

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—FEBRUARY, 1888.—No. 2.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—BETTER TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR THE MINISTRY.

BY PROF. WILLIAM C. WILKINSON, D.D.

ANYTHING like a full discussion of the subject suggested in the title to this paper would include a consideration of four points, namely,

1. The Choosing of Teachers ;
2. The Choosing of Students ;
3. The Choosing of Subjects to be Taught ;
4. The Choosing of Methods for Teaching.

Of the four important points thus stated, I select for present treatment two only, the first and the last. In treating them I will try to be as direct and as practical as possible, saying what I have to say with frankness and with candor.

In the first place, then, as to the choosing of teachers for the work of theological instruction.

I do not think we exercise careful wisdom enough in seeking to get the best teachers obtainable for our theological students. One reason is that we do not sufficiently recognize the difference between teachers and teachers. Good teachers are never anywhere in abundant supply. The teaching gift is rare ; it is perhaps as rare as it is precious. I have myself, first and last, had a great many different teachers, but among them all there are not more than two or three whom I could conscientiously pronounce eminently good ones.

Consider. To be an eminently good teacher, you must first know ; second, know how you came to know ; third, know that others are not necessarily to take that same path, or any same path, in coming to know ; fourth, be quick in intelligence to see, in each several case, what path to knowing is the one natural and best for another to take ; fifth, alert ever to understand that other's conception, right or wrong ; sixth, sagacious to divine his difficulties ; seventh, fertile in providing alternative forms of expression for an idea to be conveyed ; eighth, indefatigably patient to insist on the learner's really getting what is conveyed ;

the congregation, or the book for the reader, that, also, positive religious instruction in the public school would secure for the child, viz., the intellectual *habitat*, so to speak, in which all spiritual life must grow. Instruction in religion, though not bringing in that great matter by any kind of necessary sequence, renders its coming a thousand times more hopeful than if it had to force its way up against the combined darkness of ignorance and sin. The Master knew this, and therefore bade his disciples go into all the world, and preach. The burden of their office was to make disciples of men, that is, *learners*—teaching them to observe—the rest, of course, the individual responsibility would have to bear.

Well, then, why not let it remain with the church, upon which it was originally imposed? Why, in any manner, share this feeding of the lambs with the public schools? Because, we answer, of the new and modern order of things, which has brought the church into altered relations with the people, pressing out the parochial school, and putting a large proportion of the children of any community beyond the reach of the church; and because the Sabbath-school cannot make up the loss. The Sabbath-school is a great and powerful instrumentality, but its limitations everyone feels. Religious instruction, like all instruction, must be line upon line, and should have the advantage of a daily and persistent routine. It has a double claim to this. It is more important than all other information, and it stands back of all other as its moral incitement and support.

Our venture may, indeed, lack the hearty and confident assent of many of our public men most deeply versed in the civil aspects of this great school question, but the leading educators of the land are beginning to feel that our public schools, wholly secularized, are vitally at fault at the point in which their fashioning agency is strongest; that in promoting knowledge they drown out reverence; that the aggregate results of their methods, whilst sufficiently satisfactory as against illiteracy, are deplorably lacking in that ethico-religious element which in all ages of the world has inspired true citizenship, and has been at the heart of all patriotic devotion to God and the native land. To remedy this state of things I have not hesitated to recommend a *tour de force* on the part of the Christian teacher, whereby he shall occupy the interdicted territory in the name of the King.

III.—A GREAT COURT PREACHER AND HIS SERMONS: A STUDY OF DR. ROBERT SOUTH.

BY PROF. J. O. MURRAY, D.D., DEAN OF PRINCETON COLLEGE.

WHEN a student in Andover Theological Seminary, Professor Phelps, then holding the chair of Homiletics, called my attention to Dr. South's sermons, strongly commending them as in some respects furnishing

excellent hints for a young preacher. It was sound advice, as his advice on all subjects was wont to be. I have never opened the volumes since, but to be more deeply impressed with the singular abilities of the noted English divine. His eccentricities, his bigotry, the absence from his discourses of everything like evangelical fervor, have obscured his merits as a preacher, have repelled too many from close acquaintance with his sermons. All models must be taken with exceptions. Servile imitation is pernicious folly. It is easy, however, to make all needed exceptions to South's sermons as complete models, and as for imitating him, the study of the man himself would be very apt to cure any such desire.

It will, perhaps, give point to some of the comments if we glance at the career of this unique and powerful specimen of the English pulpit. He was born in 1633—lived through the two great revolutions in England, dying in 1716. He was the direct product of the seventeenth century, was the contemporary of great poets like Milton and Dryden, of great Non-Conformists like Baxter and Owen, of great Churchmen and prelates like Laud, Jeremy Taylor and Sherlock. He was a student at Christ Church, Oxford, at the same time with John Locke, and in 1657 took his degree of A.M., "not without some opposition" from Dr. John Owen, then Dean of the college. His rise as a preacher was rapid: appointed University Orator in 1660, Prebendary of Westminster in 1663, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1670. After an absence on the Continent as Chaplain to the Polish Embassy, on his return to England he was made rector of Islip, and when he died was honored with a tomb in Westminster Abbey. It is to his credit that he was superior to ecclesiastical ambitions, and would accept no high preferment from either Charles II or James I—though it is said some of the highest dignities of the church were urged upon him. He was a marked instance of the *nolo episcopari*, conspicuous by its absence from the lives of English Churchmen. From the outset he was a bitter and somewhat unscrupulous assailant of Puritanism. He could not perceive its nobler side: only its forbidding features ever came into his view. His sermons—some of them, at least—are filled with acrid thrusts at Puritan practice, and with stinging sarcasms on Puritan leaders. It is not too much to say that he was as bigoted and fanatical in one direction as any whom he assailed on these grounds in others. But we can well afford to pass all this by in recognition of the nobler qualities he undoubtedly possessed. Calvinists should not forget his avowed and fearless assertions of Calvinistic doctrine. Trinitarians should remember how zealously he contended for what he thought a true doctrine of the Trinity, and how determined was his opposition to Socinianism. Puritans should consider that he showed no mercy to divines of his own household, as his onslaught upon Jeremy Taylor and Dr. Sherlock sufficiently attests. A good biography of Dr. South is yet to be written. But when it is written, few more interesting char-

acters will be found in that prolific seventeenth century. What will first strike any student of South is his masterly power of analyzing a subject and of arranging the order of discussion. It is evident that he had *thought through* his topics before he began his work of composition. Any good edition of his sermons has his plan of each prefixed to the discourse. It would be interesting to know how these plans were preserved. We conjecture that it must have been his habit to write them out fully on his manuscript. At all events, their preservation and publication, along with his sermons, make the volumes unique specimens of homiletical literature.

His introductions are specimens of a direct and business-like method for taking hold of his subject. They have the cardinal virtue of an introduction—*pertinency* to the matter in hand. And, what is of still more moment, his conclusions are always a welding together of the foregoing discussions for an intensely practical end. They are leveled point blank at the consciences of his hearers. Invariably his sermons end by “commending the truth to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

For modern hearers, the fault of these plans is excessive subdivision. In South’s time, people were not in love with essay-like discourses. They prized above all things a clear-cut and logical analysis. The modern pew dislikes anything so formal, and many preachers in their anxiety to have no “skeleton” appear, have left out nearly all the bones. Invertebrate sermons are not uncommonly heard, and, like all other invertebrates, belong only to the lower orders of creation. It would do many preachers a world of good to realize this, and study closely such a master as South in this art of dividing a subject.

The next quality in South, one which has a high homiletical value, is his style. It has every quality which the rhetorics lay down as fundamental, specially those fundamental to popular discourse—*perspicuity* and *energy*. This alone makes his sermons a vital part of English literature. For this he has been lauded by critics so competent as Jeffrey and Southey and Whipple. There is no English author where the power of well-chosen words fitted into well-compacted sentences is more manifest. Professor Fisher, in his recent admirable church history, has said of him, “His sentences follow one another like the strokes of a flail.” Here is a specimen from his sermon on “Interest Deposed and Truth Restored”:

“Martyrdom is stamped such only by God’s command; and he that ventures upon it without a call must endure it without a reward. Christ will say, ‘*Who required this at your hands?*’ His gospel does not dictate imprudence. No evangelical precept justles out that of a lawful self-preservation. He, therefore, that thus throws himself upon the sword, runs to heaven before he is sent for; where, though, perhaps, Christ may in mercy receive the man, yet He will be sure to disown the martyr.”

There was never greater need than now for study of good, racy, nervous English, in which the Saxon element plays its full part. It is what, after all, the people like best to hear. Any preacher who will make it his study is sure to find his reward. And no English preacher is a better model for this than South. He had faith in his mother-tongue. He has shown his faith in his works. A course of reading in his sermons would be a homiletical drill for many a young sermonizer, which would double his power as a preacher.

South, too, is a master in the use of figures of speech, not however by way of ornament. This he disdains. But for the purpose of making his thought take hold of his audience, of vivifying and pointing it, he lays illustrative imagery under tribute. In his sermon on "Christ's Promise the Support of Ministers," he gives his view of what sort of rhetoric ministers should use. Preaching is to be "easy, obvious and familiar; with nothing in it strained or far-fetched; with no 'airy fancies'—nothing like 'the fringes of the north star,' 'the down of angels' wings,' the 'beautiful locks of cherubim.' No starched similitudes introduced with a 'Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion'"—a palpable hit at Jeremy Taylor. South's creed is that there is a "certain majesty in plainness." Hence, though he uses figures of speech not sparingly, they are always for use, and never suggest any trick of ornamentation—as when he says of innocence, "It is like polished armor; it both adorns and defends," or of an old and decrepit sensualist, that he is "creeping, as it were, to the devil on all fours." When he wishes to point out the difference between the joys of a thoughtful person and the pleasures of a *gourmand*, he says they are as unlike "as the silence of Archimedes in the study of a problem, and the stillness of a sow at her wash." He says of man, as bearing the divine image, "We might well imagine that the Great Artificer would be more than ordinarily exact in drawing his own picture." It would be easy to multiply instances of his skill in the use of comparison or metaphor. A metaphor with him is often an object lesson in logic. When Emerson wanted to show Congressmen the fallacy in "pairing off" when votes on a great issue are taken, he simply asked what would have become of Grecian liberties if Leonidas and his Spartan band had *paired off!* So South often cleaves some absurdity in twain by a happy metaphor. Every effective preacher knows how to use such weapons. No one ever reproaches such a one as Beecher for using "flowery language." His metaphors, like his style, always mean business.

Dr. South's wit is commonly named as the distinctive characteristic of his preaching. This is, however, a superficial estimate of its power. His wit is an incident—a powerful incident, but still an incident—compared with the main element of his strength in that energy and incisiveness of style resembling "the unwearied fire of the epic poet," and in that close, clear thinking which makes his treatment of all sub-

jects open them to the dullest apprehension. Still, his wit is of so high quality, and is so masterful, that it richly deserves notice. Mr. Edwin P. Whipple has well analyzed it, as "no light and airy plaything with him, but generally a severe and masculine power. It gleams brightest and cuts sharpest when its possessor is most enraged and indignant. Though sometimes exhibited in sly thrusts, shrewd innuendoes, insinuating mockeries, and a kind of raillery half-playful and half-malicious, it is more commonly exercised to hold up adversaries to contempt and scorn; to pierce iniquity with shafts that wound as well as glisten, or to evade logical dilemmas by a lightning-like substitution of an analogy of fancy for one of the reason." Yet Dr. South knew well when to forbear the use of this weapon. There are many of his sermons where it would be out of place, and he is never witty for the sake of being so.

But is wit a proper weapon for the pulpit to use? There are those who deprecate its use as unbecoming the sacred office. We do well to remind such that the Hebrew prophet did not scruple to use it, and Elijah could not restrain his fiery sarcasm as he shouted to the priests of Baal, "Cry aloud; for he is a god: either he is musing or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or, peradventure, he sleepeth and must be awaked." If God has endowed any preacher with wit, he had best not hide that talent in a napkin. Guard it, but use it. But a preacher had best be sure he has it. Nothing belittles preaching like "smartness," and the mistake is often made nowadays of confounding vulgarity and slang with wit. Dr. South has sometimes misused this gift. In him, however, the offense is condoned by the noble service it rendered often in his scathing rebukes of sin—the sins of his time. Space forbids any lengthened series of illustrative passages from his sermons. We give one, however, from his discourse on "Satan Transformed into an Angel of Light." He is speaking of some spurious forms of sorrow for sin, and says: "On which case of supposed sorrow for sin, but real disturbance from some other cause, it is not questioned but many repair to the divine whose best casuist were an apothecary, and endeavor to cure and carry off their despair with a promise, or, perhaps, a prophecy, which might be better done with a purge. Poor self-deluding souls! often misapplying the blood of Christ under these circumstances, in which a little effusion of their own would more effectually work the cure; and Luke, as a physician, give them a much speedier relief than Luke as an evangelist."

Another element of power in South is his skillful analysis of all those moral states which lead to or involve a blinded or blunted moral sense. He had evidently studied the human conscience—not in treatises on moral science, but as he had seen human consciences working about him on all questions of the day. It is impossible to study such sermons as that on "Shamelessness in Sin," "Good Intentions No Excuse for

Bad Actions," "Of the Heinous Guilt of Taking Pleasure in Other Men's Sins," "Concealment of Sin no Security to the Sinner," without seeing how apt he was in tearing off all disguises and exposing men to themselves. Dr. South is never, or rarely, scholastic. He can be deeply theological, and yet use the language of everyday life. He knows how to discuss the whole round of doctrines, and yet always treat his subject in everyday fashion. He never forgets the "majesty of plainness;" and if men in the pulpit had learned from him how to discuss such themes, we should have far less foolish talk about the dryness of doctrinal sermons. No sermons are more doctrinal than South's, and none are less dry. He held Calvinistic views on sin, and he used them to good advantage in his discussion of the human conscience. The difficulty with much of our modern preaching is that nobody in particular seems hit by it. It is sound and orthodox, but for want of an analysis of the soul's operations in any course of sinning, the coat fits everybody alike, and no one puts it on. If any reader of this magazine will look carefully through the second general head of the discourse on "Shamelessness in Sin," he will see how by his masterly analysis of the subject South struck home, every time he took up a subdivision, to some people in his audience. I fear he little knew how to guide an awakened conscience to its only source of peace. But he certainly knew how to demolish the refuges of lies in which the sinners of our day, as of his, are sheltering themselves.

It would be omitting what is, after all, Dr. South's noblest quality as a preacher if we did not emphasize his bold attacks on the social immorality of his day. What that was can be read in the pages of Macaulay or Jeremy Collier's descriptions of the stage, or in any history of the time. For details our readers must go to such sources. But it is enough to say that never was immorality of every description more unblushing, and never was it more entrenched behind the prestige of the Court. We in recent times have known enough of the immorality of high life in London to make decent people shrink with disgust. But the Court of Queen Victoria is purity itself compared with that of Charles I or Charles II. She—the bright example of every womanly virtue—has purified her Court and made it all it is. But in South's day morality was sneered at or laughed at not less often by Charles II than by the creatures about his throne. Remember, now, that South was no Puritan. He was a Court-preacher. He believed in the divine right of kings. He held his position only by their gift—though he disdained all preferment to high office. It has been truthfully said of him that "never were debauchees and criminals exposed to a more merciless storm of ridicule and execration than when he poured on them the flood of his mingled contempt and wrath." His invective lights on every rank and degree beneath royalty, and there are sentences in his sermons which, if not aimed at the King, seem to strike him nevertheless. Thus, he says,

“A corrupt governor is nothing else than a reigning sin ; and a sin in office may command anything but respect.”

Nothing can excel South's boldness in attacking sin in high places. He attacked nobility, men and women of fashion, statesmen, the men of wit, the corrupt authors of a corrupting literature. His shafts flew in every direction. He preached righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*. South not only believed in hell, but believed in preaching it, at least to this class of sinners. All praise to him for his noble fidelity ! We can forgive him, in the memory of it, for all his bitter, stinging sarcasms against the Puritans. And commenting on this characteristic of South, Mr. Whipple* has said (we commend the whole passage to our readers): “A spurious toleration and liberality have supplanted the old earnest zeal. We live in an era of good feeling. The word unmentionable to ears polite burns the fingers of those who should launch it at sin. The meaning attached to the phrases of God's wrath and justice shocks our modern sensibilities.” These be solemn words. And reading our newspapers from day to day, with what they disclose of modern sin and modern sinners, I have more than once asked myself why some Dr. South does not appear, and till then must commend the study of this brave preacher of sternest truth, in a time of fearful moral corruption, to those who occupy the pulpit of to-day.

IV.—PSYCHOLOGY FOR PREACHERS.

NO. III.

THE PSYCHIC CULTURE OF THE PREACHER.

BY PROFESSOR J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., BERLIN, GERMANY.

In spite of the predominance of material interests, the minister's position has not lost its ideal elements. The universal priesthood of believers exalts him because he occupies the foremost place among those who are all kings and priests unto God. As God's ambassador, he is called “the divine,” and he is supposed to be the embodiment of spiritual excellencies which few mortals attain. The standard by which he is measured corresponds with the ideals connected with his position, and with the majesty and responsibility of his work.

We are not now considering the training of theological students, though that largely determines the character of the future preacher ; but we cannot suppress the query whether the student is not apt to lose sight of the real culture of his soul amid the efforts to acquire knowledge, and whether he is not in danger of regarding himself merely as a means to help others, rather than as an end in himself according to the divine purpose. What he becomes himself is of infinitely greater primary importance than what he is to others, for the simple reason that he can only be to others what he is *per se*. Neither is it our con-

*Essays, Vol. I, p. 401.