

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XX.—DECEMBER, 1890.—No. 6.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—TRUE CHURCH UNITY: WHAT IT IS.

BY PROF. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

THERE seems to be everywhere rising throughout the churches a newly aroused, or, at least, renewedly quickened, ardor in seeking to realize that oneness of the Church for which our Master prayed as He was about to be offered up. Certainly the heart of every Christian should burn within him as he addresses himself to do what in him lies to fulfil his Redeemer's dying wish. It would be sad were false steps made in so sacred a cause. Yet it would not be strange, if in the natural haste of even holy zeal, somewhat confused, if not erroneous notions should mingle with our aspirations, which we need to correct by bringing them searchingly to the test of the New Testament teaching.

Nothing can be clearer, of course, than that the conception of its unity enters fundamentally into the New Testament doctrine of the Church. It is involved in the very proclamation of the kingdom of God, for there cannot be two kingdoms any more than two gods. As God is one, the King and the Mediator is one, and the Spirit one who unites to the one Christ; so those who heard the great commission and went forth in its faith to conquer the world could entertain no conception of the Church they were to found which did not include its unity. Accordingly not only is its unity implied in all the figures used by our Lord to describe the Church—the vine, the spreading mustard tree, the leaven hidden in the mass until it leavens the whole; but the same is true of the whole warp of the Apostolic teaching. The Church is the body of which Christ is the head, the building, of the foundation of which He is the corner-stone, the Bride, the Lamb's wife. The unity of the Church is even fundamental to the Gospel itself, as the unity of the race is to the doctrine of sin: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." It was for His people that Christ laid down His life; neither was any crucified for any man save Christ Jesus, in whom alone can there be salvation.

It is equally obvious that this unity is in the New Testament, a vis-

Space compels us to pass by the halls devoted to Assyrian, Phœnician, Hittite, Palestinian, Chinese, Japanese, Hindoo, Gothic or mediæval European art. All these are full of rich suggestion, echoing out of the heart and thinking of humanity the truths taught in the Eternal Word, confirming or witnessing to them. Let us close our chapter by glancing at the Roman room. Here we are impressed with strength rather than beauty, or, in the glory of full empire, with exotic loveliness clothing solidity and enduring power. Underneath the beautifying envelope of marble we find the unshakable architecture of masonry. Even when the integument of polished stone is removed, the structure of solid brick abides like the "kingdom which cannot be moved." Not yet, however, have we come to the spirituality and aspiration of Gothic, rather Germanic Christian architecture, whose every line and pinnacle seems a prayer in marble. Nevertheless, in the relics from the catacombs we are at the aurora of Christianity, and the first flush of the thought and affection of Christ's little ones fills the morning sky with hope. Time would fail to tell of the emblems and epitaphs from subterranean Rome. Down under the bright, gay streets, bathed in sunshine and the luxury of a splendid civilization, were once deposited these moulds of thought which then, as now, showed the things seen as temporal and the things unseen as eternal. How thought-provoking those pretty hand-lamps, as one imagines the virgin's fingers holding them on the path to baptism, the orphan or widow lighting the gloom to lay offerings or mementoes upon the martyr's tomb, the hunted worshipper stealing through labyrinthine passages to worship or to the eucharist. One favorite pattern, common to all Romans, was that of a sandalled foot holding between the toes a lighted taper. How beautiful is the Oriental and Biblical image of "a light to my feet and a lamp to my path," thus illustrated in art. The sandalled foot was in this manner made proof against the adder of the jungle or the dangers lurking in the unknown path.

Thus, with a wealth of suggestion herein but crudely outlined, does the art museum bring the Christian teacher nearer the original Word which must ever be the Christian's lamp, and which it is the preacher's business to keep ever trimmed and burning.

III.—DR. ISAAC BARROW'S SERMONS AND THEIR HOMILETICAL USES.

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

IT was with a delighted surprise that I came upon these passages quoted in the *Life of Henry Ward Beecher* by Dr. Lyman Abbot and Mr. Halliday:

"I was a great reader of the old sermonizers; I read old Robert South through and through; I saturated myself with South. I formed much of

my style and of my handling of texts on his methods. I obtained a vast amount of instruction and assistance from others of these old sermonizers, who were as familiar to me as my own name."

Elsewhere Mr. Beecher says :

"Dr. Isaac Barrow's sermons had long been favorites of mine. I was fascinated by the exhaustive thoroughness of his treatment of subjects, by a certain calm and homely dignity, and by his marvellous procession of adjectives. Ordinarily, adjectives are the parasites of substantives, courtiers that hinder or cover the King with blandishments, but in Barrow's hands they become a useful and, indeed, quite respectable element of composition. Considering my early partiality for Barrow, I have always regarded it as a wonder that I escaped from the snares and temptations of that rhetorical demon, the adjective."

Mr. Beecher was not the first great orator who made special study of this great English divine. The Earl of Chatham, it is said, not only studied the sermons of Barrow with diligence, but commended them to his son, the younger Pitt, as models for a public speaker. Influenced probably by these examples, Daniel Webster made himself familiar with them as best combining all the qualities which forensic oratory should embody. Not only orators have valued him. John Locke said of his sermons, they were masterpieces of their kind, and Bishop Warburton, that "they forced him to think."

Barrow belongs to that great race of preachers and theologians which is the boast of the seventeenth century. Dissenters and churchmen, what a noble array of thinkers and scholars they were. Baxter (1615-1671), Cudworth (1617-1688), Chillingworth (1602-1644), Howe (1630-1705), Charnock (1628-1680), Bunyan (1628-1688), Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667), South (1633-1716), Sherlock (1641-1707), John Owen (1616-1683)—this roll is not complete, but it shows what men Barrow had for contemporaries.

Barrow was born in London, 1630, the same year with the great nonconformist John Howe. His father was linen-draper to Charles I. The son became chaplain to Charles II. He was sent to the Charterhouse for his early education. The record he made was, however, not prophetic of the future Barrow, as he did not enter the lists of theological controversy. "Chiefly distinguished for fighting and for setting on other boys to fight." That his juvenile development was somewhat unpromising is evident from another record. "So troublesome in his early days that his father was heard to say that if it pleased God to take any of his children, he could best spare Isaac." It would seem, however, that the child is not always father to the man. We next hear of Barrow at Felsted School, and then at Trinity College, Cambridge. Barrow was a staunch royalist, and refused to sign the Covenant. He, however, despite his royalist opinions, became in due course a Scholar in 1647, and Fellow of his college, in 1649. "Trinity College was his home from the time he entered it, a boy of

fifteen, to his death at the age of forty-seven." It was during his Cambridge life that the transition was made from the old scholasticism to the "new learning" of Bacon, Kepler, Galileo, Gassendi, and others. With the new learning Barrow became fully imbued. He studied science, philosophy, mathematics, and the classics—was, in fact, well furnished as a general scholar. It was, however, in classics and mathematics that he won his highest rank. In 1660, he was chosen Professor of Greek at Cambridge. In 1662, he was appointed Professor of Geometry in Gresham College, and had among his pupils the future Sir Isaac Newton. His works on mathematical subjects were of note in their day, and we are informed that in one of them he was on the verge of the discovery of the "Differential Calculus." It is evident that he was devoted to mathematical pursuits, and this is given as the impelling motive to such studies—"finding that to be a good theologian, he must know chronology, that chronology implies astronomy, and astronomy mathematics, he applied himself to the latter science with distinguished success. In 1655, he received permission from the authorities of his college to travel in foreign lands, and was absent for four years. He sold his books to furnish the means for this foreign residence. We find him at Paris, marking the conditions of society there under Cardinal Mazarin, but somehow quite overlooking Pascal, between whom and himself there would have been a strong bond of mathematical sympathy. From Paris, he journeyed to Italy. It was, however, only Florence that he visited, Rome being smitten with the plague. From Italy, he found his way to the Turkish Empire. While on the voyage the vessel was attacked by an Algerian pirate. Barrow's early combativeness seems to have revived, and stood him in good stead. He fought with the rest, "stood to his gun," and the pirate was glad to sheer off at length. Barrow spent a year at Constantinople, and while there read through all Chrysostom's works. "There is no author whom he quotes so frequently, and his wealth of diction in his sermons often resembles that of the golden-lipped preacher."* On his return to England, in 1659, he took holy orders, receiving ordination at the hands of Dr. Brownrigg, the deprived Bishop of Exeter. Puritanism was then dominant in church and State. Barrow, however, was never anything but a devoted royalist and a staunch, though liberal adherent of the Church of England. Barrow's theological position has been very well defined in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 127, p. 365 :

"In theology he belonged to that school of independent and thoughtful men which had been gradually formed in the midst of the disputes and distractions of the Civil Wars and the Protectorate. . . . There were, of course, many shades of difference among men like them [More, Cudworth, Whichcote, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Wilkins], but all alike were men learned in profane as well as ecclesiastical writings; all were

* *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 127, p. 363.

more intent on maintaining the laws of godliness against atheism than on defending some theological shibboleth; all contended for the paramount importance of morality and the eternal distinction between good and evil. It was mainly owing to the influence of this able and moderate party that the Church of England tided over the difficulties which followed the Restoration."

An instance of his liberal thought is found in his views on the Unity of the Church. In his discourse on that subject he says: "The question is, whether the church is necessarily, by the design and appointment of God, to be in the way of external policy under one singular government and jurisdiction of any kind, so as a kingdom or commonwealth is united under the command of one Monarch or Senate. . . . That such a union of all Christians is necessary, or that it was ever instituted by Christ, I cannot grant." He places unity not in externals, but in internals, mainly in the unity of Christian life in what he calls spiritual cognitions, and flings aside all High Church or Roman Catholic notions of uniting all churches in one system under one Monarch. This great discussion is the antipodes of such a treatise as Wilfred Ward's "Ideal of a Christian Church," and those ministers who are interested in this subject of church unity would do well to study Barrow on this subject. His wit seems to have been on hand when theology was on the carpet. When he went up for examination as a candidate for the ministry, it seems the reverend examiner was in the habit of putting to all candidates *three* test questions. Barrow's answer to the first of these, "*Quid est fides?*" was "*Quod non vides.*" To the second, "*Quid est spes?*" the prompt reply was "*Nondum res.*" To the third, "*Quid est veritas?*" the last response was "*Magister, id est paucitas.*" The examiner, a venerable old scholar, ended the examination with, "*Excellentissime! aut Erasmus aut diabolus.*" If possible, his repartees to the Earl of Rochester, the well known free-thinker, are even more ingenious and witty. "Doctor," said the Earl, as they chanced to meet one day, "I am yours to the shoe-tie." "My lord," said Barrow, "I am yours to the ground." "Doctor," rejoined the peer, "I am yours to the centre." "My lord," was the reply, "I am yours to the antipodes." Nettled by Barrow's quick response, his lordship tried once more. "Doctor, I am yours to the lowest pit of hell." "And there I leave you," was Barrow's final stroke.

Barrow never held any pastoral charge. His life was spent in the University of Cambridge. He published only one sermon in his lifetime, that on "Bounty to the Poor," his sermon on the Passion going through the press in his last illness. And yet he was a copious writer of sermons. Over a hundred in all* have, since his death, been collected and published. They were prepared with the utmost care. "Two, three, and even four drafts of the same sermon are found" in

* His sermons fill six volumes of Hughes' Edition.

the singularly neat and distinct handwriting, of which he made almost a point of conscience. These sermons were preached before the King, Charles II., who had made him one of his chaplains, before the University, at Westminster Abbey, at Gray's Inn, and at churches in London. His long sermons were somewhat distasteful to the populace; only the trained and thoughtful minds could stand them. The story goes that when he preached his celebrated Spital Sermon on the "Duty and Reward of Bounty to the Poor," he was three hours and a half in its delivery, and on coming down from the pulpit, being asked if he were not weary, replied that "he was tired of *standing so long.*" The vergers of Westminster Abbey, impatient to earn three shillings from the equally impatient sight-seers subsidized the organist "to blow him down." He once took the place of his friend, Dr. Wilkins, at St. Lawrence Jewry. As he came to the pulpit, the stampede from the church became general; "there was such a noise of patters of serving-maids and ordinary women, and of unlocking of pews and cracking of seats caused by the younger sort climbing over them, that the congregation seemed to have gone mad." But among the two or three that remained was Richard Baxter, and when, shortly after the exodus, the stampeders remonstrated with Dr. Wilkins for having permitted "such an ignorant, scandalous fellow to occupy his pulpit," Baxter promptly said "that Dr. Barrow preached so well that he could have heard him all day long." Charles II. seems to have sat through some of the sermons, for he said of his chaplain: "He is an *unfair* preacher, because he is an *exhaustive* preacher, and leaves nothing to be said after him."

This suggests what is the first characteristic of Barrow deserving homiletical study—his thoroughness of treatment of his subject. Take for example that noble series of sermons on the tongue. There are four: The first, James iii:2, unfolds the proposition, "Not to offend in word, an evidence of a high pitch of virtue." The second, Ephesians v:4, is aimed "Against foolish talking and jesting." The third, James v:12, "Against rash and vain swearing." The fourth, Titus iii:2, discusses "Of evil-speaking in general." There is no repetition of ideas. There is no hammering out of ideas into the thinness of gold foil. The whole subject of human speech in its moral relations is considered. In a noble passage of the discussion on "Not offending in word," the second paragraph or head of the sermon, this view is held up. It is a fine specimen of Barrow's best manner, and I do not know where else the English language holds so masterly a summary of what human speech is and does in the affairs of life. In the sermon against "Foolish talking and jesting," occurs in the opening of the discussion that brilliant and exhaustive description of wit, which Addison praised in the *Spectator*, and which is to-day the best description of wit in our literature. Other illustrations of Barrow's

thoroughness are found in his five sermons on Contentment, Philip-
 pians iv: 11, or his five sermons on Industry, which drove Mr. Beecher
 into temporary despair. Of course, modern congregations might not
 relish five sermons in succession, an hour and a half long, on *Content-*
ment, and it would hardly be safe, perhaps, to preach five in succes-
 sion on *Industry*. But it is all important for every minister to get
 into his head a clear idea of what *thoroughness* in discussing a sub-
 ject is. He may not choose to follow his model in all details. But
 it will tend to prevent that *scrappiness* which is characteristic of
 much modern preaching. Thoroughness in single sermons is always
 desirable. We make a great mistake, if we think superficiality tends
 to brightness and thoroughness to dulness in preaching. Barrow is
 never prosy. And I cannot but think that even serial discussions like
 Barrow's, holding up continuously a subject in all its phases, would
 occasionally be of great service. Take Honesty for example, and
 suppose our metropolitan pulpit treated this as Barrow has treated
 Evil Speaking, or Industry. Would five sermons be enough? For
 example: Of Honesty in General; Of Honesty in Trade; Of Honesty
 in Politics; Of Honesty in Professions; Of Honesty with One's Self.
 Would not a congregation get an idea by the time these were discussed
 that there was some importance to be attached to the virtue?

Aside, however, from all these special benefits from a study of Bar-
 row's thoroughness, it is a fine mental discipline. Simply to see a
 broad horizon, to have one's views lifted up and spread out over a
 large surface, is in itself a mental culture.

Another feature, for which he may be wisely studied, is his faculty
 of discrimination. He turned deliberately away from many of the
 themes then in vogue with preachers. He eschewed all those scho-
 lastic theological subjects, which the pulpit of his day was largely
 addicted to. Instead of discussing grace prevenient and grace effica-
 cious, he presents a view of "the excellency of the Christian Religion,"
 which is a marvel of comprehensive discussion. He chooses practical
 themes, and dwells most frequently on the moral and social side of
 Christianity. But his choice of themes necessitated careful discrimi-
 nation in their treatment. Such discourses as those on Contentment,
 on the Moral Relations of Speech, or Self-Love, could not be written
 except for this characteristic. Barrow's distinctions always have a
 difference. He does not confound things opposite in their nature,
 nor separate things which belong together. And if we are not mis-
 taken, the homiletic use of such a study is very great. How often, for
 example, have sermons on Wealth, or Amusement, or Temperance, failed
 simply for want of true and proper discrimination. It is easy always
 to be sweeping. The pulpit, after all, is not in the wholesale busi-
 ness. It is not so easy to make careful distinction, to retail truth, so
 that it sticks in the individual conscience with its "thou art the man."

But he who will work for this, has this for his reward, that he covers the whole ground more justly and more efficaciously. He will find in Barrow's sermons a useful study for this end. Like Dr. South, he wrought out his plans carefully before writing, and while he flings aside all scholastic subtleties, he brings common sense to bear in the use of these discriminations. We have heard certain men described as "discriminating preachers." The class needs to be made larger.

Barrow has also long been commended as an author to be studied in the matter of diction. Here he is certainly a great master. He differs from Dr. South in this, that he has less of the Saxon, more of the Latin element. But in our praise of the strong, weighty Saxon diction, we have sometimes forgotten that for expressing nicer shades of meaning, the Latin element in our language cannot be overlooked. The best speakers must have both at command. Space does not allow any extended quotations to show what Barrow's power was in the use of this unrivalled diction. Mr. Beecher speaks of it as if it were mainly in his use of the adjective, and his words have a great deal of point. Few, in fact, realize how great a part the adjective plays in strengthening or weakening discourse. The late Professor Roswell D. Hitchcock was noted for his effective use of this part of speech. What power it gave him in preaching! How the epithets light up and vivify what he writes! Vocabulary is indeed a great matter. "Words, words, words," Hamlet said, and it is not to be wondered at that we get disgusted at mere verbosity. Verbiage is a great rhetorical sin. All this is true. But it is also true that many a good thought in preaching fails of its end simply because it was meanly clad. If one gives thought to the matter, he will readily see that, for many a preacher, the vocabulary he uses is the same thing from year to year, the same adjectives and verbs and nouns, without variety and without aptness. Hence the need for some study in this direction. Have we not dictionaries? Yes, plenty, and of the best. But while a good dictionary is no mean reading, we need to find words in their vital relations—that is, in the structure of noble sentences, in order to have them lodge in our memory. The student of Barrow will find that his diction has more than mere copiousness, especially in adjectives. It has accuracy and felicity. "With all his richness of style, he is not verbose; he never uses words needlessly for mere pomp of sound; every word is introduced with a true sense of its exact value; every epithet, every phrase, in his long-drawn paragraphs, adds something to the impression he desires to produce; the ornate character of his style arises naturally from his wealth of thought and learning, joined with his remarkable power of expression." *

Barrow belongs to that class of moderate churchmen, like Hooker, Chillingworth, and in our time Alvord and Lightfoot, whose scholar-

* *Quar. Rev.*, Vol. 127, p. 379.

ship has been among the chief ornaments of the English Church. Like Chillingworth, Barrow has left one of the ablest expositions of the fallacious claims of Romanism. On his death-bed, he handed to Dr. Tillotson his treatise on the Pope's Supremacy. Those who wish to study the subject of Romanism, will find in modern discussion no abler treatment of the question. Barrow died at the age of 47, and rests in Westminster Abbey. He was a distinguished mathematician in his day, and it was to Sir Isaac Newton that he resigned his professorship at Gresham College. But he is more remembered for his sermons than for his *Lectiones Geometricæ*. He has left behind him one memorable sentence, in which both the mathematician and the preacher appear: *A straight line is the shortest in morals as well as in geometry.*

IV.—A SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF CHRISTIANITY.

PART II.—REDEMPTION.

BY WILLIAM W. McLANE, PH.D., D.D., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

In a former paper, Christianity has been considered as that Revelation of God which corresponds to the nature and the needs of man.

2. Christianity claims, in the second place, to be the redemption of men from the penalty and the power of sin. Angelic voices are said to have proclaimed Christianity to be glad tidings, and apostolic voices have preached it as the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Can science verify this claim for Christianity? Whether there is any divine wrath which may be averted, or any destruction peculiar to the wicked from which they may be delivered, science cannot know and cannot tell. Such things must be either an inference from things that are known or matters of direct revelation. But that there is in the world such a thing as sin having present power and, to a degree at least, a present penalty, a comprehensive science of man must see and know. There is such a thing as character and conduct condemned both by him to whom they belong and by the society of which he forms a part. There is a sensuality which dominates and bestializes many men, sinking them in lustfulness, intemperance and vice. There is a selfishness which limits the range of the affections, which tends to the disintegration of society, to the destruction of domestic felicity, to the neglect of those who may be dependent, as children for example, and to indifference to the life and property, the peace and welfare of others. There is an avarice which would win wealth at the cost of personal truthfulness and honor, at the price of fraud and oppression, at the expense of loss and suffering on the part of others. There is an ambition which longs for power and which often spares neither orphan's tears nor widow's cries, nor men's wounds, nor human lives, if its ends can be attained and its desires gratified. There is to be