

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,

the divine Master, in that they have gone down into the pit after their fallen brother, and with their heart beating against his heart, have put under him the hand of Christian sympathy and love, while we have stood above, fearing to do more than throw him a rope, lest his touch should pollute us. In view of this possibility, let us beware how we make a virtue of our persistent estrangement.

R. C. REED.

ARTICLE IV.

"THE SIX DAYS."

Half a century ago the news came to Princeton that Benjamin Silliman had espoused the doctrine of the "Demiurgic Days." Boys and men of that date can remember the shock. The College felt it less keenly, but the Seminary appeared dazed. Yale seemed to have struck a blow at the very heart of inspiration.

Time passed, and Arnold Guyot, out of Neufchatel, in Switzerland, came first to Cambridge, and then to our Jersey village, and, after Dr. Alexander and Dr. Miller were in their graves, recited a belief much more extreme than Silliman's, and, strange to say, found that twenty years had entirely brought over the minds of Presbyterians. At least that was received with respect which had been treated with horror, and the writer can well recall how the venerable of that after date, incomparable judges as we all supposed of what was safe and even rigid in scriptural gloss, smiled upon the Swiss exegete, and accepted as almost a divine light what his lectures exhibited.

One feels like what the children call a "loony," or as though he were doing a shameful thing, like picking a pocket, if he say those older professors were right, and Arnold Guyot and the eminent gentlemen who followed were and are most dangerously wrong.

What is really the fulcrum of the "Higher Criticism"? Un-

doubtedly the first pious giving away of literal inspiration. Scriptures are like the set up bricks in a boy's play; one thrown down sweeps the whole of them. There are scriptures like the queer things in nature. Adam and his rib, Eve and the serpent, the garden and the forbidden apple, Noah and the flood, Babel and the metamorphosis of nations, Elisha and the bears, Jonah and the fish, Jesus and the swine, well held in hand by a devout confidence in God, are like the drones in a hive—horribly foolish or almost grotesque realities (so we might object), yet easily believed in when we see them to be a fact, and quietly held in place as of the God who paints the sunset or spreads the firmament of a glorious creation.

Guyot, in meddling with one, really swept the list. Convince us that the "days" are cycles, badly interlapped and fancifully distinguished from each other, and we will go on to tinker anything. We will make the Serpent sin, and the Rib a pristine evolution from the past, and the Garden high agriculture, and the Tree great worldliness, and the Fall, as Mr. Beecher seems to regard it, a most important rise. We will make the Flood partial, drowning not the Mongolian swarms, but only a few families. Give us the license of that one evening in Princeton, and we will upset the whole Bible. Bob Ingersoll's flights are not so dangerous as perhaps one hour among the good, where, as in the great Papal Church, trusted counsel moves its finger against the basis of the gospel.

Let us, however, justify such bold talk by a glance at Dr. Guyot's scheme. It is before us in a book labored upon in the author's last months, and finished with heroic resolution in the pains and weaknesses of his last hours.

The writer translates Moses as announcing in his first verse the creation of La Place's nebula; in other words, "the heavens and earth" (Gen. i. 1) were the universal mist as it sprang out of nothing, and as it lay new-born in the enormous spaces around us. The second verse simply tells of its emptiness; by which we are to understand that it was alike, and in its unmeasured reaches homogeneously mixed together. The third tells of its gravitation, by which there would ensue that squeeze inwardly

which would result in heat and light. We will not stop upon the detail. The author seems to imagine an original creation of the mist, and afterward of its gravity and motion inward as the work of the first day.

But why not *create* it heavy?

The main point, however, is that the attraction inversely as the square of the distance was the work of the first day, resulting in that natural creation of light which began the luminousness at the heaviest pressed centre of this enormous nebula.

Motion, light, and heat would not be the only consequences, but motion circularly; that is, the pressing mass would not only move in, but begin to eddy, and the maelstroms of in-rushing mist would whirl off independent nebulae, which means, Dr. Guyot thinks, "the waters under the expanse," that is, *our* nebula, being "separated from the waters above the expanse," that is, the ten thousand other nebulae making up the whole universal matter of the heavens. So much for the second day. Then the third day is but the repetition of this in the more ultimate detail. What the second day did in whirling cosmic nebula off into many, the third day did in whirling each whirled off mist, as condensation went on, into stars and planets: This is the meaning, Dr. Guyot thinks, of the waters under the heaven being gathered into one place. That is, while the second day witnessed the separation of nebula from nebula, the third day followed each nebula as it condensed (and among the rest ~~one~~2 nebula as it whirled off) into the nuclei of systems, and, as our system broke itself off, then into sun and planets. This day reaches over enormous periods, for the great whole breaks itself into lesser nebulae, and each nebula breaks itself into single systems, and each system whirls off planets and leaves a sun, and each planet hardens into crust and separates its seas, and gets ready for life, and this day also gives life—that is, part of its announcement is the breaking out of vegetable being. Let it be understood, this is the gloss that we people are to follow who would like to get back to our boyish faith, and to believe that these times were seven ordinary days, and find ourselves eagerly groping after more literal interpretation. The rest of the week

is more simple. The fourth day is the cooling of the terrestrial crust till it ceases to be luminous, and sun, moon, and stars are thus made visible in the heavens. The fifth day brings the creation of the lower animals, and the sixth of mammals, and among them of man. Then the seventh is this long day of humanity, when God ceases to create, and when the world is busy upon more divine and spiritual engagements of its being.

This is the most ripened cosmogony, and anything that we believed when a boy must give place to it. It overlaps the different days and makes plants out of a hot earth anticipate the appearance of the sun, though Guyot is ready for that. He says the order is general and not specific. And with that corrective to our thought he evidently died singularly enamored of these texts for their palæontological perfectness.

Now, in answer, let us present our own view, old-fashioned as men now think it:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" that is, ages back, how far no one knows, and whether all together or at intervals we cannot begin to determine; God created all things that exist, and our poor planet among the rest.

"And the earth was without form and void;" how long before it does not say, or why, we are not told; but we have reason to suppose that *catastrophe* is the true geology, and that the appearances we see in the rocks betoken successive re-peoplings. Palæontological remains show enormous intervals in this. And as we have to admit creation, where is the hardship of there having been many? And why, after long continuance of one mode of life, is it not easiest to imagine that God cleared the decks and started afresh with higher conditions? Then verse second shows the *tabula rasa* on which a new story began. And as a miracle saves us from being minute, why is it not sufficient that God, having a world to restock, determined to do it in a week, just as he put clay upon an eye, just as he took a rib out of the man, just as he put Noah in an ark, when he could have saved all that trouble at a stroke, and given a woman to the man, and survival to his friend, and a negro to the East, and diffusion to our race, without the "rib," and without the "ark," and without the

"tower," and, indeed, in fifty ways utterly different and more easy? When miracle is in the field, how possibly can we make a criticism?

Now the chaotic state may be explained by anything. God may have stopped the earth and on the first day spun it round again upon its axis. How can we tell? Is it not infinitely discreet to know that it was desolate and dark, and, as it is perfectly sober to believe, without seed of either plant or beast?

Then the first day is simple. Earth was a black Stygian Egypt, in its mephitic wrappings. Any of a hundred causes might have produced this, and naturally would, if the earth was a creative ruin. A mere rest from its undulations might have given light a holiday. If there were miracle, why hesitate?

Now all the texts can be explained upon a like idea:

1. God said, Let there be light, and Stygian folds were lifted from the face of nature. How, who can dream? Roofed as by a London fog, the world still shut out the sun, and still slumbered in an impenetrable mist; but the *blackness* had disappeared. The evening and morning could be distinguished, and this change, singularly intelligible in its result, is all we have a right to imagine in the work of the first day.

2. The work of the second day is still simpler. The waters in the cloud no longer blacken down upon the waters in the sea, but are lifted. There is a clearness, that is a firmament more glorious than the wet earth itself, which supports, as on this day we write, the vault of vapor. In other words, the first day thinned the vapor till distinct luminousness could shine in. The second day lifted it till there was a vault of cloud. To ask more time is absurd. Which was the easier, to clear the atmosphere in a day, or to raise Lazarus from the dead?

3. Then, "Let the waters be gathered." How? How foolish even to guess. It may have been by drying, or, if the atmosphere is a mere film, it may have been by annihilating. Who shall say that the quantity of matter is the same since its original creation? Suppose a couple should discuss the question whether the "twelve baskets full" (Matt. xiv. 20) added to the weight of our planet! If God saw fit to raise the land, as he

did Java two years ago, and to sink the sea, to split the cherry, so to speak, of the divinely supernatural, and to say that it would take more time to carry the waters to their place, is really to say that Christ could walk upon the sea, but hardly could dry it up; or that the same divine Creator would still its tempest, but hardly bring the ship to land without passing with it over the miles of separation!

Such reasonings are preposterous. Given the smallest miracle, who can bound it? With the utmost modesty as to the detail, the simplest hermeneutic for the third day is to make it the settling of our geography, either by annihilating many fathoms of the sea, or by lifting our present land. He that made our planet could toss it like a juggler's ball. He could bring it into being and put it out again at each beating of a pulse. He could shape it as on a potter's wheel. And it is a small thing to imagine that in this reinaugurating of life six thousand years ago he might welcome the lordly race with just such a scene of six days magnificence.

The rest of the third day begat plants.

4. The fourth swept away the clouds so that the stars appeared.

5. The fifth created animals, that is the lower of them.

6. The sixth created mammals; and, last of all, man. Our idea is that the work was immediate, and that God took twenty-four hours simply for a form to signalise our Redeemer's planet with the pageant of a week; "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it" (Ex. xx. 11).

Dr. Guyot's rape of this fine chapter receives its worst check in the direction of the dictionary. Here the strain is enormous. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," that is, the nebula, or as he reasonably proposes, the original material of the stellar universe. "And the earth" (v. 2)—just think now! The only excuse for using the word "earth" in the first verse is to paint as it looked, and to picture our home as having part with the rest of the "heaven." "And the earth," Dr. Guyot now says (v. 2), means "*matter*"! That is "the heaven and the earth"

(v. 1) means the nebula, and "the earth" (v. 2) means the matter of the nebula! "The deep" means the same thing! and "the waters" precisely the same! "The waters" are not necessarily liquid, but may be gaseous, and are not necessarily gaseous water, but gaseous anything, or indeed gaseous everything, that whole universe of mist that comprised the cosmos in the original creation. That is, "the earth" means the original gas, as it was desolate and empty, and "the waters" means the same matter *qua* gas, and "the deep" the same thing on account of its immensity, and "the heaven and the earth" the same, when there is no need of mentioning both in the first verse, except to distinguish them; when "earth," if it could mean "matter," never means so again; when "waters" never means gas; when "the deep" never means either, but when "waters" and "deep" and "earth" are immediately and always after used for just what men use them for now, and what we have just used them for in the adverse interpretation. If that is not a stretch for the Lexicon, we have never felt any. Dr. Guyot is not prudent in translating. He tells us בָּרָא means to *create*. It means originally to *cut*. He seems to think it is not used so. It *is*, in the majority of its instances. He says: At least it is used only of God. He is mistaken. It is used also of men in the prophet Ezekiel (xxi. 19). He says: It is used for three *notabilia*, the creation of matter (Gen. i. 1), the creation of animals (v. 21), and the creation of men (v. 27). It is used with discriminating emphasis for neither. The linguistic choice is singularly accidental. And the alternative words are strewn along chiefly for euphony. Any one of them is used for any one thing anywhere in Scripture, and neither the origin nor use of the word can be relied on the least for any argumentation.

Such is a specimen of the linguistics on which the science of the gloss is based. The science itself is worse. That "the evening and the morning were the first day" would be just waste text if the first day were whole long ages of a luminous squeeze. "And he called the light day," would be just nonsense, if in the very next sentence success in whirling off vapor were all that that term answered to. "The day" is versatile in sense and that in a sin-

gle chapter, but not in so intolerable a vagueness as that so common a noun should slowly subside from ten million of years to the ordinary term of the earth's rotation. Such things are pardoned in science, but, alas, if we talked that way in defending religion!

Now the old scheme took all the words literally. "The earth" was the earth, and "the heaven" was what seemed to men, at the time this narrative was written. "The waters" were what they have been always called, and "the deep" the same, and Moses might have been upon better rhetoric than to talk of "*the face*" of either, if "the Spirit" or eminently "the wind" of God, or still more "the darkness" were pervading the bosom of a nebula.

In after verses the agreement would be still better. Days of miraculous will would flash the flora and the fauna upon the planet. Why not? And there are unobserved notitiæ: "Every plant before it was in the earth, and every herb before it grew" (ii. 5). How poorly that agrees with long processes! It deals in sudden springing into being, for listen to it: "God had not caused it to rain upon the earth," that is, there had been no previous seasons. And though there were full specimens created, they were not the results of cultivation, for "there was no man." Afterward (v. 6) "there went up the vapor" and watering began, but before it had been universal miracle. There is not one reason to deny that if God made the first universal mist, as even Spencer might imagine, he might make and remake; if he pleased, add to or take away; indeed, it would be odd if he did not take liberties with his works, and after the revolution of millions of years come upon this old hulk, if he pleased, and choose it for the drama of a six days' rehabilitation.

The writer admits that Christians are at fault when they insist too angrily upon a perfect revelation. The writer needs no Pope or Bible to anchor him in the last resort to the system of the gospel. He holds with the infidels to the supereminence of our moral proofs. And yet, while he blames his brethren for giving up these moral evidences to the foe, he believes in both Church and Bible. The Church, broadly considered, is infallible (which

means nothing more to him than that there are men always that will be saved, and may be relied on, hence, to teach a vital Christianity). So, on the other hand, the Bible is perfect, as is attested most of all by its moral teaching, and this is his exact position when he asserts that we sell the book when we go back in our Silliman complaints, and give Princeton a praise for writing the tract which most completely reasons things away.

JOHN MILLER.

ARTICLE V.

OUR FOREIGN MISSIONARY POLICY.

There is manifestly a difference of opinion among earnest men as to our Church's policy for conducting foreign missions. There is also an extensive dissatisfaction with the provisions made in our Constitution for ordering and pushing this urgent work. The reasons for this dissatisfaction have frequently been presented to the Church, are familiar to ministers, and pertain more to what is not said, than to what is said, in our Book. Propositions are pending, and movement is now on foot, for making additional provision to meet questions that have recently sprung into positions of importance.

This, therefore, seems to be the time, if ever, for the writer to lay before the Church some opinions towards which his mind has been inclining for several years, and which have now become convictions. The object of this article is not polemic, but didactic; a sincere effort shall be made to regulate its style by its object.

We purpose calling attention to certain fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, and then severely following them out to practical results. This course should give us the best methods of conducting foreign missionary work. For the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, if scriptural, must lead to the best methods of "preaching the gospel to every creature." Careful

study of these principles will doubtless suggest to the reader, as it has done to the writer, important changes in both our Constitution and our plan of work, changes more important than any yet proposed, but not dangerous to the health and vigor of the Church. It is claimed by some, and conceded by others, that some amendment should be made to our Constitution. The only question between them and the writer is, What amendment or amendments shall be made?

Before proceeding to speak of changes particularly, we would submit two or three remarks upon the general subject of amendments. 1. No amendment should be made which is inconsistent with fundamental principles of Presbyterianism as expressed in our Constitution. 2. Any amendment may be made which is consistent with these fundamental principles, provided they add something to the strength and certainty with which the Church prosecutes her missionary work. 3. Any custom that has worked reasonably well in a past condition is to be venerated and not lightly changed; but if under new conditions a change is proposed which offers reasonable certainty of results better and larger than the old, the adoption of the new method is not irreverence towards the old.

It is unnecessary for this article to discuss what all concede, the Church's call into the foreign field. It may, however, remind the reader that the providential call which is borne from across the seas and the continents, is bursting upon us with an urgency akin to that from Macedonia, which fell upon the ears of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Hence the importance of equipping the Church most thoroughly for responding most vigorously to the loud demand.

What are some of the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism that should guide us in efforts to determine the most vigorous policy that can be adopted for our foreign missionary work? We answer:

1. The unity of the Church, as a body whose head is Christ. See Confession of Faith, Chapters 25, 26, 30, 31.

2. "The Church is governed by various courts in regular gradation which are all nevertheless Presbyteries, as being composed