the poor, is committed by the Southern Church to the deacons. The deacons may be appointed by the higher courts to serve on committees, as trustees of any fund held by any court, and may devise plans of church finance.⁶⁴ Like the elders, they are ordained in the Southern Church by prayer and the imposition of hands.⁶⁵ They elect their own Chairman of their number,⁶⁶ and receive the Pastor as an advisory member, not as *ex-officio* Chairman.⁶⁷

In the *Form of Government* of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.⁶⁸ the temporalities may be entrusted to the deacons; in practice they generally are entrusted to a distinct board of Trustees;⁶⁹ the pastor is *ex-officio* moderator of the Board of Deacons (Ibid sect. 3); ordination is only by prayer;⁷⁰ higher judicatories make no provision for deacons.

⁶³S. P. R., XXXI, p. 28.

⁶⁴*The Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.* Revised Edition, 1925, Richmond, Va., Pres. C. of Publ., pp. 21, 22.

⁶⁵Paragraph 48, p. 33.

⁶⁶Paragraph 148, p. 80.

⁶⁷Paragraph 47, p. 22.

⁶⁸*The Constitution of the Pres. Ch. of U. S. A.*, Philadelphia Pres. Bd. of Publ. 1921.

⁶⁹Chapter XXV, section 6, p. 396.

⁷⁰Chapter XIII, section IV, p. 373.

THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER

The first Southern Assembly simply adopted the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in which was specifically included the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline, only substituting the term "Confederate States" for "United States." The resolutions to this effect were presented by Dr. Thornwell, and the motion made by Dr. Leland.⁷¹ But even the brief alterations in the Constitution made by the Augusta Assembly necessitated a new edition of the book, and this necessity occasioned the appointment of a committee to revise the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline.⁷² This committee consisted of: J. H. Thornwell, D.D.; R. L. Dabney, D.D.; B. M. Smith, D.D.; J. B. Adger, D.D., and E. T. Baird, D.D.; Ministers; with Ruling Elders W. P. Webb, T. C. Perrin, W. L. Mitchell, Job Johnson, and (on motion of Dr. Thornwell) Judge Shepherd.⁷³

A historical sketch of the work of this committee states that Dr. Thornwell was made chairman of the committee, because he had been chairman of a committee of the Old School Assembly on the Revision of the Book of Discipline.⁷⁴

Death made sad inroads into the committee appointed by the Augusta Assembly, and the committee was re-constituted at the Assembly of 1863. Dr. John B. Adger was unanimously presented to the Assembly for chairman of this important committee,⁷⁵ and with the same unanimity W. P. Finley, Esq. and Rev. B. M. Palmer were nominated to fill other vacancies (pp. 151, 152). Dr. Adger's account of the proceedings in regard to the Book of Church Order shows that many brethren were invited to meet with the committee and make suggestions privately to the committee, both before and at the Memphis (1866) Assembly; that in this way five hundred emendations were made; and that there was comparative unanimity when the reported Book was scrutinized by the Assembly.⁷⁶ Dr. Adger's summary and defense of this first proposed form of government is as follows:⁷⁷

⁷¹*Minutes Assembly of the Pres. Church (C. S. A.)*, p. 7.

⁷²*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 7, 39, 10.

⁷³*Ibid.*, pp. 10, 11.

⁷⁴*S. P. R.*, 1867, p. 115. cf. *Assembly of 1860 (Old School)*, p. 18, etc.

⁷⁵*Minutes*, pp. 123, 127, 151, 152.

⁷⁶*S. P. R.*, July, 1867, pp. 116, 117, cf. *Minutes*, 1866, p. 37.

⁷⁷*S. P. R.*, July, 1867, p. 117.

The Proposed Form of Government.

“Taking up this part of the report, to examine it a little in detail, we notice that the whole of chapter I of the present Form is omitted. Dr. Baird said well, the reason of this omission was that the chapter was nothing but ‘an apology for our being Presbyterians’. Moreover, whoever will look carefully and candidly at this chapter must discover that it smacks in sundry places very disagreeably of Congregationalism, and also that the principles of value which it does hold forth, are all contained in the other parts of the Form.

“The first chapter of the proposed Form presents us with a statement of the *doctrine* of church government, under five heads, which appears to exhaust the whole of it. The various paragraphs of this chapter give precise definitions of each of these five heads, viz: 1. The Church; 2. Its members; 3. Its officers; 4. Its courts; 5. Its orders.

“The second chapter gives us, in four sections, our Presbyterian doctrine, in full, respecting the first of these heads. From the Westminster Form is borrowed that sublime scriptural statement of the kingship and headship of Christ. The *jus divinum presbyterii* is distinctly declared. The Church, considered in the threefold aspect of universal, denominational, and particular, is defined. Church power is set forth according to its nature and limitations as presented in the Scriptures. And the congregation (as the proposed Form uniformly styles a particular church, for the sake of distinctness) is fully set forth.

“The third chapter, we think, will strongly commend itself to the Church generally, for the manner in which it deals with the little ones of the flock.

“The fourth chapter treats in full of teaching elders or ministers of the Word, whose office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness; of ruling elders, who are (as well as ministers) true scriptural presbyters; and of deacons, whose jurisdiction is not over persons, but only over things, who are not charged with the government of the church or the care of souls, but of ecclesiastical goods and tables, viz., the table of the Lord, of the minister, and of the poor. It is a common impression with those not well acquainted with these subjects that to serve the communicants with the bread and the wine is the business only of the elders. In fact, many sup-

pose that is the chiefest part of their service. On the contrary, it is no part whatever of the elder's office, *as such*. To the minister alone belongs the administration of the sacraments. Any hand may pass the bread or the wine after they are delivered to the communicants by the minister. In the Church of Scotland, elders and deacons both assist at the table, as Pardovan tells us, Book I, Title VIII; Book II, Title IV.

"We do not understand the proposed Form as exclusively affixing this service to the office of the deacon. We should oppose any such view of the diaconate. But we believe that deacons may serve the Lord's table as well as the other two tables named. And we like any measure that will help to set before the Church her teaching elders and her ruling elders in their true positions—the former charged with that highest of all offices—*preaching* both in the word and in the sacraments; and the latter charged with ruling the Church, and not with serving tables any more than the other class of presbyters.

"The appointment by the sessions of godly women to the diaconal functions is allowed under the proposed Form. We rejoice at it. Protestants greatly need such an institution. The Scriptures, we believe, call for it.

"The fifth chapter treats of the courts of the Church. The proposed Form defines the quorum so that the presence of both classes of elders is necessary in every court. We believe this is right. It accords with the genius and spirit of our whole system. At the same time, let it be observed that no one could maintain that the proceedings of any court would necessarily be invalidated in any case where the ruling elders might all be absent. The definition of the quorum is designed merely to set forth what is needful to constitute a *regular* Church court, but irregularity and invalidity are not the same thing.

"The proposed Form adopts very fully the idea of ecclesiastical commissions, with certain wise and wholesome limitations. We believe our Church is prepared to adopt very cordially this feature of the proposed Form.

"There are sundry minor regulations proposed in this chapter from the arrangements of the present Form, which will commend themselves to our brethren.

"The same may be said of chapter six, which relates to orders. We have observed nothing in this chapter which we suppose can rouse any opposition, except the imposition of hands by the session in the ordination of ruling elders. But the proposed Form sets forth ordination in its true scriptural light as the act of a church court, and it also sets forth the church court in its true scriptural light as composed always of presbyters of two classes. All the rest is just a matter of logic. We feel confident that the necessary conclusion will be admitted generally, and the Church will agree that the ordination of ruling elders ought to be by the session. Even deacons were ordained with imposition of hands by the apostles; and why should this ceremony be omitted in the case of elders? Moreover, our doctrine on this subject is not that of Rome. We do not make orders in any sense a sacrament. It does not belong to ministers *as such*. It always is an act of *government* by the rulers of the Church.

"The proposed Form closes with such provision for changes in the constitution of the Church as we must say appears to us wise and reasonable and safe."

Dr. Girardeau, writing in the Southern Presbyterian Review of January, 1878, thus characterized the proposed revision: "This language of the first revision of the Form of Government sent down to the Presbyteries from Memphis in 1866 presents a rather different phase of Presbyterianism from that which has been commonly held in the Church, and also from that set forth in the old Form of Government. It was owing in large part, we apprehend, to the influence of Dr. Thornwell that such language was employed and such a proposition was affirmed in the Memphis revision."⁷⁸

The Assembly of 1866 sent down the proposed Form of Government to the Presbyteries for their adoption.⁷⁹ A canvass of the report on the Presbyteries by the Assembly of 1867 showed that the proposed Book of Order failed of adoption by the requisite number of Presbyteries.⁸⁰ Dr. Stuart Robinson declares that the matter was delayed, pending the admission of the Synods of Kentucky and Mis-

⁷⁸S. P. R., Vol. XXIX, p. 128-129.

⁷⁹Minutes, 1866, p. 37.

⁸⁰Minutes, 1867, pp. 134, 149.

souri, that they might vote on the revision.⁸¹ The question came up again by overtures to the Assembly of 1869 (pp. 375, 377, 378), and a special committee, with the help of members of the old committee and the officials of the Assembly, submitted a report on the same which was sent down to the Presbyteries.⁸² In view of the divided vote of the Presbyteries on this Book, the whole subject was re-committed "to the original committee on Revision" by the Assembly of 1870.⁸³ Dr. J. B. Adger, as chairman of this committee, reported to the Assembly of 1871, and the committee was continued.⁸⁴ The following year the subject of the Form of Government was overshadowed by interest in the Rules of Discipline;⁸⁵ and, in the unsettled state of the times,⁸⁶ the next Assembly committed the proposed Book of Church Order to the Archives of the Assembly.⁸⁷ The Assembly of 1876 took the matter out of the Archives and sent the revised Book down to the Presbyteries. In the Assembly of 1877⁸⁸ a new committee was appointed with Dr. George D. Armstrong, Chairman, and Dr. Adger, second-named member. This committee presented a plan⁸⁹ whereby the Book, as a whole, was separated from minor disputes which had arisen over particular emendations (pp. 424-426). The Assembly endeavored to embody changes for which a majority of the Presbyteries had expressed preference; to designate disputed points for particular presbyterial action; to ask approval of the Revised Book as a whole (p. 430). The final committee to prepare the Book for presentation to the Presbyteries was: J. B. Adger, D.D.; B.M. Palmer, D.D.; George D. Armstrong, D.D.; J. L. Marye, D. C. Anderson. Certain amendments were adopted by the Presbyteries that year, and a new publication, with the amendments embodied, made.⁹⁰ The Assembly of 1879 again appointed Dr. Adger chairman of its committee on the Revised Book;⁹¹ while among others associated with him was Dr. T. E. Peck of Union Seminary, an-

⁸¹*S. P. R.*, XXV, p. 123.

⁸²*Minutes*, 1869, pp. 378, 385, 388, 396.

⁸³*Minutes*, 1870, pp. 518, 519.

⁸⁴*Minutes*, 1871, p. 9.

⁸⁵*Minutes*, 1872, pp. 164-166, 218.

⁸⁶*S. P. R.*, XXX, p. 124.

⁸⁷*Minutes*, 1873, p. 329.

⁸⁸*Minutes*, 1876, p. 239, 241.

⁸⁹*Minutes*, 1877, p. 406.

⁹⁰*Minutes*, 1877, p. 430.

⁹¹*Minutes*, 1879, p. 9.

other disciple of Dr. Thornwell. On the report of this committee the new book of Church Order was declared to be the law of the Church.⁹² Certain details yet remained to be ironed out, and the revision committee was revived with the following members: J. B. Adger, Chairman; B. M. Palmer, G. D. Armstrong, Stuart Robinson, T. E. Peck, James Woodrow, H. A. Lefevre, Thomas Thompson, W. W. Henry.⁹³

The traditions of the Seminary, authenticated by Dr. Melton Clark, a member of the Faculty and the son-in-law of Dr. James Woodrow, are that the Book of Church Order was put into shape in the Old Chapel of Columbia Theological Seminary, under the direction of Dr. J. B. Adger as Chairman of the committee, and with Dr. James Woodrow acting as secretary and doing much of the actual work. The Old Chapel was one of the buildings bought with the Columbia grounds. It was originally a carriage house.⁹⁴ Perhaps the license will be allowed, of recalling, in this connection, that the Book of Church Order for a Church which glories to acclaim Him *alone* as King who was cradled in a manger, was composed in a house built for a carriage-stable.

THE RULES OF DISCIPLINE.

Dr. J. B. Adger summarizes the distinctively Thornwellian principles of discipline thus:

"In respect to church discipline, that an *offense*, the proper object of that discipline, is nothing but what the Word of God condemns as sinful; that in appellate jurisdiction our courts must not be treated as parties; and that baptized, non-communicating members of the Church are not to be subject to technical discipline."⁹⁵

A glance at Thornwell's writings on the subject of discipline amply vindicates this summary of Dr. Adger's.⁹⁶ Another point which Thornwell holds to have been implicit in the Old Book, but which he proposed more explicitly in the New Book, was "the right

⁹²*Minutes*, 1879, p. 17.

⁹³*Minutes*, 1879, p. 55.

⁹⁴Archives, Vol. II, pp. 971, 972.

⁹⁵*Semi-Centennial of C. T. S.*, p. 192. *Thornwell Collected Writings*, Vol. IV, pp. 299-375, especially p. 310 ff, 315 ff, 325 ff.

⁹⁶In addition to references above Vol. IV, p. 337 ff for infant membership; p. 364 for the standard of offenses; p. 315 ff and 374 ff for parties in appellate jurisdiction.

of inquest.”⁹⁷ He held that “every church court has the inherent right to demand and receive satisfactory explanations from any of its members,” since “the church courts are the spiritual guardians of the people” (p. 304). Scandalous reports concerning a member are an injury to him, and to his Church. The church court should institute inquiry in such a case and declare the report either true or false (pp. 371, 372). The Assembly of 1835 recognized the right of every Presbytery to be entirely satisfied of the soundness in the faith and the *good character in every respect* of ministers applying for admittance. The New Book would apply this principle to members as well as ministers, to morals as well as heresy.⁹⁸

Dr. Thornwell strove to work out these principles and simplify the procedure of the Old Book of Discipline under appointment of the Old School Assembly. As chairman of the committee⁹⁹ on this subject, he submitted a revised Book of Discipline to the Assembly of 1859.¹⁰⁰ The matter was recommitted to the same committee to report at the following Assembly (p. 546). The next Assembly again took up and re-committed the matter.¹⁰¹ The illness and absence of Dr. Thornwell in Europe and the disturbed state of the country prevented any further action the ensuing year.¹⁰² The war and the question of reunion with the New School Church seems to have prevented the Thornwellian revision from becoming permanent in the Northern Church.¹⁰³

The revision of the Book of Discipline, together with the revision of the Form of Government, was committed by the Augusta Assembly to a committee of which, because of his previous work on this subject, Dr. Thornwell was made chairman.¹⁰⁴ The checkered career of this committee has been narrated, in part, in the previous section. Dr. Adger presented a report on the revision of the Book of Discipline to the Assembly of 1872.¹⁰⁵ This book was ordered published (p. 172), and sent down to the Presbyteries. While desig-

⁹⁷Vol. IV, pp. 371 ff, 304.

⁹⁸Vol. IV, pp. 372, 373. *Minutes Assembly* 1835, pp. 27, 28.

⁹⁹*Minutes of Assembly* 1859, p. 516.

¹⁰⁰*Minutes*, pp. 516, 521.

¹⁰¹*Minutes*, 1860, pp. 18, 87, 55.

¹⁰²*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 301, 307.

¹⁰³Stuart Robinson in *S. P. R.*, Jan., 1879, p. 122

¹⁰⁴*Minutes Southern Assembly* of 1861, p. 10.

¹⁰⁵*Minutes*, 1872, p. 155.

nated in some places, *The Book of Discipline*, it seems to have been more exactly named *The Rules of Discipline*.¹⁰⁶ A divided vote of the Presbyteries and "the continued unsettled state of things" consigned these Rules of Discipline to the Archives of the Assembly.¹⁰⁷

The question of the Book of Discipline thereafter was considered with the question of the Form of Government, and by the Assembly of 1876 sent down to the Presbyteries.¹⁰⁸ "The Assembly of 1877 adopted the method of sending down to the Presbyteries that portion, both of the Form of Government and the Rules of Discipline, about which there seemed to be little difference of opinion; and, for a separate vote, some eight propositions, two of them alternative propositions, to be voted upon separately by the presbyters."¹⁰⁹ The minutes of 1878 showed, by a tabulation, the approval by a large majority of the Presbyteries of the more important proposals in the Revised Book of Discipline;¹¹⁰ but "the book as a whole" failed of the requisite votes. The Assembly of 1879 declared the new *Book of Church Order*, including the *Rules of Discipline*, to be the law of the church.¹¹¹

According to Dr. Stuart Robinson's account, the subject of revision was followed very closely by the brethren of the Northern Church, who were simultaneously engaged in a similar work under the guidance of such men as Dr. A. T. McGill, Dr. Wm. E. Moore, the compiler of the New Digest; Dr. Francis L. Patton, etc.¹¹² For the U. S. A. brethren, the *Banner* is quoted as highly evaluating the Southern Revision:

"Radical improvements are made throughout. The doctrine of Ecclesiastical and other commissions is developed, electors of Church Officers sharply defined, difference between Ecclesiastical and other Offenses stated, Judicial and Non-Judicial Process distinguished, common fame is abolished as an accuser,

¹⁰⁶*Minutes, ibid*, pp. 165, 172, 218, and Stuart Robinson, *S. P. R.*, Jan., 1879, p. 124.

¹⁰⁷*Minutes*, 1873, pp. 328, 329. *S. P. R.*, Jan., 1879, p. 125.

¹⁰⁸*Minutes*, pp. 259, 241.

¹⁰⁹Stuart Robinson in *S. P. R.*, Vol. XXX, p. 125. *Minutes*, 1877, pp. 406, 424, 426, 430.

¹¹⁰*Minutes*, 1878, pp. 639, 651.

¹¹¹*Minutes*, 1879, p. 17, and *The Book of Church Order of the Pres. Church in U. S.* as adopted by the General Assembly of 1879, Richmond, Va., Pres. Com. of Publication, Section 141, in which *The Book of Church Order* is declared to include *The Rules of Discipline*.

¹¹²*S. P. R.*, XXX, p. 123.

and the committee of prosecution erected into an original party with the right of appeal. Every indictment is to begin 'in the name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States,' and conclude with the words, 'against the peace, unity, and purity of the Church, and the honor and majesty of the Lord Jesus Christ as the King and Head thereof.' Provision is made for the demission of the ministry and special discipline for the ministers who have turned aside to secular callings."¹¹³

The following tribute to the revised Book of Church Order is quoted both from the *Presbyterian Banner* of Pittsburg, and from Dr. Halsey in the *Interior* of Chicago (November 21, 1879):

"It is Presbyterianism of the highest and purest kind in the logical relations of all the parts of the Book, the clear statement of principles and duties, and the emphasis given to the Covenant of God and to Doctrine and Discipline as an institute of God."

The quotation from the *Banner* continued that, "it is far in advance as a 'Book of Church Order' of anything that has appeared in this country."¹¹⁴

If attention be directed to the place of the ruling elder, the relations of church and state, and the systematic gradations of church courts, the typical ancestor of this Southern Presbyterian Book of Church Order will be found to be the *Second Book of Discipline of the Church of Scotland* rather than either the *First Book of Discipline*, or the *Westminster Directory of Worship*.¹¹⁵ The constitutive principles of the *Second Book* are attributed to Andrew Melville, who, like Thornwell, was a great Greek scholar with a high *de jure divino* Presbyterianism.¹¹⁶

THORNWELL'S DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS

The Lord's Supper—The Doctrine of John Calvin

The fullest treatment of the doctrine of the sacraments by a representative of the Columbia theology is to be found in Adger's *Life and Times*. He introduces the subject by narrating a conversation with Dr. Thornwell. Thornwell proposed that, "I should make the

¹¹³S. P. R., XXX, pp. 127, 128.

¹¹⁴S. P. R., XXX, pp. 127-129.

¹¹⁵Sed Contra *Historical Statement* affixed to *Book of Church Order*. Rev. Ed., 1925. Cf. Robinson, S., *The Church of God* appendices.

¹¹⁶Reed, *History of Presbyterian Churches*, p. 138.

fourth book (of Calvin's *Institutes*) a text-book on the subject of Church Polity and the sacraments, 'for,' said he, 'I do believe in Calvin's doctrine of the sacrament.'"¹¹⁷

Dr. Adger devotes almost a hundred pages of his memoirs to a summary of the fourth book of the *Institutes* (pp. 232-326). He "proposes to state definitely the exact doctrine of Calvin on the Lord's Supper" (p. 310). On this question he takes sharp issue with two Calvinistic theologians for whom he professes great respect—Dr. Wm. Cunningham of Scotland,¹¹⁸ and Dr. Charles Hodge of Princeton.¹¹⁹

Among those quoted as agreeing with Calvin's doctrine are R. J. Breckenridge,¹²⁰ and John Owen. The element in Calvin's doctrine which Adger most emphasizes is the meaning of the Incarnation: "Calvin insists on nothing whatever except the sublime truth of life for us in the Incarnation. There is life, of course, in the absolute God; it is infinite and superabounding and everlasting, but not for us. We are creatures, and cannot get access to it; we are sinners and it is impossible for us to receive it, if we could come near to it. And so that life of the absolute God is to us as though it were not; nay, it is against our life, and dooms us to death forever; but the Incarnation is a wondrous divine plan, which procures for us justification and a share in the life of God's own Son. But the life which it procures is inseparable from itself. Not God's Son, as such, gives it to us, but God's Son as He is in human flesh. He is not only our representative Head, but we are likewise vitally one with Him. He partakes of our flesh, and we partake of His spirit. His humanity is the connecting link between His Godhead and our manhood. The flesh of Christ is a reservoir, full of life, constantly drawn upon by all His people through the Holy Spirit, and by faith, which unites us to the Saviour; and this reservoir is itself constantly replenished from the everlasting spring-head. Now, then, Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper simply is, that it holds forth and seals to us this blessed truth."^{121a} "We must be in communion with this flow of life coming down from the very throne of God itself, or

¹¹⁷Adger, pp. 231, 232.

¹¹⁸*Theological Reformation*, p. 240.

¹¹⁹*Biblical Repertory*, 1848, p. 229. Adger, pp. 315-324.

¹²⁰Breckenridge, *Subjective Theology*, pp. 606, 607.

^{121a}Adger, pp. 325, 326.

else have no life in us. We must be members of His own body and of one spirit with Him or be dead" (p. 368). "The flesh of Christ is become a reservoir of the water of life. . . . We must be in communion with His flesh, and be members of His body, of His flesh and His bones. . . . Calvin's idea evidently is that we, lost and dead sinners, could never reach the infinite source of life, nor He us, except in this one way of His coming nigh to us in flesh and making Himself one with us, so as afterwards in the same way to make us one with Him; that is, partaking of our nature, that He might make us to partake of His. We must, therefore, have communion of His life" (p. 312). . . . "He takes our flesh, and gives us His Spirit, and so establishes a real communion of life with us through His flesh and blood by the Holy Spirit." . . . "Our souls are fed by communion with the life which is in His flesh." "By a sacred communion of His flesh and blood, Christ transfuses life into us by faith; and this He testifies to us and confirms to us in the Supper through the efficacy of the Spirit, so that it is no empty sign." . . . "The Lord puts the symbol into your hands to assure you that you really partake of Him" (p. 313).

Dr. Hodge falls short in stating the points of our union with Christ by neglecting to add, "that we all partake of His flesh and blood in the sacrament" (p. 317). "The force of the sacrament is in the words, 'Take, eat, this is My body and blood broken and shed for you.' " "We are to take, because it is ours; to eat, for it is one substance with us; and it was not for Himself, but for us He took flesh and then sacrificed it" (p. 311). "We are united to Him as members to the head. Others say we do have some kind of communion with Christ, but it is spiritual, and not of His flesh and blood; whereas He says, 'My flesh is meat indeed, and that we have no life unless we eat that flesh and drink that blood.' Here now is a mystery spoken by Christ, to be felt rather than understood, of which Calvin says that he always feels that he falls below the dignity of it whenever he does his utmost to set it forth."^{121b}

Thus, while in Calvinistic Scotland; in Princeton, the citadel of Old School American Calvinism; and in Union Theological Semi-

^{121b}Adger, p. 311.

nary,¹²² Richmond, Va., Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper has been held up as "error," "unintelligible," "blot out Calvin's teaching,"¹²³ "incongruous,"¹²⁴ "impossible,"¹²⁵ in Columbia it has been and is cordially received and earnestly studied. Unquestionably, it is the doctrine of the *Scots Confession* of 1560, while Dr. Adger (p. 391) and Dr. J. B. Green, of Columbia, go so far as to hold that the Westminster Confession teaches Calvin's view.¹²⁶ A brief, but genuinely Calvinistic, interpretation of the Lord's Supper is given by Dr. S. L. Morris, a Columbia alumnus, in his *Presbyterianism—Principles and Practice* (p. 81).

A direct study of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1559, of course includes the doctrine which Dr. Hodge has called "the real doctrine of the Reformed."¹²⁷ This doctrine of the sacrificial efficacy of His body as broken and His blood as shed is found Book IV, Chapter XVII, Sections I, III, IV, etc. Calvin says, "the body of the Lord was once offered as a sacrifice for us, so that we may now feed upon it, and feeding on it may experience within us the efficacy of His body as broken and His blood as shed is found in Book stated, "as bread and wine constitute important articles of food, and administer strength to our feeble frame, so the atonement of Christ is the food of the spiritual man and the source of all his activity and vigour."¹²⁹ Another feature of the doctrine of the *Institutes* is Calvin's idea of substance as force, efficacy, power, virtue. In accord with this meaning he was able to teach that believing communicants are made partakers of Christ's substance and experience His power in the communication of all blessings. Calvin maintains that 'we have a real participation of His flesh and blood by which

¹²²Dabney, *Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology*, taught in Union Theol. Seminary by R. L. Dabney, 4th Ed., pp. 810-814, Richmond, Pres. Com. of Publ., 1890. Cf. T. E. Peck, *S. P. R.*, Oct., 1879, pp. 624-646.

¹²³Cunningham as reported by Adger, pp. 314, 315, 316.

¹²⁴Hodge as reported by Adger, p. 317-324. *Biblical Repertory*, 1848, p. 252.

¹²⁵Dabney, p. 811.

¹²⁶So Adger, p. 321, and Charles Hodge as reported by Adger, p. 319. Cf. *Scot's Confession of Faith*, Art. XXI. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. III, p. 469. *Biblical Repertory*, 1848, pp. 237, 238.

¹²⁷Chas. Hodge, *The Reformed Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, *Biblical Repertory*, 1848, pp. 229; 249-252.

¹²⁸John Calvin, *Institutes*, Bk. IV, Ch. XVII, Sects. I and XI.

¹²⁹Thornwell, Vol. III, p. 299.

He communicates His life to us'; and that this is not realized in a material way, but 'by the energy of His Spirit.'¹³⁰

However, Calvin's true view is in advance of that presented by Dr. Hodge. Dr. Adger's presentation of Calvin's doctrine has recently received a striking confirmation in the monograph of Dr. Alexander Barclay, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*.¹³¹

In the sacrament of His body and blood, Christ's spiritual presence is objectively real. The significance of this statement of Calvin's doctrine can be more easily seen by contrasting it with the other two representative forms of the Protestant doctrine. Luther's view is that the Word being added, *the elements are the form of Christ's presence*. The body of Christ enters the communicant orally by, with, from, and under the bread; and imparts to the believer the Redeemer's blessings. Zwingli's position is *the elements are the sign of an absent Christ*—i. e. of the Redeemer who died on the cross nineteen hundred years ago. But as the believing communicant meditates on the breaking of Christ's body the Lord is subjectively present in his thought and imagination. In Calvin's doctrine *the elements are the seal of a present Christ*. The believing communicant enjoys a double participation. He receives the bread in his hand (and mouth); and Christ in his heart. And the bread in his hand and mouth is the seal or certificate that Christ is objectively present in his heart, imparting His grace. Thus Calvin gives to the word "communion" its full implication of a mutual or reciprocal action. The minor part of this communion is the believer's meditation upon, faith in, confession of, and gratitude to his Lord. The major part of it is the Lord's conveyance anew of the blessings of His redemption and the grace of His life to the believing communicant. ♪

BAPTISM—ITS MATTER AND ITS FORM

It is convenient to follow Dr. Adger's grouping of Thornwell's doctrine of the sacrament with his view of the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. The General Assembly of 1845 (Old School) adjudged Roman Catholic baptism invalid. Dr. Thornwell took a leading part in this debate, and was a member of the committee

¹³⁰ John Calvin, *Institutes*, Book IV, Ch. XVII, Sec. XI.

¹³¹ Glasgow, 1927. As vs. Dr. Hodge, cf. p. 166, etc.

which wrote the decision of the Assembly.¹³² Princeton opposed the decision; and Dr. Thornwell replied to a criticism of his position in *The Princeton Review* (July, 1845). Dr. Thornwell's articles appeared in the *Watchman and Observer* of Richmond, Va. (1846); then in *The Southern Presbyterian Review* of July and October, 1851, and January, 1852. They are republished in *Thornwell's Collected Writings* Vol. III, p. 279 ff. The Southern Presbyterian Church still adheres to the Thornwellian view of the invalidity of Roman Catholic baptism and baptizes those who are received from that communion.¹³³

Dr. Thornwell's argument against the validity of Roman Catholic baptism is cast into a scholastic and peripatetic form. The question is considered under the main heads of *matter* and *form*, and the question of the Aristotelean causes is carefully discussed. Relying on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* L. VII, CVII 1032b, he declares that *form* and *essence* (pp. 285, 358, etc.) are equivalent expressions;¹³⁴ "the *form* of a thing is that which makes it what it is, which distinguishes it from all other beings and limits and defines our conception of its properties." "The matter, water, is a generic term, and suggests every other kind of ablution besides that of baptism, while the form distinguishes this particular mode of washing from every other mode of using this element" (p. 266).

In regard to the matter, he contends that the priest (in a full and regular baptismal service) uses not simply water; "but water artificially corrupted" (p. 291). "It is not, *notwithstanding* the mixture, but *because* of the mixture," that the water, "*sanctified by oil*" is employed (pp. 292, 291). He argues: "1, that the oil destroys the *fitness* of water for the purpose of ablution, and so affects the significance of the rite; and 2, that the mixture is not used *as* water, but that peculiar stress is laid upon the foreign element" (p. 292). He

¹³²Minutes Assembly 1845, pp. 10, 15, 16, 34, 37. Palmer, *Life and Letters of Thornwell*, pp. 285-296; *Minutes*, p. 16.

¹³³Alexander's *Digest*, Rev. 1922 of the Acts of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. Richmond Pres. Com. of Publ., 1923, pp. 835-839.

¹³⁴Cf. Ross, W. D., *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, Oxford, 1924, pp. CI, CVI, CXI, etc.

quotes the Romanists themselves as holding the same principles when they condemn the mixing of wine with the water of baptism.¹³⁵

The *form* of baptism is discussed at length (pp. 295-412); "That which determines a specific ablution to be Christian baptism, which impresses upon the matter what may be styled the *sacramental form*, and which consequently constitutes its essence as a sacrament, is the relation which it bears to the covenant of God's unchanging mercy" (p. 297). Sacraments are regarded as *signs* which teach by analogy, representing to the eye Christ as the substance of the new covenant (p. 299). They are *visible promises, pledges, seals*, containing a solemn assurance that, to those who rightly apprehend, the spiritual good shall be as certain as the natural consequences by which it is illustrated (pp. 301, 302). Recipients are to look beyond the visible symbols to the personal agency of the Holy Ghost to render them effectual (p. 302).

But on the *ex opere operato* system the emphasis is changed from a regard for the agent who operates to the *mode of operation* (p. 305). The sacraments "cease to be, in the ordinary sense of the phrase, *means* of grace, and become *laws* of grace." They are "described as *stated modes* of Divine operation" (pp. 305, 306, 309). Another Roman Catholic view of the sacraments is that which represents them as *causes* (310). The Tridentine Symbols pronounce a malediction upon those who deny that the sacraments *contain* the grace which they signify, or that they confer that grace upon those who place no obstacles in the way,¹³⁶ and declare that the sacraments contain in themselves the *power of effecting the sacred thing* which they declare.¹³⁷ Bellarmine is quoted, contrasting the views of Calvin and Beza that sacraments are *instrumenta justificationis* with the Roman Catholic view that they are of *causae justificationis*.¹³⁸ By this change they transfer attention from the Holy Spirit to themselves and thus seriously modify the economy of grace (pp. 317, 318). He holds, "That Rome vitiates the *form* of the sacraments by inculcating the dogma that they produce their effects *ex opere operato*" (p. 323).

¹³⁵P. 293 reference to De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, Lib. I, Cap. I, Art. 14 (Cap. 42), "Sunt quidam, inquit, qui miscent vinum cum aqua baptismatis, non recte; quia Christus non jussit baptisari vino sed aqua.

¹³⁶P. 311 quoting *Trident. Con. Sess.*, Vii, Con. VI.

¹³⁷P. 311 quoting *Trident. Catechism*, Pars. II, Cap. I, VIII Eng., XI Latin.

Further, according to the Council of Trent, Roman Catholic baptism obligates the recipient to "all the precepts of holy Church either written or delivered by tradition."¹³⁹ Thus it obligates the professor to the "whole complicated system of truth and error" known as Romanism (p. 333), to the Council of Trent and to the doctrines of the memorable Constitution *Unigenitus* (p. 336), which doctrines are, in part, inconsistent with the Gospel (p. 337). The substance of the Gospel is considered under the Johannine imagery of the Spirit, interpreted as signifying the whole of experimental religion; the Water, signifying a change of character, i. e. sanctification; and the Blood, signifying a change of state, justification (pp. 344, 345). Thornwell holds that the peculiarity of the Gospel is not that it teaches justification, "but that it teaches justification BY GRACE" (p. 347). This would exclude "all reference to our own performances," all inherent righteousness. Rome, holding to justification by inherent righteousness,¹⁴⁰ has perverted the Gospel (pp. 348-351). Legalism is also brought in under the merit of congruity (p. 354) and good works¹⁴¹ (p. 355). Another error is the teaching that Christ is only the meritorious cause of justification instead of also the *formal* cause thereof.¹⁴² In treating of the Water, he condemns the degradation of the Supreme Being by the use of images and the adoration of the elements (pp. 374, 375); the depression of the Divine Standard of holiness and the substitution of a vast system of will-worship (p. 377); the fiction of the supererogatory merits (*ibid*).

Treating of the Spirit he shows how Augustinian views of effectual calling have been condemned by the Vatican in the Bull, *Unigenitus*, et al. (pp. 388, 389). Further he holds that "faith saves, because it joins us to Him who is salvation, and who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through Him." . . . But Rome "knows nothing of this mystical union with Christ," and the only efficacy she attributes to faith is that of spiritual grace, constituting one of the elements of the formal cause of justification.¹⁴³

¹³⁸Pp. 312-314 quoting Bellarmine, *De Sacramentis*, Lib. I, Cap. 16, Pars. 4, 5.

¹³⁹P. 332 quoting *Conc. Trident. Sess.*, VII, Can. VIII De Baptis.

¹⁴⁰P. 350 quoting Bellarmine, *De Justificat.*, Lib. II, C. II-III.

¹⁴¹Quoting *Council Trid. Sess.*, VI, cap. VI, can. IV.

¹⁴²P. 357, Bellarmine, *De Justificat.*, Lib. V, cap. V.

¹⁴³P. 396 referring to Bellarmine, *De Justificatione*, Lib. I, cap. XVII and Lib. I, cap. XVIII.

A wrong answer in regard to the application of redemption he regards as "irretrievably fatal," "Christ will profit none who are not united to Him by faith. Baptism will not save us" (p. 410).

He holds, therefore, that Roman Catholic baptism "wants the form of the Christian ordinance, which derives its sacramental character from its relation to the covenant of grace; it is essential to it that it signifies and seals the benefits of redemption." . . . "The one baptism of Paul is inseparably connected with one Lord and one faith. When the truths of the covenant are discarded, its signs lose their efficacy and its seals their power" (p. 412).

Dr. Thornwell thus confronts a Roman Catholic Scholasticism with a Protestant Aristoteleianism. The real difference in his doctrine of baptism from Rome's Doctrine is in the use of the Aristoteleian concept "form." Thornwell's usage of this term is at once more Aristoteleian, more spiritual, and more Protestant. By discarding that Scholastic conception of "form" which made it a formula of words; and returning to Aristotle's usage, "a term which expresses the sum of those characterizing qualities which make a thing the precise thing that it is,"¹⁴⁴ he gave a doctrinal content to baptism in accord with the genius of Protestantism. He made baptism "a visible word," a manifested doctrine of redemption, a symbol and a seal of the covenant of grace. He called for intellectual apprehension of covenant truth, rather than for verbal accuracy in performing the ceremony, as the requisite for the blessings covenanted in baptism.

¹⁴⁴Warfield, B. B., *The Person of Christ in Inter. Standard Bible Encyc.*, Vol. IV, pp. 2338-2339. Cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, LVII, CVII, 1032b.

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AND
THE MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE OF THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT OF THE FOUNDERS.

THE SOCIETY OF MISSIONARY INQUIRY.

THE SOUTHERN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

COLORED EVANGELIZATION.

"THE CHALMERS OF THE DISRUPTION," DR. J. LEIGHTON WILSON.

A WORTHY SUCCESSION.

SOCIAL SERVICE.

"The Spirit of Missions . . . is nothing but the pure religion of the Gospel, in its most amiable and active forms." J. L. Merrick, "The Spirit of Missions."

THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT OF THE FOUNDERS

An early account declares that the Seminary was the child of¹ labor, prayer and hope. The earliest records show that those charged with the promotion of the infant cause were warm-hearted, zealous Christians, burning with evangelistic interest, anxious for revivings in Zion—filled with “the spirit of missions.” The letters of the first paid agent of the Seminary, Rev. R. B. Cater, show that his journeys, in behalf of funds, were at the same time evangelistic tours. Writing in June, 1826, he speaks of the revival of religion in Beaufort and of his joy in telling the love of Jesus. Seeing the tears of God’s deeply moved people as they come to the sacrament, he laments that his own heart is too cold. He sorrows that so many are perishing for the lack of knowledge when salvation is provided. He desires to see grace prevailing, where sin abounds; and to that end, would stir the brethren to more active and energetic interest in measures for the extension of the Redeemer’s Kingdom. He sorrowfully records evidence of spiritual destitution, and writes in the full tide of revival fervor.² In April, 1827, he writes of preaching five times a week, of many resulting additions to the Church of men “asking the way to Jesus,” of “the power of the Resurrection of Jesus.”³ Like many that earnestly desire revivals, he characterizes those ministers who do not seem bent on evangelistic efforts as “cold and domineering.”⁴ The same attitude toward those who oppose, or are lukewarm toward the “revivalists,” appears in the minutes of the society of Missionary Inquiry in 1832. The *Presbyterian* is ordered discontinued because of the manner in which it speaks of revivals; and the *Philadelphian* discontinued, in order that its place may be taken by the *N. Y. Evangelist*.⁵

Rev. M. H. Reid, another early financial representative of the institution, expresses the same thought in a letter to Secretary Wm. A. McDowell, December 28, 1826. Some are interested in revivals; but others fear the revival enthusiasm and oppose them. Mr. Reid wants one of his own type, one who endorses revivals, “who will be instant in season and out of season” to succeed himself at the Red River

¹MS. *Minutes of Synod of S. C. and Ga.*, Vol. I. p. 372.

²*Archives*, Vol. I, No. 7. pp. 29-31.

³*Archives*, Vol. I, No. 14.

⁴*Archives*, Vol. I, No. 7, pp. 29-31.

⁵MS. *Records of the Society of Missionary Inquiry*, pp. 12-14.

Charge.⁶ Synod, 1830, declared it both rejoiced in revivals and believed that the still small voice of God sometimes gradually and successfully found its way into the sinner's breast.⁷

The first secretary and indefatigable worker in the cause of the new institution, Dr. Wm. A. McDowell of Charleston, was adjudged so richly endowed with the spirit of missions as to be chosen by the General Assembly of 1835, to be the Corresponding and General Agent, Secretary, etc., of the Board of Missions; and was continued in that position by the Old School Assembly.⁸

The choice of the first professor also indicates the evangelistic fervor in the Seminary fathers. The favorite rule for Dr. Thomas Goulding's own guidance; and one which he continually inculcated for the guidance of those who were young in the ministry was: Let every sermon preached contain so much of the plan of salvation that should a heathen come in who had never heard the gospel before, and who should depart, never to hear it again, he could learn enough to know what he must do to be saved.⁹

THE SOCIETY OF MISSIONARY INQUIRY

In keeping with this circle in which the Seminary was projected, the first regular session in a permanent location saw the birth of the Society of Missionary Inquiry. On the twenty-fifth of January, 1831, the exercises of the Seminary were commenced in the buildings procured by Colonel Blanding; and the first regular Seminary classes were formed after the Andover-Princeton model. The faculty account of the Society is as follows: "The missionary feelings of James L. Merrick, since missionary in Africa and Persia, led to the formation of the Society of Inquiry on Missions, which was organized in the library room of the Seminary, and has since exercised a great and salutary influence in the Seminary and in the town of Columbia." Dr. Adger states that Mr. Merrick was a native of New England.¹¹

The Book of the Constitution of the Society narrates that "at the monthly concert of prayer, being the first held in the Theological

⁶*Archives*, Vol. I, No. 8, pp. 33-35.

⁷*MS. Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 275.

⁸*Min. of Assembly*, 1836, flyleaf. *Minutes* (Old School), 1839 flyleaf.

⁹*Semi-Centennial*, pp. 185-186.

¹⁰*My Life and Times*, Adger, p. 90.

¹¹*MS. Min. of Faculty*, Vol. II, p. 24.

Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in Columbia (S. C.), February 7th, 1831, at which were present, Rev. Dr. Thomas Goulding, Rev. George Howe, James Beattie, David DeSaussure, Francis Goulding, James L. Merrick, W. Moultrie Reid, J. Leighton Wilson, and by invitation, Messrs. G. T. Snowden and William Shear (citizens of Columbia). After a free discussion of the question, 'Can we do anything for the cause of Missions?' a motion was made by Dr. Goulding 'That we form ourselves into a society for the purpose of inquiring into the subject of missions.' After imploring Divine direction and after a full expression of views on the question the motion was unanimously carried."¹²

The organization was carried out February 15th, 1831, by the adoption of the Constitution and the election of officers. The Presidents of the Society for the first three years of its life were Rev. Mr. George Howe, 1831; Mr. J. Leighton Wilson, 1831-2; Mr. James L. Merrick, 1832-3. The Society began correspondence with similiar societies in sister seminaries such as Andover, Princeton, Hamilton; with missionaries in Greece, and the Sandwich Islands. It early took up the matter of a library and a museum.³

J. Leighton Wilson, the first student president of the Society, gives a large part of the credit for stimulating his own spiriutal life and for leading him into a deep interest in missions to a correspondence with John B. Adger. They had been college mates at Union College, New York. Adger went to Princeton in 1830, while Wilson studied at home a year and then entered Columbia.¹⁴ On June 9th, 1832, Wilson writes of a visit he is expecting (at Columbia Seminary) from Adger who was then on his Princeton vacation. At the semi-centennial of the Seminary, Wilson spoke of the deep impression of this visit. "The speaker feels that it is due to himself as well as to this venerable father (Adger), to give utterance to the feelings of profound gratitude which he has always felt towards him for the kind interest he took in him when inquiring about the path of duty; for the wise counsel he gave to him when he knew as yet nothing of the trials and perils of the missionary life; and especially for the heartfelt prayers that he offered to God that his young servant

¹²MS. *Constitution of the Society of Miss. Inquiry*, p. 3.

¹³MS. *Records of Society of Missionary Inq.*, p. 1 ff.

¹⁴*Memoirs of J. L. Wilson*, pp. 24, 36.

might be guided into the path of duty. If the speaker ever knew what consecration to God meant, it was while he and the venerable father were kneeling in prayer in the foundation-room of the Seminary building. To his memory, even in the deepest wilds of Africa, that south-west corner has always been a place of peculiar sanctity.”¹⁵

Carrying out this decision was no easy matter. Wilson's father was a respected Ruling Elder. But for a South Carolina planter's son to go as a missionary to Africa was an unheard-of thing. On December 18, 1832, Leighton Wilson wrote his sweetheart that his father regarded his determination to go to Africa as a judgment upon himself for having loved this boy too much. The opposition of his father was so keen that Wilson expressed his relief that Miss Jane Bayard had no parents to object. She was an orphan.¹⁶

At his vacation Wilson returned home from this memorable decision made in prayer with Adger at Columbia Theological Seminary. His father still refused to give his consent. “‘Father,’ said Leighton, ‘would you be willing to go into the room and pray with me?’ So they began, ‘Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.’ The father could not go beyond that petition. Brought face to face with the world-embracing affections and purposes of God, he could not hold to any little contrary ambition of his own. Slipping his arm around his son's shoulder, he told him he could go.”¹⁷

THE SOUTHERN BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

The subject of interesting the constituency of the Seminary in missions was early raised. A paper was read by J. Leighton Wilson, June 27th, 1831, on the subject “What has been and what ought to be done by the Southern Churches in behalf of Foreign Missions.” At this same meeting it was agreed that, “a member of this Society be appointed to deliver a dissertation before this Society during the meeting of Synod in December next.” Brother Merrick was elected to fulfill the duty, with Brother Wilson as alternate.¹⁸ At this time, 1831, Synod declares, “for foreign missions little has been done.”¹⁹

¹⁵*Memoirs of J. L. Wilson*, p. 40.

¹⁶Letters of J. L. W. in safe at Columbia Theological Seminary, Dec. 18, 1832.

¹⁷Quoted from Smith, E. W., *The Desire of all Nations*, p. 7.

¹⁸MS. *Records of the Society of Missionary Inquiry*, pp. 3, 4.

¹⁹MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 305.

The manuscript minutes of Synod of 1819 report the organization of a missionary society within the bounds of the Synod for the purpose of supplying the destitute portions of the territory of Synod with the means of grace and of providing religious instruction and civilization to the Indians. But this society seems to have had a short life;²⁰ the minutes of 1829 record the transfer of its Foreign Missions to the A. B. C. F. M.²¹ For the reviving of missionary interest in the Synod, this resolution to present the cause during the meeting of the Synod undoubtedly had a part. The Society also solicited the use of the columns of the *Charleston Observer* and the files of that publication show that throughout the decade of the thirties the paper printed contributions from the Society.²² The same Synod during which the Society resolved to have presented the subject of missions witnessed the Synod's pledge to support George W. Boggs, a missionary from South Carolina, at Bombay. The Synod of 1832 declared that this fact had caused the subject of foreign missions to secure some of the attention to which it was entitled.²³

The next year saw the sailing of J. Leighton Wilson for Africa. Dr. Howe, discussing this at Salem Church, said: "When did our Presbytery send its first missionary to the heathen? In 1833. He (Wilson) went away, amid misconceptions, sneers, and bitter words on the part of many, and but a few months ago planted his feet on barbarian shores." Wilson spent some time in Boston and Andover²⁴ studying Arabic and sailed November 28, 1833.²⁵

The Synod of 1833 saw the organization of the Southern Board of Missions for the purpose of furthering this cause. Dr. Thomas Goulding, first professor in the Seminary, was chairman of the committee recommending the action.²⁶ On the first Board of Directors appear the names of R. B. Cater, Dr. Goulding, George Howe, Thomas Smyth and C. C. Jones, names indissolubly connected with the founding of the Seminary. On the lists of honorary members of the Southern Board of Foreign Missions appear the names of all the

²⁰MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 57.

²¹*Ibid*, p. 180.

²²Files *The Charleston Observer* in C. T. S. Library.

²³MS. *M. Synod*, Vol. I, p. 329.

²⁴*Memoirs of J. L. Wilson*, p. 45.

²⁵*Ibid*, pp. 51, 53, 63.

²⁶MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, pp. 343, 358.

early professors and leaders in the foundation of the Seminary. (The price of honorary membership is listed as a hundred dollars for laymen and fifty for ministers).²⁷ This Board contributed to the support of some of the missionaries sent out by the A. B. C. F. M. The Synod in 1836 declared that the Southern Board of F. M. was an ecclesiastical organization, and that its missionaries were under the jurisdiction of the several Presbyteries to which they belonged, with no other relation impairing Synod's ecclesiastical authority in the same. After the Old School—New School split, the Constitution was amended (November, 1838) so as to make the Board an auxiliary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church (O. S.).²⁸ But at the same time fraternal and affectionate regard was expressed for the late associates of the A. B. C. F. M., and provision made for sending funds so designated through the A. B. C. F. M.²⁹

The Secretary and moving spirit of this Southern Board was Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D., pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Charleston, South Carolina. Of his influence in inculcating the missionary spirit, Dr. J. B. Adger says, "If the South Carolina Synod has been, ever since 1833, peculiarly alive in some degree (but oh! how small that degree) to the claims of the foreign mission work, I here record, what will be generally acknowledged by those who know best, that this has been due, through Almighty grace, in a very large measure, to the missionary zeal of Dr. Thomas Smyth."³⁰ Dr. Smyth was an alumnus of Princeton Seminary; but, during his forty years' pastorate in Charleston, Columbia had no more loyal or devoted supporter and friend. His interest in and gifts to the library, his marvelous mental contributions to the thought life of the Seminary through publication and frequent addresses in Columbia, his labors on the board of directors, his endowment of the library and lectureship, have made his life and influence a vital part of the history of the Seminary.³¹

²⁷Southern Bd. of F. M. *Fifth Annual Report*, Charleston, S. C., 1839, pp. 38-40. *Sixth Annual Report*, Charleston, S. C., 1840, pp. 7-10. Charleston Observer Office Press, 1839, 1840.

²⁸MS. *Minutes of Synod*, Vol. I, p. 482.

²⁹*Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 2, 3. *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 1, 5, 10 with the amended constitution and proceedings.

³⁰*My Life and Times*, p. 84.

³¹Manuscript *Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Southern Bd. of Foreign Missions*. Southern Board of F. M. Premium Tract. Missionary Paper III, *Prospects of the Heathen for Eternity*, by Rev. Thomas Smyth, Charleston

In his eulogy of Dr. Howe, Dr. Girardeau comments on the marked change in the attitude toward foreign missions in the period between 1833 when J. L. Wilson "went away amid misconceptions, sneers and bitter words on the part of many" until 1883 when such an attitude would have been impossible. Girardeau attributes this change "to the able and persistent efforts of Dr. Howe and men of like spirit with him—Church, Talmage, Hoyt, Leland, Smyth and Thornwell."³²

In 1836, the missionaries that this Board was supporting, were Rev. and Mrs. G. W. Boggs, Mahratto Mission; Rev. and Mrs. J. B. Adger, Smyrna; Rev. J. L. Merrick, Persia; Rev. and Mrs. J. L. Wilson, Cape Palmas, Africa; Rev. J. R. Lanneau, Syria; Rev. Wm. E. Holly, Choctaw Indians. Of these, two are the leaders of the Society of Missionary Inquiry and a third, Dr. J. B. Adger, a graduate of Princeton, is met again and again in the history of Columbia, in which institution he was professor for many years. In the same year, the interest in Missions had so risen, that the Synod declared:

"That the Church, by the very elements of her Constitution, is a missionary society—that it is enjoined upon her as a duty to impart to others the blessings which she herself has received—that the great head of the Church has constituted her the appropriate channel, through which the light of the Gospel is to be offered among the nations of the Earth, and that her organization is such as to embody her strength and call forth her resources and bring them to bear to the best advantage upon the world's conversion to God."³³

In this increasing interest in the cause of missions, these missionaries, particularly, Adger, Merrick, and Wilson, bore a conspicuous part. The minutes of the Executive Committee of the Southern Board show that Mr. John B. Adger was appointed as their agent December 9th, 1833; and visited South Carolina and Georgia, securing funds and promoting interest in the missionary enterprise (pp. 11, 12). Mr. Adger resigned his agency April 8th, 1834, and on the 25th of that month is listed as a missionary to Asia Minor. On that date, he and Rev. J. L. Merrick were requested to leave behind them Farewell Letters, addressed to the Southern Churches, to be pub-

Observer, 1835. *Southern Pres. Review* index in Vol. XXXV shows articles by Smyth on Advent, Assurance, Deacons, etc.

³²*Semi-Centennial of Cola. Seminary*, p. 405.

³³*MS. Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 419. *Fifth Annual Report*, 11-20.

lished as the first papers of the Board (pp. 20, 22). Adger's autobiography shows that he and Merrick sailed from Boston, August 2, 1834, on the ship Padang.³⁴

Merrick's address has been preserved. It seems to have been widely circulated by the Southern Board. There is a minute, March, 1836, giving an order on the Treasurer for \$52.50 for printing 1475 copies of *The Missionary Spirit*, paper No. 4.³⁵

This may fairly be said to represent the thought of the first members and moving spirits of the Society of Missionary Inquiry at Columbia Seminary. In the closing paragraph the writer is appealing to some kindred spirit, whose going to foreign lands seems more certain than even that of the author. The inference is near that he is particularly appealing to his co-worker, Rev. J. B. Adger in these words:

"Who will volunteer in this glorious cause? Will you, my brother? I have heard you plead eloquently for the Missionary cause—will you enforce your arguments by the powerful eloquence of your example? Are you willing for Christ's sake to encounter Mohammedan bigotry, or pagan superstition, and labor and die on the other side of the earth? Go, then, in the strength of God, and we, who may not be counted worthy of such trust and honor, will follow and sustain you by our prayers and efforts" (p. 22).

Merrick chooses as a text for this address Acts 17:16, "His spirit was stirred in him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." He declares, "The motive which led the Redeemer to leave his home in the highest heavens, and to journey far down to this ruined world, was no other than that powerful spring of action, which has acquired the name Missionary Spirit. . . . It was the Missionary Spirit that conducted Paul through Asia Minor. . . . It was the Missionary Spirit that, in the first ages of the Church, shed the celestial blessings of Christianity on all Western Asia . . . that drove from Northern Europe the terrific religion of Odin, and the same spirit that is now operating in its redeeming power at various places in Asia and Africa and in an hundred Isles of the Sea. Such is the Missionary Spirit and such have been its effects. It is nothing but the pure religion of the Gospel, in its most amiable and active forms.

³⁴*My Life and Times*, J. B. Adger, p. 90.

³⁵*MS. Minutes Exec. Committee Sou. Board of Missions*, p. 59.

Its nature is divine; its object is the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind" (p. 2).

He protests any throttling of this spirit. "Monopolize the religion of Immanuel—the Missionary from heaven—as well might you monopolize the blessed air that vivifies creation. . . . It is my full conviction that the destitute around you, and the destitute in your midst, will never be thoroughly evangelized till you, or those who succeed you on the stage of life, shall be effectually imbued with the Missionary Spirit, that spirit whose charities embrace the world" (pp. 2, 3, 4). "A large proportion of Missionary Spirit is needed for home consumption; but home is quite too narrow a sphere for the whole of that charity which seeketh not her own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's" (5).

In giving the reasons for missions, Merrick says: "The influence of the Missionary Spirit on the intellect is peculiarly powerful and happy" (7). "Yet the moral influences derived from the same source are much more important in their nature—and in their consequences" (8). The reflex influence of interest in Foreign Missions is mindfulness of the neglected and destitute at home, the cause of Home Missions, Bible Societies, Sabbath School Societies, Seamen's Societies, etc. (9, 10).

"But the Missionary Spirit, which is as it were health to the Christian, is life from the dead to the heathen" (12). The writer stresses the sad condition of the heathen under arbitrary governments, oppressions, anarchy, ignorance, pagan superstition, religious persecution, without hope for eternity. "They are our brethren and our sisters . . . they are those for whom Christ died. . . . They are those whom He now commands us to evangelize" (16). The diffusion of the Gospel will dissipate ignorance, bring tribes into the purity and liberty of the Gospel and the hope of glory. This diffusion will tend to harmonize discordant sects of Christians. In order to reach the unevangelized, the missionaries will have to preach Christ only and Him Crucified and "not those unessential points of sectarian distinction, which have so long divided and degraded the true followers of Christ in countries already Christian." The Missionary Spirit will exalt womanhood intellectually and morally, and cause her to receive the due meed of merit (18, 19). The writer closes with a personal appeal to each one to cherish and diffuse the

Missionary Spirit; and to heed when Jesus calls to the unevangelized lands (21).

Of the manifold work of Rev. J. L. Wilson, this paper will treat later.

A third member of the Seminary's first class of six, Rev. James L. Adams, consecrated himself to the foreign mission cause, but was prevented from sailing.³⁶

In 1842 the faculty report notes that Richard Way left, just before examinations, for foreign work in Siam. He had been preceded in 1838 by Rev. S. R. Brown, a missionary to China.³⁷

A copy of the first number of *The Banner of the Cross*, published by "the students of the Southern Theological Seminary," has been preserved. This eight-page publication is dated November 1, 1834. The purpose of the paper is, "to call upon the churches in South Carolina and Georgia to regard, with a deeper interest than they have ever done before, two most important objects, their Seminary and the cause of Missions" (p. 4). It has articles on China, The History of the Seminary, Exposition of Ps. 84 1-7; an appeal to young men to enter the ministry; advantages of Sunday School, etc.³⁸

CHURCH EXTENSION

But Foreign Missions was only one phase of the interest of the Society of Missionary Inquiry—and only one (perhaps the highest) expression of the Missionary Spirit.

Wilson and Keith Legare, two of the first students, describe the Society as meeting once a month "at which time we usually have a dissertation, from a member, on some topic connected with the benevolent operations of the day." They declare that the Society has kindled a very lively interest in behalf of many of the benevolent operations of the day. They add, "most of our members have already or soon will engage in teaching Sabbath schools, in the country around the place. The country hereabouts is populated by an ignorant and poor class of men and there seems to be providential opening around us for doing good. And we hope that the ultimate end of our lives and the prevailing desire of our hearts may be

³⁶*Semi-Centennial*, p. 166.

³⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 801. Wilson in *Semi-Centennial*, p. 169.

³⁸*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 155-162.

to lead souls to Christ.”³⁹ A letter of Wilson’s, dated October 27, 1832, reads: “I attended my sand hill Sunday School this morning, and had a large and interesting school.”⁴⁰

Dr. Howe records the organization of the Sunday School Association of Charleston in 1816 and of a Sunday School Union Society in the same place in 1819—both preceding the organization of the American Sunday School Union (1824).⁴¹

The scope of the Society of Missionary Inquiry’s interests may be gathered from the following minute: “Agreeable to a resolution passed on the 28th Feb. (1832) the following committees were appointed, viz:

1. Seamen and Soldiers—Wm. B. Yates.
2. Colored Population—Adams & Goulding (i. e. Francis Goulding).
3. Foreign Missions—Merrick & Axson.
4. Domestic Missions—Reid & Du Bose.
5. Bible & Tract Societies—Petrie & Fraser.
6. Sabbath Schools & Revivals—Keeney & Beattie.
7. Temperance Cause—Legare & Peden.⁴²

The work of building up the Kingdom, through the establishment of Sabbath Schools and missions, has been a consistent part of the work of the Seminary and the Society of Missionary Inquiry. Often these schools have been the nuclei, not only of a Presbyterian Church, but also of a Methodist and a Baptist Church.⁴³

The Society has supplied religious workers for the city jail, the State Penitentiary, convict camps, cotton mill missions, community missions; as well as teachers and leaders of Sunday School and Young People’s organizations in established churches. In their vacations, the early students labored as colporteurs for the American Tract Society, and as agents for the American S. S. Union.

³⁹Letter of Wilson and Legare in behalf of the students to Dr. McDowell Feb. 24, 1831. *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 63.

⁴⁰*Memoirs of J. L. W.*, p. 35.

⁴¹Howe, *History*, Vol. II, pp. 228, 229. Trumbull, *Yale Lectures on the S. S.*, pp. 122, 123.

⁴²MS. *Records of the Society of Miss. Inq.*, p. 9.

⁴³So e. g. in the writer’s home community the Waverly Sunday School of which Dr. R. C. Reed was a first Superintendent led to the organization of congregations by the three denominations.

The maintenance and extension of the Church in the home field was the primary consideration in establishing Columbia Seminary.⁴⁶ In the Seminary's appeal of 1845 the wide savannahs of the West and extreme South-west are represented as calling to the Seminary for ministers.⁴⁵

Dr. Henry A. White, a careful Southern historian, says:

"The spiritual needs of the entire southeastern part of our country were resting upon the hearts of the men who founded Columbia Seminary. The two States of South Carolina and Georgia were at that time sending large numbers of their people southward and westward, as Colonists, to fill up the fertile regions within the borders of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Florida. The vast territory embraced in these six commonwealths, occupied by a homogeneous people, was calling for ministers of the Word. The other seminaries were not sending them."

He declares that an increase of from 10,000 to nearly 70,000 Presbyterian Christians in this territory "in eighty years" was due almost entirely to the work of Columbia Seminary and the labors of the seven hundred and fifty candidates for the ministry who passed through her halls during that period.⁴⁶

At the time of the earliest efforts to establish the institution the Synod covered the whole country from the southern border of North Carolina to the Mississippi river; and it was believed that by the confluence of the benevolent feelings of the states over which that body extended they would be more likely to succeed. At the time⁴⁷ of the organization of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia (1813) there were, in this territory, only thirty-two Presbyterian ministers.⁴⁸

In the year 1839, the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia avows that "the very establishment of the Seminary has been the direct means of bringing into the ministry twice the number that would have entered it had they been left without this institution in their vicinity to awaken their attention to the subject."⁴⁹ In 1841 the Faculty reports that forty-one (out of eighty educated in the Semi-

⁴⁴Report Faculty 1849, *Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 943, 979, 955.

⁴⁵*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 894.

⁴⁶White, *Southern Pres. Leaders*, p. 257.

⁴⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 826. *Retrospect* of 1849.

⁴⁸*MS. Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 298, *South. Pres. Review*, 1855, pp. 404, 405.

⁴⁹*Minutes Synod S. C.*, 1839, p. 14.

nary) were connected with the Synod, while twenty-one were laboring in nearby Synods.⁵⁰ In 1844 the statement is made that since 1831 there have been 95 students educated in the Seminary. Of these nine have been separated in the divisions of the Church; but forty-nine are connected with the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia (three of whom are Foreign Missionaries); and twenty-two are laboring in other Synods.⁵¹

The Synod of South Carolina, in its narrative of 1854, declares that the gradual increase of the number of ministers has come mainly through the instrumentality of the Theological Seminary; and that about half its ministers are former students of the Seminary.⁵²

In 1860 the Board presents, and the Synod accepts and endorses, the following figures showing the steady growth of the Seminary and the parallel growth in church membership and in the ministry:

		Seminary	
Year		Average No. Students ⁵³	
1831-36		17	
1836-50		19	
1850-56		32	
1856-60		50	
1860		58	

Year	State	Church		Seminary Graduates
		Communicants	Ministers	
1831	South Carolina	6,518	54	
1860	South Carolina	13,074	108	55
1831	Georgia	2,893	37	
1860	Georgia	6,812	89	28
1831	Alabama	2,094	42	
1860	Alabama	6,534	64	16

In 1871 the whole number of alumni is listed as 374, of whom 84 are deceased and thirteen are foreign missionaries.⁵⁴ The catalogue of that year gives the complete list of the former members of the Seminary by classes from 1833 to 1870 (pp. 7-19). The table of residence of the alumni shows the alumni laboring primarily in the southeast:

⁵⁰ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 642, Report of Faculty.

⁵¹ *Archives*, Vol. II, p. 825, Faculty Report to Board.

⁵² *Minutes Synod of S. C.*, 1854, p. 31.

⁵³ *Minutes of the Synod of S. C.*, 1860, pp. 66, 67.

⁵⁴ *Catalogue*, 1870, p. 23.

South Carolina -----	80	Arkansas -----	14
Georgia -----	49	Texas -----	11
North Carolina -----	38	Tennessee -----	10
Mississippi -----	33	Florida -----	9
Alabama -----	24	Scotland -----	13

Other States have smaller numbers; Japan, India, Brazil, China, Indian Nation are represented. The residences of fifty-eight are unknown (p. 20).

The catalogue of 1907 gives the list of alumni, by classes, from 1833 to 1906. While no summation of figures is given, the men represent the same section of the country as in the earlier statement.⁵⁵

In his semi-centennial addresses (1881), Dr. George Howe states, "that more than three-fourths of the ministers and licentiates of the Synod of South Carolina, more than half of those of the Synod of Georgia, about one-third of those of the Synods of Alabama and Arkansas, that nearly one-half of the Synods of Memphis and Mississippi were students of this Seminary."⁵⁶

The 1917 catalogue bears this statement (evidently by Dr. Thornton Whaling, the President), "Although the number of students at this Seminary has always been thus moderate in extent, yet Columbia has furnished more than three-fourths of the Presbyterian ministers who have labored in South Carolina, more than one-half of those who have labored in Georgia, and a considerable proportion of those in Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana. Moreover, graduates of Columbia Seminary have given themselves to the work of Missions in Africa, Syria, Turkey, Persia, Hindustan, Korea, Japan, and South America."⁵⁷

In *The King's Business* in the Synod of Alabama Dr. R. T. Gillespie, President, sums up Columbia's contribution to the Presbyterian church in the Southeast. "Columbia has trained 926 ministers, 350 of whom are living. The present (1927) enrollment is 65. This year 42 new students were enrolled." When the Seminary was founded the only Synod in Columbia's territory was a small one—73 ministers, 11 licentiates, 128 churches and 8,560 communicants,

⁵⁵*Catalogue Columbia Theol. Seminary*, 1907, Columbia, S. C., pp. 27-56.

⁵⁶*Semi-Centennial*, p. 156.

⁵⁷*Catalogue*, 1917, p. 38.

and five Presbyteries. The territory of Columbia Seminary now contains five Synods, 1,171 churches (Presbyterian Church in the U. S.), 134,770 communicants, and 632 ordained ministers.”⁵⁸

The missionary influence of the Seminary has necessarily been strongest in its immediate field. But it has, by no means, been confined to its immediate field. An excellent example of the larger influence of the Seminary in widely inculcating missions is the discourse delivered by Dr. J. H. Thornwell, by appointment of the Board of Foreign Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (O. S.), in the First Presbyterian Church, New York, on Sabbath, May 18, 1856, and published by order of the General Assembly.⁵⁹ Dr. Adger, introducing this sermon in Thornwell’s *Collected Writings*, says: “It was this sermon of which Dr. Addison Alexander, who was a hearer of it, remarked to a friend that it was as fine a specimen of Demosthenian eloquence as he had ever heard from the pulpit, and that it realized his idea of what preaching should be.”⁶⁰

The sermon is entitled, “The Sacrifice of Christ, The Type and Model of Missionary Effort.” The text was John 10:17, 18. The death of Christ is presented as an act of worship. “The internal feelings of the priest must correspond to the external significance of the act.” The motives which prompt such an undertaking are: “The first . . . an intense sense and admiration of the holiness and justice of God, and a corresponding sense and detestation of the sinfulness of sin . . . ; secondly, the sentiments of pity for man” (pp. 419-421). “Love to God and love to man—which His death, considered as a sacrifice, express—constitute the essence of virtue” (p. 422). “It has grown into a proverb that the spirit of missions is the spirit of the Gospel.” As made priests by Christ, “we must be animated by the same principles which pervaded His offering” (p. 428). Zeal for the Divine glory, love to God, compassion to man should stir our souls and move our feet. “Can we look upon our fellows, members of the same family, pregnant with the same instincts and destined to the same immortality, and feel no concern for the awful prospect before them?” (p. 432).

⁵⁸*The King’s Business*, pp. 56, 57. Birmingham. Ala., 1927. Cf. *Minutes of General Assembly* for 1926.

⁵⁹*Minutes Assembly*, 1856, p. 511.

⁶⁰*Thornwell’s Coll. Writings*, Vol. II. p. 409.

"When I consider the magnitude and grandeur of the motives which press upon the Church to undertake the evangelization of the world, when I see that the glory of God, the love of the Saviour and pity for the lost, all conspire in one great conclusion; when I contemplate our own character and relations as spiritual priests, and comprehend the dignity, the honor, the tenderness, and self-denial of the office; and then reflect upon the indifference, apathy, and languor which have seized upon the people of God; when I look to the heavens above me and the world around me, and hear the call, which the wail of perishing millions sends up to the skies, thundered back upon the Church with all the solemnity of a Divine Commission; when a world says, Come, and pleads its miseries; when God says Go, and pleads His glory, and Christ repeats the command, and points to His hands and His feet and His side,—it is enough to make the stone cry out of the wall and the beam out of the timber to answer it" (p. 448).

COLORED EVANGELIZATION

But from the heights of eloquence the realist will turn with the question—Yes, but what of the black brother at the door? And a sense of truth will allow neither the Southern Church nor Columbia Seminary to glibly repeat the words of the Scottish historian, Dr. Ogilvie, that the Presbyterian Church in the United States has done a distinguished work for their evangelization.⁶¹

Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters says bluntly, "Our Church has not done her duty to the colored people. But if she has failed, it has been for no lack of shining examples of genuine devotion to the spiritual interest of that people." He goes on to say that the Church has had few sons more gifted, and none more godly than John L. Girardeau, C. Colcock Jones, Chas. H. Stillman, and J. R. Howerton, each of whom gave the best energies of heart and mind to the evangelization of the colored people. And these four leaders in this work are Columbia Seminary men.⁶²

The Southern Church has not done her full duty in this matter; but what she has done ought not to be overlooked. The Seminary has not done her full duty—but the noblest among the sons and sup-

⁶¹J. N. Ogilvie. *The Presbyterian Churches of Christendom*. London A. & C. Black, 1925, pp. 184, 185.

⁶²*C. T. S. a Retrospect*, p. 31, by W. M. McPheeters.

porters of Columbia, have most nearly manifested the Master's spirit toward the colored brother. The early records of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia show a marked and a continued interest in the work of giving the gospel to the colored race, even in years when the small interest in Foreign Missions is lamented.

In 1831, Synod, after lamenting the little done for foreign missions and the static condition of home missions, adds; "In one feature, however, they (domestic missions) have assumed an aspect which deserves a more particular notice than can be given it in this brief narrative. All along our sea-coast, much feeling has been awakened in reference to our colored population, and inquiries have been instituted with a view of ascertaining the best means of furnishing them with religious instruction. Hitherto it has been almost entirely neglected, or left to black preachers, who are, for the most part, incapable of instructing others in the way of salvation. Many planters have taken the subject into their own hands, and either given them religious instruction themselves, or procured it for them from regular ministers of the Gospel. Societies of planters have also been formed with this express object in view; and the result of experience upon this plan, so far as it has been adopted, is favorable both to the interest of the planters and the morals of the slaves."⁶³

The next year Synod reports: "The spiritual state of our black population is found to have called forth, during the past year, an unusually large share of the sympathies of our churches. We hear, with pleasure, that some of our ministers have begun to think very seriously of devoting their labors more directly and exclusively to this part of our population." Sunday Schools for the blacks in South Carolina have been found valuable.⁶⁴

The following year (1833) the work of Rev. C. C. Jones prompted these Resolutions:

1. "That to impart the Gospel of salvation to the Negroes of our country is a duty which God in his providence and word imposes on us.

2. "That in the discharge of this duty, we separate entirely the civil and religious conditions of this people; and while we devote

⁶³MS. *Minutes*, Vol. I, p. 305.

⁶⁴*Ibid*, p. 329.

ourselves to the improvement of the latter, we disclaim all interference with the former.

.

5. "That every member of this Synod, while he endeavors to awaken others, shall set the example and begin the religious instruction of the servants of his own household, systematically and perseveringly, as God shall enable him.

6. "That we cannot longer continue to neglect the duty without incurring the charge of inconsistency in our Christian character—of unfaithfulness in the discharge of ministerial duty, and at the same time meeting the disapprobation of God and our own consciences."⁶⁵

This interest on the part of Synod was intense in the circle of Synod living in closest contact with the Seminary. Among the first committees appointed by the Society of Missionary Inquiry, one was on the subject of Colored Evangelism.⁶⁶ One of the original founders and life-long supporters of the Seminary⁶⁷ was Rev. Robert Wilson James, pastor of Indiantown and later Salem, Black River, South Carolina. Of him, this is written: "He prepared very carefully his discourses for the ignorant sons of Africa who flocked in great numbers from the large plantations on the river to hear his simple, lucid, earnest and forcible presentation of Gospel truth. He was largely instrumental in his own Synod in arousing a zeal in their spiritual welfare; and it is probable that his profound interest in their spiritual condition was the means of directing the missionary enthusiasm of his young neighbor and kinsman, J. Leighton Wilson, toward the dark continent."⁶⁸

Dr. White draws this picture of old South Carolina interest in the colored brother which produced Columbia's foremost exemplar of the missionary spirit. "As a child he (J. L. Wilson) lived in daily association with the colored men and women on his father's plantation. Every Sunday morning he saw virtually all of the negroes of the community assemble for worship in the grove of pine trees near Mount Zion Church. He heard hymns of praise, and often listened to the words of the pastor of the church as he preached the first ser-

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 342, 344, 362, 363.

⁶⁶*Records Society of M. Inquiry*, p. 97.

⁶⁷*Minutes of Board* show James present Dec. 11, 1828. Manuscript copy Vol. I, p. 16. Min. of Synod, 1841, p. 36, Min. on the death of Rev. R. W. James.

⁶⁸*DuBose Memoirs of J. L. Wilson*, p. 17.

mon of the day to the slaves who lived within the limits of the congregation. When this service was ended, then the negroes entered the seats reserved for them in the deep galleries of the church, and took part in worship there, in association with the white members of the congregation. Moreover, many of these negro slaves were members in good standing, with their names enrolled in the list of the regular membership of the church. On two Sundays in each year, therefore, all these colored members were brought into the body of the church and given seats at the long communion table, and there the elements of the Lord's Supper were administered to them. Besides all this, every Sunday afternoon throughout the year the heads of the household called together all their slaves, young and old, and taught them portions of the Bible. Sometimes also, the pastor of the church would preach to the colored people every evening for an entire week. One of the ministers whose preaching to negroes was followed by many of the signs of God's presence was Robt. Wilson Jones."⁶⁹

J. L. Wilson's year between Union College (N. Y.) and Columbia Seminary seems to have been spent with this uncle, whose efforts for the negro were so fruitful.⁷⁰ How much does the development of the Society of Missionary Inquiry and the Southern Presbyterian Church owe to that year, under the example and loving ministry of Robt. W. James—a father of the Seminary—in his work for the colored brother! John B. Adger, the one most conversant with Wilson's motives during the year when his spiritual life was revived and he decided to go as a missionary to Africa, writes:

"In choosing his (Wilson's) field of labor, his mind and heart were turned to Africa, not only because it had been a very much neglected portion of the world by Christian nations, but because he believed that America, and especially the South, owed it to Africa to send her the Gospel, inasmuch as so many of her dark-skinned children were held in bondage here." . . . "I know it was also a leading motive with him in devoting his life to foreign missions to exert some reflex influence upon the Christian people of his native State in extending and deepening their interest in the spiritual condition of their slaves."

That this was his motive is borne out by the fact that, on his return to South Carolina, Dr. Wilson provided both a school and a

⁶⁹White, *Sou. Pres. Leaders*, p. 397.

⁷⁰*Memoirs*, pp. 17, 28.

church for the negroes near his home. During the last year of his life, tho he refused to preach at Mt. Zion, the nearby white church, he continued to preach to the colored people at Mt. Sinai.⁷¹

Crossing the border into Georgia we find, among the fathers of the Seminary, Charles Colcock Jones. Jones' securing of a five thousand dollar legacy toward the Georgia scholarship was one of the first substantial financial gifts after the reorganization of the Seminary; and this gift may almost be said to have been the step between life and death—realization and failure for the new institution.⁷² After a good education at Andover and Princeton, a two years' pastorate of the First Church, Savannah, Jones, at the age of twenty-eight, returned to his own plantation near Midway Church, Georgia, to give his life to the evangelization of the negroes.⁷³ In this district there was a body of about 4500 negro slaves. Supporting himself from his own plantation, Jones gave himself to the work of spiritually shepherding this people. He instructed them day and night. Three church buildings were built for their exclusive use. Dr. White thus describes his Sabbath "routine":

"Every Sunday, at an early hour, Dr. Jones mounted his horse and rode to one of these churches. From all of the neighboring plantations the servants came in crowds, men, women and children. First in order, a meeting for prayer was held. During this service a number of the negroes, known as 'watchmen' one after another led the assembly in prayer. Then followed the sermon, preached by Dr. Jones himself, with the usual accompaniment of sacred hymns. In the afternoon the same congregation was called together as a Sunday School. The principal part of the exercises in the school was a series of questions and answers prepared by the leader himself, and widely known as Jones' Catechism."⁷⁴ Then there was a period for inquiry and help to spiritually needy; and reports from and counsel to "the watchers" by the chief shepherd. Every hour of the Lord's Day was spent bringing light, knowledge, and spiritual help to "the colored brethren." During the week there were preaching appointments on various plantations.

⁷¹Adger's letters quoted in *Memoirs of J. L. Wilson*, pp. 40, 291.

⁷²*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 219, 220.

⁷³*Minutes of Synod S. C. and Ga.*, 1833, p. 342.

⁷⁴Dr. J. B. Adger translated and used this in *Asia Minor for the Armenians*. White, p. 299.

In 1832 Jones organized "The Association for the Religious Instruction of the Negroes," the report of which he, as secretary, issued. From 1833 to 1848 he was the agent of the General Assembly's Board of Domestic Missions with reference to the colored work in the South and Southwest. The proof that this colored work met the endorsement of the Seminary is shown by the fact that Dr. Jones was twice called from it to the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in Columbia Seminary (1836-38; 1849-59). During these years he served to focus the attention of the Seminary and the student body on the work so near to his own heart, but each time his first love carried Jones back to "the plantation darkies," and earned for him the title, "apostle to the negro slaves."⁷⁵

Dr. Jones, as Chairman of the Committee on Domestic Missions in the first assembly of the Southern Church, addressed that Assembly on the subject of the religious instruction of the Colored People.⁷⁶

By reason of long sickness Dr. Jones was unable to stand throughout this address; but, seated in a chair, he plead for an hour and a half the spiritual interests of the race for which he had spent his life. He argued, "They are men created in the image of God, to be acknowledged and cared for spiritually by us. . . . They are our constant and inseparable associates; whither we go, they go, where we dwell, they dwell; where we die and are buried, there they die and are buried; and, more than all, our God is their God."⁷⁷

Stirred by this eloquent appeal the following resolution by Dr. Jones was, on motion of Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, unanimously adopted by the first Southern Assembly:

"That the great field of Missionary operations among our colored population falls more immediately under the care of the Committee on Domestic Missions; and that committee be urged to give it serious and constant attention, and the Presbyteries to co-operate with the committee in securing Pastors and Missionaries for this field."⁷⁸

Dr. Jones is the first of a trio of professors who were called directly from a ministry to the negroes to a chair in Columbia Semi-

⁷⁵White, pp. 292-297. Howe, *Jones' History of the Church*, in *Sou. Pres. Review*, Jan., 1848, p. 68 ff. Mallard, J. Q., *Plantation Life Before Emancipation*, pp. 91-152.

⁷⁶*Minutes Assembly*, 1861, pp. 14, 15, 20. Mallard, pp. 194-207.

⁷⁷Mallard, pp. 194-207. White, *Southern Pres. Leaders*, p. 325.

⁷⁸*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 14, 15, 20.

nary. Almost a tradition to this effect was established; and Columbia may unabashed compare this tradition with that of other Presbyterian institutions: the road to her professorial chairs was an apprenticeship of spiritual service for the slave brother.

Dr. John B. Adger returned for physical recuperation, after twelve years of foreign missionary work in Smyrna, and began to preach to a congregation of negroes in the basement to the Second Presbyterian Church (Charleston, S. C.), of which his brother-in-law, Dr. Thomas Smyth, was pastor. Adger appealed to the city and the Presbytery in the interest of these people. His sermon to Presbytery, May 9, 1847, was on the text, "The poor have the Gospel preached to them." Shortly after this, there appeared in the Southern Presbyterian Review a review of the sermon by Dr. Thornwell.⁷⁹ In this review Thornwell supported Adger's view that, for their adequate spiritual oversight, the colored people ought to have their own congregations, a full-time white minister, and the Gospel preached simply enough for them to comprehend. There was some opposition on account of the Vesey insurrection cabal among the slaves, unearthed in 1822; but the leading citizens of Charleston, particularly those of the Second Church, rallied to Adger's plan.⁸⁰

This white support built the first church on Anson Street, Charleston, at a cost of seven thousand seven hundred dollars. The building was dedicated May 26, 1850.⁸¹

Under the eloquent leadership of Dr. J. L. Girardeau—who followed Adger, both into the ministry for the colored people and then to a chair in the Seminary—this building became too small; and there was built for the work, on Calhoun Street, the (then) largest church edifice in Charleston.⁸² Dr. Girardeau stated that he only refrained from going to the foreign field that he might preach to the mass of slaves on the seacoast.⁸³ Notations in the Communicants' roll book and in the Minutes of the Session of Zion Presbyterian Church (1858-1867) testify to the fidelity with which Dr. Girardeau administered discipline (the chief cause being adultery);

⁷⁹S. P. R., Vol. II, p. 137.

⁸⁰*My Life and Times, Adger*, pp. 164-204; Mallard, pp. 156, 159.

⁸¹Adger, p. 174; White, p. 297; Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 379.

⁸²*The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*, pp. 31-104; Adger, pp. 174, 175; Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 379; Mallard, pp. 157, 162-171.

⁸³*The Life Work of J. L. G.*, p. 76.

and the regularity with which he attended the colored communicants in their dying hours.⁸⁴

On the occasion of the dedication of the first edifice, Dr. J. H. Thornwell preached the sermon to a large assemblage of the leading citizens of Charleston on the subject, *The Christian Doctrine of Slavery*. In general, it may be said that Thornwell's view of slavery is the same as that which the Rev. A. J. and Sir R. W. Carlyle present in their recent volumes, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, as being the view of the patristic writers of the Christian Church. Thornwell acknowledges the difficulty of holding the true view in the bitter controversy then raging; and confesses that Southern writers have run into extravagance in their defense of the institution.⁸⁵ He deprecates any attempt to deny that the negro is "the same blood with ourselves." "We recognize in him the image of God. We are not ashamed to call him our *brother*" (pp. 402, 403). He denies that slavery is the "property of man in man," as held by Channing and Whewell (pp. 498-414).⁸⁶ He affirms, instead, that the right of the master is not to the *man*, but to his *labour*; and therefore, that the rights of the slave ought not be left to the caprice or interest of the master (p. 415).

"That the design of Christianity is to secure the perfection of the race is obvious, from all its arrangements; and that, when this end shall have been consummated, slavery must cease to exist is equally clear. . . . In this sense slavery is inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel—that it contemplates a state of things, an existing economy, which it is the design of the Gospel to remove. Slavery is a part of the curse which sin has introduced into the world, and stands in the same general relations to Christianity as poverty, sickness, disease, and death. In other words, it is a relation which can only be conceived as taking place among fallen beings, tainted with a curse. It springs not from the nature of man as man, nor from the nature of society as such, but from the nature of man as sinful, and the nature of society as disordered (pp. 419, 420).

⁸⁴*Communicant Roll Book of Colored Members of Zion Presbyterian Church. Rules for the Government of the Colored Members of Z. P. C. Minutes of Session Zion Pres. Church, 1858-1867. Private library Rev. John Blackburn, Atlanta, Ga.*

⁸⁵Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 402.

⁸⁶*Channing's Works*, Vol. II, pp. 17, 46; *Truth*, Complete Edition, Boston, 1849. Whewell, *Elements of Morality*, Vol. I, pp. 372, 373, American Edition.

The speaker held that personal rights and personal responsibilities pervaded the whole system of slavery (432 et al.). He urged all the brethren of the South to go into this colored evangelization "until every slave in our borders shall know Jesus and the resurrection" (pp. 435, 436).

Two views of slavery can really be distinguished in the Southeast. Those who were laboring for the spiritual uplift of the colored brethren were anxious to put Dr. Thornwell's views into practical relation. Thornwell contemplated a memorial to the Legislature of South Carolina petitioning for the protection of the marriage relation. Even without slave marriage legislation, Girardeau invoked the extreme ecclesiastical penalty in an effort to preserve the slave home.

In the Southern Presbyterian Review for October, 1863, Dr. J. Leighton Wilson has an article on the religious instruction of the colored people.⁸⁷ In this article he urged the sanctity of slave marriage. Dr. A. M. Fraser declares that Christians conscientiously refused to obey State laws which forbade any one to teach a negro to read. In fact, they allowed these laws to fall into innocuous desuetude.⁸⁸

The spirit of Missions, the Christian Evangel, made the difference between the Christian viewpoint and the opposite view, which, sad to say, is sometimes reflected in the statute books, and is to be found in an anonymous article in the Southern Presbyterian Review of October, 1863. It is at least suggestive that Dr. Thornwell, one of the circle most concerned for the spiritual well-being of the negro, came to the place where he was ready to propose emancipation.⁸⁹

It is perhaps equally suggestive that the utilitarianism of Dr. Thomas Cooper took the diametrically opposite direction. In 1787 he was bitterly denouncing slavery and the slave trade.⁹⁰ Half a century later he was as bitterly fighting the abolitionists, declaring that negroes were "a permanently degraded people" without inherent civil rights.⁹¹ In 1838 he was willing for slavery to swallow

⁸⁷S. P. R., Vol. XVI, p. 151; Wilson's, p. 197.

⁸⁸Fraser, A. M., *Smythe Lectures*, 1925. filed C. T. S., Lecture III, pp. 11, 12.

⁸⁹Palmer, p. 483.

⁹⁰Cooper, *Letters on the Slave Trade*, Eng., 1787.

⁹¹Cooper, *Coloured Marriages*, *Courier*, Sept. 15, 1829.

up every other issue—yes, even for the “gag” law to repudiate his own fundamental political principle—freedom of speech.⁹²

In his eulogy on Dr. George Howe, Dr. J. L. Girardeau has this to say of Howe’s interest in colored evangelization: “At a time when the Southern Church was surrounded by a dense mass of slaves, who were dependent upon her for the preaching of the Gospel, he was ever the earnest and able advocate of their systematic instruction by the ministry of pastors, and their evangelization by the labors of missionaries. For years he was the chairman of the Committee of Domestic Missions in his Presbytery.”⁹³

Perhaps the best summary, from the standpoint of this paper, of the work of the Seminary and its constituency for the slave is found in the prefatory note to Thornwell’s address, written by the editors of Thornwell’s Collected Writings, J. B. Adger and J. L. Girardeau. Both editors were professors in the Seminary—their publication is the work of Columbia’s greatest mind. Both editors labored for the evangelization of the negro in the Charleston Church, and delighted to preach in colored churches in Columbia during their professorships. The editors affirm that Southern Christians were actively engaged in efforts to afford the slaves judicious religious instruction, and opportunities for securing the salvation of their souls through the gracious provisions of the Gospel. “Dr. Thornwell was always the earnest advocate of the evangelization of a people whom Providence had made dependent on the Southern Church for a knowledge of Christianity. With all the energy of an enthusiastic nature, and all the power of his mighty, impassioned eloquence, he ever in private and in public, on the platform, in the pulpit, and on the floors of ecclesiastical assemblies, pleaded for the Gospel to be given to the slaves. Nor was this zeal his, alone. His brethren in the ministry throughout the South reckoned the negroes as their parishioners, and preached to them in a style adapted to their capacities. If the mass of the colored race has, in any measure, been prepared for the responsibilities and duties of freemen, so suddenly thrust upon them, the fact is due mainly to the preaching of Gospel Ministers, the instructions of the Sabbath-school, and the training of Christian families. The Southern Church

⁹²Malone, p. 396; pp. 387, 388, quoting letter of C. to Van Buren.

⁹³*Semi-Centennial*, p. 409.

makes no boast that she did her whole duty to the souls of the slaves. As before God, she has much to confess; but as before men, she can honestly affirm that she did not neglect the spiritual interests of the negro, but sincerely endeavored to lead them to Christ."⁹⁴

The minutes of the Synod of South Carolina and other references support these statements. The earlier records have been referred to. The narratives of 1853, 1854 and 1858 speak of increasing and sustained interest in this cause and of large colored accessions to the churches.⁹⁵ Dr. Bean declares that, in this decade, many ministers were giving one-half their time to the instruction of the slaves.⁹⁶ He gives the following figures for a church in lower South Carolina in 1853:

"The John's Island and Wadmalaw Church had 359 communicants, of whom 330 were colored. In 1851, membership in Charleston (S. C.) Presbytery was 2,269, of which 1,440 were colored."⁹⁷

Dr. James Woodrow gives the following figures for the number of colored communicants in the states in the vicinity of the Seminary, before these colored brethren became separated during Reconstruction; in South Carolina 5,767 communicants; in North Carolina 5,490 communicants; and in Georgia 1,109 communicants in one Presbytery.⁹⁸

Dr. Henry A. White, also a former professor in the Seminary and a wide student of Southern history, declared that in 1860 nearly 500,000 negroes were members of the various churches.⁹⁹ Rev. R. C. Reed, sometime professor in the Seminary, also uses this figure of half million negroes being brought into the Church in the days of slavery.¹⁰⁰ His reference and a book review in the Southern Presbyterian Review of January, 1882, show that the half-million figure is taken from a book entitled *Our Brother in Black*, by President A. G. Haygood of Emory College, Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1881.

The same men who labored for the slaves continued to love the colored brother and labor to hold him in their fellowship. The

⁹⁴Thornwell, Vol. IV, p. 380.

⁹⁵*Min. of Synod of S. C.* for 1853, p. 18; 1854, p. 30; 1858, p. 31.

⁹⁶*The Presbyterian Church in S. C.*, p. 54.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 51, 52.

⁹⁸Dr. James Woodrow, p. 580, article Jan. 20, 1881.

⁹⁹White, p. 306.

¹⁰⁰*Southern Pres. Review*, Jan., 1885, p. 97.

Presbytery of South Carolina in 1867 adopted a paper, written by Dr. Adger, stating their unwillingness to constitute a Freedman's Church, i. e., a church purely and solely of colored (people) into which white people could not be received, because, "The ground of color is a schismatical foundation on which a church may not be built."¹⁰¹

Dr. Adger has preserved a heart-breaking letter from Dr. J. L. Girardeau to himself, on this subject.¹⁰² Dr. Girardeau narrates how the question of admitting negro members into our Church was raised at the Synod of 1873. He earnestly favored this admission. "I never, from the beginning, was in favor of separating the two races, of cutting off—as I expressed it—the negro race from the white, like casting loose a tow-boat from a great steamship in the middle of a stormy ocean."

The subject came up by overture from this Synod and from Mississippi, and "the Assembly voted that way (i. e., for separation) *unanimously*, excepting one vote—that of the writer."

"The issue was retention of the colored people in our Church or organic separation from them. I did not theoretically approve of separation, but, as the whole Church was going that way I practically went with it, but under protest." . . . "Theoretically, I still think the policy of retention the better one; but practically, separation *now* seems a necessity. But I cannot write as I wish. I grow tired and sick."

"That Assembly effected an organic separation between the two races ecclesiastically, so that the colored, if it desired to do so, could withdraw from any formal relation to the white." He narrates how he explained this at a congregational meeting. The old people opposed the separation, "but Young Africa was in favor of it." . . . "That was how the breach occurred."

The change of the economic, legal, social, and political relationships and views of the colored people during reconstruction eventuated, to the profound sorrow of such Seminary leaders as Adger and Girardeau, in their organic separation from the white Presbyterian Church. An article in the *Southern Presbyterian Review* of April,

¹⁰¹Quoted from Presbytery of S. C. Min. in the Pres. Church in S. C. since 1850.

¹⁰²*My Life and Times*, pp. 176, 177.

1868, on *The Future of the Freedmen* attributes a part of this result to the activities of ministers (white and black) sent from the North to preach, who "are simply political emissaries" (p. 272). But the labors of men like Jones, Adger, and Girardeau could not be forgotten, no matter what the provocation. In 1885 Dr. R. C. Reed—a man who was to give the best quarter century of his life to Columbia—wrote in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, urging the Southern Presbyterian Church to do something more adequate for the freedmen.¹⁰³

To this new call Columbia has contributed Dr. C. A. Stillman (Class of 1844) and Dr. J. R. Howerton (Class of 1885). The life, labors, and love for the colored brethren of such men have brought into being an institute for the training of colored ministers at Tuscaloosa, Alabama, now known as Stillman Institute. The *Souvenir of the 1924 Assembly* describes Dr. C. A. Stillman as the founder and father of this Institute. It is sending a small, but steady, stream of colored preachers into the work of building up colored churches and Sunday Schools in the South, and into the foreign mission service. Among these latter may be mentioned the recently deceased colored brother, William H. Sheppard. Sheppard helped open the Southern Church's mission in the Congo; and later labored in the work of colored evangelization under the Southern Church in Louisville, Kentucky.¹⁰⁴

The 1927 minutes show, as a result of Stillman Institute, the Synod of Snedecor Memorial, with 45 colored ministers; 48 churches; 1573 communicants; and 165 (about 10½%) added that year on confession of faith.¹⁰⁵

THE CHALMERS OF THE DISRUPTION

Columbia's greatest contribution to Southern Presbyterian missions was J. Leighton Wilson, denoted by his illustrious biographer, Hampden C. DuBose, as "The Chalmers of the Disruption."¹⁰⁶

And *perhaps* the greatest single service rendered to the Southern Church by Dr. Wilson was the report of the Committee on Foreign

¹⁰³Article, *The Southern Pres. Church and the Freedmen*, Jan., 1885, *S. P. R.*, p. 83. Cf. *The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*, pp. 134, 142.

¹⁰⁴White, p. 456.

¹⁰⁵*Minutes*, 1927, p. 268.

¹⁰⁶*Memoirs of Rev. John Leighton Wilson, D.D.*, by Hampden C. DuBose, D.D., p. 258.

Missions to this First Southern Presbyterian General Assembly. In this report, adopted by a Church struggling to birth in the throes of an agonizing war, is seen "the sublime spectacle of faith" . . . "a Church hedged in by a cordon of armies, looking out upon the whole world as its field."¹⁰⁷

"Finally, the General Assembly desires distinctly and deliberately to inscribe on our Church's banner as she now first unfurls it to the world, in immediate connection with the Headship of her Lord, His last command: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature'; regarding this as the great end of her organization, and obedience to it as the indispensable condition of her Lord's promised presence, and as one great comprehensive object, a proper conception of whose vast magnitude and grandeur is the only thing which, in connection with the love of Christ, can ever sufficiently arouse her energies and develop her resources, so as to cause her to carry on, with vigor and efficiency which true fealty to her Lord demands, those other agencies necessary to her internal growth and home prosperity. The claims of this cause ought therefore to be kept constantly before the minds of our people and pressed upon their consciences."¹⁰⁸

Wilson's early love for the colored brother, both at home and abroad, has been noticed. He labored for almost twenty years (1833-1852) under the A. B. C. F. M. in the African mission—first at Cape Palmas, then in the Gaboon Mission. His work involved that of naturalist, explorer, linguist, and author as well as preacher. Wilson's *Western Africa: Its History, Condition and Prospects*, New York, 1856, an encyclopaedic book, received the highest praise from Dr. Livingstone.¹⁰⁹ His biographer gives Wilson large credit for the final suppression of the African slave trade. A British naval squadron was at work trying to break up this evil practice. There was agitation in England to recall the squadron. Wilson wrote an urgent paper in favor of the maintenance of the squadron in African waters; and sent it to a wealthy Bristol merchant. The merchant gave it to Lord Palmerston, who published it in the British Blue Book. The

¹⁰⁷*Memoirs of Wilson*, p. 252.

¹⁰⁸*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17. DuBose, *Memoirs*, p. 251. Johnson, T. C., *The Southern Presbyterians*, pp. 341-342. American Ch. History, Vol. XI.

¹⁰⁹*Memoirs*, p. 190.

Premier had it widely disseminated, and afterward informed Wilson that, with the publication of his article, all English opposition to the retention of the African squadron ceased.¹¹⁰

Returning to America on account of ill-health, Dr. Wilson was elected a Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in 1853. The *Memoirs* preserve letters from Mr. Wm. Rankin, Treasurer; and from Dr. John D. Wells, President of the Board—each testifying to the high esteem in which Wilson was held by his associates in this office. Of particular moment was Wilson's advocacy of the sending of Rev. A. G. Smyngton, at his own request, to Brazil. By this act the Presbyterian Church launched its missionary work in Latin America. Dr. Charles Hodge, who came into close contacts with Dr. Wilson in connection with the frequent visits of the Secretary to the Seminary, is quoted as having said to Dr. Samuel B. Jones that, "Dr. Leighton Wilson was the wisest man in the Presbyterian Church, and had more of the apostolic spirit than any one he ever knew."¹¹¹ Dr. Wilson's training in the thoroughly organized offices of the New York Board was to be invaluable in the organization of the work in the South.

With the outbreak of the war he saw, from his New York watch-tower, the great power, the tremendous forces of the North, and their fixed determination to crush secession—the hopeless odds; but he declared: "My mind is made up. I will go and suffer with my people."¹¹²

On the advice of the Presbyterian Convention held in Atlanta he visited the Indian Missions in the summer of 1861, so that he was ready to present this work to the first Southern General Assembly as a definite foreign missionary work ready for its immediate care. The missionaries to the southwestern Indian tribes, the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, and Cherokees, were ready to cast in their lot with the Southern Church; and this trust was by that Church accepted "with joyful gratitude to God."¹¹³

The first Assembly practically placed the organization of its Foreign Mission work in the hands of Columbia Seminary. It elected

¹¹⁰DuBose, *Memoirs*, p. 219. Tenney, *Souvenir of Assembly*, 1924, p. 141.

¹¹¹*Memoirs*, p. 243.

¹¹²*Memoirs*, p. 247.

¹¹³*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 16, 44-48. *Memoirs*, p. 251.

for Secretary Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D.D.—a member of Columbia's first class and the first student president of its Society of Missionary Inquiry. It elected for Treasurer Dr. James Woodrow, Perkins Professor of Natural Science in connection with Revelation.¹¹⁴

Dr. Wilson nominated Columbia as the location of the Committee; and in the home of Professor Woodrow work was centered for many years.¹¹⁵ One reason Wilson gave for locating in Columbia was the facility with which a committee could be organized of the able ministers there. In addition to Dr. Woodrow, at whose home he stayed during the monthly meetings,¹¹⁶ on the first committee were Professors Thornwell, Howe and Adger of the Seminary Faculty, A. A. Porter and F. P. Mullally of the alumni and a group of Columbia elders most closely connected with the Seminary.¹¹⁷

In this work the business and executive ability, the multifarious service, and unswerving honesty of Dr. James Woodrow were of invaluable aid. Testimonials by Dr. A. M. Fraser, Dr. Thomas H. Law, and General W. A. Clark show that, in order to revive the *Southern Presbyterian* in 1865, Dr. Woodrow hauled its printing press to Columbia with a cart, a mule, and at times his own shoulder (p. 38); and in Columbia—at a personal loss—published both this and the *Southern Presbyterian Review* (pp. 38, 172).¹¹⁸ A part of his own home was set aside as the Presbyterian Publishing House. Dr. Law says, "He proposed to open and conduct a book depository in Columbia for the supply of our people with much needed religious literature" (p. 59). "In carrying out these plans Dr. Woodrow became a sort of factotum of our Church in this section. We looked to him for information on all subjects; we got our books and writing materials at his hands; and even sent all kinds of Church contributions through his hands" (p. 60).

Owing to the serious embarrassments to the work of the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions caused by the war, Dr. Wilson proposed to the General Assembly of 1863 a temporary union of the

¹¹⁴*Minutes*, 1861, pp. 29, 37.

¹¹⁵*Memoirs*, p. 29.

¹¹⁶*Memoirs*, p. 294.

¹¹⁷*Minutes*, 1861, p. 29.

¹¹⁸*Dr. Jas. Woodrow*, p. 172.

two committees. This step was taken by that Assembly.¹¹⁹ The United Committee on Domestic and Foreign Missions was composed of the same executive officers and included the same members of the Seminary Faculty as the former Committee of Foreign Missions. It was a Columbia Committee, centering and functioning from the Seminary.¹²⁰ The consolidated committee resolved to try to put one chaplain in every brigade. The secretary sent out a circular letter to eighty ministers and before July—Assembly met in May—sixty of these brethren were in the field.¹²¹ Among the foremost of the Confederate war chaplains, stands the names of Benjamin M. Palmer—Columbia Seminary's rich gift to New Orleans—and John L. Girardeau, called from his colored mission to preach the religion of power to the soldiers.¹²²

It was in sustaining, holding together, building up the torn fragments of the Southern Zion after the war, that Dr. J. L. Wilson and his committee shine with brightest brilliance. No sooner did the bugle call to battle cease to be heard than he seized the gospel trumpet and, with its clarion notes, summoned the Church to action. He breathed upon the Church the spirit of consecration, awoke the slumbering energies of the people to fresh resolve, encouraged the faint-hearted. His office became the "connectional centre" of the Church, and as corresponding agent he was her chief director. "In the Southern Synods no one has ever equalled him in the power for good he exerted, and we believe it is impossible in the future for any man to obtain the position of commanding influence that he exercised during the ten years following our civil struggle."¹²³ He helped ministers find their fields or exchange them, and churches find ministers; he secured and disbursed the funds to maintain struggling churches. In 1865 he called "for the restoration of our crippled and broken-down churches." To the next Assembly he presented the Sustentation Plan, which was to be the life of the feeble, the new, and the border churches for many years.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹*Minutes*, 1863, pp. 123, 138, 146.

¹²⁰*Minutes*, 1863, p. 148.

¹²¹DuBose, *Memoirs*, p. 253.

¹²²G. A. Blackburn, *Life Work of John L. Girardeau*, p. 106 ff. White, *S. P. L.*, p. 370.

¹²³*Memoirs*, 259.

¹²⁴*Minutes*, 1866, pp. 9, 49.

This resulted in a change of the Committee's name, from Committee of Domestic Missions to Committee of Sustentation; but the personnel continued to be the same as that of the Committee of Foreign Missions, and the center of the organization and work, the Seminary.¹²⁵ Dr. Craig, a successor to Dr. Wilson in the home work, declares that, but for this effort of sustentation by Wilson's Committee, "Many churches would have fallen into disorganization." Dr. DuBose declares that Dr. Wilson was gifted as a financier; in that, even in years of financial ruin, people listened to the earnestness and solemnity of his appeal and gave with self-denying hand; in that, in times of threatened disaster, he would go to the liberal Presbyterians of Kentucky and Missouri, spend a couple months going from church to church with soul-stirring addresses and secure the funds for this work; and in that he administered his funds with utmost wisdom. "We doubt if the finances of the Church, in any period of the history of God's people can show greater returns from small investment than from the money spent in Home Missions during the decade succeeding the war."¹²⁶

A member of the Columbia Committee, Dr. A. A. Porter,¹²⁷ was sent to visit the state of Texas. His stirring report touched the Committee, and Dr. Wilson sounded and re-sounded the appeal for men for Texas until they were found and sent. Dr. R. L. Dabney is quoted as saying in *The Christian Observer* that "Dr. Wilson saved Texas to our Church." Other plans which Wilson advocated were the "Relief Fund" for the families of deceased ministers, from which has grown the work of Ministerial Relief and the Annuity Plan; and a special collection for the evangelistic work.¹²⁸

In the department of Foreign Missions Dr. Wilson kept alive the work for the Indians during the war. He found a way, even amidst Reconstruction, to establish a mission at Hangchow, China—by the sending of Rev. E. B. Inslee and family there in June, 1866;¹²⁹ to send Miss C. Rouzone back to her native land, Italy, under the support of the Southern Church, to aid the Waldensian Church; to open the Brazil Mission and the Colombia Mission in 1869.¹³⁰

¹²⁵Cf. e. g. *Minutes*, 1869, fly leaf—if numbered would be p. 368.

¹²⁶*Memoirs*, pp. 261, 262, 263.

¹²⁷Class of '42 Catalogue 1907-7 appendix, p. 32.

¹²⁸*Memoirs*, p. 263.

¹²⁹Report Committee F. M. in *Minutes Assembly*, 1867, p. 161.

¹³⁰*Minutes*, 1869, p. 406.

With the improvement of home conditions came also a mission to Greece, and one to Mexico, and finally one to Africa—the continent which had enjoyed the strength of his own youth.

A NOTABLE SUCCESSION

Nor has the Seminary's influence in directing the great missionary forces of the Church ended with Dr. Wilson. Dr. R. C. Reed points out that, "in furnishing secretaries for the Committees of both Home and Foreign Missions, Columbia Seminary has done a notable part"; that for almost twenty years (1883-1900) Dr. J. N. Craig, an alumnus of the Seminary, had the Home Mission work in hand;¹³² and that the retiring Executive Secretary of Home Missions, Dr. S. L. Morris, is a Columbia man. Dr. Morris' wise and energetic administration, already extending over more than a quarter of a century, "has marked a new and striking era in this vastly important and ever-expanding department of the King's business."¹³³

Dr. Morris has found time, somehow, to produce several valuable books, in his own and other fields of thought. The wide dissemination of these books, through Bible classes, mission study classes, Circles and Brotherhoods, has deepened the Church's denominational consciousness, accentuated her sense of responsibility and obligation, and stimulated her endeavors. Among these are: *At Our Own Door*,¹³⁴ *The Task That Challenges*, *Christianizing Christendom*, *Presbyterianism, Principle and Practice*, *The Country Church, Its Ruin and Remedy*, *The Romance of Missions*, *The Fact of Christianity*, etc.¹³⁵

Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters mentions, in the home field, the labors of the following Columbia workers and organizers: Josephus Johnson, A. P. Smith, and S. F. Tenney in Texas; T. D. Witherspoon and E. M. Green in Kentucky.¹³⁶

Many others are equally entitled to honorable mention for their valiant service in the homeland. But the thousand sons of Columbia have always been willing to belong to

¹³¹*Memoirs*, pp. 256-279.

¹³²Cf. also *Souvenir Assembly* 1924, by Tenney, p. 163.

¹³³Reed, *A Historical Sketch—Bulletin C. T. S.*, March, 1922, Vol. XII, No. IX, pp. 11, 12.

¹³⁴S. L. Morris, D.D., Richmond, 1917, Pres. C. of Publ.

¹³⁵*Souvenir of General Assembly* 1924, by S. M. Tenney.

¹³⁶*Columbia Theol. Seminary, A Retrospect*, 1901, pp. 30, 31.

“The legion that never was listed,
That carries no color nor crest,
Yet split in a thousand detachments
Is breaking the road for the rest.”

On the present executive force of the Foreign Mission Committee Columbia is represented by Dr. J. O. Reavis, for ten years Professor of English Bible, Missions, etc., in the Seminary; and by Dr. C. Darby Fulton, an alumnus with a record for distinguished missionary service in Japan.¹³⁷

On the basis of his earlier *Retrospect* and the Catalogues of the Seminary, Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters gives the following list of Columbia Theological Seminary Alumni who have gone as Foreign Missionaries:

To Africa—

F. McC. Grissett, Cameroun, W. Africa.
Samuel H. Wilds, Luebo, Congo Belge, Africa.
C. L. Voss.
J. Leighton Wilson.
Hoyt Miller, Ex. '19.

To India—

L. L. McBryde.
M. M. Charlton.

To China—

S. R. Brown, R. C. Way, J. W. Quarteman, J. K. Wight, J. A. Danforth, H. C. DuBose, J. N. Montgomery, H. M. Smith, P. C. DuBose, Geo. A. Hudson, S. I. Woodbridge, H. L. Reaves, W. P. Mills (Y. M. C. A.), W. B. White.

Japan—

S. R. Hope, R. E. McAlpine, S. P. Fulton, C. Rees Jenkins, W. B. McIllwaine, C. Darby Fulton, V. A. Crawford, H. H. Bryan.

United States of Columbia, and thence to Mexico and Cuba—

J. G. Hall.

To the Indians—

A. M. Watson, C. J. Stillman, J. H. Colter, J. J. Read, J. C. Kennedy.

¹³⁷*Minutes*, 1927, p. 3.

Brazil—

Wm. C. Emerson, J. R. Baird, H. S. Allyn, A. L. Davis, W. G. Neville, Geo. Henderlite, R. D. Daffin, J. Knox Johnston, William LeConte.

Korea—

L. O. McCutchen, D. A. Swicord, John McEachern, W. A. Linton.

Mexico—

Walter E. Shive.

Persia—

Knoshaba Shimmon.

Central America—

J. T. Butler

Siam—

Alexander Waite, James Waite.

The Church fruitage of the work of Dr. Wilson, his co-laborers, and successors on the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, has been a missionary communion. For the five years ending 1928 the Southern Presbyterian Church has contributed from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000 per year for the support of its foreign missionary enterprise. The year which closed April 1, 1928, saw \$1,662,443.84 contributed for Foreign Missions.¹³⁸ Its per capita gifts for all denominational benevolences for the same period have been about twelve dollars a year.¹³⁹ A summary of the 1926 mission statistics shows that she has a native Christian constituency of 103,620; a native communicant membership of 47,879; a force of 499 foreign and 3,606 native workers, laboring in 1,664 outstations and 314 organized congregations.¹⁴⁰

A comparison of these figures with the givings and per capita givings of the Old School Assembly would indicate that the Southern Presbyterian Church has had some success in realizing the purpose avowed for it by Dr. Thornwell—"to bring out the energies of our Presbyterian system of government."¹⁴¹ In 1859, under that Board system against which Thornwell protested, the Old School Assembly,

¹³⁸*Presbyterian Standard*, April 18, 1928, p. I.

¹³⁹*Minutes* 1927, p. 270.

¹⁴⁰*Report of Executive Committee to the General Assembly* (U. S.), 1927, p. 5.

¹⁴¹*Minutes Southern Assembly* 1861, pp. 59, 60.

with 279,630 members, contributed \$114,962 for Foreign Missions, and slightly less than two dollars per capita for all denominational benevolences.¹⁴²

SOCIAL SERVICE

Among the sons of Columbia sent out by the Southern Presbyterian Church, perhaps none has a deeper hold on the affectionate memory of the church than Hampden C. DuBose—the biographer of Dr. J. L. Wilson. Dr. DuBose was a South Carolinian, a Confederate Soldier—and for almost fifty years a soldier of the Cross, claiming for his King the city of Soochow, China (1872-1910). He preached indefatigably in the market and the street. He used his pen in translating and in writing a religious literature for the Chinese. Among these works he translated a book by his old Seminary professor, Dr. Wm. S. Plumer—*The Rock of Our Salvation*. He was made President of the Chinese Anti-Opium League, and wrought so effectively in that endeavor that the movement to suppress the opium traffic became “the strongest movement in China.”¹⁴³ Mr. Tenney described its victory thus:

“He (DuBose) appealed to Rt. Hon. John Mosley, to members of the British Parliament, to President Roosevelt, to the American consuls in China, and interviewed Governor Chen of the Province of Kiang-su, to Viceroy Luan Fang in Nanking, who suggested ‘a memorial signed by the Missionaries,’ promising to present it to the Throne. Dr. DuBose wrote the memorial, secured ‘the signatures of 1,333 American and British missionaries,’ and these were presented to the Throne on August 19th. On September 20th, the Imperial Edict was issued, ‘An almost verbatim copy of the memorial written by Dr. DuBose.’ ”¹⁴⁴

Dr. H. A. White quotes this estimate of Dr. DuBose, made by an observing traveller in the East: “This daring and chivalrous soldier of a great ideal lived to see the approach of the consummation of the noblest ministry a white man ever rendered China.”¹⁴⁵

An excellent example of a crusader for civic righteousness is to be found in the protagonist of the non-secular character of the Church,

¹⁴²*Minutes Assembly 1859* (O. S.), pp. 538, 747.

¹⁴³White, p. 456.

¹⁴⁴Tenney, *Souvenir Assembly 1924*, p. 67.

¹⁴⁵White, p. 456; Tenney, *Souvenir*, p. 67.

Dr. B. M. Palmer, Jr. In the effort to free the State of Louisiana from the lottery Dr. Palmer took a most conspicuous part.¹⁴⁶ In addition to earlier services, he was called upon to make the keynote speech in the campaign of 1891, carried on by the Louisiana Anti-Lottery League. On this occasion he was introduced by Colonel Wm. Preston Johnston, Chancellor of Tulane University, as "the first citizen of New Orleans" (p. 554). The following tribute to this speech by a Jewish Rabbi would indicate that he measured up to the occasion and the introduction:

"I have heard the foremost American public speakers, in the pulpit and on the rostrum. Beecher commanded a more lurid rhetoric than Palmer. For a combination of logical argument and noble and brilliant rhetoric, neither he nor any other has equalled Palmer, when *he* was at his best. I heard him that night in the Grand Opera House. Always, except on this occasion, when listening to an address, even a great one, I have been able to say to myself,—how far do you agree with the speaker? What do you reject? How far will you go with him? Where will you stop? But I give you my word, sir, that night Dr. Palmer did not permit me to think for myself, but picked me up and carried me whithersoever he would. It did not seem to me that it was Palmer that was speaking. He spoke as one inspired. It seemed to me that God Almighty was speaking through Palmer. He had filled him with His Spirit and Message as He filled the Hebrew prophets of old."¹⁴⁷

Perhaps an even stronger testimony from this distinguished Rabbi is the fact that the next morning after the speech he advised a wealthy friend to draw out of the lottery, declaring that it was doomed, for "Dr. Palmer has spoken." This speech aroused the moral sense of Louisiana, and was regarded by the able Rabbi as essential to the victory of the anti-lottery crusade (563). Under Palmer's inspiring leadership the victory was won and the lottery banished.

Dr. S. M. Tenney, the curator of the Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, has had this to say in the introduction to a souvenir issued for the General Assembly of 1924: "Much is said today of the ministry and social problems. Our Church is noted for its conservatism. Yet among these (leaders of the Church) are three whose names will ever be connected with great

¹⁴⁶T. C. Johnson, *Life and Letters of B. M. Palmer*, pp. 552-563.

¹⁴⁷Johnson, p. 562.

social reforms, Dr. J. L. Wilson with the cessation of the British slave traffic, Dr. B. M. Palmer with the expulsion of the lottery from our borders, and Dr. H. C. DuBose with the opium reform in China."¹⁴⁸

In a day when every organization is stressing its accomplishments in the field of social betterment, Dr. Tenney has chosen to summarize the accomplishments of the Southern Church in that field, and he has used wholly the names of Columbia alumni.

With this record of the work of some of the illustrious sons of the Seminary should be placed the name of another of the sons of Columbia—a son, not of the class rooms of the institution; but of her families and of her homes, of her religious faith and life. The man who has probably done more than any other statesman in history to give the world an international conscience was, in this sense, a son of Columbia. Her library fed his alert mind; her sacred rhetoric awoke the strains of eloquence in his soul.

In a series of prayer meetings held in the old Seminary Chapel, the boy Tom was converted and confessed his Saviour.¹⁴⁹ Virginia, the mother of Presidents, needs no recession to foster her pride as the place of his *birth*; Episcopacy seeks no throbbing elegy to hallow the cathedral tomb of his *body*; but alas! how little has a debtor world remembered this School of the Prophets as the communion of the saints in which and of which, by God's grace, his *spirit* was re-born for eternity.

The father of this great American was Professor of Pastoral and Evangelistic Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in Columbia Theological Seminary during the years when the boy was changing from childhood to manhood.¹⁵⁰ His maternal uncle, Dr. James Woodrow, was, in the same institution, Perkins Professor of Natural Science in Connection with Revelation.¹⁵¹ A sister married Dr. George Howe, the son of that professor who exceeded all others in years of service given Columbia. This sister, Mrs. George Howe, was a frequent visitor to the White House until her death.¹⁵² The mingled and various emotions which the name of this son have brought to the patriots of a

¹⁴⁸Prefatory note. *Souvenir Assembly San Antonio, Texas*, 1924.

¹⁴⁹Authenticated by Dr. S. L. Morris and Dr. A. M. Fraser.

¹⁵⁰*Catalogue C. T. S.*, 1927, p. 64; Dr. J. R. Wilson, 1870-1874.

¹⁵¹*Ibid.*, 1861-1886.

¹⁵²Daniels. Josephus. *The Life of Woodrow Wilson*, Philadelphia, 1924, pp. 32-40.

score of nations, to the statesmen of the world, to the idealists of all climes, to every lover of peace, are too many and too deep to here present. Sympathizing with and sharing in these emotions, Columbia rejoices in the privilege which was hers of giving, for this world vision and service, of her blood, of her homes, of her faith, of her ideals, of two of her names, honored for their Columbia devotion and ability—doubly honored as they stand united in this rich gift of the Seminary, this twentieth century apostle of world brotherhood, world democracy, world peace—WOODROW WILSON.



COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AND

THE THOUGHT OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SEMINARY TO THE THOUGHT OF THE
CHURCH.

Publications, Periodicals, Reviews, Books.

Library and Lectureship.

Thinkers, Educators, Moderators.

CONTRIBUTIONS IN SPECIAL SPHERES OF THOUGHT.

Interpretation.

Natural Science in Connection with Revealed Religion.

Philosophy.

Theology.

"On earth there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but mind."—Sir William Hamilton, Quoted by J. H. Thorne-
well, Vol. I, p. 183.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SEMINARY TO THE THOUGHT OF
THE CHURCH

A Seminary is an educational institution, established to stimulate the mental life of the Church. It has to be finally evaluated, not by its numbers or external equipment, but by its efficiency in stimulating the thought life of its constituency. Can Columbia justify her hundred years of history by the enrichment she has given to the mental activity of the Southern Presbyterian Church? A study of such a question can be made in several ways. Has the Seminary been the nursery for periodicals and the alma mater of authors? Has she furnished a place and facilities for study in her library? Has she given a forum for the expression of thought in lectureship? Has she been awake to the currents of thought, philosophical, critical, scientific, theological? Has she striven to understand the prevailing Zeitgeist and to orient her pedagogical approach to meet the kaleidoscopic movements of world thought? Has she been trapped and trammelled in a little understood heritage of the past, "content to acquiesce in intellectual bankruptcy,"¹ or has she striven to give a reason for confidence in her rich deposit of faith—the inheritance from the past?

Periodicals

Of weekly periodicals, Columbia men have contributed to the editing of several.

The Charleston Observer was started by the same group of Charleston pastors who promoted the organization of the Seminary and at about the same time.²

Dr. W. S. Plumer edited *The Watchman of the South* in Richmond.³

To *The Southern Presbyterian*, the Seminary contributed its founder, Dr. A. A. Porter, and, as Editors, Dr. James Woodrow, Dr. W. S. Bean and Dr. J. F. Jacobs.⁴

¹Relton, *A Study in Christology*, Introd. XXVIII, XXIX. London, S. P. C. K., 1922, published 1917.

²*Archives*, Vol. I. Letter of R. B. Cater, Feb. 14, 1927, files *The Charleston Observer*, Vol. I, No. 1, in C. T. S. Library.

³*Watchman of the South*, file in C. T. S. Library.

⁴Dr. James Woodrow, Character Sketches, etc., p. 3. *The Southern Presbyterian*, file in C. T. S. Library.

The Southwestern Presbyterian enjoyed the editorial services of Professor James Woodrow, and Drs. H. M. Smith and Dr. R. Q. Mallard, '55, Columbia men. Dr. S. I. Woodbridge, '82, was editor for a number of years of the *Chinese Christian Intelligencer*; while Dr. R. C. Reed of the faculty was co-editor of *The Presbyterian Standard* from 1905 until his death, 1924.⁵

Reviews

Of more importance for the stimulation of thought were the reviews and monthlies published at the Seminary. The most notable of these was the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, published from 1847 to 1885 at Columbia, S. C., by "an association of ministers." The Synod of S. C., in 1846, endorsed and commended the proposed plan of a Southern Theological Review, "as important to the true interest of the Southern Church, as suited to subserve the cause of Christ, and to promote sound learning and doctrinal knowledge among us." Dr. W. M. McPheeters states that the founders were Dr. Thornwell and Dr. Palmer; and the managing editor, for many years, was Dr. James Woodrow.⁶

The alphabetical index published in the Thirty-fifth Volume shows that the articles and book reviews deal with the fields of theology, ecclesiology, missions, exegesis and criticism, philosophy, civics, history, education, science, worship, Christian conduct, etc. This periodical offered an opportunity for the expression, by professors and ecclesiastical leaders, of the great fundamental principles governing their plans of teaching, courses of action, principles of theology. The result, as the Nestor of our Seminary, Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters, recently suggested, was that the men of the Seminary had well wrought out architectonic principles and carefully concatenated systems sustained by abstract reasonings. In discussing a question they dug down to its fundamental presuppositions.

Thornwell and other writers in the *Southern Presbyterian Review* mined as deeply into the underlying principles of theology, as ever did Calhoun into the underlying principle of civil polity.⁷

⁵*Souvenir of the General Assembly of 1924*, p. 129, *Presbyterian Standard*, files in C. T. S. Library.

⁶*A Retrospect*, p. 33. cf. T. E. Peck, *Miscellanies*, Vol. II, p. 361. *Printed Min.*, 1846, p. 18.

⁷Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Esp. Vol. I. Peck, *Miscellanies*, Vol. II, p. 360 ff.

Moreover, the publication was an avenue for the expression of differences. Each writer must needs write, expecting to have his positions challenged, even in his own circle. Dr. Thornwell's views on the Board and the Elder questions were as strenuously contested by Dr. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, as they were by Dr. Charles Hodge.⁸ Dr. Adger took strong ground against his friends, Drs. Wm. Cunningham (of Scotland) and Chas. Hodge (of Princeton), on the question of Calvin's doctrine of the supper.⁹ The offices of the evangelist and of the deacon produced a large literature of controversy.¹⁰

The review of foreign publications was a window for the Church, into the field of international scholarship. In addition to the immediate clientele of the Seminary, articles were contributed by Drs. Peck and Dabney of Richmond; Drs. R. J. Breckenridge, Stuart Robinson and B. B. Warfield of Kentucky; Dr. A. A. Porter from Texas, etc. The Review was thus the agency for stimulating the thought of the Southern Church for forty years.¹¹ Dr. Thornwell was also a contributor and, for a short while, editor of the *Southern Review*, published in Charleston, S. C.¹²

With the passing of the *Southern Presbyterian Review* (1885), a successor to it was launched by Dr. Summey of Chester, S. C., a member of the Board of Directors of the Seminary. On this, *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, Dr. R. C. Reed of the faculty and Dr. R. A. Webb of the Alumni were Associate Editors. The Quarterly appeared in 1887 and continued until 1904. Dr. George Summey, the promoter, continued to be the guiding spirit in the publication. It was published first in Atlanta and New York; later in Richmond by Whittet and Shepperson. (Files in Seminary Library).

Near the close of the last century, another series of publications began to be issued by Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters and a group of associates from Columbia. This publication, edited by Dr. McPheeters and his colleague, Dr. D. J. Brimm, was first entitled *The Re-*

⁸Thornwell's Works, Vol. IV, S. P. R., Vol. II, p. 1; Vol. IV, p. 33. Smith's Works, Vol. II; *Presbytery and Prelacy*, p. 546.

⁹S. P. R., XXVII. p. 133.

¹⁰S. P. R., Vol. 34, pp. 96, 106, 235, 277; Vol. 33, p. 333, etc. Deacon S. P. R. Vol. 30, pp. 1-31, 117-32; pp. 191, 628, 355, etc.

¹¹S. P. R., Vol. XXXV.

¹²T. E. Peck, *Miscellanies*, Vol. II, p. 361. Files *Southern Review* in C. T. S. Library.

ligious Outlook; later *The Religious Outlook and Bible Student*. The files of these publications are preserved in the private library of Dr. McPheeters at the Seminary. In 1900 the work was re-organized and *The Bible Student* was issued each month from Columbia. The editorial staff of this periodical consisted of Drs. Wm. M. McPheeters, B. B. Warfield, G. T. Purves, S. M. Smith, D. J. Brimm, and John D. Davis. It was published by the Bryan Printing Company of Columbia, S. C. Articles appear on all fields bearing on the study of the Bible, principally by members of the faculties of Princeton and Columbia Seminaries. The publication of this work testifies to a very close interpenetration of the Columbia thought by that of the Princeton School.¹³

But there are frequent articles in *The Bible Student* from professors in other institutions, and individuals. A cursory view finds among the contributors such names as: Drs. R. A. Webb, W. H. Marquess, A. T. Robertson, W. H. Johnson, C. A. Salmond, A. C. Zenos, R. L. Stewart, F. R. Beattie, Willis J. Beecher.¹⁴

In 1906 the periodical was re-organized as *The Bible Student and Teacher* and published by *The American Bible League*, 86 Bible House, New York City. Of the new publication Dr. Daniel S. Gregory was Managing Editor and Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters, Associate Editor. This change necessarily resulted in the publication's being less closely affiliated with the Seminary.

Books

Columbia Seminary has encouraged authorship. Beginning with the field closest at hand, she has had a succession of men writing on the subject of history from her origin to the present. Dr. Geo. Howe has contributed a monumental work on the *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina* until 1850, written from manuscript records of the Synod and the Presbyteries, and being the only reliable history of this subject.¹⁵

¹³Hodge's "Three Volumes" shared with Thornwell's works the position of being the accepted theology at Columbia; the scholarship of the larger Seminary was freely drawn on by Columbia both in this periodical and for the Smyth lectureship; Princeton was recognized as the place for postgraduate theological study; the admiration for Dr. B. B. Warfield reached such a point that the initials "B. B. W." became almost the last word on a question.

¹⁴*The Bible Student*. Vols. I & II, 1900, Bryan, Columbia, S. C., Seminary Files.

¹⁵Dr. Howe also has a book on *Theological Education*, New York, 1844.

Dr. Charles C. Jones published *The History of the Church of God During the Period of Revelation*, New York, 1867, together with a number of pamphlets on *The Religious Instruction of the Negroes*.

Dr. John Bailey Adger has preserved much of the history of the Seminary in his autobiography *My Life and Times* (Columbia, 1859).

Dr. R. C. Reed's *magnus opus* is *The History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World*, adapted for use in the class room (Philadelphia, 1905). He has also written the following pamphlets: *The History of the Southern Presbyterian Church*, Charlotte, N. C., 1923; *John Knox, His Field and Work*, Richmond, 1905; *What is the Kingdom of God?* Richmond, 1922, etc.

Dr. Henry Alexander White's historical writings have been recently summarized by Prof. George A. Wauchope, Ph.D., University of South Carolina. Dr. Wauchope says: "The history of the South was his (White's) specialty, his earliest and his latest love, and here he attained national recognition as an authority."¹⁶

One group of Dr. White's writings is a series of school histories written for the children of the South, e. g. *Beginner's History of the United States*, *The Making of South Carolina*, etc. (p. 14).

Dr. Wauchope finds three of White's works admirable examples of literary biography and historical narration. These are characterized by scholarly accuracy and are carefully documented. They are *Robert E. Lee and the Southern Confederacy*,¹⁷ *Life of Stonewall Jackson*, *The Scotch-Irish in America*.

Of Dr. White's works, more closely related to the Seminary, are *The Southern Presbyterian Leaders*, N. Y., 1911; *The Gospel of Comfort*, the Stone Foundation Lectures at Princeton, and *The Pentateuch in the Light of the Ancient Monuments*.

In the field of Church Government, *Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. IV, and Girardeau on the *Diaconate* have been referred to. Dr. A. T. McGill, an honorary alumnus, published a *Treatise on Church Government*, Philadelphia, 1888; and Dr. Thomas E. Peck,

¹⁶Memorial Bulletin issued by C. T. S. October, 1927, Bryan & Co., Columbia, p. 13.

¹⁷Heroes of the Nation's Series, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897, *Life of Stonewall Jackson*, 1907, American Crisis Series; *The Scotch-Irish in America* (Ibid, pp. 14, 15).

who was for a short time in Columbia and later a private student under Dr. Thornwell, is known by his *Notes on Ecclesiology* (2nd Edition, Richmond, 1892).

In the field of Theology, Thornwell's work is found in his *Collected Writings*. Dr. B. M. Palmer's chief work is *The Theology of Prayer*, Richmond, 1904. In this department Dr. John L. Girardeau has written *Calvinism and Evangelical Arminianism* (Columbia, 1890); *The Will in its Theological Relations* (Columbia, 1891); *Theology as a Science Involving an Infinite Element*, in the *Life Work of J. L. G.* by G. A. Blackburn (Columbia, 1916); *Discussion of Theological Questions*, Richmond, 1905. Dr. G. H. Cartledge, '48, published *The Perpetuity of the Abrahamic Covenant*, Richmond, 1890.

Dr. R. A. Webb, an alumnus of Columbia, has written *The Christian's Hope* (Jackson, Miss., 1914); *Christian Salvation, Its Doctrine and Experience* (Richmond, 1921); *The Theology of Infant Salvation* (Richmond, 1907). Dr. S. S. Laws, sometime of the faculty, published *The At-Onement by the Christian Trinity*, in 1919.

Dr. Thornton Whaling has published *Questions on Theology* (Columbia, 1916). The most voluminous Columbia writer was Dr. Wm. S. Plumer. In addition to many devotional works (e. g. *Vital Godliness*), commentaries (e. g. *On the Psalms*), he has written, in the field of Theology, *The Rock of Our Salvation* (the American Tract Society, N. Y., 1867), and *The Grace of Christ* (Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, 1853). Among the recent contributions to the Columbia Theology are *The Grace of God*, the Smyth Lectures (1917) by Dr. Wm. S. Plumer Bryan, an alumnus of the Seminary, while Dr. C. O'N. Martindale, Ph. D., '92, has an answer to the timely question, *What It Means to Be Christian?* Chicago, 1927.

The Library and Lectureship

The early development of the Seminary Library was principally the work of Dr. Geo. Howe as Librarian and Dr. Thos. Smyth as chief supporter and patron of the library. Local collectors were appointed in each Presbytery. Dr. Howe and Dr. Smyth secured the buying of foreign volumes. The records show early authorizations

of such sums as \$1,500.00 and \$1,800.00 to be expended by Dr. Smyth for these purposes.¹⁸

In 1845 the report of the librarian and the Board's Committee boast of "one of the best libraries in the whole country"—About forty-five hundred volumes secured at an expenditure of \$4,595.00 and the result of many gifts.¹⁹

Books were Dr. Smyth's hobby. His personal library numbered twenty thousand volumes. He states his purpose in making this collection, as follows: "I studied Bibliography, in order to collect a large systematic, Presbyterian, Theological and Literary Library, as an armory for our ministers and churches in Charleston, similar to that of Dr. Williams in London. As it increased, I labored to adapt it for a Theological Seminary, in which I hoped it ultimately would find a providential location."²⁰

The minutes of 1856 record a great forward step in the history of the library. The Board approved the action of its Committee on the Library in purchasing "Valpy's Latin and a Variorum Classics, 190 volumes, and a porion of the library of Rev. Thomas Smyth, D.D., of Charleston, S. C., about 11,000 volumes; so that the Library now consists of over 16,000 volumes, and is one of the best in the United States."²¹ In connection with this purchase the great liberality of Dr. Smyth, in abating the prices of his books, is commended. The following year, the exact number of books in the library is declared to be 16,574.²² His son, A. T. Smyth, declared that the purpose of stimulating the thought of the Church through the library and lectureship in the Seminary was, next to the work of the ministry, "the most cherished wish and desire of my father's heart." This wish caused father and son to arrange an endowment for the cherished interests. Dr. Thomas Smyth died August 20, 1873.²³ The Minutes of the Board, 1874, record the setting apart of stock for the endowment of (a) the Seminary Library, (b) a Presbyterian lectureship in the Seminary, (c) the publication of Dr. Smyth's works.²⁴ The

¹⁸*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 366, p. 1019 ff.

¹⁹*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 654, 883, 938.

²⁰Quoted in Memorial Address of Rev. T. R. Brackett, *Smyth's Works*, Vol. X, p. 782.

²¹*Minutes of Board*, Appendix *Min. Synod of S. C.*, 1856, pp. 44, 45.

²²*Minutes of Board in Min. Synod*, 1857, p. 33.

²³*Minutes Synod of S. C.*, 1873, p. 14.

²⁴*Minutes Board of Directors*, beginning 1862, p. 219 ff.

income of the library fund, when it had sufficiently accumulated, was to be used one-third to pay salary of librarian; one-third in purchasing new books; one-third in library incidentals (Ibid, p. 222). With the funds so set aside, each professor is now allowed to purchase books to the sum of one hundred dollars a year in his own department. This has helped to gradually increase the library and bring in a small, but steady, flow of recent works. A number of other libraries have been left, in whole or in part, to the Seminary; among the latest additions so secured have been from the libraries of Dr. J. Wm. Flinn, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. R. C. Reed, Dr. David Finley, Dr. Chas. L. Vedder, Dr. Edwin Muller, Dr. M. L. Hutton, Dr. S. M. Smith, Dr. W. B. Arrowwood, Dr. Wm. E. Boggs, Dr. Thornton Whaling. Under the third purpose of Dr. Smyth's reservation, his works were collected and reprinted (1908-12) by his son-in-law, Rev. Prof. J. Wm. Flinn.²⁵ And these ten large volumes have been disposed of to the students of Columbia Seminary at the small sum of \$2.50 for the set. The last set which the Seminary could sell was so disposed of during the session 1926-27.

The funds for the Presbyterian lectureship became available in 1911, and on this, the Thomas Smyth Foundation, the following lectures have since been delivered:

- 1911 Francis Landey Patton, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, New Jersey. Subject: The Theistic View of the World.
- 1912 Casper Rene Gregory, D.D., LL.D., University of Leipsic, Germany. Subject: Theological Movements in Germany During the Nineteenth Century.
- 1913 Robert E. Speer, LL.D., New York City. Subject: Some Missionary Problems Illustrated in the Lives of Great Missionary Leaders.
- 1914 Robert A. Webb, D.D., LL.D., Louisville, Kentucky. Subject: The Doctrine of the Christian Hope.
- 1915 William Hoge Marquess, D.D., LL.D., New York City. Subject: The Period from Abraham to Joshua as Illustrated by the Results of Archaeological Discovery.
- 1916 J. Campbell White, A.M., LL.D., Wooster, Ohio. Subject: Missions and Leadership.
- 1917 W. S. Plumer Bryan, D.D., Chicago, Illinois. Subject: The Grace of God.

²⁵Columbia, S. C., R. L. Bryan, 1908-1912.

- 1918 Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, New Jersey. Subject: Counterfeit Miracles.
- 1919 Francis Landey Patton, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, New Jersey. Subject: Christianity and the Modern Man.
- 1920 A. H. McKinney, D.D., New York City. Subject: Guiding Girls to Christian Womanhood.
- 1921 Louis Matthews Sweet, S.T.D., Ph.D., New York. Subject: The Origin and Destiny of Man in the Light of Scripture and Modern Thought.
- 1923 J. Sprole Lyons, D.D., Atlanta, Georgia. Subject: Sermonic Sources.
- 1923 L. E. McNair, D.D., Jacksonville, Florida. Subject: Passion in Preaching.
- 1923 W. McF. Alexander, D.D., New Orleans, Louisiana. Subject: The Man and His Message.
- 1923 J. B. Hutton, D.D., Jackson, Miss. Subject: Regulative Ideas in Preaching.
- 1923 James I. Vance, D.D., Nashville, Tenn. Subject: Sermonizing.
- 1923 Dunbar H. Ogden, D.D., Mobile, Ala. Subject: The House in Which the Minister Lives.
- 1924 Egbert W. Smith, D.D., Nashville, Tenn. Subject: The Call of the Mission Field.
- 1925 A. M. Fraser, D.D., Staunton, Virginia. Subject: Church Unity.
- 1925 Samuel L. Morris, D.D., Atlanta, Georgia. Subject: The Fact of Christianity.
- 1927 J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Princeton, New Jersey. Subject: The Virgin Birth.
- 1928 C. R. Erdman, D.D., Princeton, New Jersey. Subject: The Life of D. L. Moody.
- 1929 Wm. T. Ellis, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. Subject: Explorations and Adventures in Bible Lands.
- 1930 Wm. C. Covert, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Subject: Worship and Spiritual Culture.
- 1931 W. P. Paterson, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh, Scotland. Subject: The Christian Interpretation of History.²⁶

Educators

Another evidence of the stimulation of thought by the Seminary is the group of alumni she has trained and sent out as educators.

²⁶*Catalogue of C. T. S.*

In addition to a number of her own professors,—four out of the present six—Columbia has contributed to the theological faculties of several of her sister institutions. To Union Seminary (Va.) she has given Dr. Thomas R. English, '75, and Dr. Thos. E. Peck, a student for a short time at the Seminary and privately directed in his studies by Dr. Thornwell.²⁷ To Louisville Seminary she has given Dr. C. R. Hemphill, '74, Dr. Edwin Muller, '84, Dr. Francis R. Beattie, Dr. Thornton Whaling, '83, Dr. R. A. Webb, '80; to the theological departments at Clarksville (Southwest Presbyterian University) Dr. Joseph R. Wilson (professor in Columbia 1870-74), Dr. R. A. Webb, Dr. Thornton Whaling, Dr. Jas. E. Fogartie, '77; to Kobe Theological School, its President, Dr. S. P. Fulton, '87; to Stillman Institute, Dr. C. J. Stillman, '55, Dr. J. R. Howerton, '85.²⁸

Among the college presidents and professors, she has furnished to the University of South Carolina three presidents, J. H. Thornwell, D.D., James Woodrow, D.D., D. M. Douglas, D.D., and Professors J. Wm. Flinn, D.D., Wm. P. Riviere, H. R. Murchison, D.D., B. S. Hodges, and R. D. Bass. To Clemson College, she has given Prof. Wm. H. Mills, '97; to the Presbyterian College of South Carolina, she gave its founder, W. P. Jacobs, D.D., '64 (also widely known as the founder of Thornwell Orphanage), three other of the presidents, E. C. Murray, D.D., D. M. Douglas, D.D., and John McSween, D.D., and four of its professors, J. F. Jacobs, W. S. Bean, D.D., D. J. Brimm, D.D., F. Dudley Jones, D.D.: to Bingham Military Academy, Wm. Banks, '40.

• To Davidson College, she has given President Luther McKinnon, Professor C. M. Richards, D.D., '95, and Professor E. A. Beaty, '24; to Arkansas College, President J. I. Long, D.D.; to Indian Territory, Rev. J. J. Read; to Washington and Lee University, Prof. J. R. Howerton, D.D.

Of leaders in the field of female education she has contributed Rev. J. M. H. Adams, the Yorkville Seminary; Rev. Wm. Curtis, Principal, Limestone Springs Academy; Rev. S. K. Axson, D.D., and Rev. H. Hendee, Principals, the Synodical Female College at Greensboro, Ga.; Rev. T. F. Montgomery, Principal, the Masonic Female

²⁷So Tenney, *Souvenir The General Assembly* 1924, p. 41. Cf. Vaughan, *Miscellanies of T. E. Peck, D.D.*, Vol. III, pp. 8, 9.

²⁸Years from Appendix of *Alumni Catalogue* 1906, pp. 30-56.

College, Auburn, Ala.; S. R. Preston, D.D., and Rev. J. H. Alexander, Principals, the Female College of Wytheville, Va.; S. R. Preston, D.D., and S. C. Byrd, D.D., '92, Presidents of Chicora College; W. R. Atkinson, D.D., President, Presbyterian College for Women;²⁹ A. M. Fraser, D.D., LL.D., President, Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.³⁰

Moderators

The Moderators of the General Assembly may be taken as the Church's estimate of her leaders. The Seminary can refer, from her list of alumni and honorary alumni, to: J. H. Thornwell, D.D. (Old School Assembly); Benj. M. Palmer, D.D.; George Howe, D.D.; W. S. Plumer, D.D.; H. M. Smith, D.D.; J. L. Girardeau, D.D.; C. L. Stillman, D.D.; Thos. A. Hoyt, D.D.; T. D. Witherspoon, D.D.; H. R. Raymond, D.D.; H. C. DuBose, D.D.; C. R. Hemphill, D.D.; Geo. T. Goetchius, D.D., '71, Assembly '98; E. M. Green, D.D., '63, Assembly, '98; Robert Q. Mallard, D.D., '55, Assembly '96; Wm. T. Hall, D.D., '58, Assembly '02; S. M. Neel, D.D., student two years Columbia Seminary, Assembly 1904; J. T. Plunket, '80, Assembly 1905; J. R. Howerton, D.D., '85, Assembly 1907; Wm. E. Boggs, D.D., '62, Assembly 1909; T. S. Clyce, D.D., 90, Assembly 1912; C. W. Grafton, '73, Assembly 1916; A. M. Fraser, '79, Assembly 1919; A. B. Curry, D.D., '75, Assembly 1921; R. C. Reed, D.D., Faculty 1898-1925, Assembly 1922; Thornton Whaling, D.D., Alumnus, Professor, President, Assembly 1925.³¹

CONTRIBUTIONS IN SPECIAL SPHERES OF THOUGHT

In studying the thought life of a theological institution for the past one hundred years, one naturally looks for contributions to the Church's thinking in those spheres in which the great movements of thought, in the last century, have taken place. These spheres have been summarized as criticism, the contribution of the sciences, philosophy, and theology.³²

What, if any, "awareness" has Columbia shown to these great thought movements?

²⁹Wm. M. McPheeters, *A Retrospect*, 1901.

³⁰Reports of *Exec. Comm. to General Assembly*, 1927, p. 27.

³¹*A Retrospect*, W. M. McPheeters. *Souvenir of Assembly of 1924. Catalogue of C. T. S. Assembly Minutes* 1927, p. 2.

³²Moore, E. C., *Christian Thought Since Kant*, N. Y., 1915.

Interpretation

At the very beginning of its history, Columbia Seminary was brought into touch with the best American knowledge of the principles of hermeneutics and critical study. This resulted from the early accession to the faculty of Professor George Howe—alumnus and Abbott Resident of Andover Theological Seminary.³³ During the years of Howe's residence at Andover, the Professor of Sacred Literature was Dr. Moses Stuart, the man whom Dr. Leonard Bacon calls the father of exegetical sciences, not only for America, but for the English speaking world.³⁴

Mr. Howe was also Librarian; and as early as 1832 he reported the purchase of foreign volumes in his own department. At the same time he urged the buying of many such works.³⁵ Even during the year when Howe was only temporary instructor in languages, Dr. Goulding reported that he (Howe) had not only taught Hebrew, New Testament Greek, and Exegesis; but also, *the first principles of Hermeneutics*.³⁶ Professor Howe's first report gives a most enlightening view into his conception of what these first principles were:

"I am free to confess that I have not succeeded, according to my wishes, in leading all the students in my department into that critical grammatical interpretation which I believe to be the only satisfactory and safe method of studying sacred Scriptures. This is attributable, in part, to my own unskillfulness; but also, as I must believe, to the circumstances that the *Masters* in sacred criticism are not to any considerable extent in the hands of our students. I feel that the judicious expenditure from time to time, as the Directors may be able to afford, of a small sum in the purchase of books in this department will greatly facilitate our studies and contribute to the formation of those habits of interpretation essential to the proper pursuit of theological inquiries."³⁷

To similar effect he writes in a letter, dated July, 1831:

"My attempt has been to initiate my class into the science and art of Biblical interpretation" . . . "The study of languages is subservient to the exegesis of Scriptures. The class

³³*Andover Theological Seminary, General Catalogue*, pp. 83, 99, 15. *Semi-Centennial of C. T. S.*, p. 392.

³⁴Bacon, *History of American Christianity*, p. 378.

³⁵*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 73.

³⁶Dr. Goulding's Report to the Board, 1831, *Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 713-714.

³⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 75.

in recitation is called upon to translate, explain the exact force of each word and particle, then to give the general sense of the passage as connected with the context: at the same time explaining all allusions to the manners and customs of the age and country in which Matthew wrote." . . . "The fundamental rule I have insisted on is that they should throw themselves back into age and circumstances of the writer to imagine how they would feel and understand if they had been the speakers, actors, hearers, and first readers of the things the Evangelist records."³⁸

The basis of this study of interpretation is the translation of Ernesti's *Elements of Interpretation* made by Professor M. Stuart and published with his notes thereon.³⁹ In the same connection reference is made to Stuart's *A Hebrew Chrestomathy* (Andover 2nd Ed. 1832), as the basis of the Hebrew study. The Library, with others of Professor Stuart's works on grammar and exegesis among the earliest books, bears its testimony to the esteem in which Howe held this preceptor, and the debt which the infant institution owed to this early American pioneer in solid critical studies—Dr. Moses Stuart.⁴⁰

Dr. Howe continued to teach Hermeneutics in the Seminary for over fifty years. Therefore, these early statements of his purpose and ideals will correctly indicate the kind of exegetical study done in the Seminary for the first half of its existence. Of course there was a development of these ideals by maturer study of the years on the part of the professor; and there was a growing supply of tools in the library for such work by the students and the professor.

In his book on *Theological Education*, Howe definitely condemns the allegorical method of Alexandrian exegesis:

"We have indeed to regret the false principles upon which he (Origen) proceeded in interpreting the word of God, and the

³⁸ *Archives*, Vol. I, p. 918.

³⁹ *Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 713-714, 917; Ernesti, *Elements*, Andover, 1832.

⁴⁰ NOTE: e. g. shelf eleven contains:

A Greek Grammar of the N. T., by G. B. Winer, trans. by M. Stuart, Andover, 1825.

A Grammar of the Hebrew Language, by M. Stuart, Andover, 1828.

Course of Hebrew Study, by M. Stuart, Andover, 1830.

A Hebrew Chrestomathy, by M. Stuart, Andover, 1832.

A Grammar of the N. T. Dialect, by M. Stuart, Andover, 1834.

A Manual of the Chaldee Language, by Elias Riggs, Andover, 1832.

Dissertation on the Original Languages of the Bible, by Zahn, et al., trans. with notes by M. Stuart, Andover, 1827.

errors into which his speculative mind led him; yet his life of toil and study, expended principally on the education of the rising ministry, shows us the estimation in which this education was held by the Church."⁴¹

On the other hand, he speaks of a school in Caesarea (c. 290), "in which the study of Scriptures was pursued with great earnestness;" and of Malchion, "head of a scientific school at Antioch" (Ibid pp. 77, 78). In this Antiochian School, "learned Presbyters . . . busied themselves with zeal in Biblical studies in the fourth century" (Ibid). He urges teachers in our theological institutions to inquire whether our system of Seminary instruction and discipline is all that it ought to be, or is capable of being made. "Is it as thorough, penetrating into those deep thoughts and investigations into which the words of the Holy Ghost lead forth the minds of men?" (Ibid p. 151).

Not less important than the ability, knowledge, care which Dr. Howe brought to the Department of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, was the magnificent example of sacrificial loyalty which he there evinced. It may be doubted whether the history of American Christianity affords any nobler examples of the self-forgetting mind of the Master, and any finer response of His constraining love than is afforded by this young professor when, at the age of thirty-four, he declined an attractive offer to become Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York.⁴²

At the time of this call there was well-nigh everything in the Columbia situation to justify his leaving. Needed funds and endowments had not been forthcoming;⁴³ his friend, McDowell, had been unable to help the Seminary, on account of the political turmoil (Ibid); his work was handicapped for lack of materials to work with (Ibid, p. 74); his heart was torn by the loss of the wife of his youth (Ibid, pp. 75-77); a scurrilous attack had been made on the professors by the *Columbia Times and Gazette* (Ibid, pp. 395, 405, 406); the brethren were whispering suspicions of unsoundness in the faith (Ibid, p. 1160); these whisperings led to a protracted interview by a committee of the Board;⁴⁴ the school was made the butt of re-

⁴¹*Theological Education*, pp. 72-77.

⁴²Prentiss, *Fifty Years of the Union Theol. Seminary*, N. Y., 1889, p. 24. Howe's *History of Pres. Church in S. C.*, Vol. II, *Biographical Sketch*.

⁴³*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 69.

⁴⁴MS. *Minutes of the Board*, Vol. I, p. 153.

marks to the effect that it was a "poor sickly institution."⁴⁵ The offer came in the midst of the turmoil of the Old School-New School strife, October, 1836 (Ibid 2; 1143-1144). It came from "the Moderate Men" in the Presbyterian Church to one of irenic temper.⁴⁶ It offered competent support, a wider field of effort, opportunity to pursue the studies to which he was devoted, a prominent connection with a larger and more influential institution. He declined it, solely because he had dedicated himself to the Columbia institution for the building up, through it, of the wastes and borders of "our Southern Zion," believing that, somehow, the fate of "our beloved country" and the kingdom of God was connected with the building up of "this Seminary on our Southern Shores."⁴⁷ An institution which boasts an example like this can never be poor in the things of the spirit. Around the life and character thus tested and revealed, the Seminary clustered for over half a century—until the contagion of the consecration of this Northern-born saint had kindled a flame of like consecration in the hearts of his Southern pupils; and had engendered a loyalty which would never suffer to fail that institution for which he had given the full measure of devotion.

The extended service of Dr. Howe, and the scarcely less extended service of Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters, in this department, make unnecessary the mention of many names in discussing the field of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. Columbia has ever rejoiced in the pearl of great price which she has given to her sister Seminary, Louisville, in Dr. Charles R. Hemphill, '74, a professor in this department in Columbia Seminary from 1882 to 1885. But Dr. Hemphill's long and rich service at Louisville, since leaving Columbia, make it proper that his teaching be left for the history of that institution.

The third longest period of service, in this field, was that of Dr. Henry Alexander White, A.M., Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., 1903-1926. That Dr. White endorsed and followed the sound exegetical methods of Dr. Howe may be discerned from his characterization of Howe's teaching: "Sound methods of Hebrew and Greek exegesis were disseminated by him throughout our Southern country. As much as any

⁴⁵*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 640.

⁴⁶*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1160.

⁴⁷*Archives*, Vol. II, pp. 1143, 1144. Reed, *Bulletin C. T. S.*, March, 1922, pp. 8, 9.

⁴⁸*Catalogue*, 1927, p. 64.

other man among us, he labored for the maintenance of a high standard of ministerial training.”⁴⁹

Rev. Neal L. Anderson, one of the most diligent students of Scriptural Criticism in the Southern Presbyterian Pulpit, commends the critical care of Dr. White’s exegesis. He remembers that, as a student, “Doctor Hodge repeatedly expressed appreciation of his (White’s) mature scholarship, and critical insight into the meaning of the New Testament text.”⁵⁰ “It was due to this revelation of his gifts, while still a student of the Seminary, as well as his distinguished service in Columbia Seminary, that Princeton Seminary conferred on Doctor White the honor, in recent years, of inviting him to deliver the Stone Lectures” (Ibid, p. 24). He graduated with a reputation for exact and critical scholarship (p. 24). As a teacher, “he was, above all else, the exegete, leaving matters of Theology to his distinguished colleagues” (Ibid, p. 25). “Conservative in his thinking, Doctor White never feared genuine progress, but always opposed critical Bolshevism that ignores or rejects the assured results of Christian experience and scholarship” (Ibid, p. 25). Dr. Anderson characterizes Doctor White as “the Christian scholar” (Ibid, p. 26).

The present incumbent of the Chair of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis has already a record of over forty years’ service in this department—a record which his friends hope is destined to continue until it shall equal the half century of Dr. Howe’s service. It is difficult to speak, as one desires, of the living. Fortunately, in this case, Dr. McPheeters has carefully worked out and printed his fundamental principle of hermeneutics; and, therefore, attention can be focused upon his teaching, and the work shall bespeak the workman.

Dr. McPheeters begins his discussion of the Science of Interpretation with the question—“Is a Science of Interpretation Possible?” To this question, “an intelligent answer presupposes insight (1) into implication of term science; (2) into nature of subject matter with which interpretation has to do; (3) into the problem thus presented to the interpreter.”⁵¹

⁴⁹White on Howe, *Southern Pres. Leaders*, p. 258.

⁵⁰*Bulletin C. T. S.*, October, 1927, p. 23.

⁵¹Wm. M. McPheeters, *The Science of Interpretation*, printed by Bryan Co., Columbia, S. C., p. I.

After considering a number of definitions of "science," Dr. McPheeters declares: "If there be a science of interpretation: (1) it must be a body of principle, rather than of specific rules; (2) these principles must completely cover all the problems of interpretation; (3) they must be so systematized as to be easily comprehended and retained, and conveniently applied; (4) there must be some ultimate principle in which they can all be reduced to unity; (5) there must be some characteristic method insuring a high degree of verification and control of results once obtained" (p. 4).

The subject matter of interpretation is limited in this discussion to written instruments (p. 4). A particular writing is defined as "the record in thought-symbols of such and such a kind of the mental, moral and spiritual functionings of a personality, so and so constituted, and so and so circumstanced, in its efforts to produce such and such effects upon other personalities whom it conceives as so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced" (p. 5).

The problem for the interpreter, which is presented by the analysis of this definition, is twofold:

First Phase of the Problem: "For a person so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced to ascertain with precision and completeness the significance and force of the functionings of another person so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced, who is functioning through thought symbols of such and such a kind with a view to producing such and such results upon other persons whom it conceives of as being so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced" (pp. 8, 9). The factors giving rise to this problem are: (a) the difference between the thought symbols used by the writer and those of the interpreter. "Hence the essence of the interpreter's task here is (1) negatively to divest himself of his own racial genius; (2) to reconstruct the racial genius and history of the people whose thought symbols have been employed in the writing under examination; (3) to invest himself with that racial genius—in a word, to Hellenize, or Hebraize his mind" (9). (b) The difference between the personalities of the writer and the interpreter (9). (c) The differences between the circumstances of the person being interpreted and those of the interpreter (10).

The Second Phase of the Problem is: "For a person so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced adequately to exhibit the

significance and force of the thought symbols in a given writing to other persons who are so and so constituted and so and so circumstanced" (10). The factors giving rise to this problem are the same as those mentioned in the case of the interpreter himself, with the difficulties enhanced by the fact that it is easier for the interpreter to Hellenize his mind than to Hellenize his mother tongue and that such is the closeness of relation between thought and thought symbols that it is difficult to change the latter without marring the former.

Dr. McPheeters offers two well known examples as the data for a satisfactory answer to the question proposed—"Is a Science of Interpretation Possible?" The first is the case of Miss Helen Keller from *The Story of My Life* (pp. 11-14); the second is the history of the decipherment of the Persepolis inscriptions (pp. 14-18).

From the decipherment of the Persepolis inscriptions, it is to be noted that the methods employed in solving the problem were: inspection—a given context examined with a view to observing and classifying the phenomena presented; comparison—phenomena presented by one context were compared with those presented by another—and the larger context, linguistic, literary, historical, constantly invoked; scientific experiment—trying results obtained in one context with another—formulating theories and testing their validity—employing data determined in one context to throw light on a different context. The conditions which determined the advance towards a final solution were: (1) enlarging and perfecting the context—linguistic, literary or historical; (2) unceasing care in inspection, comparison and testing (p. 18).

From this inductive study he offers the following, as the Architectonic Principle of the Science of Interpretation: "The context—that is to say, the *original* context, and the *entire* context—determined and will disclose the significance and force of the symbols which together constitute a given writing" (19). The architectonic character of this principle is established by the facts that it determines the constituent elements of the Science of Interpretation and their relation one to another; that it insures the unity of the science; that it provides a characteristic method, yielding results capable of a high degree of verification and control (20-21). The method is "the reconstruction of the original context with completeness and precision"; the objective character of the context assures verification and control (21).

The Constituent Parts of a Science of Interpretation, as furnished by the architectonic principle, are: Grammatical Interpretation (general and special); Literary Interpretation; Historical Interpretation; Logical Interpretation; Psychological Interpretation (p. 20).

Following this study of the Science of Interpretation, Dr. McPheeters has worked out a careful study of the *Art* of Exegesis. He defines art as "skill in the application of correct principle for the accomplishment of a given purpose."⁵²

This is usually acquired by a study of the best models and by practise. The foremost master of Exegesis proposed is Dr. August Dillman in his Commentary on Genesis. In this study of Dillman, Dr. McPheeters calls attention to the function of Special Introduction—"to ascertain and exhibit the significance of the larger historical and literary contexts of which a given writing is a part" (p. 1); and shows the importance which Dillman attaches thereto. In the course of the study the branches of Interpretation employed by Dillman—literary, grammatical, logical, rhetorical, historical—are carefully examined (p. 19). The dependence of one branch of interpretation on another is studied (p. 15). Interpretation and appreciation, comment and criticism upon the work of this master Exegete (1-32) are made.

This study is followed with outline references, questions, etc., for a similar exegetical study by the students in several of the psalms.

There are still preachers in the Southern Church who use texts as pretexts for sermons (e. g., on the Old Theology from the undeniable nature of wine—"the old is better"). But these are men who were never drilled in "the sovereignty of the immediate context" by Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters. The men who have safely passed the three years study under this exact and exacting master go forth to find the meaning which the text had for the writer and the first reader, and to proclaim that meaning.

Dr. McPheeters' approach to the questions of Old Testament Literature and Criticism may be indicated by the texts which he uses in his study; e. g. Dr. W. J. Beecher's *The Prophets and the Promise* (N. Y., 1905), and *Reasonable Biblical Criticism* (1911). With the former as a guide, the testimony from prophecy is so oriented

⁵²Studies in Exegetical Method based on Dillman on Gen. I-II, 4a-b.

that the principal weight is placed on the promise, rather than detailed predictions; in the historic continuity and verisimilitude of a nation's life is laid the foundation for the Old Testament apologetic.

This department has taught the investigation of the Bible as literature. It has striven for grammatico-historical exegesis; for the recognition of the influence of individual idiosyncrasies; for interpretation in the light of the *Weltanschauung*, the *Zeitgeist*, the Environment; for the sovereignty of the immediate context. But in studying the Bible "like other books" it has been insisted that the study ought not to begin with the assumption that the Bible is in all aspects like other books; and that the study thereof ought not to be dominated by a naturalistic conception of history.⁵³ The author of this scientific study of the principles and art of exegesis has continued to hold the loftiest views of the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

In Dr. E. D. Kerr, a Hebrew scholar, trained in his subject at Columbia, Princeton and Chicago, a teacher endowed with the rare gift of leading his students into a genuine knowledge of and love for languages; and Dr. Hunter B. Blakely, a student of exegetical method and practice under some of the best masters of that art in America and abroad—such as Dr. B. B. Warfield of Princeton, Dr. A. T. Robertson of Louisville Baptist Seminary, Dr. A. E. W. Rawlinson of Oxford, Dr. Adolph Deissman of Berlin, Dr. McPheeters has had colleagues of like appreciation of sound criticism and exegetical procedure.

The accessus of the last named may be said to signalize a needed step in the thought-life of the Seminary and the Southern Presbyterian Church—a tangible sign to both that the day of international scholarship has arrived. When he began his work Dr. Blakely had had over two years of concentrated study in Edinburgh, Oxford, and Germany. A trail had been more clearly blazed, a requisite for a professorship in a Southern Presbyterian Seminary more distinctly marked out, namely, some "awareness" of current movements in the field of international thought.

Dr. S. A. Cartledge laid a solid foundation in Greek under Dr. W. H. Bocock of the University of Georgia, and has since built a worthy

⁵³*Interpretation*, pp. 31, 32, 33.

superstructure in New Testament critical and exegetical scholarship under Dr. McPheeters and Dr. Blakely of Columbia, and Dr. S. J. Case and Dr. Edgar Goodspeed of Chicago.

Natural Science in Connection with Revealed Religion

Darwin's *Origin of Species*, published in 1859, is said to be cardinal for the whole movement of natural science in relation to Christian Thought.⁵⁴ In the same year in which this fundamental book was published, there was made in the Southern Presbyterian Church a genuine effort to establish a *rapprochement* between natural science and Christian truth. This effort was made at Columbia Theological Seminary.

The minutes of the Board of 1859 narrate a donation of \$50,000 made by Judge Perkins of Mississippi to the Seminary. Half of this sum was to be used to endow a professorship in the Seminary, which was ordered styled the "Perkins Professorship of Natural Science in its Relations to Revealed Religion."⁵⁵

The Instrument of Conveyance from Judge Perkins states:

"First, as we live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon Revealed Religion through the natural sciences; and as it becomes the Church, at all times, to have men capable of defending the Faith once delivered to the Church, it is the object and design of the said John Perkins, and it is hereby ordered and directed, . . . that thirty thousand dollars shall be vested, as a permanent fund for the endowment of a Professorship" (Ibid, p. 44).

An account of the steps and purposes leading to this foundation is given by Judge Perkins' pastor, Rev. James A. Lyon, D.D., Columbus, Miss., in the April, 1860, issue of *The Southern Presbyterian Review*;⁵⁶ and more briefly, in Dr. James Woodrow's *Inaugural Address*.⁵⁷ Dr. Woodrow declares that the plan originated in the efforts of Dr. Lyon (p. 370); and therefore Dr. Lyon's account of the origin is the fundamental source for the purposes leading to such a plan. Dr. Lyon finds the need for a study of the *connection* between the natural sciences and revealed religion in the rapid progress of the scientific department of human knowledge, and in the use made

⁵⁴Moore, E. C., *Christian Thought since Kant*, p. 154.

⁵⁵*Minutes of Synod of S. C.*, Appendix, pp. 41, 45, 68, 69.

⁵⁶Vol. XII, pp. 181-196.

⁵⁷*Dr. James Woodrow*, edited by M. W. Woodrow, pp. 366-370.

by infidelity to invalidate the authority of Divine Revelation. He finds the suggestion for such a course in Professor Hitchcock's *The Religion of Geology*.⁵⁸

The initial steps towards this foundation were taken in Lyon's Presbytery—Tombeckbee Presbytery—in the autumn of 1857—in the form of an overture to the Synod of Mississippi. This Synod in 1859 approved the overture and endorsed the plan (p. 182). Dr. Lyon declared that the Synod was influenced by facts and considerations something like the following (p. 182):

I. That the amount of time devoted in the colleges and universities to the study of natural sciences "is exceedingly meager compared with the wide and ever-widening field now embraced by that subject" (p. 183). So that the young pastor is not equipped to deal with objectors to religion versed in science (pp. 184, 185).

II. "A second object . . . is to furnish our young theologians with such enlarged views of science and its relationship to revealed religion as will prevent them from acting with indiscreet zeal in defending the Bible against the supposed assaults of true science" (p. 185). "What a ridiculous book might be made . . . if all that has been written by the impulsive and self-conceited zealots in defense of the supposed assaults of science upon the Bible was collected into one huge conglomeration" (187).

III. A more important consideration is that "the works of nature, of which natural science is but a systematic delineation, constitute the first great revelation that God has made of himself" (p. 188).

IV. Natural science "is an indispensable concomitant of the Bible, in order to unfold and illustrate its great and ever expanding truths" (p. 191).

Dr. Lyon closes by removing objections concerning lack of *time* and of *money* for such an undertaking. The last objection has been bountifully met by his venerable parishioner, John Perkins of "The Oaks," near Columbus, Mississippi (p. 195).

The personal reminiscences of Rev. Dr. Thomas H. Law, who entered the Seminary in 1859, and a note by Miss Marion W. Woodrow, a careful student of the whole story of her father's connection with the Seminary, state that it was Judge Perkins' wish that his

⁵⁸S. P. R., April, 1860, pp. 181, 182.

pastor, the Rev. Dr. James A. Lyon (Columbus, Miss.), should be elected as the first incumbent of this chair. The duty of electing to the various chairs, devolving upon the several Synods in rotation, fell upon the Synod of Georgia. Dr. Howe and Dr. Thornwell from the Faculty visited the Synod in the years 1859 and 1860, respectively, to urge the carrying out of Judge Perkins' wish. But the Synod had already, unofficially, decided to elect Dr. James Woodrow; and the incidental statements of Dr. Thornwell—just back from a visit to Europe—that Heidelberg University was warm in its praise of Dr. Woodrow only served to confirm that decision.⁵⁹ Thus elected by his own Synod Dr. Woodrow removed to Columbia in January, 1861, and entered upon the work of his new chair at that time.⁶⁰

A sketch of Dr. James Woodrow by Rev. Dr. J. Wm. Flinn is included in Miss Woodrow's book. Dr. Flinn traces Woodrow's ancestry back through Dr. James Woodrow (1637-1709), a Covenanter preacher, then professor of theology in the University of Glasgow (1692-1707); and through this Dr. James Woodrow's wife—Margaret Hair—to the Stuarts and King Robert, the Bruce (*Ibid*, pp. 5-9). The James Woodrow of this study was educated at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania; and at the Lawrence Scientific School at Harvard University under the renowned Louis Agassiz (p. 9). Dr. Flinn declares that Agassiz's friendship for Dr. Woodrow thereafter was lasting, and his influence "profound and permanent" (p. 10). Agassiz's achievements were an inspiration to Woodrow's efforts. His noble Christian character gave the joy and strength that a man of his high soul feels in the presence of a kindred spirit that cherishes the life ideal he loves. Dr. Woodrow's students in college and seminary caught, from him, the admiration he felt for his own great teacher.⁶¹

In 1856 Woodrow took the degree of A.M. and Ph.D. in Heidelberg University, "summa cum laude." Dr. Flinn further states, "immediately upon Dr. Woodrow's graduation he was offered a full professorship in Heidelberg University" (p. 10). But the young south-

⁵⁹*Dr. James Woodrow—Character Sketches and His Teaching.* Edited by Marion W. Woodrow, Bryan Co., Columbia, S. C., 1909.

⁶⁰*Minutes of Synod of S. C.*, appendix, p. 45. *Dr. James Woodrow*, p. 57. So also Dr. Flinn, *Ibid*, p. 14.

⁶¹Flinn, *Ibid*, p. 10.

erner of twenty-eight declined the honor because of his love for his own people and his Church. While abroad he made friendly acquaintance with many of the noted scientists of the world, such as Virchow, Quatrefages, Tyndall, Huxley, Lyell (p. 11).

From 1853-1861 Dr. Woodrow was professor of Natural Science in Oglethorpe University, during which period Sidney Lanier, "the Tennyson of the South," was a student there. Dr. Flinn reports a conversation with Lanier in 1881, during which the poet declared himself more indebted to Woodrow than to any living man for shaping his mental attitude toward nature and life. While teaching, Woodrow found time to do supply preaching and was ordained there-to in 1859 (pp. 12-13).

On undertaking his work at Columbia, Dr. Woodrow set forth his conception of the task assigned him, with a request for endorsement, or counsel and instructions in changing that view. He sets forth three possible ways in which the harmony between natural science and revelation might be evinced. From Natural Theology the arguments for the Being of God might be developed; the analogy which subsists between nature and revelation in other respects than Natural Theology might be shown; the design might be to evince the harmony where this has been doubted or denied. This last plan involves an endeavor to show that objections to the Scriptures (in this relationship) spring either from science falsely so called, or from incorrect interpretations of the words of the Holy Bible (p. 372). The professor purposes to devote his chief energies to this last phase of the relationship subsisting between natural science and revealed religion. "Some of the leading points of supposed antagonism between science and revelation" (p. 373) are the age of the earth (p. 373); the prevalence of death before the fall of man (p. 374); the extent of the flood (pp. 374, 375); the unity of the human race (p. 375); the age of man (p. 376).

To meet these questions Woodrow affirms that an intimate acquaintance with both things to be compared must be sought "with the most untrammelled freedom of inquiry" (p. 377). His conviction is that "truth is one," "that every part of the Bible is the very word of God," . . . and therefore absolutely true, "and that nothing will be found inconsistent with it in the established teachings of natural science" (pp. 377, 378). On a preliminary analysis of

the basal principles of science he finds that: we must receive as certainly true such things as "the teaching of geology respecting the antiquity of the earth, and the gradual nature of the processes by which the Creator brought it into its present condition" (p. 379); as certainly false (or wholly unproven) the teaching of such ethnologists as deny the specific unity of the human family; as in doubt the character and extent of the Noachian deluge" (p. 379).

He advocates a testing of the findings of science apart from our preconceived notions; an exegesis of Scripture without a torturing "to fit our preconceived opinions of its meaning"; but with the help of all the knowledge of manners and customs which geography, astronomy, etc., may furnish. "In comparing results due to the imperfect character of science, to uncertainty concerning interpretation of certain passages of Scripture, to the possibility that language may have been inadequate to convey the ideas for which we are looking (as perhaps in the case of creation, p. 382), we may expect to find many unadjusted differences. In such cases the purpose of the professor will be to suggest one or more possible and probable views of the existing relations, compatible with belief of the truth of both" (p. 383).

Conflicts between science and religion have been accentuated by "the groundless belief" that the Bible "is also a text book containing the whole body of scientific truth of every kind"; by the mistake of "taking as a formal scientific explanation of a phenomenon that which is merely a description of it in ordinary language" (p. 384); by the eager desire to bring the sacred text into accordance with the last doubtful utterance of science, or by a no less real accommodation of the interpretation "to the somewhat antiquated and distorted form of science which has reached the less educated classes of mankind" (p. 385). He laments the spirit that would crush all progress in science lest such progress disturb cherished views. Instead, every inquiry after truth should be encouraged and regarded with approbation. "Let the Church show herself the patroness of learning in everything" (p. 386). He closes with an appeal to the Triune God of truth for wisdom in prosecuting his work (p. 387).⁶²

Dr. Woodrow's plan is similarly described by Dr. A. M. Fraser (pastor emeritus Staunton, Va.).⁶³ "He was thus led to canvass

⁶²Inaugural Address in *Dr. James Woodrow*, by M. W. Woodrow, pp. 365-387.

evolution with his students." Dr. Fraser, however, avers that Dr. Woodrow never taught evolution in Columbia Seminary. He affirms that he was a member of the last class before which Woodrow discussed that subject (1880); and that *at that time* Woodrow did not embrace evolution in any form, and his influence was against it (p. 42).

Dr. Wm. E. Boggs, a student and later a colleague, sums up the significant principles wrought out by Dr. Woodrow as: "NON-CONTRADICTION" rather than didactic agreement, or concurrence between science and Scripture; and "no scientific teachings are to be sought in the Bible."⁶⁴

The records of the Board show that after a suspension—for lack of funds—the Seminary was re-transferred by the General Assembly to the Associated Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.⁶⁵ In the report of their re-opening is found the first whiff of an evolution question. The statement of the Board on re-opening is a message of great joy, since our beloved Seminary, after two years, re-opened September 14, 1882; and this Seminary is manned by those who, among other things, will not "covertly teach evolution or other insidious errors that undermine the foundation of our precious faith."⁶⁶ After such a statement, Dr. Woodrow evidently felt called upon to make his position clear. So in his report of 1883 he set forth, again, his principle of "non-contradiction." He declares that the Bible does not teach that the earth had not been in existence more than a week before man was created; and that except in the case of man the Bible teaches nothing as to God's *method* of creation—only the fact that He created. Therefore, he holds, "it is not teaching anything contradicting God's work to say that he may have formed the higher beings from the lower by successive differentiations."⁶⁷

At the same meeting of the Board a resolution was introduced by Rev. Dr. J. B. Mack, the Secretary of the Board and its financial agent,⁶⁸ requesting Dr. Woodrow to give fully his views, as taught in the institution, upon Evolution as it respects the world, the lower

⁶³Dr. James Woodrow, p. 43.

⁶⁴Dr. James Woodrow, p. 81.

⁶⁵MS. Records of Bd., Vol. II, p. 394.

⁶⁶MS. Records, Vol. II, p. 397.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 409.

⁶⁸So Dr. T. H. Law, Dr. Jas. Woodrow, p. 63.

animals, and man, and to publish the same in the Southern Presbyterian Review.⁶⁹

The request was repeated the following year, with an acceptance of Dr. Woodrow's offer to use this theme for his alumni address, May 7th, 1884.⁷⁰ Dr. Wm. E. Boggs states that in preparation for this address Dr. Woodrow reviewed *de novo* the whole question of Evolution; and in so doing, he reached the conclusion that the evidence for the truth of evolution as defined by him was now such as to make it "probably true."⁷¹ Dr. Adger quotes from a letter of Dr. Woodrow to himself of date March 18, 1898: "In the Seminary, long before 1884, I discussed the subject of Evolution, giving my opinion at the close of each discussion that the reasons in its favor were insufficient. But for years I taught that it made no difference to us, as believers in the Bible, whether it was true or not; that the Bible, rightly understood, was silent on the subject."

"While preparing the address I had consented to deliver in 1884, I, of course, reviewed the whole matter most carefully for months. I was more fully convinced than ever that the Bible was silent, and that it, therefore, makes not the least difference whether we accept evolution as true or reject it as foolishly absurd. But at the same time the evidence forced me to change my opinion that it was not true to the opinion that it is probably true. That is the change I refer to in my address."⁷²

The Board by a vote of eight to three, declared that, while the view of the professor is not endorsed, still "there is nothing in the doctrine of evolution as defined and limited by him which appears inconsistent with perfect soundness in the faith."⁷³

The address itself is entitled, *Evolution*. It contains a reiteration of the principles of non-contradiction. The Bible and science—just as different sciences—in their contents are so entirely different "that it is vain and misleading to be searching for harmonies."⁷⁴ All we are entitled to ask "as regards the relations between astronomy and the Bible is that they shall not contradict each other; not

⁶⁹MS. *Minutes of Bd.*, Vol. II, p. 421.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, p. 445.

⁷¹Dr. Jas. Woodrow, p. 84.

⁷²Quoted in Adger, *My Life and Times*, p. 664.

⁷³MS. *Minutes of Bd.*, Vol. II, p. 451.

⁷⁴Dr. James Woodrow, p. 618.

that they shall agree with each other" (p. 619). Further, "The Bible does not teach science; and to take its language in a scientific sense is grossly to pervert its meaning" (p. 620). Speech is accurate when it conveys exactly the sense intended—it need not carry a scientific explanation of the phenomenon.

He holds that creation and evolution are not contradictory; but that evolution *within the limits of natural science* necessarily deals only with the *mode* in which the effect is produced, while creation deals with the power which produces the effect.

Once he describes evolution as the Creator's purpose to create present and intermediate past organic forms not immediately but mediately (p. 643). In treating of the nebular hypothesis there seems to be a reference to Spencer's definition of evolution,⁷⁵ "The homogeneous has been transformed by successive differentiations into the heterogeneous" (p. 636). The evolution question is, "Did the universe come into its present condition immediately or mediately, instantly, in a moment, or gradually, through a long series of intermediate stages?" (p. 626).

The hypothesis of Evolution is generally defined as *descent with modifications* (pp. 629, 631, 636, 642). He finds the same probability for believing that the body of man was derived from previous *organic* matter as that the bodies of the existing animal species were (p. 632). The soul of man, "which bears God's image and which differs so entirely, not merely in degree but in kind, from anything in the animals" (p. 632), is held to have been immediately created; as also immediate creation alone bridges the gaps between the non-existent and the existent, the inorganic and the organic (p. 632). The arguments for the doctrine of descent with modifications are: "The way in which animals have succeeded each other, beginning as far back as we can go and coming down to the present; the series of resemblances which connect them from the lowest to the highest, exhibiting such remarkable unity of plan; the existence of rudimentary organs; the geographical distribution of animals" (p. 642). Throughout the article Dr. Woodrow affirms his unchanged convictions concerning Revealed Religion. In particular, he affirms, "I have found nothing in my study of the Holy Bible and of natural science that shakes my firm belief in the divine inspiration of every

⁷⁵H. Spencer, *First Principles*, pp. 305, 396.

word of that Bible, and in the consequent absolute truth, the absolute inerrancy, of every expression which it contains from beginning to end"⁷⁶ (p. 632).

In applying this principle to the origin of man's body, the statement that "God formed man of the dust of the ground" seemed, at first, utterly inconsistent with the belief that man is the descendant of other organized beings. But a reference to the usage of *dust* in the first chapters of Genesis shows that the word *dust* is used to describe Adam when he was flesh and bone, and to describe the food of serpents—flesh and blood. Therefore the word seems to imply previously existing matter without reference to whether it is inorganic or organic (pp. 631, 632). In regard to the soul of man, and in regard to the formation of the first woman—which it seems is the real test of the strength of the professor's avowed convictions concerning Scripture—he affirms that there are "unsurmountable obstacles in the way of fully applying the doctrine of descent" (p. 632). He follows this with a paragraph which for the exaltation of the supernatural—in the historical sense of that term—has seldom been equalled. Evolution is not "true of man in his whole being," and, since man is the image of God, "in man's entire history God has continually been setting aside the ordinary operations of the laws by which he controls his Creation" (p. 633). Though man so closely resembles the animals in his body, yet, as a whole, "his origin as well as his history" is different from theirs.

From Dr. Woodrow's speech in his own defense before the Synod of South Carolina further light is thrown on his teaching.⁷⁷ In this speech he compared his doctrine to the theory of "creationism" in theology. "That doctrine represents the body of each human being as derived from its parents by natural generation—as mediate-ly created; while each soul is immediately created and is imparted to the derived animal body by God's direct power. By one mode or process the animal body is brought into existence, then by an entirely different process the soul is brought into existence and united

⁷⁶NOTE: It would be difficult to find more clear-cut and unqualified statements of what has been recognized as the essence of historic Christianity than are to be found in Woodrow's sermon on "The Lamb of God." "He is God with us, the One who is over all, God blessed forever." "What he underwent was a full equivalent of all the penalties merited by all who would follow him and accept the salvation which He purchased with His blood. Heb. 2:14."

⁷⁷Adger, pp. 498-525; *Dr. Jas. Woodrow*, p. 721.

with the previously formed animal body.”⁷⁸ He also finds a likeness existing between the first and the second Adam; in that in the origin of both there has been a mixture of the natural and the supernatural, of creation mediate and immediate.⁷⁹

Dr. E. M. Green testifies, on the basis of “many conversations” with Dr. Woodrow on the subject of Adam’s body, that Woodrow’s purpose “was not to establish any hypothesis of evolution—as to this he was indifferent—but it was to prove the *silence of Scripture* respecting the mode of the creation of Adam’s body.”⁸⁰ His aim in this was to open a way whereby the scientists of his day, respected by him as earnest inquirers after truth, might believe, as he did, in Divine Revelation (pp. 47, 48). The Bible account of the formation of Eve’s body would not allow him the recognition of the evolutionary process in her case. For this inconsistency he jeopardized his scientific standing and was much criticised. “But he was first loyal to Scripture, and, secondly, loyal to science as he understood it” (p. 49). Asked why he had not simply stated evolution as a hypothesis, he replied that he had been asked to give his views and he could not do otherwise than honestly give them. “He said that the evolution controversy had been a costly one to the Church and to himself personally, but that it was worth all it had cost, that it had been educational, the ministry of the Church had been lifted to broader and more intelligent views, and it was impossible that such a controversy should ever again occur in the Church.”⁸¹

Dr. Woodrow stood forth as the defender of the scientists against charges heedlessly hurled against them by theologians, in a series of articles in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. An article entitled, *Geology and Its Assailants*, appeared in the April, 1863, number of the Review. Ten years later he published an answer to several attacks by Dr. R. L. Dabney upon *Anti-Christian Science*.⁸² This answer was entitled, *An Examination of Certain Recent Assaults on Physical Science*.

While commending Dr. Dabney’s zeal, in the light of his views on the subject, Prof. Woodrow nevertheless declares his belief that Dr.

⁷⁸Adger, p. 517.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, p. 518.

⁸⁰*Dr. James Woodrow*, p. 47.

⁸¹Dr. E. M. Green in *Dr. James Woodrow*, p. 51.

⁸²*S. P. R.*, July, 1873.

Dabney's views "are not only not true but are also dangerous," because they will lead to the rejection of the Scriptures by scientists who regard Dr. Dabney as their true interpreter.⁸³ Woodrow maintains that "our minds are equally fallen (and therefore fallible) when we inquire into the meaning of statements in Scripture, and when we inquire into the meaning of facts in nature" (p. 411). Dr. Woodrow agreed with Dr. Dabney in a condemnation of "vain deceitful philosophy" which had no observed facts for its foundation; but affirms, in opposition to Dabney, that physical science is not such a philosophy, since physical science is based exclusively upon facts any one may verify for himself (p. 414). He takes radical exception to Dabney's view that the perpetual animus of these sciences is toward atheism (p. 417). He finds that the danger of this, as of other studies, is not in the study but in the student. He finds a number of errors in Dabney's presentation of the teachings of science. For instance, "That science does not teach the nebular hypothesis is sufficiently evident from the use of the term 'hypothesis.'" "Hypothesis" is exactly equivalent to "supposition," and is used by scientific men to show their care that the suggestion should not be regarded in any other light than that of a supposition (p. 421). The coloring of certain words such as "sensuous," and "naturalism" are objected to as tending to excite prejudice against the scientists (p. 430). The fundamental postulate of the article is that natural science *per se* is neither atheistic nor Christian (p. 434). The article closes with a quotation of the stern rebuke given by Lord Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning* to the theologians who condemn too deep a scientific search for truth (pp. 454-457), and with Sir John Herschel's vindication of the study of natural philosophy (pp. 458-459). A reply to Dr. Dabney's answer to the above appeared in the Review for April, 1874, entitled, *A Further Examination of Certain Recent Assaults on Physical Science*.⁸⁴ Dr. Woodrow's efforts were toward a just appreciation of science and scientists, an endorsement of every genuine search for truth, a presentation of Scripture which a scientist might accept, and the saving of the large group of scientists for the Kingdom.

⁸³Dr. James Woodrow, p. 409.

⁸⁴Dr. James Woodrow, pp. 460-507.

The Opposition to Dr. Woodrow's Views

The request for the publication of Dr. Woodrow's views on evolution was made by Dr. J. B. Mack, the Secretary and Financial Agent of the Board. Through the courtesy of Rev. J. B. Mack, manuscripts of his grandfather have been made available. The manuscript of an article written for the *Southern Presbyterian* gives Dr. Mack's account of the trouble concerning Dr. Woodrow's address:

"In May, 1884, Dr. Woodrow delivered his address. At the Vicksburg Assembly it became a topic of conversation and it became evident that the brethren in the Mississippi Valley would not support Columbia if Dr. Woodrow remained there; and this is clearly proved by the action of their Synods last fall. Soon afterwards the election of Dr. Dabney at Clarksville (i. e. to the Theology Department of Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn.) . . . I felt that with such a teacher at Clarksville and with Dr. Woodrow at Columbia there was no hope for much patronage to our Seminary from the West." . . . Dr. Boggs had often said "that it was a doubtful matter whether he (Dr. Woodrow) was of any advantage to our Seminary." . . . "While previously differing from him (Dr. Boggs), I now not only felt that he had been right, but but felt that Dr. Woodrow ought to resign."⁸⁵ He states that he discussed this question of seeking Dr. Woodrow's resignation with Dr. Boggs; that Dr. Boggs agreed to personally present the matter to Dr. Woodrow; and that Dr. Woodrow declined to resign (p. 7).

According to this account, institutional rivalries, the fear of the name of Dr. Dabney, whose views Woodrow had several times opposed in the press, the deliberate judgment of Drs. Mack and Boggs, entered into the beginning of the Woodrow controversy.

A first hand account of the Woodrow question as debated in the Synod of South Carolina (1884) is preserved by Dr. J. B. Adger. Dr. Adger's testimony is valuable as that of one who attended and participated in the debate (p. 461), and who was quoting the current news accounts thereof (p. 460). His report is valuable on account of his historic training and experience, and broad appreciation of the views advocated by men on both sides. He presents his own speech in favor of Dr. Woodrow (pp. 461-463); he does not flinch

⁸⁵Manuscript, p. 5.

⁸⁶*Life and Times*, p. 457 ff.

from giving the caustic arguments with which it is met (p. 463); he pleads for a fair judgment by "the intelligent student of ecclesiastical history" upon those who opposed his own and Dr. Woodrow's views on this occasion—"our people were not any more in possession of all science than educated people were three hundred years ago," etc. (p. 458). Dr. Adger's own arguments in support of Dr. Woodrow are forcible. "If you listen to this outcry, a loud shout of triumph will go up from the camp of unbelief. It will be said, you selected your men; you put forward your best man; you said to him, study the question of the relation of Scripture and science, and the very first time he spoke you could not bear to hear what he said" (p. 461).

But not less emphatically does he report the arguments of the other side. Dr. J. B. Mack declared that seven points of similarity show that the doctrine of Darwin and that of Dr. Woodrow are alike. "The theory contradicts the interpretation given by the Church to several passages of Scripture. The Church interprets the 'dust' in the Bible literally. Every man's interpretation of the Bible constitutes his Bible. The Presbyterian interpretation of the Bible is the Presbyterian Bible" (p. 465). Rev. W. F. Junkin, D.D., said in part, "My sincere conviction is that the students of this doctrine of evolution, as it is commonly understood, will become more scientific than their instructors themselves. Let them take home with them the theory of evolution and believe it on the authority of a successful leader. Will they stop at the point where their honored professor would stop? I trow not, sir" (p. 467).

*Dr. Girardeau's Argument Against the Teaching of Evolution in
Columbia Seminary*

It is evident from Dr. Adger's account that Dr. J. L. Girardeau was regarded as the generalissimo of the anti-evolution men in the Synod of South Carolina (pp. 460-478); and the real author of the minority report condemning "the inculcation and the defense of the said hypothesis, even as a probable one" (p. 460, 478 note). The substance of two of his own speeches at Synod (Oct., 1884) were published by Dr. Girardeau.⁸⁷ In this pamphlet the speaker sets forth carefully the question at issue. Dr. Woodrow is not charged

⁸⁷Columbia, S. C., Wm. Sloane, 1885, *Evolution in C. T. S.*

with heresy; and "there is no ground, in fact, upon which a charge of heresy in this case could be based" (p. 5). He opposes "the endorsement of Dr. Woodrow's exposition of the relations between the Bible and Natural Science as plain, correct and satisfactory"; and the "judgment that Dr. Woodrow's hypothesis of evolution is consistent with perfect soundness in the faith, and by necessary inference the Board's consent to its being inculcated in the theological Seminary" (p. 6).

Girardeau subjects the principle of non-contradiction to the laws of logic—Identity, Contradiction (or non contradiction) and Excluded Middle (pp. 8, 9). He concludes that the true formula is, "we are not to look for the harmony of identity"; but "for the harmony of non-contradiction" (p. 10).

Dr. Mack's argument is repeated, "Whether or not the Church's interpretation of the Bible be identical with its absolute and infallible meaning, so long as she sincerely believes it so to be, it is the Bible to her" (p. 12). But the Church has ever yielded an interpretation of the Bible contradictory to a settled conclusion of science (13). Conflict and contradiction are "between the Church's interpretation of the Bible and scientific hypotheses," "between theology and scientific hypotheses" (p. 13).

He urges the prohibition of the inculcation and defense of Dr. Woodrow's hypothesis as either a proved or a probable hypothesis. He deprecates the effort to decide that Dr. Woodrow's hypothesis contradicts the Bible in its absolute sense (p. 15). The question is between Dr. Woodrow's hypothesis and the Bible as our Church interprets it (p. 15). A scientific hypothesis contrary to our Church's interpretation of the Bible ought not to be inculcated in our theological seminaries (p. 15).

As long as Dr. Woodrow taught evolution expositively, without expressing any opinion in its favor, there was no contradiction; but when he holds it as probable, his view contradicts "my interpretation of the Bible" and "my interpretation of the Bible is the Bible to me" (p. 20). He is at pains to show that the Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, in inculcating extra-scriptural, metaphysical hypotheses, takes care that between these hypotheses and the Church's interpretation of the Bible there is the harmony of non-contradiction (p. 20). He holds that professors are debarred from inculcating

within the Seminaries contra-confessional doctrines and views, even tho they conscientiously believe those views to be true. "The Standards are our impregnable rampart against error" (p. 22). In the case of a conscientious conviction contrary to the Standards the Professor may be silent in regard thereto; or withdraw from the Seminary (p. 22). Efforts to alter the Standards should be made by professors as members of church courts, not as professors (p. 23).

The other main proposition submitted is that Dr. Woodrow's view of evolution is an unproved scientific hypothesis which is contrary to our Church's interpretation of the Bible (p. 23). He holds that the Westminster Standards teach the doctrine that creation out of nothing proceeded concurrently with those six days, or periods, and that this is contrary to Dr. Woodrow's views that creation *ex nihilo* occurred in absolutely the first instance only (p. 24). Again, he holds that Dr. Woodrow's view, that the dust of which Adam's body was formed was organic dust, contradicts the Church's recognized views that the aforesaid dust was inorganic dust (pp. 26, 27); and that in five particulars. The inculcation of this hypothesis has placed the Seminary "on the edge of deadly peril." Its continuance will brand the institution as "the Evolution Seminary" (p. 35).

The fundamental key to the difference between Dr. Girardeau and his colleague, Dr. Woodrow, is, probably, to be found on page 30 of this pamphlet. Dr. Girardeau writes:

"The ground has been taken that Christianity itself is an instance of evolution. To this astonishing statement I reply: 'There is a manifest distinction to be observed—a distinction which I have heard Dr. Woodrow himself point out, and in which I agree with him, between the progressive *development* of a plan by supernatural interventions of an intelligent author and *evolution* by inherent forces in the things evolved.'

"He, Dr. Woodrow, objected that he was misrepresented—that he had expressly asserted the contrary. He misunderstood me, as I afterwards learned. I supposed him to object to the statement that he had approved such a distinction, and answered that nevertheless it was a good one. But he excepted against the statement as to the nature of evolution as having come from him. I did not, however, say self-originated or self-subsisting forces. I used the word inherent; and if evolution does not proceed by forces, however originated or sustained, inherent in the things evolved, I know not what it is."

Dr. Woodrow was pre-eminently a scientist. His training, former teaching, study, practical work, were scientific.⁸⁸ He approached the question of evolution from the scientific direction. Scientific evidences made *certain particularly defined and delineated* portions of the hypothesis probable to his thinking.

Dr. Girardeau was a philosopher and a logician, revelling in abstract principles and sustained reasonings—as even this pamphlet abundantly manifests.⁸⁹ His lectures on philosophical questions, already noticed, fairly bristle with references to Spencer.⁹⁰ His conception of evolution here presented, as “by inherent forces in the things evolved,” is based on the definition of evolution given by Joseph Le Conte.⁹¹ Dr. Girardeau was looking primarily, not at the probability that evolution might be true in a particular phase of biological history, but at the whole sweep of the term in its philosophic connotation—not at the *arc* but at the *circle*. He saw that the logic of this philosophic evolution made Christianity an instance of evolution, and erased the supernatural.

Dr. Woodrow advocated scientific evolution as a hypothesis probably true here and there along the line, e. g. the body of Adam. Dr. Girardeau opposed philosophic evolution, the doctrine that the whole history of existence can be explained as the progress upward and onward by resident, or inherent, forces. The Southern Presbyterian Church needed the contribution and distinctive thought of both the protagonists in this memorable debate before the Synod of South Carolina. Dr. Girardeau furnished the antithesis for Dr. Woodrow's thesis. It was too much to expect a synthesis in the heat of controversy.

In his speech in his own defense Dr. Woodrow maintained that he stood where Luther had stood at Worms, “With regard to the charges against me, if any man can prove that they are true by the word of God, I will repent and recant; but until then, here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me Amen. And so stand I.”⁹² The fact

⁸⁸He was the directing genius in the work of producing medicines for the Confederate Army, *Dr. Jas. Woodrow*, pp. 36, 53, 138.

⁸⁹P. 8 in re. Logic; p. 20, etc., for Metaphysics.

⁹⁰Girardeau, *Discussion of Philosophical Questions*, pp. 17, 357; p. 30.

⁹¹*Evolution—Its Nature, Its Evidences and Its Relation to Religious Thought*. Joseph Le Conte, p. 8, 2nd Ed., N. Y., Appleton & Co.

⁹²Adger, *Life and Times*, p. 518.

that Dr. Woodrow was not charged with teaching contrary to the Scriptures in their absolute sense—but only contrary to the Southern Presbyterian interpretation of the Scriptures—ought not to be overlooked in evaluating the man and his teaching. He felt that he stood under a definite conviction, holding a position not contradictory to the Scriptures, face to face with an ecclesiastical interpretation of Scripture—in so far he stood where Luther stood. The difference was that Luther's conviction was one *positively* resting on the word of God—Woodrow's was *negatively* not contradictory to the Word of God.

After Dr. Woodrow had been heard at length in his own defense, the matter was voted on by Synod. Both the original reports were defeated, and the following compromise motion adopted:

"That in the judgment of this Synod the teaching of evolution in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, except in a purely expository manner with no intention of inculcating its truth, is hereby disapproved."⁹³

The Synod of Georgia, 1884, debate is also preserved by Dr. Adger (pp. 526-536). The opposition to Dr. Woodrow was led by Rev. Dr. G. B. Strickler; while Dr. Woodrow spoke in his own defense and was defended by his colleague Dr. Wm. E. Boggs. If Dr. Mack's account of the beginning of the trouble is correct, then Dr. Boggs had, in the meantime, changed sides. Disapproval of the teaching of the theory of evolution as contained in Dr. Woodrow's address was voted (pp. 527, 536). The Synods of Alabama and South Georgia and Florida voted similarly.⁹⁴ The matter was rushed into the General Assembly by overtures from a number of Presbyteries.

The Assembly of 1884 commended the action of the Board in requesting the Perkins Professor of Science in connection with Revelation to lay before the Church his views touching evolution.⁹⁵

The Assembly of 1886, in answer to several overtures on the genetic evolution of man (p. 8), which arose out of the Woodrow Controversy, appointed a special Committee on Evolution. The majority report of this committee was adopted (p. 26) and is as follows:

⁹³Adger, p. 526, *Minutes Synod of S. C.*, 1884.

⁹⁴Adger, p. 536.

⁹⁵*Minutes of G. A.*, 1884, p. 231.

"To the several overtures on the subject of the evolution of man sent up by the Presbyteries, the General Assembly returns answer as follows, viz:

"The Church remains at this time sincerely convinced that the Scriptures, as truly and authoritatively expounded in our 'Confession of Faith' and Catechism,' teach—

"That Adam and Eve were created, body and soul, by immediate acts of Almighty power, thereby preserving a perfect race unity,—

"That Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God, without any animal parentage of any kind, out of matter previously created from nothing;—

"And that any doctrine at variance therewith is a dangerous error, inasmuch as, in the methods of interpreting Scripture it must demand, and in the consequences which by fair implication it will involve, it will lead to the denial of doctrines fundamental to the faith."⁹⁶

The same Assembly declared Dr. Woodrow's views "repugnant to the Word of God and to our Confession of Faith," and directed the controlling Synods to dismiss the said Rev. James Woodrow, D.D., as professor in the Seminary (pp. 40, 41, 44).

The General Assembly of 1888, on regular appeal from the Presbytery of Augusta and the Synod of Georgia on the charge that Dr. Woodrow was teaching and formulating opinions and doctrines "in conflict with the sacred Scriptures as interpreted by our standards," adjudged "that Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God of the dust of the ground, without any natural 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."⁹⁷

A full and documented account of the actions in the Woodrow prosecution is preserved by Dr. Adger; but is considered of insufficient bearing upon the theme of this dissertation for its further detailed presentation.⁹⁸ After ineffectual efforts on the part of the Board of Directors to remove Dr. Woodrow—the Board being either unable or unwilling to proceed against Dr. Woodrow on grounds of removal provided in the Constitution⁹⁹—the Synod of 1886 passed a

⁹⁶*Minutes Assembly*, 1886, p. 18.

⁹⁷*Minutes*, p. 408, cf. pp. 381, 388, 391, 399, 401, 409.

⁹⁸Adger, pp. 537-600, 603-648.

⁹⁹i. e. "unfaithful in his trust, or incompetent to the discharge of his duties," Article II of *The Constitution of C. T. S.* Adger, pp. 538, 540.

motion presented by Dr. Girardeau, providing that, in case Dr. Woodrow declined to resign, the Board be instructed to declare the Perkins Professorship vacant.¹⁰⁰ The Synod of 1887 endorsed the action of the Board in removing Dr. Woodrow, in accordance with the instructions given the previous year.¹⁰¹

Before the death of Dr. Woodrow, resolutions, introduced by his friend and supporter, General W. A. Clark, were passed by the Board of Directors of the Seminary, removing any and all aspersions or implications upon his character, standing, or theological orthodoxy, which might be drawn from this or other actions of the Board.¹⁰² He had continued to represent the Church in the General Assembly and to take a useful part in its deliberations. In 1901 he was honored with the Moderatorship of the Synod of South Carolina.¹⁰³

Dr. Adger's comments are: "that Dr. Woodrow's hypothesis of evolution was overwhelmingly defeated in the ecclesiastical bodies; that the vital lesson for the Church is that her mission is religious—that "she is not to enter into the domain of natural science" (p. 650); that a more just regard for the proper rights of Presbyteries, of ministers, and of proper Presbyterian legal procedure would have saved the Church much disturbance; that the history of this globe "is on some points traceable through unmeasurable periods" (p. 657); that "Man, as to his body, is an animal" (p. 661), and that Woodrow's theory on this question ought to receive thoughtful consideration; that there is nothing in the Hebrew word translated "dust" forbidding Dr. Woodrow's interpretation (pp. 648-664).

Of more importance, to the subject in hand, is the relation of the Seminary to this matter since the Woodrow controversy. The first one to be installed as formal President of the Seminary thereafter was an ardent supporter and defendant of Dr. Woodrow in the General Assembly of 1888¹⁰⁴ and in the Synod of South Carolina¹⁰⁵ in the same year, Dr. Thornton C. Whaling. Dr. Whaling professed to carry forward the duties of the Perkins Professorship in connection with his other duties, and endeavored to show that God was as truly the creator

¹⁰⁰Minutes Preserved by Dr. Adger, *Life and Times*, pp. 601. 602.

¹⁰¹MS. *Minutes of the Board*, Vol. II, p. 557. Minutes of Synod preserved by Adger, p. 602.

¹⁰²MS. *Minutes of Board*, Vol. IV, p. 426.

¹⁰³*Dr. James Woodrow*, pp. 27, 45.

¹⁰⁴Adger, p. 598. *Minutes*, 1888, p. 400.

of man whether he came by the short route of immediate fiat or the long route of evolution (i. e. as to his body). In recent addresses to the student body of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Whaling emphasized Dr. Woodrow's fundamental principles, namely, that the Bible is not a text book of science; and the non-contradiction of God's word and God's works.¹⁰⁶

Dr. Melton Clark, a son-in-law and intimate friend of Dr. Woodrow, is now teaching English Bible and Pastoral Theology in the Seminary. Dr. Clark declares that he agrees entirely with Dr. Woodrow's positions in the controversy. Those who hear Dr. Clark know that he also agrees with Dr. Woodrow's lofty views of the inerrancy of Scripture, and the truth of the great doctrines there taught.

The Nestor of the Faculty came to Columbia when no evolutionist was admitted thereto.¹⁰⁷ Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters has told his classes of recent years that he left Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, Va.) firmly convinced that *yom* in the first chapter of Genesis meant a period of twenty-four hours, and that, therefore, there was irreconcilable conflict between the teachings of science and of Scripture. He declares that, as far as he knows his own mind, he has been influenced by nothing save the Hebrew radicals; but, by that influence, has changed his interpretation and now he holds *yom* in Genesis to be a period of indefinite length. He further finds a clear distinction between *bara* used of creation and the purposeful omission of *bara*, the use of Hiphil forms, etc., expressing second cause formation.

In his course in Apologetics Dr. W. M. McPheeters devotes considerable attention to evolution. The first effort is to fix the meaning of evolution as a term of scientific definition. Formal definitions of evolution by such men as Herbert Spencer, Huxley, James Sully, Joseph LeConte, E. G. Conklin, Wiedersheim, Prof. W. Patton, H. H. Newman, are collated. Thus Evolution as a term of scientific definition is shown to be: (1) cosmologically inclusive; (2) genetically continuous; (3) wrought by resident natural forces; (4) exclusive of *ab extra* control, guidance, interference, volition or de-

¹⁰⁶*Minutes of Synod*, preserved by Adger, p. 603.

¹⁰⁶Whaling, T., *Science and Religion Today*. U. of N. C. Press, 1929.

¹⁰⁷MS. *Minutes of Board*, Vol. II, pp. 630-632.

sign. Sir J. Arthur Thompson is quoted to show that science, as at present conceived, has no place for "God" in its vocabulary.¹⁰⁸

The discussion is continued with a synopsis of an article entitled, *Creation vs. Evolution*, by B. B. Warfield, *The Bible Student*, July, 1901; which synopsis is presented in mimeograph to each student. The ideas of evolution and creation are first presented in sharp antithesis. Evolution is defined as "an eternal flux," "the production of all things out of their precedent conditions, through the natural interworking of the forces intrinsic to the changing material." Otto Pfleiderer's discussion of "Evolution and Theology" is quoted to show that if the evolutionary mode of thought be chosen "it must be uniform in all fields of investigation, in history as well as in nature"—to the exclusion of the supernatural from every sphere of action, either as nature miracle or as spiritual miracle. "Causal thinking" is the great contention. Evolution is unrolling, a change of state, *modification*; creation is *origination*. Prof James Sully, Wiedersheim, et al., are cited as showing that the two conceptions are mutually exclusive; and that the latter *in the interest of evolution is polemically anti-supernaturalistic*. It is against such a conception of evolution—such a conception which he held to be inherent in the word and the thing—that Dr. Girardeau protested. And his antithesis to evolution is thus carefully and explicitly taught at Columbia Theological Seminary. The word taken in its etymological meaning, in its logical implication, and in its anti-supernaturalistic coloring, is expressly rejected.

However, this synopsis not less clearly allows that which Dr. Woodrow believed as "probably true"; and for which he contended in the speech on Evolution. Discussing the question of "Mediate Creation" the synopsis says, "*What does Dr. (J. A.) Zahm do with 'Mediate Creation'?*" . . . "If it is meant that at the formation of Adam there was an act of absolute creation producing the immortal spirit, which accompanied the derivative creation by virtue of which his body was formed (not created) from the lower animals; or that at the birth of every human being there is an act of absolute creation of the soul, accompanying the act of 'derivative creation' by which the body is derived from its parents—Dr. Zahm is really allowing

¹⁰⁸*Introduction to Science*, p. 213.

¹⁰⁹Mimeograph Synopsis, pp. 1-4.

here for the category of 'mediate creation' of the old divines without being aware of it, a category standing between his 'absolute creation' by which an origin is given to the world and his 'derivative creation' by means of which God's providence leads second causes to the production of effects level to their power, indeed, but wrought only in accord with His will." "By 'Mediate Creation' is really meant the truly creative acts of God occurring in the course of His providential government, by virtue of which something absolutely new is inserted into the complex of nature—something to the production of which all that was previously existent in nature is inadequate, however wisely and powerfully the course taken may be led and governed—something for the production of which there is requisite the immediate 'flash of the will that can.' By the recognition of this mode of production, a third category is erected, alongside the products of creation pure and simple and of providence pure and simple,—viz: products of creation and providence working together, and each contributing something to the effect: Mixed products of the immediate and the mediate activity of God. As *Wollebius* expresses it, it is creation not *ex nihilo*, but *ex materia inhabili supra naturae vires*. Now the issue raised by the so-called theistic evolutionists in their attempt to make evolution do all the work subsequent to the primal act of creation is just whether such a category as 'mediate evolution' exists, whether there are any products of the divine power which are inserted into the course of providence by an immediate operation of God, and emerge as something new, to the production of which the second causes operative in the case are inadequate."¹¹⁰

Now this statement of the case for "mediate creation" is exactly the thing Dr. Woodrow contended for under the name of evolution—even the illustrations (e. g. "Creationism") are the same.¹¹¹ If evolution be defined as this synopsis holds and as Dr. Girardeau understood it, a product of forces intrinsic in the evolving stuff, then Dr. Woodrow was wrong—not in the substance of his hypothesis—but wrong in naming his hypothesis evolution. Probably most thorough-going evolutionists today who take the trouble to understand Dr. Woodrow would deny that he was a real evolutionist—he

¹¹⁰Mimeographed copy, pp. 8, 9.

¹¹¹In private conversation April, 1931, Dr. W. P. Paterson of Edinburgh, expressed his doctrine of "evolution" in similar terms, using Creationism as his illustration.

was too completely a supernaturalist.¹¹² But if there is still a place for another definition of evolution—for such a term as that here used, “mediate evolution”—then the thing Dr. Woodrow sometimes called “evolution,” sometimes called “mediate creation,” a mixed mode of action between creation and evolution, at once natural and supernatural, will continue to commend his thesis to many. Dr. Woodrow’s own address is, perhaps, a warning of the elusiveness of the usage of the word evolution. He varies in his usage from a Spencerian conception to that of “mediate creation.” Others who use the term may vary more. With Dr. Woodrow as an example, one certainly need inquire into the sense in which the term is used before condemning a man who calls himself “an evolutionist.” Dr. Woodrow is the proof that a minister of unswerving faith in Scripture—even his opponents being witness that his views are not heresy¹¹³—can hold “as probably true” a theory which he designates as evolution. Who shall say that there may not be others?

In a condition of thought in which evolution carries with it the purely naturalistic connotation, the Seminary’s teaching on the subject is the condemnation of the term. But in the statement of the case, there is allowed a synthesis of the thing for which Dr. Woodrow contended (his thesis minus the term which he used to designate it), and the thing for which Dr. Girardeau contended (his antithesis). Truly the labours of neither have been in vain in the mysterious providences of God. Dr. Woodrow’s articles on Science and Evolution were widely circulated and have proved a *modus vivendi* to many scientific students and teachers,¹¹⁴ particularly in the South, men who have been led to accept evolution, in a certain field, “as probably true”; and who at the same time have held unmoved their faith in the Lord Jesus as their supernatural Saviour. Dr. Girardeau’s antithesis has saved the Southern Presbyterian Church from the very real danger which Dr. Junkin pointed out in the debate in the South Carolina Synod, the danger inherent in the word, the etymology, and the connotation of evolution, the danger that the pupils

¹¹²The effort to align Dr. Woodrow with a thorough-going evolution which leaves no place for the unique supernaturalism of historic Christianity—to say the least—lacks critical discrimination. Dr. Thornwell Jacobs also errs in stating that Dr. Woodrow was removed from the ministry on account of his views. *The New Science and the Old Religion*, p. 401.

¹¹³Cf. MSS. *Minutes of Bd.*, Vol. IV, p. 426.

¹¹⁴*Dr. James Woodrow*, p. 49.

would not stop where their teacher stopped, that "mediate evolution" would soon become real evolution, that naturalism would pare down the grand particularities of the historic Christian religion.

The propriety of a synthesis which will allow a man to hold Woodrow's hypothesis and at the same time maintain Girardeau's antithesis is confirmed by reference to several twentieth century authorities. Dr. Warfield, Princeton's great scholar, concludes his article by defining the Christian's attitude toward evolution:

"What, then, is to be the attitude of the Christian man toward the modern doctrine of 'evolution'? He is certainly to deny with all the energy given to him that the conception of 'evolution' can take the place of 'creation' as an account of the origin of the universe. 'Evolution' offers no solution of the question of origins. For its operation it presupposes not only a somewhat already existent which can unroll into fresh forms, but a somewhat within which all that is subsequently evolved already potentially exists. And he is to deny with equal strenuousness that the conception of 'evolution' can take the place of that of 'mediate creation,' as an account of the origination of new somethings in the course of the divine government of the world. Things have come into being since the first origin of the world which did not lie potentially within the primal world-stuff, needing only to be deduced from it. If nothing else, the *God-Man* has come into being; and that not as a product of the precedent conditions in the world, but as an intrusion from without and above. And with him, the whole series of events that constitute the supernatural order of the Kingdom of God. Nor is there any reason to doubt that the same intrusion of purely creative force, productive of something absolutely new, may have occurred also in the natural order of the first creation—say at the origin of self-conscious, immortal beings in the complex of nature. On the other hand, the Christian man has as such no quarrel with 'evolution' when confined to its own sphere as a suggested account of the method of the Divine Providence. What he needs to insist on is merely that Providence cannot do the work of creation, and is not to be permitted to intrude itself into the sphere of creation, much less to crowd creation out of the recognition of man, merely because it puts itself forward under the new name of 'evolution.'"¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵Warfield, B. B., *Creation vs. Evolution*, The Bible Student, July, 1901. Cf. Woods, W. C., Ph.D., *Emergent Evolution and the Incarnation*, Morehouse, 1929.

More recently Dr. Paul Storey of Chicago shocked his Classical Club with a brilliant paper on evolution which supported the main lines of the synthesis proposed. He recognizes the propriety of using evolution as a biological hypothesis, and offers no objection to such scientific procedure. However, he finds that the general popularizer of evolution presents it as a dogma rather than as a hypothesis, insists on applying it in every intellectual discipline-history and literature as well as the natural sciences; and in presenting it either inculcates or insinuates mechanism. This means "the denial of all possibility of a controlling purpose in the mechanism of the universe, or a soul in the mechanism of the brain." "A mechanistic evolution, a materialistic neurology, and a behavioristic psychology consistently thought out, are quite incompatible with anything that can honestly be called religion. To teach them on the same campus would be, to those who think, a jest; and to those who feel, a tragedy."¹¹⁶

The same definition of evolution which Dr. Girardeau used in the Synod of South Carolina was used in a debate between Professor Kirtley Mather of Harvard and the Reverend John Roach Straton of New York, at Harvard University, Session 1926-27. Professor Mather accepted Joseph LeConte's definition with the proviso that the forces might be inherent either in the organism, or in the environment, or in both interacting. The debate was whether evolution was compatible with Christianity. The climax of the discussion was a series of questions addressed by Straton to Mather:

Q. Do you believe that Jesus died? A. Yes.

Q. And do you believe that He was buried? A. Yes.

Q. Do you believe that He arose again from the dead? A. (No answer).^{116a}

The last question cannot be categorically answered without giving up evolution as defined by LeConte, or giving up Christianity as it has been historically understood.

Therefore there is an ultimate point in the Christian geodesic at which evolution must be met. That point is not the Garden of Eden; but the Garden of Joseph of Arimathea. The absolute and infallible sense of "dust" in Genesis two has not been determined. Organic

¹¹⁶Shorey, Paul, *Evolution, a Conservative's Apology*, Atlantic Monthly, Oct., 1928. Cf. More, L. T., *The Dogma of Evolution*.

^{116a}Cf. Mather, K. F., *Miracles and Prayer in a Law-Abiding Universe in his Science in Search of God*, N. Y., 1928.

dust is as compatible with the doctrine of mediate creation (or if one prefers mediate evolution) as is inorganic dust. But the corpse of Christ can never be resurrected by the forces inherent in a rock tomb, nor by those intrinsic to a dead body—nor by the forces of such environment interacting with those of this lifeless organism.

The Christian man has no controversy with the scientist who holds that evolution is one of God's ways of working; but as long as one is a Christian he can never agree that evolution is the one and only factor in history and nature, or the only way of God's working. As a scientist one may see fit to oppose either or both of the above statements. In particular he can easily find grounds for disputing the latter. Entropy is, perhaps, as well attested in physics¹¹⁷ as evolution is in biology. But this last view must be opposed in the interest of Christianity. A Pauline statement of the synthesis might be: "There are diversities of operations (energizings), but it is the same God which worketh all in all" (1 Cor. 12:6); but "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain" (1 Cor. 15:17).

In line with the purpose of the Perkins gift the present course in Apologetics seeks to acquaint the students with the implications for religious thought of the revolutionary changes in the field of astrophysics, e. g., Eddington's new concept of natural law; entropy's challenge to inorganic evolution; the porosity of the atom and the principle of indeterminacy as helps in the visualization of the spiritual control of natural forces and the acceptance of supernatural intervention; the probability of the uniqueness of protoplasmic life on this planet; Jeans' mathematical argument for the existence of God.¹¹⁸

Philosophy

Throughout the history of the Seminary a study of philosophy has been, to some extent, involved in the attention devoted to natural theology.¹²⁰ But a markedly increased interest in philosophy and the study thereof is to be associated with the connection of Dr. J. H. Thornwell with the Seminary. This connection began with his election as Director in 1838.¹²¹ In November, 1837, Dr. Thornwell was made a professor in the College of South Carolina, located in

¹¹⁷Eddington, A. S., *The Nature of the Physical Universe*, p. 84. Cf. Clarke, Austin, *Zoogenesis*, for other factors in addition to evolution in biology.

¹¹⁸*A Pilgrimage to Science. Christian Observer*, March 18, 1931.

¹²⁰*Min. Synod of S. C.*, 1840, appendix, p. XIX.

¹²¹*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 507.

Columbia; and the department of Metaphysics was committed to him.¹²² Practically from this time until his death, Thornwell resided in Columbia.¹²³ During this period he was the "regular" substitute for the Seminary professors when they were sick, or absent raising funds.¹²⁴ Finally he gave up his other connections to devote his full time to the Theological Seminary.¹²⁵

The whole influence and teaching of Thornwell tended to bring to the study of theology that apprehension which thorough knowledge of the currents of philosophic thought gave. Thornwell's biographer says, "the industry with which he ploughed the field of philosophy is proved by the existence, amongst his manuscripts, of a course of lectures covering the entire field, all prepared within the two years in which he taught in this department." And after years of copious reading added wide stores of knowledge to the foundations laid by this two years' professorship of Metaphysics.¹²⁶ High testimonials to Thornwell's thorough scholarship and marked ability in this great field of thought, by Sir William Hamilton, Mr. George Bancroft, the historian, Hon. John C. Calhoun, Dr. J. L. Girardeau, Dr. B. M. Palmer (Jr.), are preserved by the latter in his biography.¹²⁷ Thornwell followed Sir Wm. Hamilton in describing Plato and Aristotle "as the opposite poles of human thought, between which speculation has continued ever since to oscillate"; and made himself thoroughly familiar with them in their original sources. His familiarity with the mediaeval scholastics "was equally great," particularly with Thomas Aquinas and Suarez. "The modern philosophy had, of course, passed under review in its original sources. The chief masters, Bacon, Des Cartes, Locke, Leibnitz, the Scottish School at home and in France, Kant and his Disciples, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, were his daily companions."¹²⁸

As to Thornwell's position, Palmer writes, "Taking his departure from the English and Scotch schools, that all our knowledge begins

¹²²Palmer, *Life of Thornwell*, p. 147.

¹²³*Ibid.*

¹²⁴Cf. e. g. Report of Faculty to Board, *Min. Synod of S. C.*, 1846, p. 31.

¹²⁵1856-1862—Appendix *Catalogue C. T. S.*, 1927, p. 64. 1855 Accessus as shown by Report of Board, 1855, *Min. of Synod*, p. 35.

¹²⁶Palmer, pp. 151, 152.

¹²⁷Palmer, *Life and Letters of Thornwell*, pp. 536-538, 379, 305-306, 541. Cf. *Thornwell's Collected Writings*, Vol. II, p. 452. So Dr. Thornton Whaling, *Thornwell Centennial Addresses*, pp. 22, 23.

¹²⁸Palmer, pp. 536, 537.

in experience, he concurred with them in the doctrine of fundamental beliefs as necessary to it, and by which alone it is made available."¹²⁹ Knowledge begins in experience, yet "experience must include conditions in the subject which make it capable of intelligence." "There must be a constitution of mind adapted to that specific activity by which it believes and judges." The mind is "subjected to laws of belief under which it must necessarily act." . . . "Certain primary truths involved in its very structure." As, "undeveloped in experience, these do not exist in the form of propositions or general conceptions, but irresistible tendencies to certain manners of belief, when the proper occasions shall be afforded." When "developed in experience and generalized into abstract statements, they are original and elementary cognitions, the foundation and criterion of all knowledge." . . . "The laws of belief qualify the subject to know, they cannot give the things to be known. These are furnished in experience; which thus not only affords the occasions on which our primitive cognitions are developed, but also the objects about which our faculties are conversant."¹³⁰ "The law of causation is at once a law of thought and a law of existence."¹³¹

A letter from Dr. J. L. Girardeau, published and endorsed by Dr. B. M. Palmer, constitutes the best presentation of Thornwell's place in philosophy, coming, as it does, on the authority of the two keenest philosophic minds which he instructed.

Dr. Girardeau writes:

"You insist that I shall give you my conception of the place which Dr. Thornwell occupied in philosophy.

1. "It is not difficult to fix his general position. He emphatically belonged to that class of thinkers who advocate what is known as the Philosophy of Common Sense, in contradistinction from the class whom he designates as Sensationalists. As both these classes hold that the materials of knowledge are in part derived from contact with the external world through sensation, they are distinguished from each other by the affirmation or denial of certain primary intuitions, or fundamental laws of belief, implicitly contained in the constitution of the mind, which, brought into contact with the material derived from the external world, enable us to know" . . .

¹²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 539.

¹³⁰Thornwell's words quoted in Palmer, pp. 539, 540.

¹³¹*Thornwell Coll. Writings*, Vol. I, p. 57.

2. "In so far as Dr. Thornwell maintained the principles of the Common Sense Philosophy in opposition to the Sensationalists, he is in alliance with the Absolute Ontologists of Germany and France. How is he to be distinguished from them? He himself answers the question. He divides the class of Common Sense Philosophers into two schools: that of the Rationalists, who not only make the fundamental laws of belief independent of experience for existence, but also for development; and that of those philosophers who, admitting that these primary principles are independent of experience for their existence, ground their development in experience alone. This latter school he designates the school of Experience. He definitely claimed to belong to this school. He utterly repudiates the view of the Rationalists, who evolved from these fundamental laws of belief a Philosophy of the Absolute and Unconditioned. He maintained that these laws would lie dormant and inoperative, were they not developed by the occasions which are furnished in experience. But Kant, who, in his advocacy of the ideas of pure reason, so far made common cause with the Rationalists in their opposition to Sensationalists, utterly opposed their ontological speculations. Dr. Thornwell, however, was not a disciple of Kant in reference to the office discharged by the fundamental laws of belief. Kant was a pure subjectivist. The certainty of existence for which he contended was altogether subjective. The Scottish school, on the other hand, found in the fundamental laws of belief vouchers and guarantees for the real existence of the external world; they grounded the objective certainty of knowledge in the subjective necessity of believing. This was Dr. Thornwell's position." . . .

3. "He was . . . very clearly a natural realist."

5. "He was very strenuous in maintaining, with Hamilton, the doctrine that all human knowledge is phenomenal and relative. He held, with him, that substance is, in itself, unknowable; that what we know is the phenomenal manifestation."

7. "He rejected the Kantian distinction between the understanding and the pure reason and assigned the primary truths, fundamental beliefs, to the understanding. He accepts the Kantian doctrine that space and time are native conceptions of the mind and, as such, condition all thinking."

"Thornwell differed from Hamilton most markedly on the question of Divine Providence. Instead of Hamilton's chasm between fatalism and chance, Thornwell enumerated three hypotheses; that of the Casualist, who asserts an absolute commencement; that of the Fatalist, who asserts an infinite series of relative commencements; that of the Theist, who asserts a finite series of relative commencements, carried up in the ascending

scale to a necessary Being, at once Creator and Preserver. He held that the extremes of casualism and fatalism are not only inconceivable, but that they are self-contradictory, and, therefore, false. The hypothesis of theism he conceded to be also inconceivable, but he maintained that it is not self-contradictory, and that upon the principle of excluded middle it must be true. However, he affiliated more closely with Sir Wm. Hamilton than with any other representative philosopher."

"In reference to conscience, he mentions that the 'Divine Government' of Dr. McCash, had brought out views which he had before held, and had it in mind to publish. Perhaps, to Dr. Thornwell is due the first explicit announcement of the great formula: the fundamental laws of rectitude, implicitly contained in the conscience, sustain to it the same relation which the fundamental laws of belief, implicitly contained in the understanding, sustain to it."¹³²

It is principally in regard to this last point—moral philosophy—that the work of Dr. Thornwell is directly available. A series of *Discourses on Truth*, delivered by him to the students at the College of South Carolina, were published by Carter of New York in 1855 and reprinted in Thornwell's *Collected Writings*.¹³³

A copy of these sent to Sir Wm. Hamilton elicited a highly flattering commendation thereof.¹³⁴

The *Discourses* treat of the following subjects: The Ethical System of the Bible; The Love of Truth, in two discourses; Sincerity; Faithfulness; Vows; Consistency. In the first, Thornwell declares, "The true light in which redemption should habitually be contemplated is that of a Divine institute of Holiness. Its immediate end is to restore the union between ourselves and God which sin has broken" (p. 474). "The first step in real moral improvement is faith in the Son of God. When that step is taken we begin to live" (p. 475).

Discussing The Love of Truth, he maintains that we are responsible for our opinions in so far as we are responsible for the motives and influences under which we form them. The love of truth for itself is the law in conformity with which all our intellectual processes should be conducted. "The end of every inquiry should be knowledge, the aim of every investigation simple and unadulterated truth"

¹³²Letter of Dr. J. L. Girardeau, quoted in Palmer, pp. 543-545.

¹³³*Thornwell's Coll. Writings*, Vol. II, p. 451 ff.

¹³⁴*Ibid*, p. 452.

(p. 496). "Evidence is the measure of assent" (p. 501). "As we know by and through the mind, we can only know according to the laws of mind; all error may consequently be traced to some transgression of the laws of belief" (p. 502). "All efforts to restrict freedom of debate and the liberty of the press should be watched with caution, as prejudicial to the eliciting of evidence and the propagation of truth" (p. 511). He expresses disapproval of arguing on the wrong side of a question as a proof of skill, warns against the love of applause and the fear of ridicule, the substitution of sarcasm for argument (pp. 512-518). The love of truth is the foundation of all solid excellence—"it makes the man of principle" (p. 518).

Turning from theoretical to practical truth, he finds three marks which should characterize truth of life and conduct. First, there is sincerity, "which obtains whenever the signs, whatever they may be, by which we intentionally communicate ideas, exactly represents the state of our own convictions" (pp. 519-520). Then there is faithfulness, which "consists in fulfilling the engagement and meeting the expectations which we have knowingly and voluntarily excited" (p. 521). The third thing is consistency "or harmony of character" (p. 522).

"These three—sincerity, faithfulness and consistency—comprise the whole duty of practical veracity. The opposite of the first is *deceit* in its Protean shapes of lying, hypocrisy, and flattery; the opposite of the second is *fraud*; and the opposite of the third is *inconstancy* or fickleness" (p. 522).

A study of Dr. Thornwell's works shows that he was a philosophic theologian. His treatises on the arguments for the Being of God in the light of Kant's Critique, on the limits of our knowledge of God, or the formal nature of sin,¹³⁵ justify the remarks made of him, "His passion was for speculation. He revelled in abstract thought, and soared with delight even to the utmost verge of the knowable and thinkable in the world of mind."¹³⁶ It is this power of sustained thought which has made the Columbia theology a power in the Southern Church. And it may be said that the writing of theology

¹³⁵Thornwell *Coll. Writings*, Vol. I.

¹³⁶Palmer, p. 536. Cf. Thornwell, Vol. III, p. 24.

along these massive lines makes necessary some presupposition of philosophic knowledge to use aright the same.

On the other hand, it should be not less clearly emphasized, that Thornwell was a Christian philosopher, with an unfaltering reverence for the authority of the Word of God. His characteristic remark was, "if there is but one passage of Scripture against us, our speculations must go to the winds."¹³⁷

The successors of Dr. Thornwell have been men who appreciated the value of studying theology, in the light of the best philosophical thought. That Dr. Palmer, Thornwell's immediate successor,¹³⁸ appreciated the value of this discipline, will have been sufficiently evident by the quotations and references already made from his life of Thornwell. The biographer has revealed himself, not less than his subject.¹³⁹

The longest professorship in the department of Didactic and Polemic Theology—since the death of Thornwell—was that of Dr. J. L. Girardeau, 1875-1896.¹⁴⁰ Dr. Girardeau felt a keen interest in philosophy. His son-in-law declares that his library was more theological than homiletical, and more philosophical than theological; and that the study in which he most delighted was philosophy. He regarded a system of philosophy as a necessity for every system of theology. His discussions of philosophical questions were found among his literary remains, carefully prepared and marked "complete." They were published by his son-in-law, Rev. Dr. George A. Blackburn, in 1900.¹⁴¹ The editor characterizes the book as "a supplement to Hamilton's *Metaphysics*," which the Seminary students were expected to read in connection with the course of lectures. The subjects dealt with in these discourses are: *Introduction*, defining terms, dividing the subject matter, setting forth the author's philosophic position, viewpoint, and end to be accomplished; *The End of Philosophy*, "an ultimate principle of unity" upon which the elements of the soul, the external world in immediate contact with us, and the universe at large, may be collected into unity (p. 27); *Conscious-*

¹³⁷Palmer, p. 545.

¹³⁸*Catalogue*, 1927, appendix, p. 64.

¹³⁹Palmer, pp. 535-546, 147-151.

¹⁴⁰*Catalogue*, 1927, appendix, p. 64.

¹⁴¹*Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, by J. L. Girardeau. Preface by G. A. Blackburn, Richmond, Pres. C. of Publ., 1900.

ness, with special reference to Sir Wm. Hamilton's views; *The Authority of Consciousness; Cosmothetic Idealism; Berkeley's Idealism; Objective Idealism; Pantheism; Sir Wm. Hamilton's Doctrine of Casualism; Spencer's Relativity of Knowledge; The Argument for the Being of God from our Cognitive Nature; Mr. Spencer's Agnostic Philosophy; Physiological Psychology; Space—What Is It?*

Girardeau's epistemology is that, by consciousness, we have not only the immediate knowledge of the subjective phenomena of our own souls (p. 49); but also an immediate knowledge of the external world¹⁴² (p. 50). Consciousness, immediate knowledge, and perception, in relation to the external world, are held to be one and the same (Ibid). Consciousness and perception are different names for the same faculty (p. 84). Therefore, he holds that "it is impossible to doubt the testimony of consciousness to a phenomenal fact without doubting the existence of a consciousness itself" (p. 94). He concurs with the Scottish School in affirming the substantive difference between matter and spirit "contrasted in the antithesis of existence"; but "related in the synthesis of knowledge" (p. 18). He denotes the view he advocates as "natural realism"¹⁴³ (p. 51).

Dr. Girardeau offers a high tribute to "the views of the profound German philosopher, Jacobi." He declares, "with the exception of the defects implicated in them, they will, in the destined triumph of truth in a golden age, be brought to the front and win a wider and happier recognition" . . . "a consummation devoutly to be wished" (p. 25). The inference can scarcely be avoided that Girardeau's chart of intelligence, found on the next page, is profoundly affected in the special function assigned to the Believing Faculty by F. H. Jacobi, whom Ueberweg characterizes as "the philosopher of faith."¹⁴⁴

¹⁴²Cf. Alexander, *Time, Space and Deity*, pp. 16, 21, 24, "compresence," "togetherness." Or for a much closer approximation cf. D. C. Macintosh's theory of *critical natural realism* as a form of epistemological monism which may be called "critical realistic monism, or more briefly *critical monism*." *The Next Step in the Epistemological Dialectic in The Journal of Philosophy*, April 25, 1929.

Sed contra. Lovejoy, *Revolt vs. Dualism*, "Between 'nature' and experience there is a radical discontinuity," p. 265. Relativity and the quantum theory support this bifurcation, i. e., epistemological dualism, pp. 263-264.

¹⁴³Cf. Macintosh, D. C., *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 161 ff.

¹⁴⁴F. Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, trans. from the 4th German edition by G. S. Morris, N. Y., 1888, pp. 194, 198-200.

“TABULAR STATEMENT
Exhibiting the Theory I hold in regard to the Development of Knowledge.

Reason or Intelligence
(The Complement of the Cognitive Faculties)
Generic Power or Source

<i>Faculty of Immediate Knowledge</i>		<i>Faculty of Mediate Knowledge</i>			
<i>Presentative Faculty</i> (Consciousness, the Complement of Internal and External Perception) Specific Power or Source	<i>Representative Faculty</i> Specific Power or Source	<i>Thinking Faculty</i> Specific Power or Source	<i>Believing Faculty</i> Specific Power or Source		
Conditions of Consciousness	Laws of Representation Empirical Conditions furnished by Consciousness	Laws of Thought Empirical Conditions furnished by Consciousness	Laws of Belief Empirical Conditions furnished by Consciousness		
Precepts	Representations	Thought	Faith		
Presentative, Intuitive in short	Representative Knowledge	Thought-Knowledge	Faith-Knowledge		
Immediate Knowledge	Specific Result	Specific Result	Specific Result		
Specific Result					

According to Dr. Girardeau's chart, there are three faculties of mediate knowledge—Representative Faculty, Thinking Faculty, Believing Faculty. Faith has a double function. First, it is a voucher for the other faculties of knowledge. Secondly, faith is as truly a source of knowledge as is reason.¹⁴⁵ On this last premise, Dr. Girardeau was led to develop, in his inaugural address, the thesis that Theology is a Science, Involving an Infinite Element. The endorsements of this thesis by two of Dr. Girardeau's successors, Dr. W. T. Hall and Dr. Thornton Whaling, give to the view the standing of a particular philosophico-theological tenet of the Seminary.¹⁴⁶

Dr. Hall thus summarizes the position of Girardeau:¹⁴⁷

"Faith being a source of knowledge, our author proceeds to discuss the question, 'Have we a valid knowledge of the Infinite Being?' This he tests, both in the sphere of natural and supernatural revelation. The conclusion reached is that in neither sphere is a knowledge of God as Infinite attained by the cognitive reason. Must we, therefore, abandon hope of reaching such knowledge? By no means. In all our knowledge there are two elements, one of which addresses itself to the cognitive powers, the other to the believing faculty. It is the joint operation of these two classes of faculties that gives the full result. We know substance; only, however, as it is manifested through its properties. When the phenomena are apprehended by the faculties of cognition, the existence of the substance becomes known by an immediate and necessary act of faith. In like manner, when the world is apprehended as contingent, the believing faculty, under the law of the casual judgment, infers a self-existent Creator. And the process is the same in the sphere of Supernatural Revelation, the necessary conditions being furnished by the life-giving energy of the Holy Ghost. Man was made to know God. There is, in every soul of man, a fundamental faith which adapts it to the knowledge of the Infinite Being. This proposition will bear the test of all the criteria by which fundamental beliefs are discriminated. And when this native faith is developed by a cognitive experience, it gives valid knowledge of the Infinite God."

"Still another question in this connection is raised by the author. Granting that we have a valid knowledge of the Infinite God, he goes on to inquire, 'Is it possible for the reason to employ it as an element in the processes of science?' The sig-

¹⁴⁵Cf. Thornton Whaling in *The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*, p. 294.

¹⁴⁶*The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*, p. 192, 292, 393 ff.

¹⁴⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 192, 193.

nificance of this question will be recognized at once by all who have reflected upon the difficulty of finding a satisfactory definition of theology, or of allowing to it, in strictness of speech, the character of a science. In grappling with this problem, the author notices first that we may define without limiting. For instance, unless we are Pantheists, we must distinguish the divine substance from all created substance. And yet we do not limit it. Again, we distinguish one divine attribute from another, but do not limit any of them. Again, it is admitted that, while we know the fact of God's existence, we do not know how He exists. It is the fact that God is Infinite that we know. It is revealed to faith. It is susceptible to affirmation and negation—may be made a term of human judgments. In like manner, a divine attribute cannot be perfectly comprehended by us, but it may be known as an infinite perfection by faith; and as known may be made the subject or the predicate of a proposition. Cognition may furnish one term, and faith the other, and the proposition be valid. For example, we are entitled to make the affirmation; the justice of God is infinite. Cognition gives justice a particular kind of perfection, as the subject, and faith gives the term *infinite* as predicable of justice. Here, then, we have an infinite element as a valid constituent of a premise, and as other premises may be construed in the same way, legitimate conclusions may be drawn. But if we may reason about the infinite and from the infinite, it is manifest that it may constitute a valid element in human science under the limitations, however, which have been pointed out."

In view of the recent developments in Behaviouristic Psychology, the Chapter on "Physiological Psychology" is of special interest. Prof. G. T. Ladd's book, *Physiological Psychology*, is highly evaluated as "the most satisfactory book upon this subject" (p. 437); is commended in so far as the new science deals with the relations of mind and body as its proper object-matter. But Girardeau objects to the view that, by investigating the correlations between the structure and the functions of the human nervous mechanism, conclusion as to the laws and nature of the mind can be drawn.¹⁴⁸ He declares that the conditions required for the development of a science of physiological psychology are such as to make it an extremely difficult thing to reach trustworthy results thereby (p. 441).

Girardeau's criticisms upon the claim that psychology and physiology are reducible to unity as one and the same science are:

¹⁴⁸References to *Physiological Psychology*, p. 4, quoted p. 448.

1. "The presumption is mightily against this claim." A line of thinkers from Plato to Lotze admit the distinction between psychology and physiology (pp. 447, 448). Opinions so universally held can only be overthrown by proofs (p. 449). Such a revolution will exceed any revolution accomplished in the field of science, and will strike at the very foundation of morals and religion—making "no real difference between a moral principle and a sensation" (p. 450).

2. The investigations of the sciences of psychology and physiology proceed by different methods.

His final consideration is whether ultimately mind and body are one and the same entity (p. 470 ff). In this section he endeavors to refute the arguments of Dr. Bain in *Mental Science*. One great defect he finds in this work is the absence of allusion to God—which he regards as eminently consistent. "A psychology without a soul is the correlative of a philosophy without a God" (p. 485). This discussion is closed with two incidents of personal observation which revealed the difference between soul and body. The soul showed brilliance of light, as the body passed into the shadow of death (pp. 492-495).

The last discussion presents arguments to show that space and duration are neither relations, nor conditions either of existence or of thought, nor substances; but are perfections of the Infinite Spirit¹⁴⁹ (pp. 18; 496-515).

Dr. Thornton Whaling ventures the assertion that the Southern Church will recognize, in Girardeau, her greatest philosopher.¹⁵⁰

Among the Seminary alumni, Dr. J. R. Howerton was for many years Professor of Philosophy in Washington and Lee University; and is the author of *Freedom and Causality*.¹⁵¹

Dr. Whaling averred that he was a disciple of Thornwell and Girardeau, and as such a philosophical theologian. In accord with this platform, as President of the Seminary¹⁵² (1911-1921) he arranged his classes so that, in the Junior year, the hours for Systematic

¹⁴⁹Cf. Alexander, Samuel, *Space, Time and Deity*, London, 1920, pp. 341-342. (Time-space is the infinite substance, "the stuff of things." But, space and time are attributes of the universe or Space-Time or God, or the One.)

¹⁵⁰*The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*, p. 287.

¹⁵¹Tenney, *Souvenir*, p. 99.

¹⁵²*Catalogue C. T. S.*

Theology were given to the study of Prof. Ralph Barton Perry's *Present Philosophical Tendencies*.¹⁵³

The intricacies of this work were somewhat simplified by a series of questions and answers prepared by the professor. Dr. Whaling used Prof Perry for criticism of other systems; and himself differed from Perry's Neo-Realism in the direction of the Scottish School of natural realism. He favored the dualism of being rather than the "neutral entities" of *panobjectivism*; and so anticipated Lovejoy's declaration that the revolt against psychophysical dualism has failed.¹⁵⁴

At the present time, in tracing the course of Christian thought an effort is made to present as a background the principal philosophical movements, and to consider their relations to the theological views of the corresponding period; while Psychological Apologetics seeks to demonstrate the fact of consciousness and the fallacy of Behaviourism.¹⁵⁵

It is evident that three elements have entered into the structure of the theory of knowledge as it has been propounded at Columbia. With the Empiricist, there is the recognition that knowledge is derived from the external world through sensations, and as such is phenomenal. With Kant, there is the recognition of primary principles or categories in the mind, such as space and time, conditioning all thinking. With the Scottish School, in this constitution of the mind there are found vouchers and guarantees for the real existence of the external world. The ultimate trustworthiness of observations is based upon the veracity of consciousness. "The categories are both principles of thought and principles of being."¹⁵⁶ This third element, "the fundamental laws of belief," "the subjective necessity of believing," the believing faculty as the voucher for the other faculties of knowledge and as a source of knowledge, is the striking element in the Seminary's philosophic presentation. Faith, "the cornerstone of the heart,"¹⁵⁷ is the keystone in this arch of thought.

¹⁵³*Present Philosophical Tendencies*, N. Y., Longmans Green & Co., 1916.

¹⁵⁴Lovejoy, A. O., *The Revolt Against Dualism*, Norton, 1930.

¹⁵⁵King, *Behaviorism, a Battleground*, Cokesbury Press. Apologetics, 1930. Class papers bound C. T. S. library.

¹⁵⁶Brightman, E. C., *An Introduction to Philosophy*, N. Y., 1925, p. 97.

¹⁵⁷Luther, M., *Tischreden*.

Other systems have failed to acknowledge with the same frankness their cardinal foundation, or to define faith-judgments as true forms of knowledge. But in some form, every comprehensive Weltanschauung has had to accept something as data to be received on faith, in some sense of that variously used and abused term. Even Dr. Loyd Morgan, in fitting his Spinozistic Emergent Evolution into the Realist's "Time—Space—Deity" pyramid, confesses that the basal elements thereof are held with acknowledgment that they cannot be proven.¹⁵⁸ Meanwhile Dr. Knudson avers that "faith is the ultimate ground of every philosophical system"; that faith alone bridges "the gulf between thought and reality"; that the ultimate justification of all our faculties is to be found in an "auto de fe."¹⁵⁹ Lovejoy denies that physical realism rests on a blank act of "animal faith"; but confesses a general faith in the orderliness of physical reality.¹⁶⁰

As between the two modern schools which are challenging the attention of the older Natural Realists, the Columbia philosophy has more in common with the Personal Idealists of the Bowne-Brightman-Knudson type than with the Neo-Realists. Neither of these schools accept external, material reality as adequately as did the Common Sense Realists. The Neo-Realist discards such a metaphysical question in the interest of epistemology and their "logical or neutral entities." The Personal Idealist is inclined to follow the Absolute Idealist in making the physical universe a manifestation of spirit. But for the Personalist that abrogation is in the interest of vital personalities, not of "logical entities," "the scholasticism of epistemology." Both Thornwell and Girardeau realized the propriety of, and need for, a unifying element in all philosophy. "The insatiable demand for unity, ever crying out from the depths of our souls, forbids our being satisfied with the bewildering multifariousness of phenomena."¹⁶¹

In the field of natural philosophy Thornwell found this unity presented as substance and attribute, as thinker and thought, as cause

¹⁵⁸Morgan, Loyd, *Emergent Evolution*, pp. 24, 33. Alexander, Samuel, *Time—Space and Deity*.

¹⁵⁹Knudson, A. C., *The Philosophy of Personalism*, pp. 67, 140-153, New York, 1927.

¹⁶⁰Lovejoy, A. O., *The Revolt vs. Dualism*, pp. 267-268.

¹⁶¹Girardeau, *Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, p. 323.

and effect.¹⁶² Of these three, he felt that the reasoning which supported the idealist view of the Thinker and his Thought was the more cogent, and this unity was the more attractive to him. The suggestion that consciousness, the unicity of the Thinker and the multiplicity of his Thought, gives the analogy to the solution of the problem of monism and pluralism, is certainly very apt. The place which Columbia theologians have given to the spiritual and personal realities lends sympathy to the personalistic as against the neo-realistic interpretation of the universe. Thornwell avers that God is first of all the God of men rather than first of all the God of nature. He holds that the government of the natural world, "the dead universe," is subservient and in order to the higher spiritual ends, the ethical harmony, of the universe. The government of the lower is in the interest of the government of the higher.¹⁶³ He reiterated Hamilton's dictum, "On earth there is nothing great but man. In man there is nothing great but mind." Girardeau held as axiomatic, "spirit as greater than matter."

The visible creation is transient and doomed to perish (Hebrews 1:10-12); while the things that are not seen are eternal (II Cor. 4:18). The highest, the unchanging, realities are personalities; the ultimate values are personal; in its ultimate meaning the universe is a plurality of persons. The highest purpose of physical universe is to manifest the wisdom and power of God. Though distinct from God, it is a medium of communication between persons.

One essential difference between the Realism of Thornwell and theistic Personalism, the most attractive monistic philosophy, is to be found in the doctrine of creation. As a philosopher "thrilled" by the Word of God, Thornwell held fast to the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*; while Girardeau declared the doctrine of God's creation of the Universe, non-spiritual as well as spiritual, was vital to theism.¹⁶⁴ Their doctrine of creation rests on a philosophy of Being, rather than of Becoming; while the Boston School is bringing about a recrudescence of the doctrine of continuous creation hitherto associated with New England Calvinism. For the Natural Realist this is counter to the testimony for the external reality of matter found in Empiricism

¹⁶²Thornwell, *Collected Writings*, Vol. 3, p. 365.

¹⁶³Thornwell, *Collected Writings*, Vol. 3, pp. 187-188, 272-273. Girardeau, *Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, p. 318. Cf. Dr. James Woodrow, p. 633.

¹⁶⁴Girardeau, *Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, p. 159.

and in the fundamental constitution of the human mind; and, therefore, incompatible with trust in the veracity of the Creator of both the physical and the psychical, the Maker of both the laws of being and the laws of thinking. Dr. Girardeau reasons: "The thinking faculty furnishes, in connection with cosmical phenomena first perceived by the presentative faculty, then represented in the imagination, and finally mounting into concepts under thought relations, the empirical conditions upon which a faith-judgment is reached that positively affirms the fact of creation. This is conceded by the abettors of the theory before us with reference to the origination by causal efficiency of personal spirits." . . . But in addition the Natural Realist "affirms a free Creator. Acting freely and not necessarily, he caused some being not analagous to his own" (i. e. not personal).¹⁶⁵ A unity for the duality of being can only be found in their common origination. Thornwell holds that physical reality is "a nature apart and distinct from God"; and that finite substances have a being, dependent to be sure, but still a being of their own, possessed of active properties in relation to each other.¹⁶⁶ He would have held with Dr. W. W. Fenn of Harvard that external reality is present to God; rather than that it is identical with God.

But creation not only gives real existences and both final and second causes; it also guarantees pure theism. For the Columbia School, God rather than the universe is the ultimate reality. Creation *ex nihilo* shows His sovereignty to be absolute, limited neither by man nor by nature.¹⁶⁷ The outcome in the Boston School is a finite deity and a self-limited sovereignty.¹⁶⁸

For the Columbia School, God is the absolute person, wholly self-conscious, since He has acted in a genuine creation, and creation is the most distinctive mark of personality.¹⁶⁹ In Him is the flash of the will that can. His act of creation reveals Him as the self-determining and self-acting as well as self-knowing Person. In their search for truth the Columbia philosophers ultimately rested their minds in an act of faith in special revelation and in the veracity of

¹⁶⁵Girardeau, *Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, pp. 163, 322.

¹⁶⁶Thornwell, *Collected Writings*, Vol. 3, pp. 231, 230, 265.

¹⁶⁷Cf. Hodge, C. W., *The Significance of the Reformed Theology*. Van Til, C., *Notes on Apologetics*.

¹⁶⁸Brightman, E. S., *The Problem of God*. Knudson, A. C., *The Doctrine of God*.

¹⁶⁹Cf. Pupin, M., *The New Reformation*, p. 264 ff.

the Creator, whose stamp of verification is the constitution of the human mind.

Theology

The theology of Columbia Seminary is, first of all, a Confessional Theology. The Constitution, found in the Manuscript Minutes of the Board for 1833, declares, "The design of this institution is, and ever shall be, to educate young men for the gospel ministry, who shall believe, love, and preach the doctrines of the Bible, as set forth in the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."¹⁷⁰

This Constitution, the revised Constitution of 1844, and the present Form of Government, require a subscription by every professor on inauguration.

The form of the subscription has remained essentially unchanged. The original reads:

"In the presence of God and this Board I solemnly subscribe the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as a just summary of the doctrine contained in the Bible, and promise and engage not to teach, directly or indirectly, any doctrine contrary to this belief, while I continue a professor in the Seminary."¹⁷¹

The subscription records of the various professors are preserved in the Manuscript Minutes. For example, J. H. Thornwell, p. 467; J. B. Adger, p. 501; James Woodrow, p. 607. The first professors referred to the Confession of Faith as part of the instruction in Theology.¹⁷²

In 1837, the professors refer to their solemn oaths to maintain the standards of the church, and to the alumni as "specimens of their doctrine."¹⁷³ Eleven years later they speak of their endeavors to carry out, in their teaching and example, these great doctrines.¹⁷⁴

The recent professors, Dr. Thornton Whaling and Dr. J. B. Green, have both continued the direct teaching of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

¹⁷⁰MS. *Min. of Board*, Vol. I. p. 101.

¹⁷¹MS. *Min. of Board*, Vol. I, p. 105, cf. pp. 501, 607, 467. Cf. *Plan of Government*, Sec. III, Art. 5, p. 8, Bryan, Columbia. 1919.

¹⁷²*Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 874, 1831.

¹⁷³*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 1159.

¹⁷⁴*Archives*, Vol. II, p. 975.

Very strict confessional ground was taken by Dr. Girardeau in the Evolution Controversy. He held that professors were debarred by their subscription from inculcating contra-confessional views; that the standards were the impregnable ramparts against error; that to teach what is contrary to any statement of the doctrinal standards, was to teach what is contrary to some statement of doctrine in the Scriptures.¹⁷⁵

In the Historic Address to the Synod of South Carolina, 1885, he urged those who object to subscription to the standards in their historic sense not to come into the Presbyterian ministry. He affirmed that the standards were the most effectual barrier which men could oppose to the introduction of error.¹⁷⁶

Moreover, this confessional theology has been Old School Calvinism. In the momentous years of 1837 and 1838, the men of Columbia Theological Seminary were called on to declare themselves. *The Charleston Observer* of June 24, 1837, preserves a set of resolutions endorsing the Philadelphia Pre-Assembly (Old School) Convention. These resolutions were drawn up by Harmony Presbytery and signed by Dr. George Howe, as Stated Clerk. Dr. Thomas Goulding, first professor in the Seminary; and Dr. A. W. Leland of the Faculty were members of this Assembly. Also from South Carolina came Dr. John Witherspoon, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, and Dr. J. H. Thornwell. Virginia sent Dr. Wm. S. Plumer.¹⁷⁷ All of these were active in their support of the Old School positions.¹⁷⁸ Dr. Witherspoon was chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, and was on the Committee of Ten on the State of the Church.¹⁷⁹ "Overtrue No. 1, viz. Testimony and Memorial of the Convention, in relation to errors and irregularities in the Presbyterian Church," was referred to a committee of seven of which Dr. Plumer, and Dr. Leland were members (p. 418); and action in regard to this question was shaped, presented, and in part, defended, by this Committee.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁵*Evolution in C. T. S.*, by J. L. Girardeau, pp. 22, 31, 32.

¹⁷⁶J. L. Girardeau, *Historical Address to Synod of S. C.*, p. 66, Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, 1886.

¹⁷⁷*Minutes Assembly*, 1837, p. 414.

¹⁷⁸*Minutes Assembly*, 1837, pp. 422, 425, 426, 440, 443, 445.

¹⁷⁹*Ibid*, pp. 415, 427, 430-436.

¹⁸⁰*Ibid*, pp. 419, 421, etc.

The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia elected Dr. John Witherspoon and Rev. J. H. Thornwell to the Board of Directors of the Seminary in 1838,¹⁸¹ and from this time until his death, 1862, the latter continued in increasingly close connection with the Seminary.¹⁸² Mr. Thornwell presented the following paper commending the Old School positions in the Synod of 1838.¹⁸³

“Whereas, disputes and contentions, which have existed among the members of the Presbyterian Church, have resulted in a division of our Communion into two denominations, differing from each other, as we suppose, on topics of faith, involving essential elements of the Gospel Plan; and whereas, it is the duty of all the courts of the Church to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; we, as a Synod feel called upon, in the present crisis of our ecclesiastical affairs, to bear this, our solemn testimony, for the truth as it is in Jesus, in opposition to the errors and heresies which are now abroad in the land.

“1. It is a fundamental article of the Christian faith that the guilt of Adam’s first sin is imputed to all his posterity, descended from him by ordinary generation, so that they are born in a state of condemnation and depravity; that this imputation is immediate and direct, having no reference to their subsequent concurrence in his sin by voluntary transgression, but founded solely upon the fact that he was constituted, by the sovereign appointment of God, their federal head and representative.

“2. It is a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel that Jesus Christ was actually the substitute of a chosen seed; that He assumed their legal responsibilities, and rendered a true and proper satisfaction to Divine justice on their behalf, by enduring the penalty of the law in their name and stead; that the obedience and death of Christ constitute the alone ground of a sinner’s acceptance before God, and that ‘to all those for whom Christ purchased redemption He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same.’

“3. The inability of the sinner to comply with the demands of the Divine law, to believe the Gospel, or to exercise any holy affection, is absolute and entire; so that regeneration is effected alone by the direct and immediate agency and power of God the Spirit; the subject of this work of grace being passive, in respect to the vital operation of renewing the heart. We believe, more-

¹⁸¹MS. *Min.*, Vol. II, p. 43.

¹⁸²*Catalogue*, 1927, p. 64.

¹⁸³MS. *Min.*, Vol. II, pp. 37, 53, 59, 60. Palmer, *Life and Letters of Thornwell*, pp. 214, 215.

over; that the saving grace of God is always efficacious and invincible, and its final triumph sure.

"4. We believe that the form of doctrine usually called Hopkinsianism, though a milder form of error than Taylorism or Pelagianism, is inconsistent with the Presbyterian standards; and, if fully carried out in its consequences and results, is utterly destructive of the fundamental principles of the Gospel.

"5. This is our solemn testimony of the truths of the Gospel. And for the satisfaction of those brethren who have been perplexed with anxiety and doubt in regard to the Theological instruction which is given in our Seminary, or in our pulpits, that as Professors of the Theological Seminary and members of this Synod (we) do pledge ourselves that no contrary doctrines shall be taught in that Seminary, or in our pulpits, and that as Professors and Ministers we will endeavor to guard our pulpits and hearers against all the heresies condemned in this testimony."

There were 49 votes for this resolution—including Cater, Howe, Witherspoon, Leland, Smyth, McDowell,—with eight against.¹⁸⁴

The catalogue record of professors shows that these same Old School men continued directly to guide the teaching of the Seminary until about 1880.¹⁸⁵

It is safe to say that the Old School influence has determined the teaching of the school to the present.

The earliest references to theological text-books point to the lectures and then the printed *Works* of Professor Leonard Woods, of Andover.¹⁸⁶ Woods was an avowed opponent of Taylorism. From the explicit condemnation of Hopkinsianism in the Thornwell Resolutions of 1838, it may be inferred that the Andover Hopkinsianism was one matter of which the Board used great plainness of speech to the Faculty in 1836.¹⁸⁷

Statements by Dr. Adger¹⁸⁸ and by Dr. Palmer¹⁸⁹ show that the chief text book used by Dr. Thornwell was Calvin's *Institutes*. Palmer, himself, used Thornwell's manuscript lectures with the *Institutes*. Drs. Adger and Girardeau edited Thornwell's works and

¹⁸⁴MS. Min., Vol. II, p. 60.

¹⁸⁵Catalogue shows: Dr. Wm. S. Plumer, Professor in Seminary 1867-1880; Dr. George Howe, Professor 1831-1883.

¹⁸⁶Archives, Vol. I, p. 874.

¹⁸⁷Leonard Woods' *Works, Minutes of Bd.*, Vol. I, p. 149.

¹⁸⁸*Life and Times*, p. 232.

these have been a staple for class study in Columbia ever since. Rev. John Blackburn has the copy of Thornwell's *Writings* with Dr. Girardeau's notes on the margin—an eloquent testimony to the class room use made by Girardeau of this book. Dr. D. M. Douglas, President of the University of South Carolina, stated that Dr. W. T. Hall used, almost exclusively, Thornwell and Hodge (i. e. *Systematic Theology* by Charles Hodge, Scribner, 1871) in the Systematic department. Dr. Whaling taught the Thornwell-Palmer-Girardeau Theology; but used Hodge as a text. Dr. J. B. Green uses Dr. Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, with Thornwell's and Dr. R. A. Webb's works as collateral texts. Dr. Webb is regarded as the last exponent of the Columbia Theology whose work has been published.

The continued teaching of the Westminster Confession has tended to bring out, from time to time, certain emphases in that document which find small place in Dr. Hodge's treatment. Some of these emphases will be briefly noted, together with some of the different subjects which have been regarded as the center and organizing principle of theology.

Justification

As a student seeking the way of salvation, Thornwell stumbled upon the Westminster Confession of Faith and "cast anchor" in its chapter on Justification.¹⁹⁰ Small wonder then that he found here the center of gravity.

In his inaugural address, Dr. J. H. Thornwell discussed the central principle of "Dogmatic Theology as a Science." Rejecting the view of the Dutch School that the doctrine of the Covenants is central; or that the fact of redemption, the incarnation or the Person of Christ can be such a principle, he holds, "the central principle of all Theology is *justification*, and every Divine system of religion is only the answer which Divine wisdom gives to the question: How shall a moral creature be justified? If that creature be considered simply as a creature made in the image of God, the answer is the Religion of Nature; if that creature be considered as fallen, as a sinner, the answer is the Religion of Grace."

¹⁸⁹*Life of B. M. Palmer*, by T. C. Johnson, Richmond, Pres. C. of Pub., 1906, p. 272.

¹⁹⁰Palmer, p. 80.

He goes on to say that, while the principle of justification is not an original and essential principle of moral government, yet this principle has operated in the Covenant of works, determining the modification of the whole system of natural religion, (1) by limiting probation as to time; and (2) by concentrating it as to persons; whence federal headship.

The great question of revealed religion is, How shall a sinner be just with God? The solution of this question, consonant with the essential principles of moral government, necessitate all the provisions of the covenant of grace—the incarnation, the person of the Saviour, His humiliation, His death, His resurrection, and ascension, and His coming at the last day to judge the world. “All the facts of His history and mediation depend upon God’s purpose to justify the ungodly.” Further “we are *justified* to the *guarantee* of *holiness*.”¹⁹¹

In setting forth this principle Dr. Thornwell was following the earliest Columbia tradition. Hon. J. H. Lumpkin, Chief Justice of Georgia, was a member of Dr. Thomas Goulding’s Session. Of Dr. Goulding’s preaching, Mr. Lumpkin says: “The doctrine of justification by faith he regarded as the epitome of the Christian system, and . . . (it) formed the favorite theme of his ministrations.”¹⁹²

The Life of Dr. Archibald Alexander indicates that the doctrine also had a primary place in the thinking of the first professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton.

The Federal Theology.

Perhaps nothing shows more clearly that Dr. Girardeau, while a disciple of Thornwell, was an independent thinker, than his proclamation that the federal or representative principle is of first import and regulative influence in the Reformed theology. (If further proof be sought it can be found in the marginal notes in his own copy of *Thornwell’s Collected Writings*—these show many sharp differences in details of exposition.)

Dr. Girardeau’s Semi-Centennial Address is entitled *The Federal Theology; Its Import and Regulative Influence*.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹*Thornwell’s Collected Writings*, Vol. I, pp. 580, 581.

¹⁹²*Semi-Centennial*, p. 185.

¹⁹³*Memorial Volume of the Semi-Centennial of the Theological Seminary at Columbia*, Columbia Pres. Publ. House, 1884, p. 96 ff.

The principle of representation was involved as an essential element in the covenant of redeeming grace (p. 99). This covenant *to Christ* was a covenant of works requiring of Him perceptive and penal obedience (p. 99). As the head and representative of His elect seed, He secured justification for Himself and His seed in Him (p. 101). Christ Himself was justified in the sense that His imputed guilt was removed by God's justifying sentence—and His justification involved the justification of His elect seed (p. 102). The elect were in mass justified *in foro Dei* in the justification of Christ as their federal head and representative (p. 103); and they are severally justified *in foro conscientiae* when, in the period of their earthly history, they actually exercise faith in Christ (p. 113). On the basis of their *representative* or *virtual* justification the elect are invested in the court of heaven with a right and title to eternal life; and on this basis, at God's appointed time, their Advocate and Intercessor sues out for them the gift of the Holy Spirit, who regenerates and "enables them to exercise that faith which conditions their conscious and actual union with Jesus," and hence their *conscious* or *actual* justification (pp. 103, 104).¹⁹⁴

The same principle—to an opposite result—is followed through in the case of federal representation in Adam and federal imputation of his condemnation (pp. 107-111).

The regulative influence of the federal theology upon the doctrines of natural religion and upon those of supernatural religion is carefully traced out (p. 111 ff). It is maintained that this principle shows the incompetency of the Pelagian and of the Arminian doctrines (pp. 111, 112). This theory makes other Calvinistic theories, whether Dr. Shedd's realistic theory of generic unity, or President Edward's theory of sovereign constitution, superfluous (p. 113). The theory of propagation and of mediate imputation is also ruled out as unnecessary (pp. 114, 115); as also the theory of Concurrence (that federal guilt and subjective depravity so concur in the same concrete and inseparable experience that neither is in order to the other (pp. 115-116).

The regulative influence of the federal theology is shown in affording "the only tolerable solution" of the mysteries which hang over the moral history of the race. It shows that "our inability is

¹⁹⁴Cf. Thornwell, *Coll. Writings*, Vol. II, p. 282.

not original; it is penal" (p. 119). It shows that the only dealings of God with the race are covenant dealings; and salvation is only through the covenant of grace (p. 120).

In the field of Supernatural Religion the representative principle has the solution of the question of the relations of justification and regeneration and offers the following *ordo salutis*:—forensic justification (or implicit justification); intercession, suing out the grace of the Holy Spirit for the sinner (implicitly justified); regeneration, uniting the sinner vitally and spiritually to his federal head; faith and actual justification (pp. 121-123). On this principle the electing decree is found to be utterly unconditioned; atonement, particular; vocation, efficacious and irresistible; perseverance, certain; the enthronement of Grace, secure (pp. 124-125).

Adoption

Still another key-note in the Columbia Theology is the doctrine of Adoption, a subject not indexed in Hodge's *Systematic Theology*. Discussing Dr. Thornwell as a theologian, Dr. Thornton Whaling said:

"The most valuable work of our master Theologian was accomplished in the Theology of Redemption by the supreme and regulative place he assigned *Adoption*. In fact the organic and unifying principle in Thornwell's theology is found in his doctrine of Adoption. The question proposed, both in natural religion and in supernatural religion, was the same, viz: how may a servant, through adoption, become a son. In the Covenant of Works the question relates to a righteous servant; in the Covenant of Grace to an unholy and condemned servant; but the end proposed in each case is the same, the change from the status of a servant to that of a son through adoption. From this point of view, Election is election 'into the adoption of sons.' Justification is a means devised by which the standing of the servant may be so assured that adoption of sonship shall certainly follow; Federal Headship, again, is a sublime means which the adoptive decree utilizes, in order that the one who is represented shall receive this gracious benefit of the change from the status of a servant to that of a son; Regeneration is the effective way in which the spirit of sonship is made real in those who have secured the adoption of sons. No other system of theology has assigned so large a place to this ruling conception which occupies so supreme a position in the Scriptures and in religious experience. And in making Adoption central, Dr. Thornwell is at

once the more scriptural and the more philosophic. This is his chief achievement as a Theologian, making a distinct advance upon the Reformed Soteriology and that of all subsequent thinkers, by giving Adoption the regal position assigned to it in revelation, and belonging to it in Christian experience, and which theology ought to recognize in its systematic construction of Scripture and experience by giving Adoption the same influential and regulative place in the doctrinal system."¹⁹⁵

Dr. Girardeau also gives to adoption a fundamental place in his own and in Thornwell's theology. But Dr. Girardeau (and Dr. Whaling) held that Adam as created was both a son and a servant; while Dr. Thornwell and Dr. J. B. Green hold he was created a servant only.¹⁹⁶ Dr. Girardeau divides objective soteriology into two parts, justification and adoption. The former is grounded in the obedience of Christ as the servant of the Father and entitles his people to appear before God's throne. On the other hand, Christ's obedience as a son grounded His people's adoption as children in God's house and entitles them to sit at God's table, confirmed in all the rights, immunities and privileges of his children. The grounds of Adoption are the eternal purpose of God, and union with Christ naturally (by His Incarnation), vitally (by regeneration), and federally (by imputation of his filial obedience).

All the powers of Dr. Girardeau's eloquence are called into play to magnify the blessedness of adoption. The adopted are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ with an indefeasible title to an inheritance which is "all that can be conceived or believed as embraced in the paternal favor and love of God"—here and hereafter, "the riches of grace and the riches of Glory." It signifies "Home!"; "ineffable communion," immunity from slavish obedience or fears; boldness of access; liberty of communion as children; the wholesome, loving, saving discipline of children in God's family; the enjoyment of all conceivable good in God as the portion of the soul.¹⁹⁷

Dr. Girardeau's well marked copy of Breckenridge's *Subjective Theology* shows that the excellent treatment of *Adoption* there found was heavily drawn upon.

¹⁹⁵Thornwell *Centennial Address*, Spartanburg, S. C., Band & White, 1913, pp. 28-29.

¹⁹⁶Girardeau, J. L., *Discussions of Theological Questions*, p. 453.

¹⁹⁷Girardeau—The Doctrine of Adoption in *Discussions of Theological Questions*, p. 428 ff. Richmond, Pres. Com. of Publ., 1905.

Dr. Thornton Whaling published an article setting forth this central tenet of the Columbia Theology, in the Princeton Theological Review for 1923, p. 233. Dr. R. A. Webb has devoted marked attention to it.

But if the primary sense of theology, as the word of God,¹⁹⁸ or the revelation of God, is to have a genuine place in determining its central or unifying principle, some principle must be sought which bespeaks the nature, being, or self-revelation of God in Himself—and not only a great principle in His relationships with His creatures. A study of Dr. Thornwell's Collected Writings presents two principles for such consideration—spirituality and holiness.

The Spirituality of God

The only conception of God's being which can seriously be considered as disputing with His holiness the central place in the Thornwellian system is the spirituality of God. God in Himself is indefinable. Man's finite conceptions of Him can be expressed. The expression of these concepts should begin with the recognition that, as to His genus, God is Personal Spirit¹⁹⁹ (Vol. 1.158-161). No believer in God as immaterial reality can desire more emphasis than Thornwell placed upon this doctrine.²⁰⁰ He said, "The spirituality of God is the foundation of all religious worship—it is the foundation of all the Divine attributes" (p. 173). As spiritual, God is necessary life and activity—self-moved and self-determined (p. 183). As spiritual activity, His is the highest of all activity—"the activity of thought and will" (p. 184). "Because spiritual, God can commune with our spirits" (p. 186, cf. pp. 510-512); and become the portion of our souls. Further, this thought is carried into the human realm as of primary importance. "On earth there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but mind" (quoted p. 183). A natural or fundamental image of God consists of those spiritual properties which belong to man as a person—the faculties of intelligence, conscience and will (p. 236). Such a nature is the indispensable condition of the moral image of God. It is the *sine*

¹⁹⁸*Ein investigare deum in sua inscrutabili altitudine*, Calvin quoted by Thurneysen. *Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche*, p. 4. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munchen, 1927. Cf. Meeter, H. H., *The Fundamental Principles of Calvinism*, Ref'd Press, pp. 26-28.

¹⁹⁹So in effect Girardeau, *Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, p. 28.

²⁰⁰Vol. I, p. 179.

qua non of the moral similitude of God (p. 236). This expression seems to give the key to the relative placing of spirituality and holiness in Thornwell's system. Spirituality is the foundation, the necessary condition, the *sine qua non* of religion, and of theology—whether as the study of God or of man. But that condition being supplied and implied, holiness is the vital determinant in the systematization. Nevertheless, this great natural principle is never lost in the system. Under the force of this thought the Columbia Theology has affirmed the self-determination of the will in the supreme case of the sin of the first parents, and so has definitely broken the complete reign of the dogma of Determinism.²⁰¹

The central place of the spirituality of the Church—an inference from a high conception of the spirituality of God—has been elsewhere treated. Another effect of this principle has been the simplicity and spirituality of worship. As Dr. Girardeau led the worship, there was no reading in concert, no repeating of creeds and prayers; "but only the simple, oldtime Presbyterian worship—consisting of solemn, earnest prayers led by the minister, plain congregational singing, the impressive reading of the Scripture," the exposition of the Word, and an offering. In this plain bill of spiritual fare, instrumental music and, generally, trained choirs were never allowed, being regarded as without New Testament warrant.²⁰²

The students passing under the forty years of Dr. W. M. McPheeters' professorship have all been drilled by precept and prayer in the dictum that "God is spirit, and that they who would truly worship Him must worship Him with their spirits."

The Holiness of God

The most distinctive and most vital doctrine of the Columbia Theology as revealed by the present study is that of the *holiness of God*. This principle stands out as determining the formulation of and space given to many of the themes discussed in *Thornwell's Collected Writings*. Whether or not it is the logical center, it is the vital center of the Thornwellian Theology.

²⁰¹Dr. Thornton Whaling, *Thornwell as a Theologian in Thornwell Centennial Addresses*, p. 28. Cf. J. L. Girardeau, *The Will in Its Theological Relations*, Chap. I, Columbia, S. C., Duffie, 1891.

²⁰²T. H. Law in *The Life Work of J. L. G.*, pp. 141, 142. J. L. Girardeau, *Instrumental Music in the Church*.

The Reformed Theology has been characterized as the vision of God in His majesty, of the King in His beauty.²⁰³ Dr. Thornwell laid hold of the beauty of holiness, the supreme vision of God, to bow souls in adoration, humility, and absolute dependence upon Him. In emphasizing this element as the very life of God, Dr. Thornwell is standing in the line between Charnock²⁰⁴ and B. B. Warfield,²⁰⁵ both of whom make God's holiness His crown and His glory. More generally, this element has found a large place in P. T. Forsyth *The Cruciality of the Cross*;²⁰⁶ in Harris E. Kirk's, *The Consuming Fire*;²⁰⁷ and is a vital element in Edward Thurneysen's, *Das Wesen der Reformation*.²⁰⁸

One can not define terms that are, in their very nature, indefinable. It is impossible to scale the inaccessible heights of the Divine Holiness with a definition. In this Alpine effort, Dr. B. B. Warfield was compelled to fall back upon a negative or apophatic method: According to its Hebrew etymology the central thought is found to be division, "specifically separation from the world conceived as a sinful world. When we call God holy, then, the central idea in our minds concerns His absolute and complete separation from sin and uncleanness. Not that the idea has this negative form as it lies in our minds. There is no idea so positive as that of holiness; it is the very climax of positiveness. But it is hard to express this positiveness in a definite way, simply because this idea is above the ideas expressed by its synonyms. It is more than sinlessness, though it, of course, includes the idea of sinlessness. It is more than righteousness, although again it includes the idea of righteousness. It is more than wholeness, complete soundness and integrity and rightness, though, of course, again it includes these ideas. It is more than simpleness, high simplicity and guilelessness, though it includes this too. It is more than purity, though, of course, it includes this too. Holiness includes all these and more. It is God's whole, entire, absolute, inconceivable and, therefore, inexpressible completeness and

²⁰³C. W. Hodge. *The Significance of the Reformed Theology Today*. Printed as Addresses at his Inauguration, p. 19.

²⁰⁴*Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God*, New Edition, London, H. G. Bohn, 1860, especially p. 469.

²⁰⁵*Faith and Life*, Longmans, Green & Co., N. Y., 1916, p. 443.

²⁰⁶*The Cruciality of the Cross*, H. & S. London.

²⁰⁷*The Consuming Fire*, Harris E. Kirk's, N. Y., 1919.

²⁰⁸*Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche*, pp. 15, 16.

perfection of separation from and opposition to and ineffable revulsion from all that is in any sense or degree, however small, evil. We fall back at last on this negative description of it just because language has no positive word which can reach up to the unscalable heights of this one highest word, holiness. It is the crown of God, as mercy is His treasure; as grace is His riches, this is His glory. Who is like unto God, glorious in holiness?"²⁰⁹

But in its etymological derivation and its Biblical usage, the term the Holiness of God should also be construed as carrying in itself the thought of the exaltation of God. The conception of One set apart above, distinct from, implies separation from the creaturely limitation inherent in man. This element is virtually that which is often expressed as "the transcendence of God." Dr. George Adam Smith finds this thought symbolized in Isaiah's vision of the Lord *high and lifted up* and expressed in the seraphim trisagion:

"Generally speaking, then, holiness is equivalent to separateness, sublimity. . . . Better expression could not be found for the full idea of Godhead. This little word *Holy* radiates heaven's own breadth of meaning. Within its fundamental idea—distance or difference from man—what spaces are there not for every attribute of Godhead to flash? If the Holy One be originally He who is distinct from man and man's thoughts, and who impresses man from the beginning with the awful sublimity of the contrast in which He stands to him, how naturally may holiness come to cover not only that moral purity and intolerance of sin to which we now more strictly apply the term, but those metaphysical conceptions as well, which we gather up under the name 'supernatural,' and so finally, by lifting the Divine nature away from the change and vanity of this world, and emphasizing God's independence of all beside Himself, become the fittest expression we have for Him as the Infinite and Self-existent. . . . The Holy One is not only the Sinless and Sin-abhorring, but the Sublime and the Absolute too."²¹⁰

Thornwell followed Charnock in making holiness the glory of all of God's other perfections.²¹¹ But he seems to have gone beyond Charnock in making the holiness of God almost the synonym for the

²⁰⁹Warfield, B. B., *Faith and Life*, pp. 443, 444.

²¹⁰Smith, G. A., *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I, *The Expositor's Bible*, p. 65. Armstrong, N. Y., 1900.

²¹¹*Charnock*, p. 469.

nature of God; and in the nature of God as thus conceived, rather than in the will of God, he laid the ultimate foundation for his theological structure. He declares:

“As moral character in man depends upon dispositions and principles back of his volitions, must there not be something analogous in God, something in the very nature and grounds of His being which determines His will to command and forbid what it does? Unquestionably there is; it is the holiness of the Divine nature, that essential rectitude of His being, which constitutes His glory and without which we could not conceive Him to be an object of worship or reverential trust. Holiness is represented in the Scriptures as the very life of God. In all other beings it is an accident separable from the essence; in God it is His very self. It pervades all His other attributes and perfections and makes them to be preeminently Divine. His infinite knowledge, tempered by His holiness, becomes wisdom. His infinite power, wielded by that same holiness, becomes the guardian of justice, truth and innocence. His infinite will, impregnated with holiness, becomes the perfect standard of rights and duty. This perfection is God’s crown and glory.²¹² He declares that holiness is not restricted or co-ordinated with the other moral perfections of God, but is inclusive of them. ‘It is that in which they are contained, from which they spring, and by which they are determined. They are so many expressions of it.’ ‘It may be styled a transcendental attribute, that, as it were, runs through the rest and casts a glory upon every one, it is an attribute of attributes.’ ‘In matters of greatest moment He is brought in swearing by His holiness, which He is not wont to do by any single attribute, as though it were a fuller expression of Himself an *adaequatior conceptus*, than any of the rest.’ ‘The reason of such representations is that holiness implies the fullness and energy of God’s delight in righteousness. It is the very life of that love and blessedness which flows from His own self-sufficiency. God is love—In other words God, as a holy being, contemplates Himself as His own infinite good; and the blessedness of the Divine nature is but the delight of the Divine holiness in being what He is—It is the fullness of love to His own perfections which determines Him to express them and to stamp them in some degree upon every work of His hands. Hence His holiness pervades His whole being; underlies every Divine activity; prompts every Divine energy.’²¹³

²¹²Thornwell’s *Col. Writings*, Vol. I, p. 357.

²¹³Thornwell’s *Col. Writings*, Vol. I, pp. 367, 368.

“Without holiness His patience would be indulgence in sin—His mercy a fondness—His wrath a madness, His power a tyranny, His wisdom an unworthy subtilty.”

Turning from theology proper to anthropology, the centrality of the idea of holiness is not lost. Man was created “in actual possession of knowledge, righteousness and true holiness.”²¹⁴ “There is no middle betwixt sin and holiness. Every moral being must be either holy or sinful” (p. 231). That man is said to have been in the image of God implies positive holiness. It is true that this phase is sometimes transferred to our spiritual and personal nature, but the thought is that this nature is the indispensable condition of holiness; it is the subject in which it must inhere.²¹⁵ “But the strict and proper acceptation of the phrase is holiness—holiness of nature, or habitual holiness.”—“The image of God consists generally in true holiness, and this holiness, as the universal spirit or temper of the man, manifests itself in knowledge and righteousness” (p. 236). Adam’s proper spiritual discernment of God “was holiness as it irradiates the understanding” (p. 237).

Dr. Whaling has mentioned, as first and foremost “among the striking instances of Thornwell’s originality,” the large place and novel treatment which he gives to Christian Ethics as a section of Systematic Theology. Concluding his first discussions on Truth, Dr. Thornwell says, “I have now completed what I had to say upon the ethical system of the Bible. The true light in which redemption should be habitually contemplated is that of a Divine institute of holiness.”²¹⁶ One ground of his objection to the Roman Catholic system is that “her doctrine of venial sins . . . is utterly incompatible with those awful impressions of the malignity of the least departure from rectitude which the holiness of God imparts.”²¹⁷

Thornwell finds that sin, objectively considered, is non-conformity with the law. But the moral law is the expression of God’s will. And God’s will is not arbitrary or capricious; it is grounded in the very nature and being of God. It is determined by “the holiness of the Divine nature, that essential rectitude of His being, which constitutes His glory and without which we could not conceive Him to

²¹⁴*Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 229.

²¹⁵*Thornwell’s Col. Writings*, Vol. I, p. 236.

²¹⁶*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 474.

²¹⁷*Thornwell’s Col. Writings*, Vol. II, p. 372. cf. 377.

be an object of worship or reverential trust" (p. 357). Sin, therefore, is "the transgression of the law, disobedience to God and contradiction to His holiness" (p. 361).

Sin in its subjective determination is traced back to "the want of holiness." A subjective consideration of sin shows that "supreme devotion constitutes the moral condition of the soul indispensable to holiness" (p. 358); that this devotion is expressed in love; and that a negation of the feeling of devotion and dependence (i. e. independence, estrangement from God, self-affirmation) is the root thought in sin. "As love to the creature in a state of holiness is determined by its relations to the purpose of God, so, in a state of sin that love is determined by relations to our own views and selfish purposes" (p. 260).

In considering the formal nature of sin, Dr. Thornwell shows that moral distinctions are necessary as being grounded, not in the arbitrary will, but in the very nature of God. He finds also that all right motives and actions go back to a unity in the holiness of God. "What God's holy will embraces, that is right; what it rejects and abhors, that is wrong." Truth, justice, benevolence, temperance find their unity in conscience, and conscience is what the holiness of God loves and approves (p. 370). "Holiness in man pervades the soul in all forms of its existence as a nature or as an exercise. It is light to the understanding, beauty to the heart, and good to the will" . . . "Its longings are after God distinctly as the holy God." . . . "It is ravished with the glory of the Lord because that glory is only the splendour of His holiness. It is fundamentally the principle of supreme love of Him as the supreme good." Therefore the notion of right in a creature ought to be carried up to that of the good. "There must be the love of the thing as beautiful and becoming, as assimilating the soul to God and bringing it into a condition to enjoy His favour." Sin, then, is nothing but the contrast of holiness—enmity toward God. It is rebellion against God—opposition to God and opposition even to Him in the height of His glory, His holiness. It is the denial of the creature's fundamental relation of dependence and the putting up of self as the rival and enemy of God. "Sin stands revealed in awful malignity as a profane attempt to dethrone the Most High and to exalt ourselves to His glory and sovereignty" (p. 393).

Out of this sense of sin as the contrast of holiness, Thornwell stresses the polluting effect of sin.²¹⁸ "It recoils upon ourselves and in separating us from the source of all real and solid good, it robs the soul of its native beauty and excellence, pollutes them in every faculty with foul deformity, makes them a hideous and ghastly spectacle—a loathsome and putrid mass to all intelligent beings that have retained their integrity." The sinner "is morally ulcerated from head to foot; he is a universal mass of gangrenous matter. He is covered with filth." Sin is the original ugly, and nothing is ugly except in consequence of its analogy to sin. With sin, as the sentiment of the ugly, the vile, the dirty, the mean, comes the sentiment of shame. As the opposite to the beauty of His holiness Thornwell paints sin as heinous, hateful, filthy, foul and ugly.

But, according to Thornwell, holiness comprehends the righteousness of God—righteousness is what holiness affirms. And the justice of God is His holiness acting in His power. And when sin stands before this manifestation of the holiness of God, it is seen in its blackness of guilt. Conscience, the echo of the holiness of God, brings the soul into the depths of agony with her solemn declaration that sin ought to be punished and that sin will be punished. The moral law as the expression of the very nature of God is ineradicable.

Therefore, the violation of the law brings the inexorable necessity of punishment. "The necessity of punishment is as inexorable as the necessity of obedience. It is not a thing which God may institute or abolish at will without reflecting on His glory. It is a thing which He must do, or cease to be the holy and just God. The end of punishment is to uphold the majesty of the law." And the law is the necessary expression of the nature of God. God's character is inexorably pledged to the punishment of sin—he can no more fail to punish sin than he can lie. Divine justice is simply the triumph of Divine holiness.²¹⁹ "In the penal fires of hell we contemplate the inextinguishable hatred of God to all forms of iniquity. They result from the purity of infinite holiness in terrible collision with guilt."²²⁰ "It is a radical principle of all religion that no sin is unconditionally pardoned."²²¹ The opposition of God to sin is the

²¹⁸*Thornwell's Col. Writings*, Vol. I, pp. 400-424.

²¹⁹*Thornwell's Col. Writings*, Vol. I, pp. 406-424.

²²⁰*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 244.

²²¹*Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 375.

opposition of His nature as holy to sin—for God to do other than take vengeance of sin would be for Him to violate the fundamental attributes of His nature.

The flaming glory of the holiness of God is revealed for Thornwell in the consideration of the sacrifice of Christ as that of a holy priest. This theme is presented in two of Thornwell's Addresses preserved in Vol. II of his *Collected Writings: The Priesthood of Christ*; and *The Sacrifice of Christ, the Type and Model of Missionary Effort* (pp. 265-290; 449). Here Thornwell presents the glory of God not only in the saving work which is done, not only even in the Lord of glory who does it, but in the sublime way in which it is done, the work of a priest. "That our substitute, ransom and surety should be a priest is grace on top of grace—the exuberance of grace" (p. 272). More recently, Dr. P. T. Forsyth in *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* has declared, "New Testament religion is a priestly religion or it is nothing. It gathers around a priestly cross on earth and a Great High Priest in the heavens—it means the priesthood of each believer—and the collective priesthood of the Church as one" (p. 12). The same writer makes the fundamental action of Christ's death a prime regard for the holiness of God.²²²

Thornwell represents the soul of the Lord Jesus as burning with a holy adoration of God, as He sees the Father in the radiant glory of His holiness. And from this vision he gathers the unescapable argument for the necessity of the atonement: "When I consider His soul as a pious offering, and then reflect that He celebrates the grace and the condescension of God in accepting the gift; when I consider the extent and severity of His sufferings, and then remember that all were to express to the universe His sense of the Divine holiness, I ask no more: I am satisfied that thus it must be—that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission. So intense was His conviction that His death was indispensable to the righteous pardon of the guilty, that He seems to have coveted the cross, and to have been straitened for His baptism of blood. He could not brook the thought that man should be saved at the peril of the Divine Glory, and whatever His Father's honour demanded He was prepared to render at any cost of self-denial to Himself" (p. 420).

²²²*The Cruciality of the Cross*, p. 205, etc.

But more than the need of the atonement, Thornwell teaches here the beauty of the atonement. In the priestly work is seen, not a price demanded, but a sacrifice freely offered, a heart of adoration and worship under the falling darkness and sacrifice, a heart so full of the sense of the glory of holiness that it rejoices to glorify that holiness even at such a cost to itself. "The whole transaction is an august and glorious act of worship." The sacrifice of the Great High Priest is the most glorious litany ever chanted, the grandest doxology ever sung—worship of the glory of holiness at its highest and noblest. "We feel that God is glorious, that the law is glorious, for Christ glorifies them." We "enter into the awful reverence for God which invests the cross with the sanctities of worship and converts its shame into glory. The beauty of holiness gilds its terrors" (pp. 419, 426, 279, 280). The atonement is defined, as, "guilt expiated by an act of worship."

Instead of a feeling of the harshness of God which sometimes comes from exclusively contemplating the legal aspects of the cross, Thornwell's vision of Calvary focuses the eye on the light of the holiness of God and ravishes the heart with the glory of the Triune (p. 281). It is with the free, voluntary, spontaneous, self-devotion of the priest that the offering is made. It is made with his heart full of mingled adoration and zeal for the Divine glory, and sympathy and love for those He represents (pp. 419-422). Our happiness was not purchased at the expense of the rights of another; "and though there was an immense cost of suffering and blood, it was never for a moment begrudged, never for a moment sustained with reluctance. We have no occasion for regrets that the blessings which we enjoy have been put into our hands by cruelty, injustice or overharshness and severity to others. They are the free gifts of that sublimest of all spirits—the spirit of the priest" (p. 276). Entering into the scene and into the workings and emotions of the Saviour's heart, it is maintained that nothing less than the Divine nature could be the dwelling place of such holy zeal and such ineffable love (p. 427). At one and the same time, adoration of the glory of holiness and the energy of that same holiness are manifest; the Father is reflected in the Son. "The piety of the Priest flows from a fountain of inexhaustible fullness"—the holiness of God. In His own unspotted holiness He confesses the guilt of His brethren and adores the justice which dooms Him to woe as their substitute. With profound ado-

ration of the Divine character, He, in His own spontaneous act, lays His life upon the altar, virtually saying; "Take it, it ought to be taken; let the fire of justice consume it; better ten thousand times better, that this should be than that the throne of the Eternal should be tarnished with an effeminate pity!" The grandest hymn of praise, of worship, of adoration of the Lord glorious in holiness, arose when the High Priest of our Profession offered up Himself a voluntary sacrifice to express the love of God, to satisfy the justice of God, to magnify the holiness of God.

Justification, the Federal Theology, Adoption, have all found prominent places in the Columbia Theology. But the supreme theme in God's self-revelation is "the idea of the holy." That theology is the vision of the Lord glorious in holiness; the vision of sin as the contradiction of His holiness; the vision of redemption as an institute of holiness; that vision of the saving Cross which the Fourth Gospel presents as Jesus' own, "Holy Father, Glorify Thy Name!"²²³

²²³John 12:28; 17:11. Cf. Vos, T. *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, pp. 302-305. Doran, 1926.

²²⁴Since completing this work the writer has been privileged to read the private diary of the Reverend Robert Z. Johnston, in whose pastorate at Lincolnton, N. C., he was first permitted to see the light of day. It is a pleasure to note that this first pastor endorsed the views herein set forth on two matters which will probably be disputed. Commenting on the evolution controversy, December 14, 1884, Dr. Johnston expresses an appreciative judgment of Dr. Woodrow in accord with that set forth in this book. There are several references in Johnston's account of his experiences as a student at Columbia Seminary, 1858-1861, which sustain the position that the holiness of God is the vital center of the Columbia Theology, e. g. a lecture by Dr. Thornwell to the Junior Class on the ethical system of the Bible; a sermon by Dr. Adger on the text Exodus 15:11, delivered March 6th, 1859; the statement, "I do think Dr. T(hornwell) is the most profoundly pious man I ever saw."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MANUSCRIPTS

1. Manuscripts in Vault of Columbia Theological Seminary 1928:
Archives of the Seminary, Vol. I. Vol. II. Shelf 481, No. 14. 15.
 Letters, original reports, minutes, constitutions, etc.
 Date March, 1826, to c. 1849, principally 1826-36.
Minutes of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.
 Vol. 1, December 14, 1827 to November 22, 1861.
 Vol. 2, May 6, 1862 to May 7, 1888.
 Vol. 4, May 8, 1889 to 1909.
 Vol. 5, 1909 to 1919.
Minutes of the Faculty of the Theological Seminary.
 Second Book of Records begins 1850, but incorporates a history of the origin
 of the Seminary and the principal acts of the first book (first book burned).
 Vol. II begins 1871.
 Extant Vol. III begins 1884
 Vol. IV begins 1896.
 Vol. V begins 1918.
The Society of Missionary Inquiry of the Seminary.
Constitution of, organized February, 1831, organization, etc.
Constitution (Revised), Committees, By-Laws, etc.
Records of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, February 21. 1831-1855.
Records of the Society of Missionary Inquiry, 1855-1880.
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Southern Board of Foreign Missions,
 January, 1834-March, 1842.
 *Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina.
 1. Rough Minutes to be transcribed in due time into a book to appear before
 some venerable synod. 1785-1788.
 2. Minutes of the South Carolina Presbytery Book A. 1784-1790.
 3. The Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina. 1785-1799 (inclusive),
 transcribed by J. B. Davis, approved by Synod.
 4. Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina, 1800-1814. i. e., the Second
 Presbytery of S. C., 1800-1814. The Presbytery of S. C.. 1810-1814 (the
 First Presbytery having been dissolved 1810).
 *Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina.
 Vol. I, November 4, 1813 to November 29, 1836, app. May 26. 1838, Wm. S.
 Plumer, Moderator.
 Vol. II, November 8, 1837, to October 17, 1857, app. May 28, 1859, W. L.
 Breckenridge, Moderator.
 *Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina.
 October, 1859-1860, app. with exceptions, Wm. C. Backus. Moderator. May
 30, 1861. Held by the General Assembly, U. S. A., during the War and
 returned thereafter damaged by water and fire.
Records of the Congregational Association of South Carolina, c. 1801-1822.
 II. Manuscripts in private library of Rev. John Blackburn. Atlanta, Ga.:
Communicant Roll Book of Colored Members of Zion Presbyterian Church
 (Charleston, S. C.)
 Rules for the Government of the Colored Members (of same).
Minutes of the Session of Zion Presbyterian Church, 1858-1867.
 Notes of J. L. Girardeau.
 III. Private Library of Rev. J. B. Mack, Jr.:
 Manuscripts of Dr. J. B. Mack in re. Evolution Controversy.
 IV. Whaling, Dr. Thornton.
 1. *Why the Southern Church Prefers Organic Union.*
 2. Address before the Chicago Presbyterian Social Union, 1913.
 *Since transferred to Historical Commission, Montreat, N. C.

B. SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published and Printed Books and Articles.

- Adger, J. B. *My Life and Times*. Richmond, 1899.
- Alexander, W. A. *A Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S.*, Rev. 1922, Richmond.
- Bean, Wm. S., Mills, W. H., Jones, F. D. *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina Since 1850*. Columbia, S. C., 1926.
- Blackburn, Geo. A. *The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau*. Columbia, 1916.
- Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, The*. Adopted Assembly 1879, Richmond.
- Same, Revised Edition 1925, Richmond.
- Charleston Observer, The*. Charleston, S. C.
- Catalogues of Columbia Theological Seminary*. Columbia, S. C.
- Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.* Phila., 1921.
- Daniel, Eugene. *Church Polity and Worship*. In, *Memorial Volume of the Westminster Assembly*. Richmond, 1897.
- Dabney, R. L. *Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology*. Fourth Edition, Richmond, 1890.
- DuBose, Hampden C. *Memoirs of J. Leighton Wilson, D.D.* Richmond, 1895.
- Girardeau, John L. *The Diaconate*, In S. P. R. XXX, XXXI, XXXII.
- Evolution in Columbia Theological Seminary*. Columbia, 1885.
- Historical Address to the Synod of South Carolina*. In *Historical Addresses*, Richmond, 1886.
- The Life Work of J. L. Girardeau, D. D.* Columbia, 1916.
- Discussions of Philosophical Questions*, Richmond, 1900.
- Gillespie, Richard T. Columbia Theological Seminary in *The King's Business in the Synod of Alabama*. Birmingham, 1927.
- Howe, George. *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*. Columbia, S. C. Vol. I, 1870; Vol. II, 1883.
- A Discourse on Theological Education*. N. Y., 1844.
- Jones, C. C. *A Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice for Families and Sabbath Schools for the Oral Instruction of Colored Persons*. Philadelphia. Third Edition, 1852.
- Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the U. S.* Savannah, 1842.
- Johnson, T. C. Calvin's Contribution to Church Polity. In *Calvin Memorial Addresses*. Richmond, 1909.
- Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer*. Richmond, 1906.
- Laws, S. S. *The At-Onement By the Christian Trinity*. 1919.
- Malone, Dumas. *The Public Life of Thomas Cooper*. Yale U. Press.
- Mallard, R. Q. *Plantation Life Before Emancipation*. Richmond, 1892.
- Martindale, C. O'N. *What It Means to Be Christian*. Chicago, 1927.
- McPheeters, Wm. M. *Columbia Theological Seminary, a Retrospect Involving a Responsibility*. 1901.
- Interpretation*. (Printed not published.)
- Studies in Exegetical Method*. (Printed not published.) Bryan, Columbia, S. C.
- Minutes of the General Assembly (South), Augusta, Columbia, and Richmond, 1861-1927.
- Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina. 1840.
- Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia.
- Morris, S. L. *At Our Own Door*. Chicago, 1904.
- Presbyterianism; Its Principles and Practice*. Richmond, 1922.
- The Task That Challenges*. Richmond, 1917, etc.
- Peck, T. E. *Miscellanies of T. E. Peck, D.D.* Three volumes. Richmond, 1895-1897.

Notes on Ecclesiology. Richmond.

Palmer, B. M., Jr. *Life and Letters of James Henley Thornwell.* Richmond, 1875.

Reed, R. C. *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World.* 1905. Reprinted 1917, Philadelphia.

A Historical Sketch in Bulletin Columbia Theological Seminary. Columbia 1922. Vol. XII, No. IX.

History of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Charlotte, 1923.

Robinson, Stuart. *The Church of God with Appendix.* Philadelphia, 1858.

Semi-Centennial of Columbia Theological Seminary. Columbia, 1884.

Southern Board of Foreign Missions.

Annual Reports—Fifth. Charleston. S. C., 1839; Sixth, Charleston, S. C., 1840.

Missionary Papers:

III. *Prospects of the Heathen for Eternity.* Thomas Smyth, Charleston, 1836.

IV. *The Missionary Spirit.* J. L. Merrick, Charleston, 1836, etc.

Southern Presbyterian Review. Columbia, S. C., 1847-1885. Volume XXXIV Index.

Statutes of South Carolina, Vols. VIII, XII, XV, XVII, XXII.

Stacy, James. *History of the Presbyterian Church in Georgia.* Atlanta, 1912.

Smyth, Thomas. *Complete Works.* Ten Volumes. Reprinted Bryan, Columbia, S. C., 1908-1912.

Tenney, S. M. *Souvenir of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.* San Antonio, Texas, 1924.

Thornwell, J. H. *Thornwell's Collected Writings.* Four Volumes. Edited by Adger and Girardeau. Richmond, 1873.

Thornwell Centennial Addresses. Before the Synod of S. C., October, 1912.

T. H. Law, A. M. Fraser, Thornton Whaling. Spartanburg, S. C., 1913.

Wilson, John S. *Necrology, the Dead of the Synod of Georgia.* Atlanta, 1869.

Wilson, J. Leighton. *Western Africa, Its History, Condition and Prospects.* N. Y., 1856.

White, Henry Alexander. *Southern Presbyterian Leaders.* N. Y., 1911.

Robert E. Lee and the Southern Confederacy. N. Y., 1897.

Life of Stonewall Jackson. Philadelphia, 1909.

The Making of South Carolina. N. Y., 1906, etc.

In Memoriam of Henry Alexander White. Bulletin of Columbia Theological Seminary October, 1927, Vol. XXI, No. 1. Addresses: G. A. Wauchope, Ph. D.; Neal L. Anderson, D. D.

Woodrow, Marion W. *Dr. James Woodrow, Character Sketches and His Teaching.* Columbia, S. C., 1909.

Whaling, Thornton. *Science and Religion Today.* U. of N. C. Press, 1929.

C. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andover Theological Seminary, General Catalogue. Boston, 1908.

Bacon, L. W. *A History of American Christianity.* 1897. Scribners, N. Y., 1925.

Batiffol, Pierre. *Primitive Catholicism.* Longmans, Green & Co., 1911.

Barclay, Alexander. *Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.* Glasgow, 1927.

Beecher, W. J. *The Prophets and the Promise.* N. Y., 1905.

Reasonable Biblical Criticism. 1911.

Biblical Repertory. Princeton, 1848.

Brightman, E. S. *An Introduction to Philosophy.* N. Y., 1925.

Carlyle, A. J. & R. W. *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West.* Four Volumes.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Trans. J. Allen. London, 1844.

- Channing, Wm. E. *Works*, Volume II, *Slavery*. Eleventh Edition. Boston, 1849.
- Charnock, Stephen. *Discourses Upon the Existence and Attributes of God*. New Edition. London, 1860.
- Cunningham, William. *Theological Reformation*.
- Daniels, Josephus. *The Life of Woodrow Wilson*. Phila., 1924.
- Darwin, Charles. *Origin of Species*. 1859.
- Dillman, August. *Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded*. Translated by W. B. Stevenson, Edinburgh. 1897.
- Ernesti, J. A. *Elements of Interpretation*, translated with notes by N. Stuart. Andover, 1822.
- Forsyth, P. T. *The Cruciality of the Cross*. London, H. & S., 1908, 1909.
- Gwatkins, H. M. *Early Church History to 313*. *Bishop Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*. N. Y., 1900.
- Hamilton. *The Philosophy of Sir Wm. Hamilton*, edited O. W. Wight. N. Y., 1858.
- Harnack, Adolph. *The Constitution and Law of the Church*. N. Y., 1910. Crown Theological Library.
- Hatch, Edw. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*. Fifth Edition. London, 1895.
- Hodge, Charles. *Biblical Repertory*. 1848.
- Hort, F. J. A. *The Christian Ecclesia*. Macmillan, 1914.
- Kirk, Harris E. *The Consuming Fire*. N. Y., 1919.
- Keller, Helen A. *The Story of My Life*. N. Y., 1903.
- LaPiana, George. *Lectures on History of Christian Institutions*. Harvard, 1927.
- LeConte, Joseph. *Evolution—Its Nature, Its Evidences and Its Relation to Religious Thought*. Second Edition, N. Y. Appleton & Co.
- Ladd, G. T. *Elements of Physiological Psychology*. N. Y., 1900.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *Essay on the Christian Ministry*. 1868. Re-published in St. Paul's Epistle to Philippians. Macmillan, 1915.
- Lovejoy, A. O. *The Revolt Against Dualism*. Norton & Co., 1930.
- Lindsay, T. M. *The Church and the Ministry*. N. Y., 1902. Quoting F. Loofs in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1890.
- Meeter, H. H. *The Fundamental Principles of Calvinism*. Grand Rapids, 1930.
- Morgan, C. Lloyd. *Emergent Evolution*. 1923.
- Moore, George F. *Judaism*. Harvard, 1927.
- Moore, E. C. *Christian Thought Since Kant*. N. Y., 1915.
- Ogilvie, J. N. *The Presbyterian Churches of Christendom*. Edinburgh, 1925.
- Perry, R. B. *Present Philosophical Tendencies*. N. Y., 1916.
- Prentiss. *Fifty Yars of the Union Theological Seminary*. N. Y., 1889.
- Relton, H. M. *A Study in Christology*. London, 1917.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. *Essay on the Christian Ministry*. In H. B. Swete, *Early History of the Church and the Ministry*. Second Edition. London, 1921.
- Schaff, Philip. *Creeds of Christendom*. Fourth Edition, 1884.
- Stuart, Moses. *A Hebrew Chrestomathy*. Second Edition, Andover, 1832.
- Streeter, B. H. *The Primitive Church*. Macmillan, 1929.
- Spencer, H. *First Principles*, etc. N. Y., 1888.
- Trent, Council of—*
 Canons et Decreta Sacrosanti . . . Rome, 1834.
 Canons and Decrees of the Sacred . . . Translated Waterworth, London, 1848.
 Catechism for Curates, tr. J. Donovan, Dublin, 1829.
- Trumbull, H. C. *Yale Lectures on the Sunday School*. Phila., 1888.

- Thurneysen, Eduard. *Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche*. München, 1927.
- Thompson, R. E. *Presbyterians*. American Church History Series. N. Y., 1900.
- Ueberweg, F. *History of Philosophy*. Trans. N. Y., 1888.
- Warfield, B. B. *Faith and Life*. N. Y., 1916. *Creation vs. Evolution*, The Bible Student, 1901.

16611



Published by
DENNIS LINDSEY PRINTING COMPANY, INC.
421 CHURCH ST. DECATUR, GA.
