

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

VOL. XXXVI.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXV.

ARTICLE I.

PROFESSOR WOODROW'S SPEECH BEFORE THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Moderator, Fathers, and Brethren:

It affords me, notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances which surround us to night, no little pleasure once more to meet with the Synod of South Carolina. It is not the first time that I have enjoyed the pleasure of addressing this body; many years ago I met with you in the dark time that tried men's souls. And therefore I come to you as no stranger. At that meeting, Moderator, I had the satisfaction of communing with my brethren touching the interests of the same Seminary which is occupying so much of your attention at this time. We had been broken and blasted by the fortune of war; we were in the deepest depression, and despair well-nigh filled every heart: and under these circumstances we came together to consider what we should do for our beloved Church. Stout-hearted as is my brother and father who is sitting there before you [Dr. Adger], wrapped up in the Theological Seminary as its venerated Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Howe, so much loved by all—wrapped up in the Seminary as he was—even they were ready to give up all, to retire, the one to his farm in one direction, the other to seek a home in another,

and to give up the ship. But however little it may have been that I could do, when this beloved Seminary seemed to be so near temporary extinction, I have ever thought with infinite satisfaction that, little as it may have been, I could contribute at least something to the restoration of hope and to the resumption of the exercises of that institution absolutely necessary to the well-being of our Church. I come to you, Moderator, as no stranger for another reason also: for thirty-two years I have been your servant. You know my manner of life; I have taught you, and you,—but how can I enumerate, as I look around on this body, all those whom I have taught? You have seen me; you have tried me; and if I am guilty of aught, you know it. I come, however, fearlessly, because you have known me—not fearing that one recollection of all my past will cause you at this time to distrust or doubt one word that I shall utter. Whatever others may do, you know that there is no room for distrust.

But, Moderator, I have to confess that though I have these reasons for thinking that I am not a stranger, as I have been sitting here during the last few days I have wondered of whom the members of this Synod could be speaking. As I listened to words of praise, I felt that they could not apply to me, I did not deserve them. When I listened to words of blame, I knew that I did not deserve them; I knew that they must apply, if applied truthfully, to some one else than myself. I am not guilty, Moderator, of those things which have been said touching me, and of those things which have been charged against me since your sessions began. But I said “guilty.” Am I on trial, Moderator? In what capacity do I appear before you? Am I a prisoner at the bar? Am I on trial for my ecclesiastical life? I have been told, as I have been listening day after day, that I am not on trial; and I might have known it, Moderator; because, when one is to be tried, a bill of indictment is prepared; specific charges are laid against him; he is told of the offence that he has committed; he has legal safeguards thrown around him; he may appear and answer for himself, not to vague rumors, not to indefinite utterances, but to the sharp, accurate, definite specifications of the evil that he has done. And, Moderator, no charge has been laid against me;

no accuser has appeared to challenge a single thought or utterance of mine before any tribunal of the Church. Moderator, I know by that that I am not on trial; I know that this Church which you represent is a law-abiding Church; I know that when it has thrown the ægis of its protection around me it will not mob me; it will not take away my ecclesiastical life by lynch law. And therefore I have known, notwithstanding the appearances, that before such a body—a body made up of honorable, truth-loving, righteous men—I could not be on trial when no forms of trial are observed, when no charge is made, when no utterance of mine has been challenged in accordance with those rules which you have ordained by your authority. And yet, Moderator, this, well as I know it, seems inconsistent with much that I have heard. I have heard definitions of offences read to see whether or not they applied to me; I have heard the question discussed whether that of which I had been supposed to be guilty was heresy or not. “Supposed to be guilty”? “Offence committed”? Committed by whom? It was not said; it was intimated; the whole discussion took it for granted that offences were laid to my charge, and that the only question to be decided was: What is the nature of the evil that you have done? Now, Moderator, what has been my offence? But before attempting to answer in any way that question, let us see how it happens that I am here before you in any capacity—what is the cause of my presence. I was not summoned as I would have been if I had been a prisoner at the bar; but I came. Why did I come? I can give most readily, perhaps, an account of the reasons of my coming by referring to the initial stages in this—what shall I call it?—in this process. Why, I could hardly keep from saying “process”; and yet, is this a process? Of what nature is the process? Pardon me, Moderator, if I forget to discriminate sufficiently before this body in the use of the terms that will exactly describe my position.

To begin, then, at the beginning, Moderator, let me read from an account of the origin as I suppose. You will find it contained in the journal which I hold in my hand. I find from this that in the year 1882–3 the Board of Directors of the Theologi-

cal Seminary invited me to deliver an address on the subject of "Evolution" as it is taught in the Theological Seminary. They told me that this invitation was given because scepticism in the world is using alleged discoveries in science to impugn the word of God; and they thought that, as my studies had lain in that direction, I possibly might be of some service in removing the objections to our sacred word, the foundation of our hopes, by pointing out that the charges made against it were not true. In obedience to that request, I delivered an address on the subject which had been assigned to me. I had this address, in accordance with the request of the Board, printed, and I sent a printed copy of it to the Board, which met on the 16th of September in the present year. I said to the Board that "in the autumn of 1882 your report to the Synods contained certain expressions touching Evolution which led me to regard it as my duty to take the earliest opportunity to call your attention specially to my instructions on that subject in the class-room, although I had already frequently done so at the successive annual examinations." Delight, joy, was expressed in that report sent to the associated Synods in 1882 "that Evolution and other insidious errors" were not taught in the Theological Seminary. Now, that was certainly true, Moderator; Evolution as an insidious error was not taught nor referred to in the remotest way. But it was known to the Board of Directors that for years I had been pointing out the fact, in the discharge of my duties, that Evolution, whether true or false, did not in the slightest degree impugn the absolute truthfulness of a single word in the blessed Bible. Still, I supposed that it was my duty at the earliest opportunity—that self-respect demanded it of me—that I should give the Board of Directors an opportunity of correcting any mistakes in their future reports to the authorities of the Church. After I had called their attention specifically to the teaching of Evolution, as it is called (the teaching, that is to say, in the sense that was explained this morning, of *handling* the subject), the Board of Directors sent precisely the same report to the General Assembly, and thus proved that they could have no possible reference to me or to my teaching, in speaking of

Evolution in connexion with insidious errors, and that it must have been, consequently, that which was on the face of their invitation that had led them to make the request which they did. The rest of my letter from which I was quoting is simply a reference to the occasion which I have already in other words stated. On the receipt of this address, after full and exhaustive discussion, the following paper was adopted by the Board by a vote of 8 to 3: "The Board having carefully considered the address of Dr. Woodrow, published in pursuance of its request, adopts the following: 1st. *Resolved*, That the Board does hereby tender to Dr. Woodrow its thanks for the ability and faithfulness with which he has complied with its request. 2nd. That in the judgment of this Board the relations subsisting between the teachings of Scripture and the teachings of natural science are plainly, correctly, and satisfactorily set forth in said address. 3rd. That the Board is not prepared to concur in the view expressed by Dr. Woodrow as to the probable method of the creation of Adam's body; yet, in the judgment of the Board, there is nothing in the doctrine of Evolution, as defined and limited by him, which appears inconsistent with perfect soundness in the faith. 4th. That the Board takes this occasion to record its deep and ever-growing sense of the wisdom of our Synods in the establishment of the 'Perkins Professorship of Natural Science in connexion with Revelation,' and of the importance of such instruction as is thereby afforded, that our ministry may be the better prepared to resist the objections of infidel scientists and defend the Scriptures against their insidious charges."

Moderator, such approval from the representatives of the Church was a full reward for all the labors of the past twenty-four years. It is not as if another occupant of the chair, or the chair itself, had been commended, for the Perkins chair, from its beginning to this day, has been occupied by myself alone, and, consequently, whatever is said of the importance and value of the teachings of that chair is said of the importance and value of my teachings; and when these words, upon which I will not now further comment, are uttered by eight such men, repre-

sentatives of the different Synods of this Church, I am satisfied—I am satisfied that I cannot have been walking far astray in the paths of infidelity or heresy.

But, Moderator, how came I to speak of natural science in any of its aspects in the Theological Seminary, and of Evolution in particular? In order to show this, it will be necessary for me to carry you back for some years, to give a distinct history of the origin of my connexion with the Theological Seminary and the teaching of natural science there in any of its aspects.

In the year 1857 the initial steps looking to the establishment of the Perkins chair were taken, first in the Presbytery of Tombeckee, and afterwards in the Synod of Mississippi, all based upon this resolution:

“Whereas we live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon revealed religion through the natural sciences; and as it behooves the Church at all times to have men capable of defending the faith once delivered to the saints; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That this Presbytery recommend the endowment of a professorship of the natural sciences as connected with revealed religion in one or more of our theological seminaries, and would cheerfully recommend our churches to contribute their full proportion of funds for said endowment.”

The Synod of Mississippi subsequently adopted the same resolution; and so began this chair. To that chair, Moderator, the Synod of Georgia, representing the three Synods, covering four States, which had control of the Seminary, called me. I did not seek the honor or the labor. When I was named as a suitable person for it, I knew nothing of it; when subsequently I was urged to allow efforts to be made in behalf of my election, I sternly forbade it, and by no word or act of mine was a single step forward taken in the direction of my occupancy of the chair. You took me from other duties; you took me from other church work, from teaching by your authority and in your name, and spending as much of my time as I possibly could in preaching to the poor and neglected in the regions round about. You knew, Moderator, what my opinions were; I had been serving you for eight years. I taught one, and another, and another of those

who are now to-night in this house, principles which I have heard, since I came here into this city of Greenville, denounced as contrary to the Confession of Faith and the standards of our Church; and you knew it. The very men who called me to that chair had either sat under me, or had been my associates, or had been members of the Board of Trustees of Oglethorpe University, or had been of those who confirmed or approved of my nomination and my teaching. Consequently you were not electing some one who might have entertained opinions that were wholly and grossly different from those which you would have taught the theological students of this Church. And now, what was I to teach, Moderator? To what was I called? At the earliest possible moment after my election I met with the Board of Directors, presented myself before them, to consult, to advise with them, as to what I was to do. The chair was new; it was without parallel in the world; no theological seminary in America or Europe had anything that could even remotely serve as my guide. And what was I, a youth, to do without the help of the Church, through its representatives, to guide me? I presented to that Board, (not the Synod of Georgia; it was the Board of Directors of this Seminary, representing all of the constituent Synods, although it met indeed at the same time and in the same place with the Synod of Georgia,) I presented to that Board an outline of what seemed to me to be my duty, and asked their counsel; and they freely gave it to me. They approved my suggestions; they sanctioned all that I proposed to do; and from that day to this I have been carrying out in good faith, with pure conscience, the instructions which I thus received from the Church; because, though this was only a Board of Directors, you may say, yet when one part of the Church is authorised to speak on any point, it is the whole Church that is speaking, and I so regarded it. So strengthened I have gone forward as I have done to this day.

I will, by reading a portion of the Inaugural Address which I delivered on that occasion, indicate as briefly as possible the work that you, Moderator, gave me on that occasion to do, you sitting as the representative of the Church. It was not a differ-

ent body, it was this body; and therefore I claim that until I am condemned, until disapprobation of my course has been expressed, I may assume that I am walking in the narrow path which you pointed out to me at this long time ago. After stating other duties that might have been supposed to belong to the professorship, I say: "In the third place, it may be the design of the professorship to evince the harmony [between natural science and revelation] only where it has been doubted or denied, or where opinions prevailing among scientific men either are, or are supposed to be"—*either are, or are supposed to be*—"inconsistent with our sacred records; in other words, to scrutinise the nature and the force of current and popular objections to the Scriptures; to meet them, to set them aside by proving"—proving what, Moderator?—"that they spring either from science falsely so-called, or from incorrect interpretations of the words of the Holy Bible." I was warranted, then, Moderator, in scrutinising the interpretations of the Bible which might be prevalent around me. You gave me that work to do; and now are you going to make the objection that I have ventured to indicate that possibly some interpretations of the Bible that have been floating around in the popular mind are incorrect? No, Moderator, you are not going to treat me so; you are not going to tell me to scrutinise with all vigilance interpretations of the Bible and interpretations of nature to see whether they are correct or not; and when, with all modesty, I venture to suggest that here may possibly be some popular interpretation that is incorrect, turn upon me and say, "You are a heretic. You are destroying the Church; you are tearing up the foundations; you are denying the Word of God; you are violating your vows."

I proceed:

"This would involve a careful study of the fundamental principles of the various branches of science from which the objections are drawn, and of their details, carried far enough to enable one to judge correctly of the amount of truth in each objection." Will you now say that I may teach, that I may handle nothing in science, except that which some ecclesiastical council has pronounced to be a verified hypothesis? Why, then, did you let me

say to you twenty-three years ago what I have just read, and approve of my saying and of my doing it? And now, when I have done it, will you charge me with all of those things which I have heard echoing and reëchoing through this house these last few days, and flooding the land in the religious and in the secular journals from Maine to Texas and California?

I say further:

“It would involve, further, the careful study of the principles of biblical interpretation, as far as these relate to the mode in which the works of God are spoken of. The comparison of the results obtained thus, if the processes have been properly conducted, must inevitably evince entire harmony, or at least the entire absence of discord.” Moderator, that was twenty-three years ago. In those twenty-three years I have tried to learn something, and I think that I know more now than I did twenty-three years ago of these relations; and I find that this is the chief thing, perhaps, that I have learned in that direction: that the last phrase which I used is the one which I ought exclusively to have used, instead of the alternative proposition which I then presented, and that the connexion is that which I then, youth as I was, pointed out: the entire absence of discord. Now it is this which I regard as constituting the field on which most of my labor is to be expended. I had marked other passages to read from my Inaugural Address to show the design of this chair, but I will not weary your patience by reading them.

And now to what extent and how am I required to “teach” science, by this compact to which I have been referring you? Why, teach it so that its connexion with revelation can be clearly understood in all cases where that connexion is to be discussed. As you have been told over and over on this floor, I have not been teaching science for its own sake. I have been teaching it, indeed; but in no case have I taught or presented—or handled, if you prefer the word—in no case have I handled the subject of natural science, except for the express and limited purpose of pointing out the connexion which you had ordered me to do by the voice of the Church, representing the voice of God. That is the extent.

And now, how have I taught, Moderator? Did I ever teach you that you were to receive at my lips, by my authority, a single sentiment—a single opinion? Did I ever inculcate upon you the duty of receiving one opinion that I expressed, because I expressed it? Yes, one—one, not with regard to natural science, however. The only thing that I ever inculcated upon any of these dear brethren, whose faces I see turned up towards me at this moment, was that there is but one authority before which you must bow. You must bow before the Lord God Almighty; you must accept his word; you must submit to his control; and beyond that you must submit to no control. You are freemen in the Lord. If I have with weariness to you taught any one thing, it was: "*Nullius jurare in verba magistri.*" I have not inculcated science upon you; I have insisted that at every step that you took you must judge for yourselves as you were to answer to the sole authority. You know this, as do those, not yet members of this body, who are still sitting under my instructions. I am to be forbidden to inculcate? I never have inculcated, except in the sense explained. If you call that *inculcation*, I have done nothing else. But science, as I repeat—and this seems to me to include all the information that you desire on that point—science for its own sake I have never even remotely referred to in the hearing of any human being within the walls of that Theological Seminary.

Let me say, further, as is perhaps sufficiently evident—but for fear it may not be, let me refer very briefly to another point—that the object of this chair is purely apologetic; it is purely defensive. Let me recur to the Synodical resolution establishing the chair and then you will see:

"*Resolved*, That in accordance with the conditions annexed to the generous donation of Judge Perkins, there be added to the existing departments of instruction in the Seminary, a chair, to be entitled the Perkins Professorship of Natural Science in connexion with Revelation; the design of which shall be to evince the harmony of science with the records of our faith, and to refute the objections of infidel naturalists." When I had the opportunity for consultation with it, I found that the Board, that is to

say, the Church, agreed with me that the last clause of this resolution chiefly set forth the intention which it had in establishing the chair: "to refute the objections of infidel naturalists."

Moderator, to refute, to answer objections, what does that require? I see learned members of the Bar sitting in this house. When the evidence of two witnesses is said to be contradictory, what do they do? Do they undertake to show that the evidence of the one is identical with the evidence of the other? Do they not rather maintain confidently before the judge and the jury that they have refuted the objection that was made against the evidence of the two witnesses when they have presented some probable hypothesis which would entirely remove the apparent contradiction which had existed? It is not necessary—it would be absurd, impossible—to require that it shall be shown that the two witnesses, who may be speaking of entirely different things, agree with one another. But when they have shown that there is a reasonable interpretation of their testimony which is consistent with the absence of contradiction, they have accomplished all that any court of justice ~~would~~ ever require, or the common sense of any man living, whether in a court of justice or not. Therefore this is the point of view from which I have regarded the subject.

But you have heard, Moderator, frequent reference to the formula of subscription.¹ I will not take time to read that formula; I will simply remind you that it includes my vows, my solemn oath before God and the Church, that I accept the Confession of Faith as containing "a just summary of the doctrines contained in the Bible," and pledging myself that I would teach nothing directly or indirectly in opposition thereto. And with regard to this I may say again in all good conscience, I have kept my vows.

¹ Const. Theo. Sem., Section III., Article 5: "Every Professor, when inaugurated, shall publicly subscribe the Confession of Faith and other standards, agreeably to the following formula: 'In the presence of God and these witnesses, I do solemnly subscribe the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and other standards of government, discipline, and worship of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, as a just summary of the doctrines 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.' "

But during the progress of the single act of inauguration or introducing me into my chair, I called the attention of the Church—for remember, Moderator, that it was the Church that was assembled in the Board of Directors—I called the attention of the Church to that which I might have assumed they well knew before, and insisted that they should observe that I was going to teach, in the sense explained, this: that the teachings of geology respecting the antiquity of the earth are true. A vow is binding in the sense of those who impose that vow. The Church was assembled in the Board of Directors when this vow was imposed upon me, and I took it in the sense in which they imposed it. They imposed it in such sense that it was not to be regarded as inconsistent with it that I should teach that this world was created more than one hundred and forty-four hours before Adam. The Board knew, and they accepted my subscription with this understanding, that I was going to teach something very different from the doctrine that the world was created only one hundred and forty-four hours before Adam; if that is in the Confession of Faith, that is not what I am going to teach; I am going to teach that the world is more than ten days even older than Adam; yes, more than several months older. Moderator, I told them, in telling them what I did, that I was going to teach that the world was so old that the mind of man would utterly fail to grasp not the years alone, but the centuries and the thousands of years during which I not only believed but knew it had been existing. And, Moderator, having taken this oath in the sense of those who imposed it upon me, I repeat I have kept it in all good conscience to this day.

The part of the Confession of Faith which refers to the matter of which I have just been speaking is this: "It pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning, to create or make of nothing the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good." I will not enter upon an argument as to the meaning of this; I am perfectly willing to admit the argument of my learned brother from Columbia [W. A. Clark, Esq.], or the argument of

my learned colleague [Rev. Dr. Girardeau] on the opposite side. I am perfectly indifferent as to what its meaning is. Following a principle which I have always adopted, whenever any interpretation of any doctrine has been favorable to myself or to my supposed opinions, I have leaned against it and away from it. And therefore I have never sought to show that this meant anything else except that which my colleague insists that it means; I have always assumed that it meant what he supposes. And it was under the influence of that principle at that early date that I guarded against any possible misconception—against the idea that by any attempt, any effort of mine, I was stealing into public office in the Church with the intention of violating my vows and corrupting the youth of the Church by my false teachings.

I wish to say at this stage, for fear I shall forget it later, that from that day to this, with regard to all of my teachings, there is not one other word or syllable that I would wish to have changed in this Confession or in these Catechisms, from beginning to end. With regard to all the rest of what is said of the work of creation, there is not, "Evolutionist" though I may be, there is not one syllable that I would have altered—not one syllable that does not express my interpretation of the word of God. The rest of this chapter is as follows: "After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own image," etc. And the Larger Catechism says: "After God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female; formed the body of the man of the dust of the ground, and the woman of the rib of the man," etc. There is not one word here, not one syllable, which I would have changed, if I had the power of the entire Presbyterian Church in my hands this moment. This expresses my exact belief as to the meaning of the word of God; and in that word—though the opposite may be charged again and again, as it has been charged—in that word I find not one syllable which I disbelieve. Shall I again be met by the taunt, "So says the Unitarian; so the Arian of every grade"? Whether this shall be repeated jeeringly against me or not, I will say

once more that every word of the Bible I receive as coming from the God of all truth.

Now, Moderator, after this historical statement, I may repeat that it was the Board's invitation that I publish my views, the Board's report upon my address, and the protest against that report—it was these things which brought up this case—case I suppose I can call it, inasmuch as a recent determination of the General Assembly in one instance was that anything that might be presented before an ecclesiastical body was a “case.”

In the next place, let me ask what right has the Church to teach anything directly or indirectly with reference to natural science? Does the Church exist for the purpose of teaching natural science? Had the Church any right to establish such a chair as that which I occupy? Let us consider a little while this question, What right has the Church to do anything? Moderator, what is the Church? What commission has been placed in its hands? I will not read that commission as recorded in both the places where I find it, but content myself with reading it as it is presented in one of these. As our blessed Lord was about to leave this earth as to his bodily presence, he said to the assembled eleven, representing you, representing me, representing there the entire body of those who should be collected in subsequent ages as constituting the members of his kingdom and the subjects of it upon earth: “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,” or as it is given in a parallel passage, “the things that I have commanded.” There, and there alone, do we find our commission. Whatever is inconsistent with that commission, you have no right to do. If you go one step beyond the things here commanded; if you authoritatively undertake to teach anything that is outside of the gospel or the “things commanded,” that is to say, the contents of the Holy Bible; if you go a hair's breadth outside of that, you are adding to what the Lord, the King of this kingdom, has enjoined upon you; you are transgressing his law; you are preparing the way for the addition of the plagues which are written in this book to your lot, if you so do. You may preach the gospel, you may teach that; and you may authoritatively teach nothing else. Here is the foundation, then, upon which we rest.

But, Moderator, that does not exhaust the statement, although every addition to it must come within it. I suppose that it will be conceded without argument that the principle is true that whenever a duty is commanded or a right conferred by competent authority, everything necessary to the proper performance of that duty or enjoyment of that right is also commanded or conferred. Is this admitted? Then it follows that since the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded his Church to preach the gospel to every creature, he has also thereby empowered it to do what is necessary to obey that command in the best possible manner—among other things, to train and educate those who shall preach the gospel. If there is anything “expressly set down in Scripture,” or by good and necessary consequence deducible from the Scriptures, showing how this is to be done, such methods must be rigorously followed, and the slightest departure from them is sin against the headship of the King. But no methods being prescribed in the Scriptures, then such and only such are to be adopted as “are ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed.” All that relates to the training or educating of the ministry, according to the universal interpretation of our Church for ages, falls under the last sentence just quoted from the Confession, and consequently that wisdom, that prudence with which the King of Zion has endowed his subjects, is to be exercised in selecting the methods by which his great command is to be best observed.

But what are the limits, Moderator? I do not mean now, in asking that question, the limits so far as regards simply the matter of educating or training those who shall preach the gospel; but what are the limits universally? Moderator, the Church may not only teach those things which tend to prepare preachers efficiently to preach the gospel, but it may do anything that will directly or indirectly promote the efficient preaching of the gospel. It may buy land; it may build houses; it may go on Wall Street and buy exchange; it may set type and print books; it may build ships; in short, there is nothing that it may not do, all under this limitation: that the building, that the printing, that the buying of exchange, is done with reference to the accom-

plishment of the one great aim, the proclamation of the gospel with the utmost power and efficiency. Do you believe that, Moderator? I know that you believe it; I know that there is no one here who can fail to believe it, if he will but exercise his unprejudiced reason upon it.

But, next, as to this matter of teaching—let me call your attention to the fact that it is not teaching in the Theological Seminary alone; but in accordance with the principle just stated, the Church may, if it is necessary to accomplish the object which I have pointed out, take the little child and teach it its alphabet; it may take the boy and teach him in the academy; it may teach him in the college; it may teach him in the theological seminary; it may do whatever fairly and honestly comes within the limitations presented. And accordingly the Church, recognising this principle, has established colleges and schools of all grades; and its relations to each—its relations to the college, to the seminary, to the parochial school—its relations in every case are identical, without the slightest modification. The Church as truly teaches mathematics as it teaches theology. At Davidson College, for example, you find that the relations subsisting between the professors and the ecclesiastical bodies controlling that institution, are exactly the same as those which exist between myself and the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary and the Synods associated in control of the Board of Directors. Prof. Martin and Prof. Blake and Pres. Hepburn are as really the Church's representatives, clothed with church power, as is any theological professor under your control. It is you who are teaching mathematics; it is you who are teaching political economy; it is you who are teaching chemistry, just as truly as it is you who are teaching church history or theology at Columbia; and you have the same right to do it, provided always that the exercise of wisdom and prudence shows that thereby you are preparing for the most efficient preaching of the gospel, which is your sole duty. It is useless, therefore, in view of the facts which I have now stated—it is useless for you to attempt to make any distinction between teaching in a theological seminary and teaching in a college. That which you do by your agent, you do

yourself; and President Hepburn is as much your agent as I am your agent; and if you have no right to teach metaphysics or political economy through President Hepburn, then, and then only, have you no right to teach any subject that it may please you to teach through me in the exercise of your wisdom and prudence.

And now, Moderator, having, as I think, established your right to have a Perkins Professorship, let me ask you, What is your responsibility for my teaching? How far are you responsible for the details of my instruction? Are you to see to it that every word that I say is strictly scientifically correct? I suppose that we can best examine this question by examining another similar case. How is it in the matter of chemistry? When you, the Church, teach chemistry through Prof. Martin, what is your responsibility for the kind of chemistry that he teaches? Did you, as a Synod, a few years ago, when the chemistry of the world underwent a revolution, and that which thirty years ago was supposed to be true came to be regarded as not true in this science, did you expect Prof. Martin to come before you and say, "The chemistry that I am going to teach in the future is not like the chemistry that I have taught in the past; I tell you now that I believe that what I formerly taught was not true"? As we have now an entirely new chemistry, why did Prof. Martin not come before you and urge upon you the consideration of the question: "Shall I teach the new chemistry? Or am I, because I taught the old when I was elected, under obligation to continue to teach it whether I believe it or not?" Moderator, the idea is preposterous that you are responsible for the kind of chemistry that is taught. I do not ask it in any personally slighting way—I hope you will understand me—but how could you tell which was right? What do you know about it? What does this Synod know? I have the utmost respect for their knowledge; but just imagine yourselves undertaking to direct your agents as to what they shall teach in Davidson College. I will not apply this question to myself, Moderator; I will assume that you know exactly what I ought to teach with regard to scientific matters. But speaking of these other gentlemen, I am not so sure. And

it would be an unfortunate thing if this Synod's time should be occupied year after year in considering whether the changing aspects of science did not require that you should say to the professors at Davidson, "You shall teach this and not this," or "You shall not teach the other; because we, sitting as a court of the Lord Jesus Christ, pronounce it to be an 'unverified hypothesis.' " Is that the function of a court of the Lord Jesus Christ? But I ask, what is your responsibility then? Your responsibility terminates when you have selected those in whom you confide as to their general knowledge, as to their ability, and as to their fidelity, and, above all, as to this: that they shall teach nothing that contradicts the word of God. There, and there alone, is the limit of your responsibility. Your professors, like yourself, Moderator, as pastor—your professors are of the nature of professional counsel. You indeed employ your professors; so do I employ a lawyer or a physician—and in the same sense. But when I have employed him and put the case into his hands, and told him which case of mine I wish him to attend to, do I venture to say how he is to bring suit? Am I to watch him and see that he pleads law correctly and that he makes no mistakes? Or when you are called as pastor, does the Presbytery undertake to prescribe for you your texts; whether you shall preach extemporaneously or otherwise; whether you shall preach chiefly from the Old Testament or the New; whether you shall use poetic language or plain simple prose; whether you shall confine yourself to the very words of the Bible, or make it the basis of your ideas without using its very words? No, Moderator; when you are called to be pastor of a church, you become the professional counsel of that church; and you teach what you think to be the truth of the Scriptures in the way that you think best; and the only control—the only rightful control—which the Presbytery has over you is that you shall teach nothing contrary to the word of God. There is no other limit; and as to any supposition that you may make in the course of your exposition of the Sacred Scriptures respecting the meaning of this passage or that, there is no control over you except within the limits that I have pointed out: that your teachings shall not contradict the word of

God as interpreted by our standards. The Church teaches natural science, Moderator; teaches it, that is to say, as I need hardly continue to repeat quite so often perhaps, with the intention of training by the culture and absolute knowledge that is conveyed; teaches it so that thereby it may prepare one the better to preach the gospel, which alone it may authoritatively do. Here is its authority in both directions. Now, as it may teach authoritatively nothing except the word of God and the things intrusted to it by its King, is it competent to sit in judgment on anything else? Is it competent to the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ to sit in judgment on the truth or falsity of any proposition in science? Has it a right to consider whether the multiplication table that is used throughout its schools is correct or not? You are abundantly competent, Moderator, no doubt, to tell whether the multiplication table is correct or not; but it is not competent to you, sitting as a presbyter, in the Church, to express any opinion on that subject. The Lord Jesus Christ has not intrusted you with that work. Truth indeed is involved; it may be a false multiplication table. It may be filled with ruinous errors, as to the business man who conducts his business according to it; it may lead astray in many directions; but it is not your business to correct it. However competent you may be, it is not competent to you to sit in judgment upon it.

And this brings me to that which is the conclusion of this part of what I have to say to you: that you can have, that you dare have, no opinion on any subject except as that subject is related directly to the word of God. As to whether an opinion is correct or not, as to whether an hypothesis is proved or not proved, you may not open your lips when you are speaking as the representative of Christ Jesus our Lord. He has not commissioned you to do that thing; and if you do it, you will be going beyond the authority that he has given you. Just as, according to one of the illustrations used in the debate now in progress, you may not interfere with my political opinions or discuss the question as to whether on the 4th of November next I should vote for Blaine or Cleveland, just so you have no right to discuss any of my opinions or any of my teachings in the discharge of the duties to

which you have appointed me, except in the one particular as to whether or not they contradict the word of God. Where do you get such authority? In the charter containing the things commanded? No, Moderator; you don't get it anywhere; and what you don't get in that charter is withheld from you; and if you claim such authority, you are usurping the rights of others, you are stepping out of your sphere, you are claiming that which the Lord the King has carefully kept out of your hands.

Now, Moderator, having established these principles, as I trust and believe all will agree, I proceed to the examination of the paper which was presented to you by the minority of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, but prepared, as the writer of it informs us, from notes furnished by the Rev. Dr. Girardeau, my colleague in the Theological Seminary. The first resolution in this minority report is:

"Resolved, That the question whether Dr. Woodrow's views in regard to evolution involve heresy is not before the Synod."

Moderator, I am perfectly certain that every word of affection and of care for the reputation of his colleague which was spoken by Dr. Girardeau is strictly true in its fullest sense; I know that all that he said in that direction is not to be questioned. But, Moderator, I cannot blind myself to the conviction that his heart has interfered in this particular with the usual clearness of the working of his head. "The question whether Dr. Woodrow's views with regard to evolution involve heresy is not before the Synod." Well, why did you say anything about it? Suppose I were to say and publish to the world "that the question of the Rev. J. Spratt White's honesty and truthfulness is not now before the Synod;" what would you think of that, Moderator, if I introduced a paper containing that expression? Would you be content with the disclaimer, going out with the paper to the world, that it never occurred to me to question your honor and truthfulness and integrity? Why say anything about it, if your honor and truthfulness and integrity are not called in question? But, Moderator, that is not all; let us read on and take in connexion with this the fourth resolution of this minority report: *"Resolved, That the action of the Board of Directors virtually*

approving the inculcation and the defence of the unverified hypothesis of evolution in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, is, the majority of the Synods of Georgia, Alabama, South Georgia and Florida concurring, hereby reversed; and that the inculcation and defence of the said hypothesis, even as a probable one, in the Theological Seminary, as being contrary to the interpretation of the Scriptures by our Church and to her prevailing and recognised views, is, a majority of the associated Synods concurring, hereby prohibited." Now, it seems to me that that is a charge which comes very near placing me on trial. If I use very inaccurate language on this point, Moderator, and speak of myself as being on trial, remember I don't mean it—I don't mean, of course, that I am on trial; but if I do slip, let me slip, and I won't correct myself, but I'll take it for granted that you'll understand that I don't mean that. But, Moderator, here I am before this Synod directly charged with teaching in the Theological Seminary that which is contrary to the interpretation of the Scriptures by our Church; and yet you are told that I am not charged with heresy. Well, I care very little about the words employed; but so to teach is an "offence," isn't it? Let us see.

"An offence," as you heard read by the author of this paper in direct reference to this particular matter, "the proper object of judicial process, is anything in the principles or practice of a church member professing faith in Christ which is contrary to the word of God." Now it is stated in this paper which this Synod is asked to adopt, that what I do, what I teach, what I believe, is contrary to the interpretation of the Scripture by the Church, which is the Scripture. I am then charged with an offence; so much, at least, is clear. But an offence is the proper object of a judicial process. If then I am charged with an offence, and the safeguards of a judicial process are not thrown around me, is justice done me? But this offence is not heresy, you are told. Oh no, it is not heresy that you are charged with; that is not before the Synod. Well, what is?

What is heresy, Moderator? I will not inquire of Blackstone, I will not inquire of Webster; I will read what the nature of heresy is from our sole guide in this matter: "Heresy and schism

may be of such a nature as to warrant deposition; but errors ought to be carefully considered, whether they strike at the vitals of religion, and are industriously spread, or whether they arise from the weakness of the human understanding, and are not likely to do much injury."

Now, under which of these categories does my contradiction of the Holy Scriptures come? Is my false teaching, that is, this teaching that is contrary to our interpretation of the Scriptures, such as arises from the weakness of the human understanding? I will not express any opinion on that point. Is it that they are not likely to do much injury? O Moderator, what have you been hearing as to the injury that has come from my false teaching? Why, Moderator, you have been told that the vital doctrines of our blessed gospel are utterly uprooted by my false teaching; you are told that the federal headship of Adam is denied; you are told that therefore our connexion with the Saviour is denied; you are told that the Church is likely to be rent. O Moderator, is teaching attended with such effects not likely to do much injury? That your future ministers shall be taught to doubt and disbelieve the Bible, to deny the supernatural, is that not likely to do much injury? And then as to the other qualifying phrases, let us see: "carefully considered, whether they strike at the vitals of religion"—well, you know what that is; "and are industriously spread:" I cannot deny the industry, if my teachings are false; and whether they are false or true, I have industriously spread them, and the Board of Directors has helped. The Board, after it had heard these dangerous teachings, after it had heard all that I had to say on this particular subject and in this direction, requested that they should be widely disseminated, so far as the circulation of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW extended; and then—I will not shield myself behind the Board of Directors and its request—I printed a great many besides and widely disseminated them. I printed thousands of copies in a religious journal and in pamphlet form; I cannot shield myself under the plea that I have not widely and industriously spread the poison that some of you profess to have found in my teachings. No, Moderator; my offence of teaching

that which is contrary to the word of God comes under the very gravest specifications that are here presented; and whether, after having seen this so clearly, it is heresy or not, I will not venture to express an opinion. If such an offence has been committed by me, ought I not to be deposed? If I thought that you, Moderator, had done a tithe of what I have been charged with, I would say, much as I love you, that you ought to be deposed; and if you think deposition is not warranted by the enormity of my offence, it is only because the clear working of the mind is obscured by the loving heart.

And then it is to be observed still further in this direction, Moderator, that this is not my first offence. For all these twenty-four years—as to the eight years before, you need not count them; when I was serving you then I had not promised to regard the Confession of Faith as the expression of my faith—but for twenty-four years I have been, according to the author of this paper [Dr. Girardeau], violating my vows. As you have been told by him, it was too late when in my Inaugural Address I told the Board what my views were; it was then too late, I had already signed the Confession; and I was bound to take the Confession in the sense that has been pointed out to you by him, as teaching that the whole universe was created only six times twenty-four hours before Adam; and here year after year I have violated that vow.

Whether or not there might be any propriety in pleading a statute of limitations, I will not undertake to say.

But there is one comforting thought. Is it a comforting thought, Moderator? I am not sure. Misery is said to love company, and I suppose under the same general principle, it may be a comforting thought that he who charges you with a sin, if he has not committed it along with you, at least has never reproved your sin and your folly, although he knew it all the time. The author of this paper was a member of this Synod, and in that sense one of the controllers of this Seminary, twenty-four years ago; for years he was a Director in that Seminary; for eight years he has been my colleague; and yet he has allowed me to go on in sin all this time without ever having breathed to

me that I was guilty of such enormities. As he has told you, we have taken sweet counsel together in the house of God. He suffered this sin in me, although he knew, according to what he has been saying to you during these last few days how grievous my fault, my sin against God, was every day.

The second of the resolutions in the minority report reads as follows:

“Resolved, That the Synod is called upon to decide, not upon the question whether the said views of Dr. Woodrow contradict the Bible in its highest and absolute sense, but upon the question whether they contradict the interpretations of the Bible by the Presbyterian Church in the United States.”

Moderator, are you going thus to publish your shame to the world? For is it not a shame if you proclaim that the meaning of the Bible as interpreted by your standards is not what you believe to be the absolute and highest sense of the word? Are you going to say to the world, “We don’t believe our standards.” “We think that there is a high and absolute sense which is inconsistent with our standards.” “When we preach to you and interpret to you the word of God according to the standards, we are preaching and interpreting in a way that we believe to be false”? Are you going to say that? Are you going to put that on record? Is not what I have intimated in these last few sentences most strictly true? Let us imagine a case, Moderator: there are a number of your flock and of your neighbors sitting under my instructions in South Carolina College. I teach them that geology is true; that this world was created more than a week before Adam. Suppose that one of these when he returns to your pastoral care, anxious for the salvation of his soul, shall come to you and ask you what he is to do. After you have told him that he is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and he will be saved, he tells you, “I feel that that is true; I believe what you say; but don’t you remember that when you last expounded in church the first chapter of Genesis, you taught in obedience to your church principles and to your Confession of Faith, that the world was created only six days of twenty-four hours each before Adam?” You look incredulous and are not willing to sit as the

original of that picture, Moderator. But you must; you are bound from what you have heard on this floor to do so; if you undertake to explain the first chapter of Genesis and explain it in any other way, you are told that you are violating your vows, you are bound to teach that very thing; and so the young man goes on: "I believed that to be true before; but I have been down at Columbia for the last year or two, and I have been taught in such a way that I have come to believe that that is not true, and consequently I cannot receive this Lord Jesus Christ whom you urge upon me, because the book that contains the lessons touching him is one that you told me contradicts the truth as I have ascertained it elsewhere." And so the poor young man, your lips being sealed—if you open them to say that that is not the meaning of the Bible, you are violating your vows, and you may not say it—so the poor young man goes away, there is no hope, no Saviour for him, and he is lost. Would you let him go away? Wouldn't you call him back, notwithstanding all that has been said about violating your vows, and teach him what you believe to be the highest and absolute sense of the Sacred Scriptures, and say, "The Scriptures don't teach that lie; the Scriptures do not teach that this world is only 6,000 years old, and the Scriptures are true. Come, accept the Saviour whom they present, without fear of believing two contradictories at the same time."

This is the inevitable result of the teaching as you will send it forth if you adopt the minority report: that the highest and absolute sense of the Sacred Scriptures is different from that which you pledge yourselves to teach as ministers and to support as ruling elders in the Church of Christ. Isn't it? Why, Moderator, I am under no more obligation to teach received interpretations than you are, am I? Didn't you accept the Confession of Faith in the same sense in which I did? And are you going to charge me with violating my vows, are you going to hold me up as a perjurer before God and man, if I teach the highest and absolute sense of the Sacred Scriptures as I can find it, untrammelled by that which, you yourself being judge, is not true? No, Moderator, I am bound by no vows by which you

are not bound in substance; and if you can justify yourself in holding up the gospel and earnestly entreating the enlightened youth to come and embrace the Saviour, I may teach the students that you send me that they may do it—that they must do it, or be recreant to the King himself. And yet, Moderator, you are asked by adopting this resolution to proclaim to the world that these two things are entirely different.

In the next place, you find in the third resolution this:

—“That the declaration of the Board of Directors that ‘the relations subsisting’”—observe, Moderator—“that ‘the relations subsisting between the teachings of Scripture and the teachings of natural science are plainly, correctly, and satisfactorily set forth’ in Dr. Woodrow’s address, was inexpedient and injudicious.”

Moderator, observe what is commended here, or of what approval is expressed. It is not said that anything else in the address is approved; it is not said that Dr. Woodrow’s ideas about Evolution are approved; no, there is not a syllable about that; but that the relation subsisting between natural science and revelation is non-contradiction, because the Bible does not teach natural science, that that is plainly, correctly, and satisfactorily set forth. The Board do not become responsible for any of my scientific errors; the Board knew their duty too well, as it seems from what they have sent here, to venture to express any opinion on such points. It is true there is an ambiguous expression in one of their resolutions: “That they are not prepared to concur,” and, if you choose, you may press that, as has been done, into an expression of non-concurrence or disapprobation. I will not venture to express any opinion, although I may just say privately to you, Moderator, that I know that that is not what they meant. But I will not argue that matter. They simply express in this resolution their approbation of what they were pleased to regard as a demonstration: that the relation that ought to be regarded as subsisting between the teachings of Scripture and the teachings of natural science is the relation of non-contradiction, and that based upon the proved truth that the Bible does not teach natural science.

But I am told that this definition of the relation is defective ; that I ought not to have said that the relation is that of non-contradiction ; I ought to have said that the relation is to be expressed by the terms "the harmony of non-contradiction." It is not non-contradiction ; it is agreement, it is unity, it is "harmony of non-contradiction." Now, Moderator, I don't care much for refinements of language ; but I really, soberly, honestly do not think that that expresses the true idea any better than the simple plain words that I used. As an illustration, we may inquire what are the relations between these two expressions : "General Washington commanded the American troops during the Revolutionary War in the last century ;" "Christopher Columbus several centuries ago discovered America." What is the relation now between these two statements that have—I was going to say no connexion, Moderator ; I must not say that ; I must be more careful. But do these two statements contradict each other ? Oh no ; they do not contradict. Well, would it do to say that the relation is that of non-contradiction ? According to my idea, that would express it. But then you begin to criticise me ; you say, "That is defective. George Washington and Christopher Columbus were both men ; isn't that harmony ? And didn't God make them both ? And are they not thus taken up into a higher harmony ? You ought not to have said 'non-contradiction' ; you ought to have said that those two expressions are related to each other in the 'harmony of non-contradiction.' " Now, I can't understand that ; that weakness of comprehension of mine is again shown ; it is too deep for me, or something.

But the basis of the statement commended by the Board is a fact, viz., that the Bible does not teach natural science. I don't intend to talk, as my Brother Martin did, of the law of identity, and the law of excluded middle, and all those things. But it has been said that the Bible does teach natural science. If I was wrong in saying that the Bible does not teach natural science, then the opposite of that must be to some extent true, and the Bible must teach natural science. And this proposition has been gravely maintained before you. Not for the first time, Moderator, has that proposition now been maintained. It was main-

tained during not only the Middle Ages, but the ages before the Middle Ages. Yes; and it is maintained now, as you heard the other night, down into the latter part of the 19th century. The Bible teaches natural science, Moderator; why, of course it does. For example, doesn't the Bible speak about the stars, and doesn't astronomy speak about the stars? And since they both speak about the same thing, if astronomy teaches about them, isn't the Bible also teaching about them? Of course, therefore, the Bible teaches astronomy; and I might here appeal to received interpretations of the Sacred Scriptures, and cite these in proof of my assertion. And then, again, with regard to geography, with regard to every subject that you can think of that forms the subject-matter of natural science in any of its aspects, doesn't the Bible speak of those objects, and is not the Bible therefore teaching natural science? That is the argument; and it is an argument that has convinced the world for hundreds and hundreds of years, and therefore, no doubt, ought to be spoken of with the utmost respect. But now let us examine it. If I call your attention to the fact that that book is lying there, am I stating a scientific fact? Am I teaching science when I say that there is a book lying on the Moderator's table? Is that what you would call teaching science? I suppose you would say, "No; that is not teaching science." But now suppose when I go back to Columbia, in lecturing before my class in physics, there is a book lying upon my desk, and I call attention to it as to its form and its color; I take hold of it and attempt to raise it up, and find that I am resisted by some power—something is holding it down when I try to raise it; when I go through with all this, and thus call the attention of those young gentlemen to that fact, am I teaching them science or not? Yes; I am teaching science then. But why? Because I say, "There is a book lying there"? No, Moderator; that is not the reason; but because I am calling their attention to the relations existing between that book and other things; I am speaking of the forces by which it is operated upon; I am calling attention to the way in which light is affected by it; I am presenting an orderly view of the relations between things, and not simply

stating the fact of their existence; and, therefore, in this latter case I am teaching science; but in the former, when I merely asserted the book was lying on your table, I was not; was I? Was I teaching science then? You are not going to say so, Moderator; nor are you going to pronounce my analysis of the relation between the Sacred Scriptures and natural science false on the ground that I made a mistake in saying that, notwithstanding the fact that the Bible speaks of man, it therefore does not teach human anatomy. You are not going to say that because the Bible speaks of woman, it therefore discourses on the science of loveliness and beauty; or that because it speaks of the earth, therefore it teaches geology. No, Moderator; it does not teach any of these things; it does not teach anything concerning the orderly arrangement of the facts which constitute a science; and it is to no purpose, it is misleading, to imagine for an instant that natural science in any of its aspects is taught in the word of God.

In the next place, Moderator, I recur to the fourth resolution, which I read before for another purpose. I need not now say much with reference to it, because I have probably already said all that was necessary. "*Resolved*; That the action of the Board of Directors virtually approving the inculcation and defence of the unverified hypothesis of evolution"—Moderator, they did nothing of the kind: the Board of Directors neither virtually nor otherwise approved of the inculcation and defence of the unverified hypothesis of evolution. If they had, they would have committed that sin which I have pointed out to you, of arrogating, when they were speaking in the name of the Lord, to decide that which the Lord had not committed to them; they would have been expressing an opinion that an hypothesis of natural science was true, and inasmuch as they were speaking as representatives of the Church of matters most closely connected with the faith of the Church, they might not utter any sound on that subject; and, Moderator, neither may you. When you are sitting as the court of the Lord Jesus, when your utterances are utterances touching the faith of the Church, you may say nothing whatever that even looks in that direction. As to the remaining portion of this

resolution, I suppose that it is not necessary for me to speak at present; I will confine myself to this matter of the "unverified hypothesis." I have already said that you have no right to consider it at all; but inasmuch as it has been considered, you must pardon me for following the example of those who have been so largely discussing it.

Now I ask first, Moderator, how do you know that it is an "unverified hypothesis"? Putting aside the question as to whether it is competent to you as representatives of the Lord Jesus to consider the question, how do you know that it is an unverified hypothesis? Well, the answer has been given already by those who have preceded me: "You think so, and have told us so in your address, and you have told the world so; you have said it was only probable in your opinion, and you are supposed to know something about it. At any rate you have said that, and you have no right to object to our calling it an 'unverified hypothesis,' whatever right other people may have." But, Moderator, I was called on for my opinion in that case as an expert; I was appealed to to state what I knew myself—what I had found out by examining into the evidence personally. I was not giving my opinion; I was called on to state what I knew, and that is all I know on the subject up to the present time. I cannot say that I know Evolution, within the limits that I have applied, to be true; but I have followed the various lines of evidence connected with the matter during these past years so far that I can say that it is probably true. And I do say it; I don't conceal it; I have no concealed opinions, notwithstanding all that has been said about my trying to teach without letting the Church know. But if you ask me with regard to the evidence on this point that may possibly carry conviction to others, if you ask me in any other direction on this matter, I would have to say that the answer must be quite different. But before undertaking to give an answer, let me ask how you are to find out when an hypothesis is verified? Of course one way is by examining into the evidence yourself. Well, Moderator, I know that you are not gray yet, and I am becoming so; but you have not, with your other duties, years enough, however long your life may be—and may it be very long—you have not

years enough to inquire into the evidence and form an opinion of your own. And what then? Why, take the concurrent testimony of those who have, you say. Just so soon, we are told over and over again, as the experts will tell us that this hypothesis is verified, why, then we will believe it. But some of you refuse to do that. Well, now, Moderator, we want to be consistent, do we not? We do not want to apply one rule in one direction and another in another. How are we to find out the truth concerning the Scriptures? First, what are the Scriptures? I suppose if I was an outsider, and should come to you, I would learn from what I have been listening to here during the past few days, that there is a good deal of difference of opinion among you about the Scriptures; and I might learn that though you have been studying them for a good many years, you don't agree as to what the Scriptures are. Now, I might say to you, You first agree among yourselves, and then come and tell me, and I will take your opinion as the opinion of experts. But you don't agree yet, and I will not accept your opinion that the Scriptures are true; I find that you don't agree even as to what the Scriptures are: whether it is the word of God which constitutes the Scriptures, or whether it is only that the Scriptures contain the word of God, and containing the word of God contain much else that is not the word of God. I find that large numbers of professing Christians exclude much that you ask me to believe as the word of God. Agree among yourselves before you ask me to receive the Scriptures. After you have found out what they are, I come to you and ask you what is the truth with regard to this matter of predestination? I hear a great deal about it; I come to you as experts; you have had time to study the question; I have not much time, and I don't know anything about it. Is your Methodist brother there right, or are you right? He doesn't believe it; you do believe it. He is as pious as you are; he loves the Scriptures as much as you do; the word and Spirit of God will enlighten him as much as they will enlighten you, for anything that you know to the contrary. And yet he comes and tells me that the doctrine of predestination is not true, and you tell me it is true. Now settle your difficulties among yourselves

before you come to me about this matter ; just so long as I can quote respectable witnesses on this matter contradictory to your views, your views are not worth anything to me. There must be absolute unanimity. And so I might go down the whole list of doctrines. What is the absolute, divinely appointed form of church government ? Is there any ? What is the proper mode of performing the rite of baptism ? If I put it to vote here in this city of Greenville and in this State of South Carolina, will I get an answer from the majority that will carry conviction to you ? Why, our Baptist brethren will out-vote you ten to one. And yet are not Dr. Broadus and Drs. Manly, Basil and Charles, and Dr. Boyce, and all the other Baptist worthies whom I might name—are they not as learned as you, and don't they love the Scriptures as much, and are they not as likely to be right as you ? And yet you will not believe them. You cannot settle this matter by votes. You cannot look for substantial unanimity, yourselves being judges ; and if you will not apply this rule in one case, you are not going to be dishonest enough to insist upon applying it in another. And then with regard to other matters. Is the Copernican system a proved hypothesis ? Is it true that this world is a sphere, and that it rotates on its axis ? Why, Moderator, I was told by one of your number on our coming here the other day that he knew of a most devotedly excellent Christian man who did not believe that. Well, he had as good a chance to know perhaps as I. I know a respected and prominent citizen in Columbia who scouts the idea of the world's being a sphere : "Why, if it was a sphere and turned on its axis, we'd spill out." Although I might multiply them almost indefinitely, I will not add more than one other illustration. Some thirty-four years ago I spent a delightful evening in company with Judge Ezekiel Pickens, whose name I give because I dare say that some of his relatives may live in this region, and who was a prominent Judge in Alabama, where I was residing at the time. He spent the whole evening in presenting in the most ingenious manner, and to not a few present there in a convincing manner, arguments to prove that all that had been said with regard to the rotundity of the earth and the rotation of the earth upon its axis,

was—to use the expression that has been here repeated so often—an unverified hypothesis. Now, Moderator, I can quote these cases when you want to prove to me that that is a verified hypothesis.

Now, without going further in that direction, let me ask you what are the facts as to the opinion of experts touching Evolution? I do not like any more than is absolutely necessary to refer to myself in any way; but in this case I must be allowed to stand here as a witness for the time being, if indeed I can combine the characteristics of witness and prisoner; as I am not prisoner formally, perhaps you will let me be witness. Now, Moderator, what is the state of opinion touching this question of Evolution, within the limits that I have applied in the address which I delivered? Well, Moderator, I suppose that if any persons are likely to know about these things, it will be college professors who have been studying the question at issue all their lives whether long or short. Beginning in the far northeast at Harvard University, there are the distinguished Professor of Botany, Asa Gray, and a number of younger men associated with him; and near by, Alexander Agassiz, the son of the distinguished Louis Agassiz, and very like his father in the extent of his knowledge, however unlike him in his belief on this particular subject—all evolutionists. Coming, without exhausting the number at Cambridge and Boston, to the university at Providence, Brown University, there is the son of a Congregational minister, Prof. Packard, who is a pronounced evolutionist. At Yale there is the venerable Dana, and there is the learned Marsh, and Verrill and Brewer and the younger Dana—all evolutionists. And, let me say in passing, not a single anti-evolutionist. At the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia there are the earnest Prof. Heilprin, and Cope and Leidy and Lewis; they are all evolutionists, and there is not an anti-evolutionist. Perhaps I ought not to speak of Johns Hopkins, as we have been told [by President Shepherd] that the learned Professor of Biology there is an infidel; but Prof. Brooks, I don't know whether he is an infidel or not, and it does not matter—he is an evolutionist. While I cannot say of my own personal knowledge, I am told that in the Uni-

versity of Virginia the same doctrine is taught. May I go on? What does Prof. Blake teach by your authority in Davidson College? If I make a mistake, I hope that any one who knows that I make a mistake will correct me. He teaches the nebular hypothesis as probably true. And while his colleague, Prof. Martin, does not believe in Evolution, he does believe what I believe, that belief in Evolution is perfectly consistent with belief in the Sacred Scriptures, as he has written to me himself. And so, when we come within thirty miles of this place, I am told that Prof. DuPre, the ardent young scientific professor at Wofford College, teaches it. I am not informed as to the belief of Prof. Purinton who adorns the University in this place, and so I say nothing with regard to him. I know that in the University of Georgia Evolution is taught. I know—shall I tell it?—that the Synods of Nashville and Alabama and other Synods of the Southwest are teaching Evolution at the Southwestern Presbyterian University. I know that the Synod of Kentucky is teaching Evolution at the Central University; and so I might go on; but this surely is enough. Along the whole line of these colleges which I have named I have failed to find an exception.

Now as to the belief of naturalists in foreign lands. When I was in feeble health some twelve years ago, in order that I might recover I went away from this country. I spent a portion of my time in the enlightened capital of Saxony, where I was warmly received and invited to become a member of the scientific association of that city. I visited the Scientific Association of Switzerland in 1872, and I spent days in conversing with my fellow-members upon this very subject. In 1873 I had the pleasure of attending the meeting of the German Naturalists' Association at Wiesbaden, and there too I pursued my inquiries. Amongst others I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of one who has been continually named during this discussion, Prof. Virchow, with whom I conversed freely touching this very subject. In London I had the opportunity of attending the Geological Society and the Anthropological Society, and making the acquaintance of the distinguished naturalists in those great Societies. Now, Moderator, do you want to know what I found? I didn't then believe

Evolution to be true; I believed it to be not true, and I wanted—we all want, don't we?—I wanted to be upheld and strengthened in my opposition; and I was trying to find all the help I could in that direction. So far as the capital of Saxony was concerned, the Professor of Comparative Anatomy, in whose laboratory I was dissecting day after day, did not believe in Evolution. The Professor of Geology, distinguished highly in that kingdom, was in doubt. But every other naturalist in that association, so far as I could learn, except those two and myself, were decided evolutionists. At the meeting which I have referred to at Freiburg, in Switzerland, I found no anti-evolutionist except one Presbyterian minister, who had paid a little attention to science and so had become a member of that association; but he had paid only a little attention to science. Whether or not there was any connexion between that fact and his not believing in Evolution, I am not going to express an opinion. At the meeting of the German naturalists at Wiesbaden, the subject having been brought prominently before the association by Prof. Oscar Schmidt, who delivered on that occasion a lecture that contained much that was offensive and untenable, the greatest interest was felt. Every one was ablaze with regard to the matter; and yet, though I prosecuted my inquiries with great diligence, I could not find a single member who agreed with me. From my conversations with Prof. Virchow, I feel sure he would be greatly amused and amazed if he knew how he has been quoted during this controversy as an anti-evolutionist.

I beg pardon of North Carolina for neglecting to speak of the University of that State in the enumeration that I was giving a little while ago. If I am wrong, I hope that the brother or the father of Prof. Holmes will correct me: in the University of North Carolina Evolution is taught by the eager young professor from Laurens.

REV. Z. L. HOLMES: "I think, sir, that he is undertaking to examine the subject, and I am trying to bolster him up as much as I can."

REV. DR. WOODROW: I would not have referred to him but for the fact that I knew that I could by this inquiry obtain respecting his teachings immediate information.

I had begun to think that I must really have been mistaken in supposing the great body of naturalists the world over to be evolutionists. I thought that perhaps the constant reiteration of the statement that naturalists generally rejected Evolution, or at least regarded it as a mere unverified hypothesis, might have some foundation. Hence, besides making the inquiries to which I have referred, I have continued them recently on this side of the Atlantic. During a recent visit to Philadelphia, where I met many members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, I asked each of them to what extent Evolution was received. On being invariably told it was almost universally believed, I asked if they knew of any exception among leading naturalists in America; the answer was always the same: "Yes, one, Sir William Dawson, of Montreal." During the same visit, I met a member of the British Association; and to my stereotyped question, I received the answer that Evolution was accepted as true by nearly all British naturalists. In France, I have been able to hear of but one anti-evolutionist who is eminent, the distinguished De Quatrefages.

Wishing to gain all the information I could on this subject, a few days before coming here I wrote to Prof. William H. Brewer, of Yale College, a Christian gentleman, my former fellow-student, as I knew his opportunities of knowing the views of scientific men. I knew that he had been engaged in various geological surveys and other scientific work in the field, and thus had become intimate with many working naturalists; and as Professor in Yale and member of scientific associations he must know many others. Hence I wrote to him to inquire what proportion of active working naturalists believe in Evolution, and also requested him to give the names of such as do and such as do not, as far as might be convenient. I will read his reply:

Yours of the 18th is just received. You ask my views on two questions:

"1st. What proportion of the working naturalists of this country and abroad believe in Evolution?

"2d. The names of as many as do so, as far as your patience will allow you to write them?"

I know of but one EMINENT naturalist in America who does not "believe in Evolution"—that is the venerable Sir William Dawson, of Canada, who is an illustrious geologist and a good man.

Precisely what his belief is, I do not understand; but my impression is that while he does not believe in Evolution, he holds that the idea of species that was held thirty years ago is not tenable, and our conception of them must be greatly modified.

When I speak of *naturalists*, I include all geologists, whether structural or experts in paleontology; and from my earlier work in the field and later associations here and with societies, I have a somewhat wide personal acquaintance with this class in this country, less so in Europe.

I have an impression that in Europe a few naturalists are still left, all old men, who have not accepted the modern doctrine of Evolution, but who they are, and what their present belief is, I do not know. While I can repeat many names of eminence there who believe in Evolution, I cannot cite one who does not, although I think some still exist.

Among my personal (scientific) acquaintances there is a wide range of belief and view as to the details—as to the comparative force of several causes, as to the paths along which lines of evolution took place, but this does not affect belief as to the general fact of Evolution.

I think that the working naturalists of the world are as substantially agreed as to the truth of the doctrine of Evolution as the educated men of the world are as to the rotundity of the earth.

I am a member of the National Academy of Sciences. Of the ninety-four living members (I have run through the list), I am acquainted personally with thirty-two naturalists who believe in Evolution (I exclude from this all the mathematicians, astronomers, physicists, engineers, etc., and all others whose belief I have no knowledge of), and I do not know of *any* member, naturalist or otherwise, who denies it; but then I have no positive knowledge as to the beliefs of a number of the members.

As I look down the first page of the list, I find the naturalists (including geologists) Alex. Agassiz, Spencer F. Baird, W. K. Brooks, W. H. Brewer, C. Comstock, E. D. Cope, E. Coues, J. D. Dana, C. Dutton, W. G. Farlow, G. K. Gilbert, F. N. Gill, Asa Gray, and so on down the list.

There is an annual "Scientific Directory," or "Naturalist's Directory," published at Salem, and some years ago I looked over the list as then constituted and marked the names of all those scientists whose religious belief I had any knowledge of, and I was struck with the large number who were connected with some evangelical Church—I then and still think a larger proportion by far than would be found to be the case with a similar list of lawyers or doctors.

I have among my scientific acquaintances devout and zealous Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, etc., etc.,

who believe in Evolution, and who are no more disturbed in their religious faith by this belief than by the belief that the earth is round, the sun the centre of the solar system, or the world more than 6,000 years old.

It seems to me that the doctrine of Evolution is now as surely and firmly established as either of the three doctrines (dogmas if you choose) I have named. Many of my friends will not discuss it now, except as they might discuss either of the other three beliefs named, and it seems to me most unfortunate that the clergy should be the last and most reluctant to accept, even as an intellectual belief, a doctrine so firmly placed, and so generally accepted by other classes of educated men.

As a teacher, I see much of young men, and know their difficulties. Some years ago I had much experience with the rougher elements of society, when at work on explorations and surveys; and my belief is that this attitude of so many good clergymen against scientific progress is a more powerful factor in the turning of the masses away from religious teaching which so many are deploring, than all the writings and all the arguments of all the infidels in Christendom.

You and I are both old enough to have seen its sad effects in the discussion of the geological question. That is now settled; the evil appears to be renewed in the matter of Evolution, with the same sad results.

He ends with the prayer that this Synod may be kept from similar folly.

Now, Moderator, I have given you the evidence on this point fully, and as clearly as I could, setting before you the sources of my information even at the risk of doing that which was immodest.

But have we not much evidence on the other side? Haven't we heard a great deal of Sir William Thomson's opposition to Evolution? And is he not a distinguished scientific man? And ought not his testimony to be decisive? Undoubtedly he is one of the most eminent men of science living. But on a question of natural history, is he an expert? The sphere of his greatness lies outside of that department of science. He has studied mathematics, the molecular constitution of matter, electricity and heat, and various other physical subjects; and in these departments of knowledge he is a master. But he has not so studied natural history, and there he cannot speak with authority. But let us suppose that he is here a competent witness, and let us hear what he said some years ago. When he was delivering an address before the

British Association, he gave it as his opinion that the way life originated on this planet was that it was brought hither by meteorites wandering through space and falling on the earth, and that all present life came from that source. Now, as anti-evolutionists have introduced Sir William as their witness, they are bound to accept his testimony. Will not Judge Walsh there tell you that that is the rule? So here we have a person introduced as a witness to prove the orthodox belief, maintaining Evolution by the most fanciful ideas ever uttered in relation to it. Why, Darwin himself was nearer the orthodox belief than that. He held that God did create immediately *some* things—the first forms of life on the earth; but this good Presbyterian elder, Sir William Thomson, tells us that he thinks it most probable that the first germs of life were brought by these wandering meteorites wildly careering through space!

Another anti-evolutionist witness is that prince of naturalists, the great Louis Agassiz, my friend and my teacher. We are told that he pronounced the theory of Evolution a scientific blunder; and surely he knew if anybody did. Well, if we must receive his testimony as conclusive on one point in natural history, we must receive it as equally trustworthy in all. As believers in the Bible, we are much interested in the question of the unity of the human race. Ask this master what he believes on that point. He replies: "All the members of the human family belong to a single species." "Oh," you will say, "that is all right; that is just what we believe." But he would stop you before you rejoiced too much. "Yes," he adds, "a single species, but that species consists of many varieties; and each of these varieties had entirely different ancestors. There is the red man, the negro, the white man, and the Chinaman; and I know too much about natural history to believe that all of these could come from the same source. Instead of a single pair being created as you think, there must have been hundreds of negroes created at the same time, and hundreds of Chinese, and hundreds of white men. There is no such thing as unity of origin." That is what he would tell you. But I am not going to accept the testimony of even so eminent a man as conclusive against that of the cloud of

witnesses I have produced before you, when I find him going so far astray and teaching what I know to be not true.

Now are you going to commit the Synod of South Carolina and the whole Church to the assertion that Evolution is an "unverified hypothesis" on such evidence? Is that to be the belief of a body that has no business to have any scientific belief? If you are going to have a scientific belief in this matter, it would be well perhaps to study the subject somewhat longer, lest you meet the fate which has befallen every council in every part of the Christian Church which has ever undertaken to formulate its belief with regard to natural science or natural history from the earliest ages down to the present time. I know that the Holy Office of 1633 has its defenders and upholders upon this floor; but if you can consistently with a proper sense of duty, abstain from putting yourselves in the same category, surely you will do it.

The next allegation in the report against the hypothesis is that it is "contrary to the interpretation of the Scriptures by our Church and to her prevailing and recognised views." Now what is the interpretation by our Church on this subject? I have read to you what it is so far as the Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism are concerned.

So far as I have been able to discover, that is all there is in our standards on the subject. Do the Confession and Catechism teach anything concerning the *mode* of the creation of man? Do they say whether the creation was mediate or immediate? I presume that no one will say they do. But this report does not confine itself to "the interpretation of the Scriptures by our Church," (to be found in the standards of the Church and only there,) but speaks of "her prevailing and recognised views." What are they? Well, I suppose it would be the prevailing opinion of the prominent Christian men, the ministers throughout the Church. If I desired to find out what were the prevailing ideas or opinions concerning any branch or department of learning, wouldn't I ask the leading men in those departments? If I had wanted twenty-five years ago to find out the prevailing views concerning geology, wouldn't I have gone to that class of men? When scarcely more than a mere lad, I became Professor of Geology

in Oglethorpe University, I found that the honored President, Dr. Talmage, held the view that the world was only six thousand years old, and that the Scriptures so taught. That was the prevailing view there. When I came to Columbia I found that the loved Thornwell held the same views, and so did his successor. They knew better than I, didn't they? If I were to go to the Union Theological Seminary, I know that a few years ago the three senior professors there believed just as Dr. Talmage did; but it isn't worth while to go any farther in this enumeration, after giving such names as these. Well, those were the "prevailing and recognised views" of our Church twenty-five years ago. But because these good and learned men believed thus, and I didn't, was I disbelieving the truth of the Scriptures? Their judgment, great, good, and learned as they were and are, couldn't affect the opinion of any one who looked into the subject for himself. If you wish to go farther— [Dr. Adger here moved for an adjournment.]

PROF. WOODROW: I am in the hands of the Synod; but as my life, my ecclesiastical life, is at stake, I know you will not be angry with me if I do weary you a little in trying to show that I do not deserve to die. But I feel that there are a great many of those who are present whose home duties will not allow them to remain much longer; therefore I would beg that those who desire to withdraw should now do so.

[Some persons having retired, the speaker continued.]

Thanking you for the rest allowed me, permit me to say (and I shall omit as much as I possibly can of what I intended to say) that much of the difficulty on this subject arises from the failure to perceive that Evolution and Scripture do not stand in opposition to one another. I know that it is supposed that if one believes in Evolution in one sense, that he must believe it in every sense. No argument I think is necessary to prove that that is not the case. Is it true that what Haeckel believes as to Evolution, I must likewise believe? Must I believe what Herbert Spencer and Darwin believe, because I have declared that I regard something else as probably true? So you have been told; and has it not been proved by quotations from the *South-*

western Presbyterian to show that whatever Darwin believes I also believe? You have heard seven reasons given, drawn from that source, to prove that what Darwin believed I believe; although I have kept saying, "I don't," "I don't," and I say so still, the seven reasons of the *Southwestern Presbyterian* to the contrary notwithstanding. I ask you if it is fair, or right, to attribute to me views that I utterly disclaim? I do not say that this is done through either inability to understand or a desire to misinterpret; but I ask if it is fair or just that I should be held responsible for views that I absolutely abhor, and which I have proved over and over again that I do not hold? I know and knew the difficulties surrounding the subject; and therefore in preparing my address I took the precaution, before giving my opinion upon Evolution, to state as accurately as I could what I meant by it. I gave my definition of Evolution, which, as it relates to the organic world, is contained in the three words, "Descent with Modification." That is, as animals and plants descend from generation to generation, at length modifications appear. In my definition I do not say anything of the power under whose influence the modifications appear. So far as the earth is concerned, I define Evolution as derivation of one state from another previous state, such as is illustrated in the *résumé* I give of the nebular hypothesis. That is to say, Evolution is simply a process, a description of a mode according to which changes take place, not a description of the power which produces the changes. On this point I shall read what I have written:

"This definition or description of Evolution does not include any reference to the power by which the origination is effected; it refers to the mode, and to the mode alone. So far as the definition is concerned, the immediate existence might be attributed to God or to chance; the derived existence to inherent uncreated law, or to an almighty personal Creator, acting according to laws of his own framing. It is important to consider this distinction carefully, for it is wholly inconsistent with much that is said and believed by both advocates and opponents of Evolution. It is not unusual to represent Creation and Evolution as mutually exclusive, as contradictory: Creation meaning the immediate

calling out of non-existence by divine power; Evolution, derivation from previous forms of states by inherent, self-originated or eternal laws, independent of all connexion with divine personal power. Hence, if this is correct, those who believe in Creation are theists; those who believe in Evolution are atheists. But there is no propriety in thus mingling in the definition two things which are so completely different as the power that produces an effect, and the mode in which the effect is produced."

Moderator, knowing that that was what I had believed and maintained, and knowing that I had so explicitly repudiated all atheistic forms of Evolution, I could not but spring to my feet when I heard two or three days ago, for the first time, that which I had denounced as atheism attributed to me. If I erred in my vehemence in repelling the charge, I crave your forgiveness.

Perhaps it may be well to make clear by an illustration that which may be too abstract for ready comprehension by those who have not studied such subjects. Take an oak, for instance. First observe the acorn. You notice that under the influence of heat and moisture it begins to swell. Then little leaves make their appearance; then these leaves are repeated and repeated until at last the full-grown oak stands before you. Let us now try to see what is the religious character of the process of this growth. Is the passage from the acorn to the oak a religious or an irreligious process? Do I need to show that the idea that it was God who made the acorn to develop into the oak is not involved in the description of this process? So the idea of God is not involved in the definition which I have given of Evolution.

DR. JUNKIN: I desire to ask for my own information this question: Does this process of Evolution which you have thus described carry with it the presumption of a growth from one form of life into another? That is, does it carry along with it the presumption of divine power or supervision in the change from vegetable to animal life; or is that done without the immediate intervention of a divine creative act?

DR. WOODROW: As to that I would have to answer at length, instead of saying yes or no. In describing the changes from the acorn to the oak, I am stating the results of observation. So if

that particular oak gives rise to a slightly different form, I simply note that as a fact. I am not then considering the power that has produced the changes when I am merely describing the changes. The mere observation of the process or mode by which the acorn becomes an oak, does not tell me whether it is God who is the cause of the change or not. So the observation of cases in which I observe modification during descent tells me nothing of the power producing the observed changes. Within the limits of natural science, it is only the natural or the ordinary—that which occurs uniformly—that can rightly be considered. All else the student of natural science would regard as extraordinary or extra-natural, and so beyond his province. If he should speak of the supernatural, he would be going beyond his province.

Speaking of the processes or modes, it is true that a knowledge of them depends on observation, which teaches us nothing of their origin; but so soon as I have learned from other sources that there is a God; that there is a being, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in wisdom, power, and all his attributes; and when I know the relations of this being to the universe, his workmanship, then I perceive that this process of change from acorn to oak is his mode of working—that every step in the process is the working of an almighty and all-wise God. And so when I come as a believer in God to the study of those things which I now begin to call the works of God, I find him present in a way that I had never imagined before. When I look at the quivering leaf growing under the influences of the sunshine and the rain, I see before me God's power effecting the wonderful changes that are there taking place; I see the present power of that God directing and guiding its faintest movement. When I see the dew-drop resting on the blade of grass reflecting from its surface the prismatic hues, I see not proofs of the existence of a distant or absent God; I see his hand there immediately present holding the particles together, for my delight as one of his ends; causing the white ray of light to be broken up into the marvellous rainbow colors so as to charm the sense of sight; it is God who is doing this before me. As I look abroad upon the operations of

nature on a grander scale—when I stand in the presence of the mountain and behold the veil of blinding snow on its summit, I see there the power of God holding particle to particle and producing that which fills my mind with awe; that which expands my soul and gives me a new and an exalted idea of the mighty Creator—not in whom we *did* live, but in whom we now live and in whom we have our being, who is now causing every pulse beat in this wrist, who is now giving me the power to be heard by you. He is a God near at hand; he is not a God afar off. This, I say, is the Christian's view of God and his relation to his works. Can you imagine, then, if this is true and not a mere fancy, can you imagine that when I, so believing, speak of Evolution, or when any right-thinking man speaks of it, he is pushing God away and doing that which tends to materialism, or to a blank denial of the existence of the Almighty? Need I now undertake further to prove that Evolution is not antagonistic to Creation; that Evolution is Creation?

If anything more is needed, let me ask you again the question which I have heard so frequently during the last day or two: "Who made you?" I don't mean who made several ages ago those from whom you have descended, but who made YOU? Are you an orphan so far as the Creator of the universe is concerned, or is God your Father and Creator? Are you going to allow some one to come here and say that because he did not create you immediately, he did not create you at all? No; you have as much claim to him as your Father as Adam had. But did he make you immediately? Oh no, he did not. Yet, for all this, no one is willing to give up his right to say "Our Father" and "our Creator." Creation is not antagonistic to our evolution. God may create out of nothing; but so far as the daily operations of his hands are concerned, we see that he does not create out of nothing, but out of something that he had previously brought out of nothing. But he is not the less *creating* before our eyes. There is no antagonism between Creation and that mode of Creation which we call Evolution.

You will now better understand why I should say that I want no change in the expression of the Confession: "After God had

made all other creatures, he created man." The only difference between us is as to the probable mode of that creation.

I wish, in the next place, to call attention to the fact that it has been constantly reiterated that I subordinate Scripture to science. The only answer that I have for that statement is that it is not true. I cannot give any explanation of the matter except just that. I say that there is not a word that I ever spoke, or wrote, or thought, that would bear that construction; and any one who has read what I have written ought to know that it is not true. I have always sought to know what the Scriptures teach with regard to any matter that I was examining; and when I have found the meaning of the Scriptures, I have accepted that as final. I say again that there is not a syllable I ever uttered, or a word I ever spoke, that could even remotely sanction any such construction. When I said that I believed it to be probably true that Adam's body was included in the method of mediate creation, it was only after I had shown that it might not be inconsistent with the Sacred Scriptures. [Here a motion was made that the Synod adjourn. Lost by a large majority.]

Hastening on as rapidly as I can, and omitting many things, I will take up a sample of the objections that have been made to my views. "You are utterly unscientific," I am told, "in your statement that Adam, as to his body, was derived from beast ancestors." That is about the way it is put. I don't think that all who use this language mean thereby to excite disgust or contempt towards me. But when I say that Adam, as to his body, may have been a lineal descendant of the higher forms of mammalian life, I believe it because I think it in accord with God's usual plan as I find it in the case of other animals. "When you come to the soul of Adam, you are guilty of a breach of continuity; and when you come to Eve, instead of believing that she descended from the lower animals, you say that she was created in a supernatural way. Therefore you are talking nonsense; you contradict yourself; you are doing that which is unscientific; you are making a muddle and a jumble. Is it not perfectly clear that God made man, male and female, and that he created them in the same way? You say there are two ways."

Why do I say so? I say part of what I do because God tells me so plainly in his word; I say the other part because, his word being silent, he has allowed me to learn its probable truth from a study of his works. I do not believe it unscientific to believe in miracles, or that the Almighty God, who chooses to effect certain purposes in one way now, ties himself to that way, and that he can never effect the same purpose in another way. I do not think it unscientific to believe that God can make wine by causing the grapes to grow on the vine, and the juice to be expressed and to ferment, and at the same time to believe that he can also make it even better without that which is his ordinary process. If that is making a muddle and a jumble, I am satisfied to make it. It may be making a botch and doing what is very ridiculous to say that while fire ordinarily burns, it does not always burn. I remember a case where fire did not burn. Don't you? Is that unscientific? If it is, I am content to be unscientific. Why do I say that there are two different ways as to the creation of the bodies of Adam and Eve? Because I find in the Bible no expression which certainly shows the mode of the creation of Adam's body, and I do find the mode of the creation of Eve's body and soul clearly set forth. It is not the ordinary way, and therefore it is excluded from Evolution. Is that a subordination of the Scriptures to science, to accept their plain and simple declaration? Again they say: "If true science admits of no change or exception, how can you believe that God made the first man? If he made our parents in a certain way and their parents in the same way for all time, we will have to keep going back for ever before we arrive at the origin." With regard to that matter I might reply that such an objection might come from a certain kind of so-called science, but I do not see how it can come from a Christian believer. The same objection, if valid, would keep one who believes in the possibility of miracles from believing in any branch of natural science.

But I wish to say that what is involved in my probable belief as to the creation of Adam, has been the belief of the Church of Christ from the earliest ages down to the present time as to the creation of each human being. What has been the doctrine of

the Reformed Churches with but few exceptions until very recent times? What was the prevalent belief in the Church before the Reformation? It is that doctrine which is spoken of as "Creationism." That doctrine represents the body of each human being as derived from its parents by natural generation—as mediately 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 with the previously formed animal body. This is not, I understand, the doctrine of the Professor of Theology in the Columbia Seminary; but if you will read any work on Theology or Church History, you will see that it has always been the widely prevalent belief of the Church. And you cannot fail to perceive that this furnishes an exact counterpart of the suggestion that Adam's body may have been derived from ancestors, while his soul was immediately created and inbreathed by God.

I might also call your attention to the wonderful likeness that exists between the first Adam and the second Adam. That is to say, in the origin of the one and of the other there has been a mixture of the natural and the supernatural, of creation mediate and immediate. How was it in the incarnation of our adorable Redeemer? He was formed as to his body of the substance of his mother. He grew according to the laws of God as in the case of any other human being. And then, whatever may be true as to the doctrine of Creationism, we know that in his case there was superadded that other nature the nature of the Almighty God. There was plainly that admixture of the natural and the supernatural which is presumed in the hypothesis which I have been inclined to believe as probably true, and which has been held up as only worthy of withering scorn.

Moderator, I am told that in the contest now in progress I stand alone; that no one stands beside me, or believes with me. Now, if there is anything for which I yearn, after the love of God and of Jesus Christ my Saviour, it is the love and approbation of the good, the pure, the upright, of those who bear the image of God in their hearts. And I know that isolation is deso-

lation. But if I must stand alone in defence of what I believe to be his truth, I submit to the decree and to the will of my God. I will not be the first who has seemed to stand alone. As I look through the vistas opened before me by the word of God, I see the forms of three who were cast alone into the furnace of fire heated seven times more than it was wont to be heated. But as I look again, they are not alone, for four are walking in the midst of the fire; and when they came forth from that furnace not even the smell of fire had passed on them. I remember also that when an apostle was once called to stand before Nero, all men forsook him; but yet he was not alone. As I look in another direction, I see a form standing alone, in the presence of a mighty emperor and the princes of the empire, and saying, all alone as he seemed to be, "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 otherwise; God help me. Amen." And so stand I.

But, Moderator, I do not believe, with regard to the only point concerning which I care, comparatively, in this whole discussion, that any such loneliness even as to the human kind is in store for me. And yet there might well be. Why, you have heard, and you well know that it is true, that when this address of mine was published, when it went abroad throughout the land, there was a shock given to the Church and to every Christian heart. There was apprehension and terror with regard to the truth which God himself had dictated. There was wild agitation, which, we are told, threatened to rend the Church. Moderator, I was the poor cause of that shock. It was what I believed or was said to believe that sent this thrill throughout the land. No sooner was the address published than it was stated in a journal of this Church that I, a minister of this Presbyterian Church and a teacher in your Theological Seminary, was treating, to all appearance, the sacred Bible as a Hebrew legend. Was not that well calculated to shock the Church from one end to the other? In speech after speech on the floor of Synods and Presbyteries, this same teacher was represented as holding doctrines which would require you to throw away the Confession of Faith, and to introduce a Confes-

sion that would not recognise Adam as the federal head of the human race. And you have been told here what has been uttered in many a place before—you have been told that, if the principles of this Seminary professor are received, you must throw away the supernatural altogether; you must give up all hope of a resurrection. Was not that enough to shock the Christian world? Was not that enough to excite the agitation which followed?

But is it true that I have ever taught that the Scriptures are to be regarded as doubtful in even a single word? No, it is not. Every word of it and every syllable I have maintained must be received as true. Have I ever taught any doctrine which involved the giving up of the federal headship of Adam? No, I say again.

And then, again, to show the effect of such teachings and such beliefs as this professor is charged with, in some journals to which reference has been made, my personal religious character has been blackened.

Now, is it any wonder that a shock should be felt by this Church from one end to the other? But am I the guilty party? Do you see, do you hear, any foundation for the charges which you have heard brought against me? Did you ever hear anything from me (and I would appeal also to those young gentlemen sitting there who are still under my instruction), did you ever hear from me anything that would give ground for such charges? There is not one thing that I believe or have said that could give color to these gross misrepresentations of my belief. I cannot and will not say it was because I may have been misunderstood. It was gross misrepresentation and nothing else. The extent to which this shock has been felt is shown by the interest taken in the matter both by the secular and religious journals of the land. One Presbytery, the New Orleans Presbytery, has published to the world that it is not to be held responsible for any of the wicked teachings of this wicked professor. It has recently sent a young man to the Columbia Seminary, but it gives fair notice that, if this poison be not eradicated by drastic measures, that youth will be taken away so that he shall not be harmed. As I have told you already, Synods which are themselves teaching

Evolution in their Universities, are raising most loudly the cry that my wicked teachings must be stopped. Now are they not a pretty set of people to ask you to sweep away this foul blot from the Theological Seminary of South Carolina? "We can teach it as much as we please here at home," they say practically; "but there you shall not do it. We will take our students away, and send them to other institutions." But where will you send them, I may ask. Is not Evolution taught in those other places? Is not that, Moderator, jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire?

I do not know that it is really worth while (and I shall do it in the most rapid manner) to consider some of the objections made to the theory of Evolution. Dr. Junkin gave as one of those objections the difficulties presented by hybridism. He said that there was no possibility of the theory being true on account of such difficulties. Now, on a point of this kind, I must prefer the authority of Dr. Asa Gray, who has been studying that subject longer than Dr. Junkin has been living; and Dr. Gray says it is not so. He finds that the notion that hybrids are not fertile is by no means always true. Another of Dr. Junkin's objections is the naming of the animals by Adam as showing the perfection of speech. Well, I must say that I cannot see the force of that argument; for if the animals had come by evolution, couldn't they have been named just as well? As to the philological theories alluded to, I have never intimated that I knew anything about the evolution of language; and there is no propriety in holding me responsible for what I know nothing about. But I cannot see what the evolution of language has to do with the evolution of plants and animals; or how that subject, about which I do not profess to know anything, can affect what I do know, and of which I have spoken.

In the next place, we are told that Evolution is to be rejected, because it is born of atheism. It is said that many atheists hold the doctrine of Evolution, and therefore it is not true. Darwin was not an atheist, but at the same time he was not a believer in Christianity. But how does that affect the truth of Evolution? On the other hand, we know that there are many others who believe in Evolution who are not atheists. If others say it leads

to atheism, I say it does not; and I content myself with pronouncing their proposition an "unverified hypothesis."

Then you are told that it assigns a beastly origin to man. Well, we need not be so proud. We have bodies exactly like the beasts, if you choose to call them so. Our muscles are arranged in the same way. The heart beats in the dog just as it beats in me. His legs are made like mine and like my arms. He has a brain in his skull and a spinal marrow. He digests as I do. He does everything in the same way. Again, as to our instincts being shocked: what is there in red clay that is so much more noble than the most highly organised form God had made up to the time of Adam? You have only the choice between red clay and the highest and best thing that was produced by the power of God up to the time of man's existence. And if your decision is to be controlled by your prejudices and your instincts and your feelings, let me ask you, Moderator, how do you like to think that the negro is your brother? Is your instinct shocked by that? Will you follow instincts in one case and not follow them in another?

Without dwelling longer on that point, let me call your attention to an objection urged against the theory as to man's body. We are told that, according to the received interpretation of the Scriptures, he was made of inorganic dust. (Of course, when I say that man's body may have been made of organic dust, I mean God may have chosen to derive man's body from a previously existing animal form.) You are told that the idea of mediate creation is precluded by the received interpretation of the Bible. Well, it is not precluded by anything said in our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, as we have already seen. Outside our standards I suppose that some of the most widely "prevailing and recognised views" of the meaning of the Scriptures are set forth in the little Catechism, already frequently quoted during this discussion. What is said there on this subject? Let us see: "Who made you?" "God." Did he make you mediately or immediately? I suppose you would say: God did not make me immediately, but mediately, through my ancestors. "Of what did he make you?" "Of the dust of the ground." Mediatly or immediately?

Now, if you say it was mediate in the one case, why may you not at least say it may have been mediate in the other? In Ecclesiastes xii. 7, we learn that each one of us is made of the dust of the earth; and yet each one of us has come from a long line of ancestors. But that language is figurative, you say; and it is true, as has been said on this floor, that every figure must have its literal basis. Now, you say that the basis for the figure is to be found in the fact that Adam's body was formed of the literal dust of the ground. How do you know that? Suppose I say you may go back a generation or so farther for the basis of the figure, why not? According to your own exegesis, you can go back from yourself to Adam. Why can't you go back a step farther, and farther, until you reach the very beginning of all organic life, when inorganic matter was organised and vivified? If you may go back to Adam for the basis of your figure, what right have you to say that I must stop there, and may not go still farther in search of the true basis? What right have you to say that I shall stop at any particular place?

[At this point, another motion was made to adjourn, which, a division being had, was lost. In answer to a question by Prof. Shepherd, Dr. Woodrow continued.]

DR. WOODROW: I have answered the objection as to the evolution of language already. I said that I did not know enough about it. I have never studied it in such a way as to entitle me to say one syllable as to the development of language. But that does not interfere in the slightest degree with what I do know and have studied. If I had confined my investigations to the changes in animals, I would not consent to speak as if I knew anything about the changes in plants. And if I had so studied the facts of the solar system as to convince me of the truth of the nebular hypothesis, I would not be disturbed in my belief by any difficulties that may be connected with the evolution of plants and animals. I cannot therefore undertake to answer the question that has been put. And so far as the evolution of the standards of the Church is concerned, my venerable friend, Dr. Adger, is the proper person to whom to address that question.

Next, let me call your attention to the formidable objection

urged by Mr. Pratt, derived from the genealogy of the Saviour as it is presented in the third chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke: "Which was the son of Methusaleh, which was the son of Enoch, . . . which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." Now, let us read that genealogy in accordance with the interpretation which Mr. Pratt has insisted on, and wouldn't it be: "Which was the son of Adam, which was the son of"—what? Of what shall I say? Go back to the Catechism; what is the substance of which Adam was made? If it is true that a belief that Adam's body may have been derived from previously existing animal forms requires you to read, as you have been told, "which was the son of Adam, which was the son of a beast," is it not equally true that Mr. Pratt's belief requires you to read, "which was the son of red clay"? Is that the way in which you would reason? Well, it is not the way, Moderator, in which I would reason. You know, and it would seem that everybody must know, that this genealogy cannot have the remotest bearing on the question as to how it pleased God to form the body of Adam. Would Adam be less the son of God if God formed him of one substance rather than another? Our venerable friend [Dr. Frierson] tells us that we are not certain about the meaning of anything contained in the Bible. Still I am persuaded that my friend and I would agree as to the meaning of this genealogy: that going back step by step we at length come to the first great Cause, the God and Father of us all, the omnipresent and almighty God, the Source of all being; the Framer of Adam's body and the Father of his spirit, and, through him, of all his descendants to the latest generation.

But I find, Moderator, that I am so exhausted that it is utterly impossible for me to proceed, and hence I must ask your indulgence.

[After a short debate, a motion was made to adjourn, which was carried, Dr. Woodrow having the floor. Next evening (the morning having been devoted to replies to his remarks), Dr. Woodrow, resuming the argument, said:]

Moderator, you need not be at all alarmed at this formidable array of books, for I do not intend to read them to you. I had

intended to read extracts from them on certain points; for example, from this work by President Schmid, to show who are evolutionists; but I think probably it is not necessary. I had also intended to read an extract or two from this work on *The Origin of the World*, by the anti-evolutionist, Principal Dawson, to show that in some important particulars the views of the author correspond precisely with those set forth in my address. I had intended to read from Guyot's book on *Creation*, to show that his teachings upon points touching the Scriptures are identical with mine; and that while I do not know what his views were with regard to Evolution, yet that is a matter of entire indifference, for he has distinctly set forth in the work that the question, so far as Evolution is concerned (within the limits of my definition), is an entirely open one. I had intended to read from *Truths and Untruths of Evolution*, by the Rev. Dr. Drury, lecturer before the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church, for the purpose of showing the strong support the theory received from those high in that Church; and particularly from the teachings of one of his predecessors in the lectureship, the learned Tayler Lewis, who, notwithstanding the fact that he was an avowed anti-evolutionist, maintained that it was perfectly consistent with the Scriptures to entertain the views of the theory which I do, and of evolution in all the various directions which I point out. But I shall not burden you with all this. Nor shall I read to you a letter which I have in my pocket from the Professor of Theology in the Allegheny Theological Seminary [Rev. Dr. S. H. Kellogg], in which he makes it appear that in all the scriptural points involved his views are identical in every particular with mine. I may say, however, while on this point, with regard to the chairs of theology, that Evolution is discussed by every Professor of Theology in the Presbyterian Church, whether North or South; and there is a good deal about it in the textbook used by the Professor of Theology in the Columbia Theological Seminary. I am not singular, therefore, you will observe, Moderator, in my course.

Now, inasmuch as the course of the Holy Office or the Inquisition has been so stoutly recommended as an example for us to

follow, and as it has been maintained that the Church of Rome performed its duty, and that we, being similarly situated, must now take similar steps in reference to a similar matter, I have thought it might be well for the Synod to have the method adopted by the Church of Rome fully before it, that it may adopt whatever course of action may be suggested by the reading of the whole case.

I will now give you, therefore, from this book the

"Sentence of the Tribunal of the Supreme Inquisition against Galileo Galilei, given the 22d day of June of the Year 1633."

We, Gasparo, etc., etc., by the mercy of God Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, Inquisitors of the Holy Apostolic See, in the whole Christian Republic specially deputed against heretical depravity:

It being the case that thou, Galileo, son of the late Vincenzo Galilei, a Florentine, now aged 70, wast denounced in this Holy Office in 1615:

That thou heldest as true the false doctrine taught by many, that the Sun was the centre of the universe and immovable, and that the Earth moved, and had also a diurnal motion: That on this same matter thou didst hold a correspondence with certain German mathematicians: That thou hadst caused to be printed certain letters entitled *On the Solar Spots*, in the which thou didst explain the said doctrine to be true: And that, to the objections put forth to thee at various times, based on and drawn from Holy Scripture, thou didst answer, commenting upon and explaining the said Scripture after thy own fashion: And thereupon following was presented (to this tribunal) a copy of a writing in form of a letter, which was said to have been written by thee to such an one, at one time thy disciple, in which, following the position of Copernicus, are contained various propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the Holy Scripture:

This Holy Tribunal desiring to obviate the disorder and mischief which had resulted from this, and which was constantly increasing to the prejudice of the Holy Faith; by order of our Lord (Pope) and of the most Eminent Lords Cardinals of this supreme and universal Inquisition, the two propositions of the stability of the Sun and of the motion of the Earth were by the qualified theologians thus adjudged:

That the Sun is the centre of the universe and doth not move from his place is a proposition absurd and false in philosophy, and formally heretical; being expressly contrary to Holy Writ: That the Earth is not the centre of the universe nor immovable, but that it moves, even with a diurnal motion, is likewise a proposition absurd and false in philosophy, and considered in theology *ad minus* erroneous in faith.

But being willing at that time to proceed with leniency towards thee, it was decreed in the Sacred Congregation held before Our Lord (Pope) on the 25th of February, 1616, that the most Eminent Lord Cardinal Bellarmine should order thee that thou shouldst entirely leave and reject the said doctrine; and thou refusing to do this, that the Commissary of the Holy Office should admonish thee to abandon the said doctrine, and that thou wast neither to teach it to others, nor to hold or defend it, to which precept, if thou didst not give heed, thou wast to be imprisoned: and in execution of the said decree, the following day, in the palace and in the presence of the said most Eminent Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, after having been advised and admonished benignantly by the said Lord Cardinal, thou didst receive a precept from the then Father Commissary of the Holy Office in the presence of a notary and witnesses, that thou shouldst entirely abandon the said false opinion, and for the future neither uphold nor teach it in any manner whatever, either orally or in writing: and having promised obedience, thou wast dismissed.

And to the end that this pernicious doctrine might be rooted out and prevented from spreading, to the grave prejudice of Catholic truth, a decree was issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Index, prohibiting books which treated of the said doctrine, which was declared to be false and entirely contrary to Holy Scripture.

And there having lately appeared here a book printed in Florence this past year, whose superscription sheweth thyself to be the author, the title being: *Dialogue of Galileo Galilei on the Two Great Systems of the World, the Ptolemaic and the Copernican*: and the Sacred Congregation having been informed that in consequence of the said book the false opinion of the mobility of the Earth and the stability of the Sun was daily gaining ground; the said book was diligently examined, and was found openly to transgress the precept which had been made to thee, for that thou in the said book hadst defended the said already condemned opinion, which had been declared false before thy face: whereas thou in the said book by means of various subterfuges dost endeavor to persuade thyself that thou dost leave it undecided and merely probable. The which however is a most grave error, since in no way can an opinion be probable which has been declared and defined to be contrary to Holy Scripture. . . .

Therefore, having seen and maturely considered the merits of thy case, with thy above-mentioned confessions and excuses, We have adjudged against thee the herein-written definite sentence.

Invoking then the Most Holy Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and of His most glorious Mother Mary, ever Virgin, for this Our definite sentence, the which sitting *pro tribunali*, by the counsel and opinion of the Reverend Masters of theology and doctors of both laws, Our Counsellors, we present in these writings, in the cause and causes currently before Us,

between the magnificent Carlo Sinceri, doctor of both laws, procurator fiscal of this Holy Office, on the one part, and thou Galileo Galilei, guilty, here present, confessed and judged, on the other part:

We say, pronounce, sentence, and declare that thou, the said Galileo, by the things deduced during this trial, and by thee confessed as above, hast rendered thyself vehemently suspected of heresy by this Holy Office, that is, of having believed and held a doctrine which is false, and contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to wit: that the Sun is the centre of the universe, and that it does not move from east to west, and that the Earth moves and is not the centre of the universe: and that an opinion may be held and defended as probable after having been declared and defined as contrary to Holy Scripture; and in consequence thou hast incurred all the censures and penalties of the Sacred Canons, and other Decrees both general and particular, against such offenders imposed and promulgated. From the which We are content that thou shouldst be absolved, if, first of all, with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, thou dost before Us abjure, curse, and detest the above-mentioned errors and heresies, and any other error and heresy contrary to the Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, after the manner that We shall require of thee.

And to the end that this thy grave error and transgression remain not entirely unpunished, and that thou mayst be more cautious for the future, and an example to others to abstain from and avoid similar offences, We order that by a public edict the book of *Dialogues of Galileo Galilei* be prohibited, and We condemn thee to the prison of this Holy Office during Our will and pleasure; and as a salutary penance We enjoin on thee that for the space of three years thou shalt recite once a week the Seven Penitential Psalms, reserving to Ourselves the faculty of moderating, changing, or taking from, all or part of the above-mentioned pains and penalties.

And thus We say, pronounce, declare, order, condemn, and reserve in this and in any other better way and form which by right We can and ought.

Ita pronunciamus nos Cardinales infrascripti.

Now, is that what is to be commended in this Synod of South Carolina? In one respect—

DR. JUNKIN: Even in the face of the kindly suggestion made by the Moderator, that we do not interrupt the speaker, as I conceive the reading of this paper to be an effort to show the utter contemptibility of the position which I have assumed, and am willing to maintain, I feel that Dr. Woodrow would not respect my Christian manliness were I to allow to go unchallenged the imputation contained in that reading. What I say is this: The argu-

ment of that paper which he has just read is as solid as any we have ever heard read. It contains the logic that runs through every Presbyterian judicial process that is adjudicated in the courts of that Church. The condemnation which rises in the mind of Dr. Woodrow has arisen in the mind of every one of us—a condemnation of the assumption of authority and power by the Romish Church over the persons and opinions of its membership. But in the exercise of an acknowledged right, in the performance of an authorised duty, she says and declares that that which is to her a sacred truth shall not be denied by any one who stands in her schools. I say, in the exercise of that right, and in the meeting of that responsibility, the action of the Romish Church was logically correct and scripturally sound; but I do not mean that to extend to the issue she made over the person of the man. In the principle that as long as she maintained her creed, she had the right to silence those who opposed her teachings by teaching contrary doctrines in her name, did she have the right, with that conviction upon her, to interrupt such teaching? I say she did. I am willing, Moderator, to be branded for many things; but as a fool and a coward, I shall not be without a protest. I say that the school at Pisa was a school under the domination of the Romish Church just as much as the school at Clarksville is under the domination of the Presbyterian Church. Galileo taught in a school in which the domination of his Church was as dogmatic as it is to-day. Now, with that premise granted, I defy any man to show that the action of the Church was inconsistent with the rights of the individual who taught in her name. She simply asserted the exercise of a right which, in that age, was unquestioned, and which is to-day in vigorous exercise in the Presbyterian Church, and I say that the logic of it is as sound as the oak.

DR. WOODROW: It is very important, Moderator, that every utterance should be distinctly understood, and I am glad to know what Dr. Junkin meant. You all see now to what extent he commends this document. There is one particular in which I also think the Inquisition is to be commended: When Galileo was called to appear before a tribunal which claimed jurisdiction over

him, he was regularly summoned according to the Constitution of his Church in the matter; and before that regularly constituted tribunal he had the privilege of defending himself according to the laws of the Church. But as to this matter I will only say farther that it was not I who introduced Galileo into this discussion; but since his name had been introduced, I thought that it was extremely desirable that this Synod should know what the decree of the Holy Office was which had been so strongly commended.

In the next place, Moderator, passing over this, I call attention to a remark made by my colleague [Dr. Girardeau] to the effect that my teaching as to the rights and authority of the Church was one thing at the Seminary, and quite a different thing here. He told you that I maintained on the platform in the Seminary that the Church has no right or authority to teach anything except the gospel. Now, is not that exactly what I said last night? That the authoritative teaching of the Church must be the gospel, and the gospel alone? I say so before the young gentlemen in the Seminary, and I say so before you. As regards authoritative teaching, the Church is, of course, confined to the gospel. But that position is perfectly consistent with what I have further maintained here and everywhere, that whatever will aid the Church in properly accomplishing that duty, it is competent to the Church to do. Will any one deny that fact? Will any one deny that the Church has a right to build a house for the worship of God? Will any one deny that the Church has the right to train and educate young men, or old men, to become preachers of the gospel; and must their training be confined to things expressly commanded in the word of God? But surely it is not necessary to pursue this distinction any farther. The Church, I maintain, in this last sense, has the right to do and teach whatever will aid it in accomplishing its holy purpose; but so far as its authoritative teaching is concerned, that must be confined to the things commanded. I am glad that I have the opportunity of reiterating this principle; because the application of the doctrine will completely cut off all introduction into church courts, whether Holy Offices, or Councils, or Synods, all

decrees in reference to that which is scientific in its character, except so far as that which claims to be scientific may be proved to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures. The question will not be whether such and such a teaching is right or wrong; but it will be confined exclusively to whether or not it contradicts the Scriptures. If it contradicts the Scriptures, then to us it is false; and for that reason we may rightfully in a church court condemn it. And I say that the application of this principle will necessarily cut off the first part of the fourth resolution of the minority report, as that part of it denounces the teaching of Evolution, because it is an "unverified hypothesis." That is, because it is false in science. It does not say whether or not it is contrary to the Scriptures. It undertakes to decide a purely scientific question without even having claimed that it has any connexion with the Holy Scriptures. Oh, Moderator, it will be a sad day when this Synod resolves itself into an association for determining the exact amount of truth in a purely scientific proposition. I would respectfully call to mind the action of this Synod some twenty-five years ago, when a matter involving political questions came up, and there was doubt in the minds of many members as to whether that could be discussed by the Synod. The Synod adjourned and met simply as a company of citizens to consider the subject. I would suggest that, when you take into consideration the first part of that 4th resolution, you adjourn and reassemble as a company of scientific gentlemen, forming a scientific association, to engage in the settlement of this purely scientific question. But I trust that as rulers in the house of God you will not undertake to pass judgment upon a question not ecclesiastical, when your Constitution tells you that you shall "handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical."

DR. GIRARDEAU: I would like to ask if there were a chair in the Theological Seminary designed to teach and indicate the connexion between political science and revelation, and the professor should give his opinion in favor of Democracy, wouldn't that be somewhat an analogous case? I would admit that Dr. Woodrow's position was the correct one, if we had assembled to decide a question of science alone.

DR. WOODROW: I don't think it would make a particle of difference. I showed last night that so far as auxiliary matters are concerned, the Church has no right to inquire into their truth or falsehood. Or, as I illustrated then by the multiplication table which might be taught by the authority of the Church, or by the various kinds of instruction given in that combined institution which is both seminary and college, all under the same organisation, some of the professors teaching one class part of the day and some another; an institution both as college and seminary bearing in every particular the same relations to the constituted ecclesiastical authorities. I do not think that this Synod would have the right to decide the question of political economy, as stated by Dr. Girardeau. The Church's teachings, that is, Christ's teachings, must be confined to things found in the word. But I maintain, if you pass upon this part of the 4th resolution, where it is not shown or even asserted that there is any connexion between science and the Scriptures, you will be deciding a purely scientific question, which Christ has given you no right to decide.

The only thing, Moderator, that you have a right to inquire into, as to any proposition, is whether it is scriptural or not; and it is only so far as any thing agrees with the holy word that you may adopt it, and it is only when it is inconsistent with the holy word that you can condemn it, when sitting as a church court. There is much truth that is not contained in the Scriptures; but with it you have nothing to do. Otherwise, why should not the Church adopt the multiplication table, or some good treatise on algebra, as matters of faith, simply because they are true?

Are there those in this Synod who still desire that it shall be put on record as undertaking to decide a scientific problem, without the slightest opinion expressed as to its agreement or disagreement with the word of God? It is not competent to you, I say again, to decide such a question without going beyond the limits of your authority, and legislating with reference to things which the Head of the Church has not intrusted to you. You have no right to go a single step beyond the boundaries which I have pointed out.

There is one thing, Moderator, which has been used during

the discussion to which it is scarcely worth while to allude; but as no little stress was laid on it in the way of appealing to the feelings, perhaps I should say just a few words about it. You were told that the science of Evolution and all those bad things that were said about it were not fit to be taught in a Theological Seminary, because they would be of no practical use to a minister when he was called to the bedside of a dying saint or a dying sinner. You were asked what comfort or what guidance the dying man would receive from a discussion of the origin of man's body, or any unproved hypothesis connected with the subject. Is this a proper test of what shall be taught in a theological seminary? Then you must put a stop to Professor Hemphill's teachings; for what comfort or guidance will a dying man derive from listening to the conjugation of a Hebrew verb at his bedside? And so with a large part of the auxiliary instructions in every Seminary course. But I beg pardon, Moderator, for taking up your time with this; I have alluded to it only to ask you to think what such an argument is worth.

I have already intimated that in my opinion Evolution—its truth or falsity—is a matter of extremely small importance. I think that, as regards your Christian character, it does not make the slightest difference whether you believe in Evolution or not. I have said directly and by implication over and over again, that the Church may not teach science, even what would be admitted by all to be true science, so far as such teaching would imply that that science is sanctioned by the Church. It makes no difference, as to the doctrines of the Christian Church, whether one believes the Ptolemaic doctrine of the solar system, or whether he believes the earth to be round or flat, or, as I think, whether he regards Evolution to be probably true or an unverified hypothesis. Scientific beliefs, even those which are in some respects of the highest consequence, when they are compared with the doctrines with which the Church of God is concerned, and which alone it is commissioned to teach, are of utter insignificance.

It is for you now to keep the Church from being again dragged down from its sublime and sacred work, as it has so often been in the past. The Church in various ways has uttered its belief on

one scientific question after another during the past; and I think I am right when I assert that every time the Church has undertaken to express an opinion on scientific matters, it has expressed an opinion that was wrong. And what, Moderator, is the sad result? In every land where knowledge prevails, just in proportion frequently to the extent of the knowledge is the extent of the rejection of the Holy Scriptures. How could it well be otherwise? When you go into a church and hear denounced from the pulpit as false those things which you know to be true, are you going to believe the Bible to be the word of God on such authority as that? The authorised interpreter of the word, speaking in the name of the Church, tells you that geology is not true, that astronomy is not true, and that you must reject such things as contrary to the inspired word of God. Is it a wonder, Moderator, that those who know the truth are driven by such teaching into utter rejection of the Bible, and so from hope and down to hell? And by whom? By all, Moderator, who insist on maintaining that there is a struggle, an opposition, an enmity, between that science which is derived from the word of God and the science which is derived from his works. It will be an awful and a terrible thing in the day of judgment to have the blood of such men, Moderator, on our souls. The evils to which I am calling your attention are increasing every day. A larger and larger proportion of the truest and the noblest of our youth are coming every day to understand and to know the truths of natural science; and just in proportion as it is asserted from the pulpit that natural science and the teachings of the Bible contradict each other, just in that proportion will unbelief and its fearful consequences increase. I will venture to say that there is scarcely a community in this State where you cannot find one who utterly rejects the Sacred Scriptures and Jesus Christ for this reason. Can any one say that such an effect has ever been produced by the teachings which have been denounced here as contrary to the word of God?

Moderator and Brethren, you now have one of the grandest opportunities that could be presented of maintaining the pure spirituality and exclusive scriptural character of the Church. As you look backward over the dreary past, you will see that it has

been taught in the Church's name that if you believe that human beings live beyond the torrid zone, you must reject the Scriptures as false; if you believe that the earth is a sphere, you must reject the Scriptures as false; if you believe that the sun does not revolve around the earth but that the earth revolves around the sun, you must reject the Scriptures as false; if you believe that the universe was created more than six thousand years ago, you must reject the Scriptures as false. Will you add to this dismal list of appalling examples your teaching, that if you believe that Evolution is true, you must reject the Scriptures as false?

I beseech you that you abstain from speaking as rulers in the Church of Christ that which the Head of the Church has not authorised you in his word to speak. I beseech you that you will not place deadly stumbling blocks in the path of those who are seeking the way of life in the Holy Word. For the sake of the intelligent ingenuous youth of the land, for the sake of the greater multitudes who will look to them as their guides, that you may not drive to eternal death those whom you would fain win to eternal blessedness, I beseech you that you will not tell them in Christ's name that if they accept the teachings of God's works, they can have no share in the unspeakable blessings offered in God's word. By your love for the souls of your fellow-men, by your loyalty to the King and Lord of the Church and your desire to obey him by keeping within the limits which he has prescribed to you, as you would glorify him by bringing souls into his kingdom, I beseech you as his representatives do not commit him to what he has not commanded, but preach the word, and the word alone.

[The foregoing speech was delivered before the Synod of South Carolina on the 27th and 28th October, 1884. It is published (after revision) from reports furnished by stenographers; but these reports omit much that was said by the speaker, as well as many questions put by members of Synod and short speeches made by them, while Professor Woodrow occupied the floor. But the speech was wholly unwritten, and it has been found impossible to supply the omitted parts from memory. The action of the Synod in the case may be found in the published Minutes.]