

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 8. — APRIL, 1889.

I. WOMAN IN THE CHURCH.

As straws show the direction of the wind, so recent events in church and state indicate the movement of a popular current, more or less clearly defined, towards the removal of what are called woman's disabilities, and her enfranchisement in what are claimed to be her civil and ecclesiastical rights. There is not room in an article like this for a discussion of the genesis of this movement, or for a review, however cursory, of the debates and deliverances of various public assemblies, social, political and ecclesiastical, in which the strength of the movement has recently made itself felt. There is, we think, no just ground for fear that its current will gain momentum enough to sweep away the conservative barriers within which woman's agency is rightly confined. We have no sympathy with the fears expressed by a distinguished speaker in one of the recent Northfield conferences, when he says, "We behold woman to-day in a condition in which she is absolutely a menace to human society; grown restless and discontented; clamoring for rights when Christianity has brought her all that she has; at times divorced from the church, listening to the siren's song of infidelity, threatening to depart from the church that would withhold from her any privileges or rights she would claim; in the very capital of our nation threatening to join hand with anarchists to secure under another government what she may not secure here." It would be a gross injustice to the noble women of our land to hold them responsible for the incendiary utterances of a few restless spirits amongst them, or to suppose that they endorse the revolutionary sentiments of the speaker to whom Bishop

V. PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

There is an impression somewhat prevalent in these parts that the Presbyterian vehicle is "going slow." There are two possible methods of accelerating its speed: one is to get another horse, the other is to grease the wheels. The first method is, we fear, impracticable; we cannot very well dispense with all our present ministry and get a new set. The plan has been tried in individual cases, but on a large scale we fear it would not work. The other alternative remains: we must lubricate the running gear.

An examination of the catalogues of Union and Columbia Theological Seminaries will disclose this somewhat remarkable fact: There are, in the former institution, five professorships—one of Didactic and Polemic Theology, one of Church History and Polity, and three whose instructions cover the broad field of Exegesis. Columbia Seminary now possesses three professors (the fourth professor having recently met with an accident¹), teaching the same three branches of theological lore. The surprising thing hereby disclosed is, that one feature of theological instruction, second in importance to none of the above, is conspicuous by its absence from the apparatus of these schools of the prophets. We allude to that important topic the name of which stands at the head of this article. [The catalogues and advertisements of both seminaries do say something to the effect that provision will be made for instruction in the department of Pastoral Theology until the chair can be filled. That is, the duties of the missing pastoral theology man are to be saddled on the other professors, and they are expected to work the miracle of rightly attending to their own business and somebody else's too.]

In Union Seminary it does not seem to have yet dawned upon the theological mind that a separate professorship of Pastoral Theology is needed. And in Columbia Seminary Pastoral The-

¹ Written before Dr. Beattie's election as Perkins Professor, which does not alter the point of our criticism, but rather adds keenness to it.

ology is made to play second fiddle, and this manifestly since upon the reorganization of the Seminary the other chairs are filled and Pastoral Theology is deferred to a more convenient season.

And yet it certainly would appear to an ordinary mind quite as important to be taught how to go from house to house in pastoral visitation, to conduct a protracted meeting, to handle judiciously and tenderly the mourner, the inquirer, or the skeptic, as it is to learn how to dig up a Hebrew root, to narrate the personal history of Arius, or to dissect and refute in detail the Arminian dogma of common sufficient grace. These last our students are superabundantly taught to do; of the former, as the catalogues of the seminaries will show, they can learn little or nothing. For our part we are almost tempted to say that we would rather dispense with instruction in the original languages of Scripture, and far rather give up all knowledge of church history, than send out young preachers and pastors who know everything but how to preach and how to do pastoral work. We know whereof we affirm in this matter. We spent two years in one of these beloved institutions, and one year in the other, and were ordinarily diligent in the improvement of our opportunities; and when we left those walls knew as little practically of how to run a church as how to run a steam engine. We knew who was the morning star of the Reformation, and could distinguish carefully between mediate and immediate imputation, but when a young Methodist woman joined our church and asked for some readable tract upon the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, we were in a quandary. We feared to lend her our *Turretini Opera*.

But right here let us give our views more fully as to what that professor who does not teach pastoral theology at Union or Columbia Seminary should teach if he ever got a chance. It is barely possible that this article may not secure our election to that vacant professorship in Columbia Seminary, and we have a fear that a new chair will not at once be created in Union Seminary for our special occupancy; so that this may be our only opportunity to give the church the benefit of our views on this neglected subject. The professor who, some time between this and the millennium, will have the privilege of instructing our rising ministry in Pastoral

Theology, ought to do a work for them very different from what the other professors in the seminaries are doing, or should do. The business of those other professors is to teach them *what* to preach, his business to teach them *how* to preach. The professors of theology, exegesis, and ecclesiastical history, *instruct* the seminary student; the professor of Pastoral Theology *trains* him. While every other professor in the institution crams and stuffs him, the professor of Pastoral Theology should exercise him; the others put tools into his hands, he teaches him their use. They teach the physician of souls how to mix his drugs; he teaches him how to prescribe for his patient.

With just enough of theory to give consistency to the future minister's work, the preponderating aim of instruction in this department should be intensely practical. Teach your young preacher to work; make a fisher of men, a soul-winner, a sheep-feeder out of him; these practical objects should be our professor's great aim. He can rely on the brethren occupying the other chairs to make of him a theologian and an exegete.

But, to be more specific, "What sort of a course of instruction would your professor follow?"

We would say in answer, that, of course, he should give thorough instruction in homiletics. The making of a sermon, its delivery, the very important question of extemporaneous or manuscript preaching, the best drill in vocal culture, these and kindred topics should be carefully treated, with exercises appropriate to each. Doubtless "Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric," long time a text-book in Union Seminary, would furnish an excellent basis of instruction upon some of these topics. But special attention should be paid to numerous suggestions upon homiletics dropped by prophets, apostles, and evangelists, in a volume not specifically devoted to that subject, and yet exceedingly rich in suggestions upon it. *Suggestions*, did we say?—we mean positive *directions*; for we consider a preacher as much bound to get the *manner* of his preaching out of Scripture as he is its *matter*. Why did he who has called him to be a pastor and teacher, specifically direct that the preaching should be, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but in the words that the Holy Ghost teacheth," if this

and like explicit directions were not to be followed? Our professor, then, should lay especial stress upon the homiletic maxims and models which he finds in the inspired word. If it was said of him whom the common people heard gladly, that "without a parable spake he not unto them," our professor might very properly say to the future ministers of the Word before him, "My young brethren, your sermons can never be good sermons, if sermons at all, unless they contain abundant homely, pointed illustrations." If Peter's sermon upon the day of Pentecost, reported for us by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and embracing twenty-four verses of the second chapter of Acts, is found to contain twelve verses of direct quotation, and five of exposition of these quotations, our professor might well exhort his pupils to this effect: "The less original matter, and the more scriptural material, plainly expounded and pointedly applied to the people, your sermons contain, the more likely is it that your hearers will be 'pricked to the heart and cry out, men and brethren what must we do?' under your preaching." We should not be surprised if our professor might derive from the same source some light upon that vexed question of manuscript *versus* extemporaneous preaching to which allusion has already been made. It has always seemed to us a little inconsistent that the Presbyterian Church, which sets its face as a flint against the reading of prayers, should tolerate a read sermon.

The basis of objection, as we understand it, to the liturgical form is, that it conflicts with "likewise the Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought." Can the man be said to know not what to pray for as he ought, and so need the Spirit's aid, who has it all printed before him? And in the same manner how can that man preach entirely in "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth," when he too has the very words cut and dried on paper before him? It seems to us that the ideal of pulpit manner (not "manners") consonant with both the example and precept of Scripture, is that of him who, having studied his text on his knees, and grouped together in outline Scripture truth and every-day illustration and application around it, goes into his pulpit looking to the Holy Ghost to

“teach him in that same hour what he shall speak.” That very uncertainty as to the verbal success or failure of his effort which makes him cast himself utterly on God; the power to mould the sermon at will to the suggestions of the ever-present Spirit; making unpremeditated application to the case of this or that hearer; seizing on the illustrations of the time and place; shortening this point or enlarging on that one, as the Spirit gives him utterance—all this confers on the extemporaneous sermon a sense at once of freedom and dependence, a flexibility and spiritual power, which the written sermon (unless extemporaneously delivered) cannot by any possibility possess. And this our professor should exhort and teach with all authority. If the beloved reader will pardon a little digression here, we will say that we mean no reflection on such of our older ministry who have habituated themselves to the use of the manuscript. We simply desire that our professor of pastoral theology should enjoin upon the ministry of the future “a more excellent way.” We are heartily in sympathy with that suggestion of the new Directory which expresses decided preference for the extemporaneous over the reading method. By the way, while the new Directory was undergoing that presbyterial scrutiny two years ago which consigned it to the *limbus infantum* (or *limbus patrum*, which is it?) we were not a little amused at hearing a brother beloved, who is joined to his manuscript, make a speech against that feature of the new Directory recommending extemporaneous preaching. The strong point of his argument was that he and other older brethren could not now learn to speak extemporaneously, and this he urged in a most vigorous *extemporaneous* speech!

But to return to our professor’s course of instruction. He would naturally direct the young brethren as to all the usual duties pertaining to the pastoral office, give such hints as he thought best with regard to the visitation of the sick and afflicted, the solemnization of marriage and the burial of the dead. But right along here he would step out of the beaten track and inculcate most earnestly upon them the duty of knowing the spiritual state of each member of their future flock. He would say something like

this: "My dear young brethren, a week before you go to Smyrna, or Thyatira, or any other church to which you may be orderly called, do you prepare a list of questions such as these: 'When and how were you converted?' 'Have you evidence of growth in grace since your conversion, and if so, what?' 'What is your plan of Scripture reading, and do you *study* your Bible as well as read it?' The afternoon of the day after you settle in Thyatira, do you start at the house nearest the parsonage, and, with this list in your hand, securing, if possible, a private interview with each member of the family who is a member of your church, examine them by these questions. Do it with tact, as delicately yet as faithfully as possible; and when you have run this list of questions through your whole congregation, you will find your work among them on a solid basis." In like manner our professor would go out of the beaten track in some other particulars. He would say: "Part of your work, my dear young brethren, is to give direction to that quickening spiritual energy which faithful preaching and house to house visitation is certain to arouse. When you have exhorted your members to work, you must be very sure to point out, and if need be to furnish work for them to do. Hence I will now suggest to you some ways of organizing your members which will greatly facilitate the process of putting them to work." And then the professor will make the young brethren take down in their note-books certain tried and proven plans,¹ such as giving individual members the watch-care of one another, getting each to pledge himself to pray and work for the conversion of some unbelieving friend, helping in the prayer-meeting, and taking personal part in increasing church attendance; and all those numberless ways which the accumulated experience of the most successful pastors has suggested, and by which, through the simple agency of giving them some plain work to do, lifeless church members have been transformed into active, useful ones.

The subject of protracted meetings and other special work for the unconverted would be given a due share in his instructions. Two things we are certain our professor would insist on. One,

¹ See *Methods of Church Work*. By Sylvanus Stall. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1888.

that not one of his students should ever close a sermon to the unconverted without some species of practical proposition, by which an immediate decision for Christ would be pressed upon them. "Draw the net," he would say, "whenever you have let it down, whether you invite them to come with you at once into the session room,¹ or to come forward and give the hand in token of immediate acceptance of Christ,² or appoint an inquiry meeting at which they may be present;³ always give them some practical proposition which brings them face to face with immediate decision." And second, he would lay much stress upon the advisability of special and protracted services, the wisdom of which the Scriptures ought to settle beyond question, even if abundant experience had not demonstrated their utility.

The apostles seem to have made the early history of the Jerusalem church one long protracted meeting, to say nothing of the Old Testament example of three protracted meetings a year—the Feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. (Ex. xxiii. 14–17.) And we would have our professor lay himself out right here. We are firmly of the opinion that while the stated Sabbath and week-day services, year in and year out, are, if properly conducted, sufficient to gather in the children of the church, and to secure that ordinary increase natural to every church which has any life in it; yet for anything like rapid ingathering from the world at large the protracted service is indispensable.

And we would have our professor so drill his students that they could be independent of a "vagrant revivalist" to hold these services for them. Let the coming ministry be instructed to accumulate a stock of discourses suitable for seasons of reaping, as well as for steady years of sowing. Let them be shown how a congregation may be so drilled that when such season comes each man will be able to beat his plow-share into a reap-hook. Let the student when he leaves the seminary have at his fingers' ends the most judicious, sound and sympathetic methods of answering the anguished cry, "what must I do to be saved?" In short, let every one of our rising ministry be able to do the work of an evangelist

¹ The late Dr. Hoyt's method.

² Dr. Guerrant's method.

• ³ D. L. Moody's method.

for and with his own people, being thoroughly instructed in the common sense and Scriptural methods which the best evangelistic work of former and present times has suggested and proven.

To our country congregations, with preaching only one or two Sundays a month, (which comprise the bulk of our churches, the ratio to city churches in the Synod of South Carolina, for example, being four to one,) the protracted meeting is a necessity to their onward progress, and woe be unto them if a pastor settled over them has not learnt somewhere and somehow to wield effectively the evangelistic arm of his ministry.

Nor is it simply needful that our professor should train the seminary student in the methods of evangelistic work, but it would be well for him to drop a few hints as to how that "disastrous reaction" supposed to follow even genuine revivals is to be avoided. With regard to that reaction we want to say a word. We have observed the same "disastrous reaction" in business affairs after the cotton season in southern cities. We have heard every year in warehouses and offices the cry of "Dull! Dull!" from February to September; and yet, strange to say, that disastrous reaction does not deter these same cotton-men from going into another cotton season as soon as the Fall rolls round. And we have thought that just as foolish is it for a church to lazily hang back from seasons of special effort, because in religious work, as in everything else human, there is an ebb as well as a flow of the tide. But when such a revival goes along with efforts of the pastor and his people, rather than is timed by the arrival and departure of an imported revivalist, we do not see why there should be any reaction, anything more than the settling back from *special* to *steady* work. We know from experience that there is not. The most interesting time in our church experience is after the revival, when we and our older members are "breaking in" a lot of new members to the steady routine. To us the joy of seeing the soul putting forth the activities of the new life is second only to the joy of witnessing its first entrance into the kingdom. And in our church it is a popular belief that the seraphs tune their harps anew when they behold the prodigal, now at home in his Father's house, begin to lift his voice in public prayer or leave the pater-

nal roof only to go out into the highways and hedges and compel other prodigals to come in. And so back to our professor again, he should say to his students: "Brethren, when God has given you a revival—and he will continually grant them, if in faith and prayer you put in operation these methods of revival work—see to it that you give a place in the ranks of the workers to every man, woman and child thus added to your numbers; and God will grant your church not only steady increase, but fresh, young life continually; and the raw recruit and the aged veteran will stand shoulder to shoulder in ranks which have all the steadiness of age, with the vigor and onward rush of youth."

One thing more about our professor, and then he retires into obscurity. How is he going to spend his vacations? Well, the poor fellow has a notion that the best exercise and recreation under the sun is preaching the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and so every summer, taking with him a band of students whom example as well as precept will not hurt, he and they are going into the mountains of West Virginia and North Carolina, or the sand hills of South Carolina and Georgia, and they are going to "stump" that entire region in a better cause than ever politician advocated. And it may be that while he and those students hold a good Presbyterian camp-meeting in some region where people do not hear the gospel often enough to get tired of it, he may take up a collection or two that will give those struggling "theologues" no small lift through the financial straits of another seminary year. It is true that our professor is going to be cut off prematurely and die of *angina pectoris*, like Daniel Baker, at the age of sixty-two, or Guthrie, at the age of seventy. But if permitted to do until that age one-half of the work suggested to him in these pages, his life in our southern Zion will not have been in vain. Here we part from him, however, and may a blessing attend his labors whenever that good day shall come that he, or some one after his likeness, shall take his place in one of our seats of theological learning.

We close, as we began, expressing our firm conviction that the one thing the Southern Presbyterian machine needs just now is *greasing*. We do not need a new team; it is our candid belief

that we have as able, sound and devoted a ministry (*quorum pars fui!*) as any church need possess. It is not a new body, wheels, axle or tongue that we want—our doctrine and polity are *jure divino*; and for this we would most earnestly contend. But we do sadly need grease on the running gear—the practical adaptation by our ministry of our faith and government to the masses of mankind. And we need this nowhere so much as on the fifth wheel, our theological seminaries, where, by the present constitution of our two leading institutions, the whole subject of practical adaptation, sometimes called Pastoral Theology, is left almost out of sight.

The stream does not usually rise higher than the fountain. And let a ministry receive their training at theological institutions where they are taught principally what to preach, but not how to preach it, how to study books, but not how to reach and mould mankind, and you will see in the church to which they minister the unique spectacle that our beloved church presents—a church first for orthodoxy, first for learned ministers and well-instructed congregations, and yet far behind in the grand race of bringing the world to Christ.

ROBT. A. LAPSLEY.