

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

Published Quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church
Entered as second class matter, May 1, 1907, at the post office at Princeton, N. J.,
under the Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Vol. IX

PRINCETON, N. J., NOVEMBER, 1915

No. 3

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT STEVENSON AND PROFESSOR SMITH.

In the presence of a gathering which completely filled the historic First Presbyterian Church of Princeton, on Wednesday morning, October 13, the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., LL.D., was inaugurated as President of the Seminary and Professor of the History of Religion and Christian Missions, and the Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., as Professor of Homiletics. In addition to the Directors, the Trustees, the Faculty, the student body and a large gathering of the alumni and other friends of the Seminary, nearly eighty institutions of higher learning were represented at the ceremony by official delegates. The Rev. Maitland Alexander, D.D., LL.D., President of the Board of Directors, presided. The Scripture lesson was read by the Rev. John F. Patterson, D.D., and prayer offered by the Rev. George Alexander, D.D. After the Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., the professor-elect, had subscribed to the required formula, the charge was delivered by the Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D., This was followed by the inaugural address. Professor Smith selected as his topic "The Place of Homiletics in the Training of the Minister." The Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., then subscribed to the formula and a charge was delivered to him by the Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., President Emeritus of the Seminary. President Stevenson then delivered the inaugural address on the subject "Theological Education in the Light of Present-Day Demands." After the singing of a hymn, the benediction was pronounced by the Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D.

At one o'clock luncheon was served to the guests of the Seminary at the Casino, and at the close of the luncheon a number of addresses were delivered. The Rev. Russell Cecil, D.D., President of the Alumni Association of the Seminary presided. The speakers at the luncheon were as follows:

President John Grier Hibben, Ph.D., LL.D., of Princeton University.

Dean Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., LL.D., of Hartford Theological Seminary.

President James G. K. McClure, D.D., LL.D., of McCormick Theological Seminary.

The Reverend Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., of Cairo, Egypt.

President Walter W. Moore, D.D., LL.D., of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond.

Ex-President Francis L. Patton, D.D., LL.D., of Princeton University and of Princeton Theological Seminary.

The charge to Professor Smith, and the charge to President Stevenson and the speeches delivered at the luncheon are printed below, and also portions of the inaugural addresses. The complete inaugurals will appear in the January number of *The Princeton Theological Review*.

The list of official delegates was as follows:

Harvard University and Harvard Divinity School
The Reverend George Foot Moore D.D. LL.D. Professor of the
History of Religion

stations of the Presbyterian Church, two thirds of them were founded by Princeton Seminary men. It was a son of Princeton who rallied the forces which brought into being the reorganized missionary life of our Church (Dr. E. P. Swift). He laid down the principle that Church courts are not merely for routine business and for litigation, but for the corporate prosecution of Christ's commission to disciple the nations. It was because of the stirring appeal of another Princeton son (Dr. Jas. W. Alexander), that the General Assembly declared in 1847, "The Presbyterian Church is a missionary society, the object of which is to aid in the conversion of the world, and every member of the Church is a member for life of said society and bound to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object." This spirit of missions has been quickened by the blood of our martyrs to the glorious company of which there has recently been added another name, a graduate student, massacred in Armenia. I mention this only to say that the missionary spirit of the Church and the demands growing out of it, Princeton has to a large extent encouraged and stimulated, and loyalty to our own sons and heirs compels us, the stewards of a large legacy of missionary interest, achievement and expectation, not only to conserve our apostolic estate, but to enlarge and enrich it, and to do this by making ample provision for the thorough and complete training, according to the highest standards of those who are to engage in missionary service.

The guiding hand of God, which has so significantly blessed and used this school of Theology in the years that are gone, would seem to have been conducting her into a realm of power and influence for such a time as this. Here is a unique position of confidence because of a century's faithful service, sending out more than six thousand men to minister in Christ's name—a position of confidence because of a representative directorate and trusteeship, which knows and possesses the mind and spirit of the Church; because of a tried and trusted Faculty,—a united body, not easy to secure in these days of acute theological differences, and yet essential to a harmonious and prosperous stewardship; because of a multitude of Alumni, scattered all over the world, and upon whose cooperation we may depend. These should be gathered into associations at strategic centers in order that the Seminary may be of

service to her sons, and in order that they in turn may help keep their Alma Mater young and vigorous, in touch with living issues. It is commonly supposed that our income is adequate for the financial burdens which the Church would place upon us. But although we may have enough for immediate sustenance, we shall require a great deal more for the proper care of the increased number of students required for the waiting harvest fields of the earth, and for the enlargement of departments which the more highly specialized work of the Church has made a necessity. "I want to live" was the burden of Phillips Brooks' thought shortly before he died, giving as his reason that the next twenty years would offer greater opportunities for the Christian minister than any other like period of history. For any time, but more particularly for the time just before us there can be no higher, nobler, calling than that of leading the forces which are to establish a kingdom of truth and goodwill,—the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ,—which is to rule over all and endure forever. To train these leaders is a task whose grandeur and range engaged the three years' service of the greatest of all Teachers, and today challenges the largest investment of consecrated life for its adequate prosecution. And who is sufficient for these things? Who can lead the leaders of the coming day, so that through them the knowledge of God shall cover the earth and the Kingdom of His truth and love be established. Thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ and maketh manifest through us the savor of His knowledge in every place, and to Him is the Kingdom and the power, shall we give glory forever and ever.—Amen.

THE PLACE OF HOMILETICS IN THE TRAINING OF THE MINISTER

INAUGURAL ADDRESS*

PROF. J. RITCHIE SMITH, D.D.

It is with mingled emotions that I assume in this public and formal manner the duties of the office to which I have been called. I am sensible of the honor, I am grateful for the privilege of service, I am mindful of the responsibility. And as I consider the importance of the work, and call to mind the learned

*The complete address will appear in the January number of the *Princeton Theological Review*.

and godly men who have filled and adorned this chair, men whose memory is among the choicest treasures of an institution so rich in memories, I am conscious of my own unworthiness.

I am bound to Princeton by a chain of gracious and sacred associations that stretches back to the days of early youth. I think of my College and Seminary training received in this place; of frequent visits in later years; of the uniform kindness shown me by the authorities of the Seminary; of my classmates and friends, Benjamin B. Warfield and George T. Purves, called to the service of the Seminary, and discharging the duties of their office with conspicuous honor and fidelity; of my sons educated here; of my father, who gave this institution so large a place in his thought, his love, his ministry; of the work of the past year, made easy and delightful by the cordial good will of the governing boards, the faculty, the whole student body; and under the spell of these grateful and inspiring recollections I feel that Princeton to me is home.

The occasion suggests, even prescribes, our theme. The Place of Homiletics in the Training of the Minister. Four years ago my predecessor, Dr. Loetscher, treated a similar theme in his inaugural address—Homiletics as a Theological Discipline; and the field was so ably and thoroughly surveyed that it would be superfluous as well as presumptuous to attempt to trace again the line of thought which was then pursued. I shall essay the simpler and easier task of discussing some of the more obvious and practical aspects of the subject, and indicating the methods of study and training that may be employed.

We shall consider first the nature of Homiletics, then its relation to other branches of theological discipline; and close with a brief study of methods.

I. The nature of Homiletics. It is both a science and an art. Science is primarily concerned with the acquisition of knowledge, art with the use of knowledge. Science is the root of art, art is the fruit of science. No art accomplishes worthy results that is not based upon scientific principles; no science is turned to practical account except through the medium of art. Art is science at work. There are departments of theological study which are purely scientific. Though the end which they are to serve be not forgotten,

they do not provide or even directly contemplate the means by which the end may be attained. They do not undertake to show how the knowledge which they furnish is to be put to service. That is the task of Homiletics.

The actual content of Homiletics as a science, the contribution which it makes to the common stock of knowledge, is meagre. Regarded as a branch of rhetoric, it simply recognizes the laws and principles which regulate all forms of oratory and composition, and applies them to the sermon. Clearness, force and beauty are everywhere to be sought, and always by the use of the same means. There is indeed a marked distinction between the sermon and other forms of public address in two respects: (a) the preacher has a fixed and definite message, which he is not at liberty to alter. He is bound by the terms of his commission. (2) he must seek a definite spiritual end. Both means and end are prescribed. But these differences evidently concern rather the ethical quality than the literary form of the sermon. It is plain that if Homiletics is distinguished from rhetoric, little remains that may be called scientific. Since it draws its material from other sources, indeed, and its form from rhetoric, we might speak of it as a science of method. And here of course we touch, if we do not cross, the borderline between science and art.

Homiletics is related far more intimately and directly to the application than to the acquisition of knowledge. That is to say, it is predominantly an art rather than a science. It teaches men how to use the knowledge that they gather from every quarter. The main elements that enter into preaching are the message, the man, the method. What is the relation of Homiletics to each of them?

(1) It is not the province of Homiletics to convey or impart the message. That is the function of exegesis, of Biblical and Systematic Theology. Homiletics presumes the message. (2) It is the law of the kingdom that God speaks through man. The Word became flesh. The message is given to the man, the man must be prepared to deliver the message. With this preparation the several departments of Practical Theology are immediately concerned, and the professors should sustain a pastoral relation to the students. Homiletics deals not merely with the formal rules of rhetoric, but with methods of study, with modes of life,

with habits and purposes and motives, as these are all involved in the training of the minister for his high calling in Christ Jesus. (3) Beyond the general discipline of mind and heart for the work of the ministry, there is need of special training for the duty of preaching the Word. How may the truth be most clearly and effectively presented? That is the question of method which Homiletics attempts to answer.

II. The Relation of Homiletics to other branches of theological discipline.

It may be said in general, as has been already suggested, that it is the function of Homiletics to show how the truth acquired in other departments of study may be put to service; translated from terms of thought to terms of life; converted into character and conduct. This opens the question of the relation of action to knowledge. There is no room for detailed discussion of so large a theme; we can only indicate the direction in which the discussion might proceed. (a) action is the test of knowledge, defines its boundaries, determines its value. Ideas vague and undefined appear magnificent, as objects loom up large and imposing in the mist. A little water makes a great cloud of steam. A little knowledge swells to vast conceit. The wisest of men in his own esteem is he who has just crossed the threshold of learning. He says in the words of the Psalmist, though for a different reason, I have more understanding than all my teachers. Condense the vapor, apply the knowledge, and its real bulk and utility are seen.

(b) Through action knowledge is mastered, becomes really ours, is made obedient to our will. Knowledge is a tool that we learn to use by using it. Knowledge used is power. We get possession of it by putting it to work. Then it becomes our servant. We learn the general principle by applying it to particular instances. He that will do shall know is the law. It is not knowledge stored up idly in the brain, but knowledge linked to the will, knowledge at the tip of the tongue, at the ends of the fingers, that is really ours. We learn by doing. So Emerson reminds us: "Skill to do comes of doing; knowledge comes by eyes always open, and working hands; and there is no knowledge that is not power."

(c) Through action knowledge is transmuted into character. Knowledge of itself has no ethical quality. But as soon as we begin to use

it, we enter the sphere of relations, motives, purposes, that is, the sphere of morals. One of our Lord's most weighty and pregnant sayings has its application here. "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man." It is not the knowledge that we gain, but the use to which we put it, that honors or defiles.

(d) Through action knowledge is made the minister of God in the service of men. Knowledge alone is barren. Knowledge is fruitful when it is allied to action. It is the uniform and emphatic teaching of Scripture that all gifts and attainments must be measured and valued by their utility, the service which they render to the Kingdom of God. Knowledge for its own sake has no place in the Christian life. Nothing exists for itself. Everything has its relations, its responsibilities. In the Old Testament wisdom is concrete and practical, beginning in the fear of God, and issuing in a godly life. It is knowledge turned to character and conduct, and enlisted in the service of God and man. When our Lord gave his disciples an example of humility and service in the washing of their feet, he said to them: "If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them." Blessedness is nowhere attached to knowledge alone. "To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Paul gives the first place among the Christian graces to love, because love is the grace that serves, and therefore wears the likeness of the Master, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and humbled himself even unto the death of the cross for the redemption of men. Usefulness is the standard by which every gift and grace of Christian character is tested. "Knowledge puffeth up, love buildeth up." Mere knowledge acts upon a man like a pair of bellows, inflating him with self conceit and vanity; makes of him a bag of wind, swollen, empty, useless. Love builds up in himself and in others the temple of a godly character and life.

In harmony with this teaching of the Scripture our Form of Government affirms as one of the first principles of our faith that "truth is in order to goodness." The religion of the Bible is singular among the great religions of the world in making the preaching and teaching of the truth the central feature of its worship, and the main function of its ministry. Religion

is essentially a matter not of form but of faith, not of ritual but of righteousness, not of sacrifice but of service. Under the old covenant priests and prophets were teachers, and in the later years of Jewish history the synagogue was established for the religious instruction of the people. Under the new covenant the preaching of the Word is the duty enjoined by the risen Lord upon his disciples. The more closely the church approaches the New Testament norm, the more highly is the pulpit exalted. The minister is a preacher, not a priest.

If this be true, it determines the answer to a question with which we are profoundly concerned—What is the primary purpose of Seminary training? It is not scholarship, but efficiency in the work of the ministry, the service of the Kingdom of God. To that efficiency scholarship contributes an important element; but it may never be made an end in itself. If truth is in order to goodness, scholarship is in order to service. There are men whose lives are devoted to scholarly pursuits, bounded by the four walls of the study. The church has need of them, and their work is of inestimable value. But they too have before them a higher aim than the mere amassing of knowledge for their own enrichment. They are set for the defense and confirmation of the gospel. They provide munitions of war for those who are engaged upon the field of battle. Their books are arsenals. Though scholarship may be the immediate purpose of their labor, the ultimate purpose is service. For such men abundant provision is made, and every facility is afforded them to pursue their studies.

But great scholars are few. For exceptional men special opportunities are properly furnished. But it is the main function of the Theological Seminary to train the average man for the average pulpit. The great work of the church and of the Kingdom is not done in cloistered retreats, where great scholars, in Milton's phrase, "behold the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies"; or in splendid cathedrals, where eloquent orators hold the rapt attention of listening thousands; but in a multitude of humble manses, often scantily furnished with books, and in modest sanctuaries, where men unknown to fame, of ordinary gifts and attainments, break the bread of life to meagre congregations.

In accordance with this principle, this test of utility to which all things must submit and by

which all things are measured, Homiletics undertakes to show how the knowledge gathered from every source, within and without the range of seminary training, may be turned to practical account, may be enlisted in the service of the Kingdom of God.

The knowledge acquired elsewhere is sifted, tested, measured here. The studies of the entire curriculum are passed in review. Though exegesis and theology and church history and apologetics are not directly taught, yet the material which they provide, so far as it appears in the sermon, must be examined with critical care. And as everything that the student has learned may find a place in the pulpit, the professor of Homiletics must be prepared to pass judgment upon it all. The man who holds this chair should not only be a master of the art of preaching, but his studies should cover the whole range of theological science. He cannot of course become an expert in every department, but he should be sufficiently acquainted with all branches of sacred learning to know, in the case of every sermon that is presented, whether the argument is logically developed, whether the illustrations are apt, whether the statements are true, whether the doctrine is Scriptural. He must be prepared to examine, to question, to challenge, to defend at a moment's notice, any position that may be taken by any member of the class on any subject; from the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word, or the construction of a sentence, to the most profound problem in philosophy or theology. He must be able to distinguish truth from error at a glance. Of the questions that are raised in other classrooms how many are there that may not be sprung upon him? And as there is no department of knowledge, in history science, art, literature, from which the pulpit does not draw its material, the man who is fully equipped for this position should take all knowledge as his province. All that other men teach he is called to examine, to criticise, to approve or condemn. He is the inspector general of the Seminary course. Surely upon no man does the question press more heavily, Who is sufficient for these things? And no man has greater need of the strength and comfort of the assurance that our sufficiency is from God.

It follows again that as it is the province of Homiletics to show how the knowledge gained in all other departments may be put to service,

it unites them in the bond of a common purpose. So numerous and varied are the branches of theological education that there is need of some unifying and coordinating principle that shall reduce them to a single system. The several studies which have a place in the curriculum may seem to be without connection or relation; and each classroom may appear to be conducting a separate and independent work. It is hard for the student to recognize the unity of the Seminary course as he is hurried from one study to another. He is apt to feel that subjects in which he is not particularly interested may safely be neglected while he gives himself to those which are more congenial. It is the office of Homiletics to keep constantly before the mind of the student the common end which all his studies are designed to serve; to point out the place and value of every study in its relation to the lifework of the minister; to show how they may all be used, and used together, in the preaching of the Word. It turns the several streams of theological learning into a common channel. It indicates that the practical aim of every department is precisely the same, and shows how the knowledge acquired in every classroom may be turned to account in the pulpit. The unity of the course is seen when it appears how all departments are knit together in the bond of a common purpose, a purpose to which each contributes an important part. This surely is not the least of the services which Homiletics renders to the training of the minister.

Thus intimately related are the theoretical and practical branches of Seminary instruction. The practical alone would lack substance, material, content; for they deal chiefly with the results obtained in other departments. They depend upon exegesis and theology and all those studies which are scientific in their nature, and are concerned primarily with the investigation of truth. The theoretical alone would lack adequate aim and motive, would remain detached from life, without product or result. Here as everywhere practice alone is blind, theory alone is barren. Theory is the mind that guides, practice is the hand that shapes. The intelligent mind and the skillful hand must work together, and if either fails the task remains undone.

III. Finally we turn to consider the methods that may be employed in the study and practice of Homiletics. They are the familiar

methods which have been tested and approved by long experience. The principles of Homiletics as a science are taught by textbook and lecture, and are immediately reduced to practice. For Homiletics as we have seen is far more an art than a science, and art is essentially the application of the principles of science. Art is not necessarily artificial. It seeks not to fetter nature, but to set it free; not to supplant but to develop. If it is rightly directed, it puts a man in possession of himself, teaches him how to use his powers to the best advantage, with the greatest freedom and effect.

Each class is drilled once a week in the preparation and delivery of sermons. These are criticised by the students as well as by the professor, and the instructor in elocution is invited to pass judgment upon the delivery. There are several points to which criticism is specially directed.

(a) The exposition of the text. Sound exegesis lies at the root of good preaching. The text must be studied minutely, word by word, that its precise meaning may be discovered; then in its historical or doctrinal setting; then in its relation to the whole scheme of Scripture truth. Every fact is part of a great history, every doctrine is part of a great system. No text is thoroughly understood until it has been studied in this three-fold aspect—in itself, in its context, in the place that it holds in the course of revelation. And it must be remembered that every text has an individuality of its own, has its distinctive place and message. To respect that individuality, to suffer the text to speak its own peculiar word, is to secure freshness and variety in preaching, and to adhere to the teaching of the Scripture. There is no pervasion that may not find support in isolated verses of Scripture, detached from the general trend of Bible teaching.

(b) The analysis of the theme. The text furnishes the theme; the theme must be developed. This is often the most laborious part of the preacher's task, to marshal his thoughts in logical order, with cumulative power, so as to drive home a single impression. The clearness, the force, the effect of the sermon depend upon it in immense degree. Are the thoughts of the preacher an orderly array, going on from strength to strength, or a disconnected jumble without unity, system, or proportion? That is a question of vital im-

portance not merely to the artistic or literary quality of the sermon, but to its power of instruction and appeal. All men are sensible of the force of logic, even though they are ignorant of its rules and forms. It is the purpose of analysis to draw out, develop, illustrate the message of the text in the most illuminating, impressive, and convincing way.

(c) The application. It is the task of the preacher to translate the general into the particular, to apply eternal and unchangeable truth to the special needs of his own generation. The word spoken many centuries ago, what message has it for the men of today? In face of the changes that have passed upon the world, political, social, industrial, moral, religious, is the old law still valid? And if it is, how is it related to our modern life? How shall it be interpreted, and how applied to these new conditions that have arisen? For every age in turn the truth has its special accent and emphasis. How enormously extended, for example, is the scope of the Eighth Commandment, when we consider the vast and complicated fabric of modern trade and commerce. New problems emerge. The principle remains the same, but there is created an endless variety of applications unknown before. The chain lengthens, but it holds.

It is evident how wide is the range of topics that may be treated in the pulpit. "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man." Nothing that concerns God or man is foreign to the preacher. He must seize upon those aspects of the truth which the times especially require, and drive them home with all the power he can command.

Attention is called of course to the cultivation of style, which should be vivid, striking, picturesque. Everybody loves pictures. God paints them everywhere, on earth and sea and sky. Jesus taught by parables, and a parable is a picture. The preacher should not be morbidly afraid of sensationalism. There is a true and a false sensationalism. They are distinguished by their motives—one seeks the glory of God, and the other the glory of the preacher; by the means employed—one uses the truth, the other uses anything that may serve its purpose; by their results—one awakens, arouses, convicts, converts; the other arouses a momentary flame of interest that soon dies out in darkness. "By their fruits ye shall know them." The

preacher ought to make a sensation, ought to aim at making a sensation; for it is his mission to turn men from sin to God, to reconstruct society, to turn the world upside down. The prophets were decried and denounced as sensationalists, so was John the Baptist, so was Jesus, so were the apostles. The imminent danger and besetting sin of the pulpit is not sensationalism, but dulness, sheer deadly dulness.

The great end of preaching is held up constantly before the students, which is that men be born again through the Word, and sanctified through the Word. The conversion of sinners and the sanctification of believers, unto the glory of God, that is the purpose of our ministry. And underlying, sustaining, controlling, inspiring all our ministry must be the power and passion of the Cross. "*Whom we preach*"—not a doctrine, a truth, a system, but a Person. It is not the Cross but the Crucified that saves. It is not the word printed or preached, but the Divine Word, incarnate for the sake of men, that is the power of God unto salvation. It is the duty and the joy of the minister to bring men into personal loving fellowship with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Lifted up upon the Cross of Calvary, lifted up upon the throne of glory, lifted up in the preaching of his disciples, by whom he is openly set forth crucified, he is drawing all men unto himself. To him be all the praise.

CHARGE TO DR. STEVENSON DELIVERED BY DR. PATTON

My dear Dr. Stevenson: The fact that I preceded you in the office into which you are now being inducted may make it appropriate that the duty of delivering the customary charge to you on this occasion should devolve upon me. But for this fact, it would have seemed more natural for this service to fall to the lot of one of my colleagues in the Board of Directors who is still engaged in the active work of the ministry and who therefore might reasonably be expected to speak more sympathetically and out of a more intimate knowledge respecting the relation of the Seminary to the Church than I can be expected to do. But whatever my shortcomings may be, I claim to be behind none of my colleagues in the warmth with which, in the