



32101 067015709



RECAP

P94
.838
.036
.02
COPY 1

P 9 4
. 8 3 8
. 0 3 6
. 0 2
COPYL

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
OCT 29 1896
PRINCETON, N. J.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.



Allegheny Theological Seminary.

INAUGURATION

OF THE

REV. WM. H. HORNBLOWER, D. D.
¹⁸³⁸

TO THE

PROFESSORSHIP

OF

Sacred Rhetoric, Church Government and Pastoral Theology

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PITTSBURGH,

Wednesday Evening, November 15th, 1871.

PITTSBURGH:

PRINTED BY BAKEWELL & MARTHENS, NO. 71 GRANT STREET.

1872.

Allegheny Theological Seminary.

INAUGURATION

OF THE

REV. WM. H. HORNBLOWER, D. D.

TO THE

PROFESSORSHIP

OF

Sacred Rhetoric, Church Government and Pastoral Theology.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PITTSBURGH,

Wednesday Evening, November 15th, 1871.

PITTSBURGH:

PRINTED BY BAKEWELL & MARTHENS, No. 71 GRANT STREET.

1872.

Statement.

THE REV. DAVID ELLIOTT, D. D., LL. D., having retired from the Chair of "*Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Theology*," so long and so acceptably filled by him in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny, and having been made "*Emeritus*" Professor by the General Assembly, and a new Chair having been founded by the munificent donation of the Rev. Charles C. Beatty, D. D., and his wife, Mrs. Hetty E. Beatty, entitled "*The Re-union Professorship of Sacred Rhetoric, Church Government and Pastoral Theology*," the Board of Directors of the Seminary, after much anxious deliberation, inquiry and prayer to God, assembled on the 8th of August, and unanimously elected the Rev. Wm. H. Hornblower, D. D., to the Chair.

Dr. H. was well and favorably known as the beloved Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Paterson, New Jersey, during a period of twenty-seven years, and as a preacher and presbyter of eminent gifts, devoted to the service of the Church. It was highly gratifying to the friends of the Seminary that he declared his acceptance of this office, in consonance with his studies and his tastes, and with a high sense of duty. It was accordingly arranged that his public induction should take place on Wednesday evening, November 15th, in the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh.

P94

.838

.036

.02

(RECAP)

10'354

Digitized by Google

On this occasion the service was introduced by the Rev. C. C. Beatty, D. D., President of the Board of Directors, in the use of Hymn 374,

“Ye servants of God your Master proclaim,
And publish abroad His wonderful name,” etc.

Prayer was then offered by the Rev. David McKinney, D. D. After this, the Professor elect advanced to the pulpit, and in the hearing of the congregation read and subscribed the formula appointed by the General Assembly in the plan of the Seminary. This being done, the Rev. George Hill, D. D., of Blairsville, Pa., in the name, and on behalf of the Directors, delivered to him the *Charge*. After the singing of a verse,

“Glorious things of Thee are spoken,”

Dr. Hornblower pronounced his Inaugural Address.

This was followed with prayer by the Rev. Professor Jacobus, and the audience was dismissed with the Apostolical Benediction.

NOTE.—A meeting of the Alumni present was also held according to notification, and it was resolved to hold a Re-union at the Commencement in April, 1872, at which time also, it is proposed to lay the corner-stone of the new Fire Proof Library Building which is in progress. The Committee to arrange for this occasion is

Rev. GEORGE P. HAYS, D. D., *Washington.*

“ WM. T. BEATTY, *Pittsburgh.*

“ JOHN GILLESPIE, “

“ THOMAS H. ROBINSON, D.D., *Harrisburg.*

“ ALEXANDER REED, D. D., *Philadelphia.*

All the Alumni are earnestly invited to be present.

Charge.

BY REV. GEORGE HILL, D. D.

REVEREND AND HONORED BROTHER :

Custom rather than expediency, I am persuaded, has led the Board of Directors of the Seminary to appoint one of their number to address you on this occasion of your inauguration as a Professor in the Institution of which they have charge. This duty has fallen upon me. In occupying your attention for a few minutes, my sole object will be to give emphatic expression in your hearing to the feeling which the Board have of the high importance of that particular department of instruction to which you have been called.

Comparisons as to the intrinsic importance of the different Chairs might seem invidious, and are not necessary. It is sufficient to say that the Chair of Sacred Rhetoric, Church Government and Pastoral Theology, into which you have now been inducted, has, *at the present time*, an importance not inferior to any of the others. This judgment is based on the belief that the training of our ministry has, for many years past, been relatively less perfect in this, than in any of the other departments of study.

It may be questioned whether the effect of the establishment of Theological Seminaries for the education of our candidates for the sacred office, has not been to exalt the dogmatic and scholastic, to the disparagement of the practical and executive. It is not asserted,

nor even intimated, that this result was either in the design of their founders, or consciously in the purpose of any of those who have been instructors in them. But the question is raised, whether this has not been the drift and practical result of their working.

In the times of our fathers, when all the training which theological students received was under the instruction and guidance of some of the more able and godly pastors, mostly of country churches, just the opposite state of things existed to that which it is supposed has resulted from our present method of training; the practical and executive were then largely in excess over the didactic and scholarly. In that case too, this was a necessary result of the method itself, rather than the purpose of those who adopted it. The lack of books, and time, and other essential requisites for patient investigation and profound study on the part of those who acted as theological instructors, necessarily limited the amount of knowledge imparted by them to their pupils. In addition to this, the lack of that distribution of labor which now exists in all our Theological schools, was another element of limitation, both in the amount and thoroughness of the instruction communicated. It is certainly safe to say, that the very idea of the establishment of special institutions for theological training, had its origin in the minds of their founders, in the felt imperfections of the old method, in the direction which has been named. The result of the experiment has been an immense advance beyond any thing ordinarily attained under the old system, as regards varied and solid attainments in the several branches of theological study. This, moreover, is a result in which every wise and good man rejoices.

But is it not true that just in proportion as the various fields of investigation have opened up and widened and been thoroughly explored, just in proportion as their treasures have been brought out and exposed to the gaze of the thoughtful student, and his energies taxed in storing them away in the archives of memory, the time and attention which have necessarily been given to these processes have

crowded out of place, and cast in the shade those parts of training in which the old method excelled—those parts, namely, which had for their immediate object the making of impressive preachers of the gospel, wise administrators of the affairs of God's house, and successful shepherds of Christ's flock ?

It is not denied or doubted that under the present system many men are trained, who are eminent in all these respects ; eloquent preachers, wise presbyters, and useful pastors. And it is not without special thankfulness to God we make mention of the fact, that our own beloved Seminary has a record in this respect, not inferior to any of her sisters. But while this is so, the question still recurs, is not the kind of popular, practical training which was the chief excellence of the old system, in a great measure wanting in the new ?

That there are more "educated failures" in the ministry at the present time, than there were forty or fifty years ago, perhaps no one acquainted with the facts then and now, will deny. It is a startling fact that in the statistical tables, published in connection with the minutes of the last General Assembly, there are no less than 843 ministers—almost one-fifth of the whole number—to whose names the letters are suffixed which indicate that they are without charge. And this, unquestionably, does not include a large number, whom a strict construction would have assigned to the same list. On the other hand, it is true that many of those thus marked are aged and infirm, or otherwise disabled, and some are usefully employed in various ways in their Master's service. But after all proper abatements, the number of those who ought to be employed in pastoral work, but are not, is distressingly great.

Now, instead of entering into the controversy as to who is most to blame for this state of things, an incompetent ministry, or a penurious people, a controversy in which on both sides much has been unwisely, not to say foolishly written, it is doubtless wisest and nearest the truth to admit, that in this, as in most other controversies truth lies between the extremes. No doubt this is a mercenary age ; no doubt the

love of the "mammon of unrighteousness" exists largely in the Church. All this, and much more, is true. But, after all, the sad conviction forces itself upon the mind, and a regard to truth obliges us to admit, that the existing state of things is owing largely to a want of practical adaptation to the work, on the part of many who are invested with the sacred office. It is the clear and firm conviction of many wise and good men, that of all the causes of failure in the ministry, the most prolific by far, is to be found in the lack of *those* qualifications for the work which it is the special province of the occupant of the Chair to which you, my brother, have been called, to supply. Indeed, it would not be overstating the case to say, that in the judgment of many, the failures resulting from all other causes combined, do not bear the proportion of tithe to those resulting from this cause alone.

Remove from the number of ministers without charge, who are able-bodied, and who ought to be steadily employed in their Master's work, all the uninteresting preachers, the unwise rulers, and the inefficient pastors, and the number of those left will be very small indeed. There are men in the ministry whose attainments in Theology, in Church Government, in the original languages of the Scriptures, and in Biblical Criticism and Exegesis would not disgrace a Professor's chair, who are nevertheless, so far as the direct work and object of the ministry are concerned, total failures, *simply because* they do not know how to prepare God's message to man, and address it to the hearts of the people. There are others of like attainments, who fail through lack of knowledge and wisdom in the administration of the government of the Church, or in their pastoral intercourse with the people. And in multitudes of other cases, where the ministry is not wholly a failure, the greatest drawbacks to usefulness, the most serious hindrances to complete success, result from the same causes.

Of the three branches of instruction assigned to the chair into which you have been inducted,—Sacred Rhetoric, Church Govern-

ment, and Pastoral Theology,—it is in respect to the first, undoubtedly, that the greatest defects in the present ministry exist. As respects the composition and delivery of sermons, it would be unjust and therefore cruel to say of any in the ministry, as is sometimes said of those in civil office, in reference to their appropriate work, that “they know well how not to do it.” Such a charge would imply a deliberate purpose on their part not to do their duty. But certainly it may be truthfully said of some, that *if this were their purpose*, they could scarcely be more successful in not doing it in a way adapted to accomplish the great ends of preaching. The dry, prosy, lifeless style, both of composition and delivery, on the part of some, the stiff, stilted, stately style of others, and the affected, mock-solemn, sanctimonious style of still others, are all alike destructive of any hope or prospect of effectiveness in the pulpit; and are, at the same time, utterly inconsistent with that manly dignity, that godly simplicity, and that earnest sincerity which become ambassadors of Christ.

It is certainly no strange thing, much less is it to be accounted a matter of complaint, that to such men the people *will* not listen with interest, and *do* not listen with profit. It is not in human nature, unless it has more grace than falls to the lot of most Christian congregations, to be interested in what is not only most uninteresting, but is furthermore positively repulsive. It has come to be understood by all classes, except sleepy and sleep-inducing preachers, that the human mind, in order to be profited by a subject, must first be interested in it. Modern philosophers have generally given up the idea that mental inertia is an essential condition of spiritual profit, in other words, that “ignorance is the mother of devotion.”

The fore-front of the great work to which you have been called, my brother, in this Seminary, is to prepare the young men who may come under your instruction, *to be interesting and effective preachers of the everlasting Gospel*. On your brother Professors it devolves to lay in the minds of the students, broad and deep, the foundations of the sciences of Theology, Church History, and Biblical Exegesis,

and to instruct them in the methods and means by which they may continue to add to the stores of knowledge which they have already accumulated. To *you* it belongs to teach them how to use these stores, so as most effectually to accomplish the great ends of the ministry, the conversion of sinners, and the edification and salvation of God's people. You are to make of them "workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

What is essential to this, and how to make them such workmen, the fact of your call to this Chair presupposes you to know better than the majority of your brethren in the ministry. It would be presumption, therefore, in me to attempt to instruct you on these points. Permit, however, a single suggestion as to the method of instruction in this particular department; not because the suggestion is new, but because of its importance.

It is manifest that the method of teaching Homiletics ought to differ, and, if successful, must differ materially from the methods employed in some of the other departments. Text-books, lectures, oral and written questionings, and essays by the student, may be sufficient in Theology and History, but certainly they can never be deemed sufficient in the Chair assigned to you. Preaching is an art as well as a science, and the work of a Professor here is to teach his pupils, not only how it ought to be done, but *how to do it*. The great mistake, it is to be feared, in Seminary training, has been the too large substitution of science for the art, acting on the false assumption that the knowledge of how a thing ought to be done insures necessarily aptness in doing it.

It is but right, however, to say that this has been a mistake, arising less from a false theory on the subject, than from the operation of other causes, preventing the devotion of sufficient time to patient, pains-taking drill in the composition and delivery of sermons. It is a mistake, however, which must be rectified before our Seminaries will fully answer the ends for which they have been created. No mastery of text-books of sacred rhetoric, no acquaintance with the

laws of sermonizing and the rules of oratory, no mere head-knowledge of any kind will make a man a preacher. To act on this principle, in the training of our candidates for the ministry, is just as absurd as to suppose that a boy will become a master mechanic whose whole training consists in learning the names and properties of the materials employed, and the implements used in his trade, and the principles and rules by which it is to be carried on.

What is wanted in training a mechanic is to put the tools of his craft into his hands and teach him to use them. Just so must our young men be taught to be master-builders in God's temple. They must be put to work, and be shown how to work. Kind, but honest criticism must point out to them their blunders and imperfections, and their work must be repeated until it grows more and more perfect. There must be faithful dealing with each one personally, and if necessary in private, pointing out to him his individual defects and errors, and helping him to correct them. It was said of a certain railroad authorized by the Legislature of this State some years ago, "It begins in the woods, and ends nowhere." It should never be possible to say the same thing truly of the criticism which our young men receive in their work of preparing for the pulpit. What they need is the same kind of faithful dealing that David received from Nathan. There are multitudes of ministers who pass their whole lives with the most glaring defects in their manner in the pulpit, and never know it. No man has ever had the honesty to tell them of these defects.

Now, my brother, you have been called to this Professorship to do this honest and unpleasant work ; to point out to every man his imperfections, and require him to correct them. You are to eliminate the affectation from one, the pedantry from another, and the stupidity from all. You are to teach them to be natural (pardon the solecism), earnest, impressive preachers of the Gospel. As in the military and naval schools the weapons of a carnal warfare are put into the hands of the cadets, and they are drilled in their use, until they become prepared for effective service to their country ; so must

the weapons of that warfare which is not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, be put into the hands of our ministerial cadets, and, by a similar training and drill, must they be made good soldiers of Jesus Christ, prepared to be leaders of the sacramental host of God's elect. Only thus can they be taught so to use the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, that it shall be "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and become a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Only thus can they become successful in "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

I have spoken of the training of *preachers* as your first and chief work. Another, and by no means unimportant part of your duty, will be to train wise, prudent, skilful presbyters. The defects of the existing ministry in this regard, are not less manifest, though they may be less detrimental than those of which mention has already been made. Good presbyters are even rarer than good preachers. So uncommon, indeed, are the endowments which constitute a man a wise administrator of ecclesiastical affairs, that church courts have become the derision and scorn of the men of the world. The attempt at the exercise of discipline in the church, is in many instances most painfully puerile, not to say contemptible. And the same ignorance and looseness which appear in the discipline, often appear also, in all the other departments of practical church government. Individual will is allowed to override ecclesiastical law, and the regular forms of procedure are permitted to degenerate into the veriest farce; and there is not wanting on all such occasions, some sapient Solomon to demonstrate with most edifying ignorance, that the whole thing has been done according to the strictest principles of Presbyterian church government.

Now, here also, what has been wanting in our professional train-

ing, is not so much the "line upon line, and precept upon precept," as the personal experience of practical work, under a competent master. In our law schools they have in operation what are called "mock courts," in which the principles of law, and the various forms of judicial procedure are made familiar to the student by actual application to feigned cases. Why should not the same thing be deemed necessary in our theological schools also? Why may there not be organized in our Seminaries extemporized churches, sessions and presbyteries, in which all the principles of ecclesiastical law, and the forms of procedure in our church courts, shall be made familiar to the student, by his being required to take part therein?

This is thrown out merely as a suggestion; it is not proposed as a remedy for existing evils. But certainly something ought to be done to wipe away the reproach which comes to the Church, by reason of the ignorance and imbecility too often displayed by her ministers, in the administration of her government and discipline. It will be for you, my brother, so to train the young men who may come under your care, that they shall be in this matter wiser than their fathers.

The third branch of instruction committed to your special charge is that of Pastoral Theology. Here too, even at the risk of being regarded as a complainer, it must be said that there is great room for improvement in the existing state of things. Not that pastoral work is generally neglected by our younger ministers; not that they do not conscientiously endeavor to perform it, but that in a great majority of cases, they enter upon it with the most meagre and imperfect qualifications for its discharge. With the most superficial acquaintance with their own hearts, with almost no knowledge of the spiritual exercises of others, with no experience whatever in the work of dealing with the hearts and consciences of men personally, they find themselves suddenly charged with the care of a church, and with the duty of adapting the gospel remedy to the ever-varying experiences of saints and sinners. The consequence is, they go stumbling through

the first years of their ministry, feeling their way, like men in the dark, under the painful consciousness continually that fatal loss may come to immortal souls through their incompetency. I can truly say that the most distressing experiences of my own early ministry had their rise in this source.

This *whole* matter of pastoral work is one of immense importance in the training of an efficient and successful ministry. It cannot be too highly estimated, and it deserves all the pains-taking effort you can bestow upon it. May you be successful in training many such men as was Ichabod S. Spencer. There is *one particular department* of it, however, which demands much more attention than it has as yet received, perhaps, in any of our Seminaries; the department, namely, of *organization*. Of all men, he shall be esteemed the greatest benefactor of the Church of Christ, who shall impart to all the members of her rising ministry the secret of organizing, and the skill to organize all the members of the churches they may serve for efficient work; so that every one will have his place, and fill that place faithfully and effectively. If all the young men who pass through the Western Theological Seminary could be taught to do what Theodore L. Cuyler does in this matter of organizing church work, and to do it as perfectly as he does it, the service of the man who should so teach them would be beyond price. While you, brother, may not be able to make all your pupils Ichabod Spencers or Theodore Cuylers (we did not expect when we called you to this Chair that you would have the power of working miracles), still we hope and believe that you may do much to promote their efficiency in pastoral labor.

And here let it be suggested, with great diffidence, that perhaps the very best service you can render them in this respect, may be rendered by acting to them the part of a faithful pastor yourself, and thus setting them an example of what pastoral work is, and how it should be done. Many have long felt that there is no want in any of our Seminaries more imperative than the presence of some one

in them, with all the rights and powers of a Professor, whose special function it shall be to take oversight and charge of the spiritual interests of the students.

It is true, doubtless, that in a general sense, *all* the professors do feel themselves charged with the duty of promoting the personal piety of the students. But it is just as true, that what is every body's business is generally regarded as the business of no one in particular, and so between hands, often fails to receive much attention. The delicacy which a Professor feels in prying into the spiritual state of the students, and the sensitive pride of the human heart, which may sometimes lead a student to resent such efforts as inquisitorial and impertinent, are well known. It is not surprising therefore that there is but little done in the way of direct and honest dealing with the hearts of the young men under this plan of general responsibility. What we need is, that some one be specially charged with the pastoral oversight of all the students, so that they may feel that this is his appropriate work, and that he is held responsible for the discharge of the duties growing out of that charge. To none of the existing Chairs does this so appropriately belong, as to that Chair which embraces Pastoral Theology among its subjects of instruction.

If the present plan of the Seminary does not provide for such pastoral supervision, it ought to do it. The young men come together fresh from college life, which is, alas! too often not a promoter of spirituality; they are away from the pastoral care of the churches of which they are members, and of the presbyteries under whose control they are; they are in new scenes which expose them to many influences adverse to the growth of piety; they are engaged in studies which are absorbing, and which, though in a certain sense sacred, have nevertheless, nay, have for that very reason, a tendency to quiet conscience, and lead the soul to be satisfied with a form of godliness, while destitute of its power. They are all of them comparatively young in years, and most of them younger in Christian experience. Where,

then, is there a class of men anywhere who more urgently need pastoral care than they? And especially in view of the work for which they are preparing, who can utter or estimate the importance of that soul-culture which must result from the faithful labors of one who sustains to them the relation of pastor-friend?

But I must not prolong these remarks. Let it be said, once for all, dear brother, that in this whole work to which you have consecrated your life, the work of training Preachers, Rulers and Pastors, you will succeed best, you will only succeed at all, just in proportion as you bring your own heart, and the hearts of your pupils under the power of the cross of Christ. The experience of every faithful minister testifies that he preaches best, and discharges every other duty best, when he is nearest his Saviour, and has the sweetest communings of heart with him. You will do most to promote earnestness, and that naturalness and impressiveness which are begotten of true earnestness, by drawing your pupils often and lovingly to Gethsemane and Calvary. They must come to know Paul's secret of power, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." They must learn to say with Luther, "*Bene orasse est bene studuisse*;" then shall "one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight."

Inaugural Address.

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
— MY COLLEAGUES IN THE FACULTY — PATRONS, STUDENTS
AND FRIENDS OF THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY :

You expect me, doubtless, to afford you some opportunity to judge of the spirit in which I accept of the office you have now so graciously conferred upon me, and of the principles that will control me in the discharge of its duties. In doing so, I desire to be candid and explicit. A man who has positive opinions, and is truly honest, in maintaining them, can hardly be otherwise.

The name of the Chair I am to occupy only indicates, it seems to me, without expressing the full extent of its requirements. The terms employed are too specific. The first communication addressed to me on behalf of the Directors of this Seminary, was an inquiry if I would accept "the Professorship of *Preaching, Pastoral Care* and Church Government." No other form of putting the question could have gone so directly to my heart, or to the heart of any minister of the gospel who loves his work in the pulpit, the parish and the presbytery. Afterwards, when the formal call announced the name of the Chair as that of "Sacred Rhetoric, Pastoral Theology and Church Government," I confess that a new feeling of hesitation and reluctance chilled the enthusiasm of my response. I am no such rhetorician or theologian as should assume the professorial chair in either of these departments. An humble minister, devoted to work, has not time, if he have the disposition, to attain

eminence in purely scholastic studies. But a little reflection satisfied me that the education of candidates for the holy ministry cannot be restricted to "sacred rhetoric" and "pastoral theology" in any merely technical and theoretical sense of those terms.

Rhetoric, even if you prefix the word *sacred*, and then define it as Homiletics, or the preparation and delivery of sermons, does not express all or even the best part of what is to be taught here in order to make successful preachers of the gospel. There have been great preachers who were no rhetoricians. There have been great rhetoricians, with the brilliant name of Blair at the head of them, who were miserable preachers when judged by any right standard of what preaching ought to be. The instructor in this department must seek for the matter of instruction very largely outside of that pragmatical system, which schoolmen call rhetoric, or the system which comprises the rules and methods of elegant and persuasive writing and eloquent elocution or oratory; and the highest qualifications of this instructor must be, on the one hand, his knowledge of men, of their wants, their passions, their sufferings, their weaknesses, and their temptations, and, on the other hand, his knowledge of the gospel and of the secret of its power over human souls, and how best to render that power effective. He who is to teach men to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the power and demonstration of the Holy Spirit must go far beyond any rhetoric, sacred or profane.

"Pastoral theology" is a sort of oxymoron in technology. To explain and justify it taxes the philosophical adroitness of a Vinet. The instruction the young man needs, to fit him for his work in the pastorate, is not a λόγος, but a τέχνη, it does not belong to γνῶσις, but to πράξις, it is not a science that is to be taught to him, but an art that he is to learn and practice. We accept the term, therefore, in its objective sense, and understand that the young men of this Institution are not merely to be enlightened in regard to the Divine doctrine of the pastoral office in the church, but to be instructed in reference to the actual work of a pastor and the methods of its accomplishment.

I am encouraged to interpret the title of this Chair in a very practical sense, by the wise Charge which has been delivered to me on this occasion, and by the expressed intentions of the pious donors who have endowed the Chair, and desired that it might be devoted "to the *training* of students for *preaching* and pastoral work." I would call this the P. P. P. Chair,*—the chair that is to train the Preacher, the Pastor and the Presbyter, for the Pulpit, the Parish and the Presbytery.†

It may occur to some that this would be absorbing the work that is now divided among four professorial chairs; for what other object than that just specified has any instructor in this Institution? The question is pertinent and claims an answer, lest I should be deservedly rebuked for presumption. Our answer is simply this, my colleagues are, each in his own department, imparting instruction which is required to fit these young men for the work of the gospel ministry; but this chair alone is devoted directly to imparting instruction in reference to the work itself and the way to do it. My colleagues are to supply them with arms and ammunition; they are to come to this chair to learn how to use their equipments, how to carry them, how to load, take aim and fire, and how to avail themselves of the results of their execution. In point of fact, this chair is the only one directly engaged in imparting that peculiar kind of knowledge which is required in ministerial work. This chair alone fulfils the idea of what a Theological Seminary for the education of a gospel ministry ought to be. What is taught in the other departments,—the original languages of the Holy Scriptures, hermeneutics, exegesis, theology, the history of the church in reference to its facts, or in the development of its philosophy—are branches of knowledge which, not ministers only, but every man of accomplished education may and ought to learn, and which should be studied in those Universities that profess to embrace all science and all knowledge.

* See letter of Rev. Charles C. Beatty, D.D., "for himself and wife," in Minutes of General Assembly, 1870, p. 146.

† See Harms, Archidiaconess, Pastoral Theologie, "Preacher, Priest and Pastor."

It is only in this chair that those things are taught which are of exclusive and professional interest to ministers of the gospel. Therefore, while I shall look up to my colleagues with modest reverence on account of their acknowledged attainments, and confess that the departments in which they excel demand a higher order of ability than this particular chair, I shall, at the same time, in regarding our relations to our common work in this Seminary, look down upon them from this chair, which of necessity occupies the very apex of the ideal of an Institution that has for its object the training of young men for the Christian ministry, to send them forth to be preachers, pastors and presbyters in the Church of God. It will be an object with me to impress these ideas on the minds of the students who may honor me by attending upon my lectures and recitations. I shall try to convince them that if they graduate from this Seminary full of Hebrew, Greek, history, philosophy and theology, but ignorant of the practical work of the minister in the pulpit, the parish and the presbytery, they may become useful and distinguished as men of learning, of elegant scholarship, of profound thought and of orthodox theology, but not successful ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ. It will be still further my object, not merely to impart to them an intelligent apprehension of the work to be done, and of the way in which it is to be done, but to incite in them a holy, enthusiastic, passionate love for *the work* itself, that they may enter upon it with the ardor and delight that insure success.

Thus far I have spoken of the duties of this chair with reference to their strictly practical direction. We must not ignore the fact, however, that the functions of the Christian ministry are themselves determined by the theory and doctrine of Christianity, or by theology in its widest sense. The nature of the offices of the preacher, the pastor and the presbyter, is determined *directly* by the external form of church order and polity, and *mediately*, through the outward form, by the idea of the church and the sacraments—the symbols of the church—of which idea the outward form is the expression and

the resultant. I cannot doubt, therefore, that it belongs to my province to expound and inculcate the right theory of the church and the sacraments. Objection has been made to the term *pastoral theology*. But very obvious reasons would lead us to prefer, as more comprehensive of the real scope of this third department of our chair, the term *ecclesiastical theology*. Were the object of this chair only to treat of the duties of a presbyter in our Presbyterian Church as already organized, the present incumbent would congratulate himself upon receiving the students already indoctrinated as to the theory of the church and sacraments from the hands of a Professor of Didactic Theology to whom God has given most eminent qualifications for His work. But if the term "Church Government" signifies instruction in the right principles of church order and polity, and their defence from all ecclesiastical forms of order and polity that emanate from false principles, then that branch of theology which treats of the idea of the church and sacraments must be presented from this chair. I am encouraged in this view by the declared opinion of the present occupant of the chair of Didactic Theology, and by a knowledge of the fact that the field of ecclesiastical polemics is not fully occupied in his department of instruction. Whether I am right or wrong in this conclusion, it is at least apparent that my views on the theory of the church must give shade and coloring to all instruction in reference to the ministry of the church. You, therefore, should know what those views are. Let me premise, however, that it is my intention now rather to state them than to defend them.

Since all truth is related, any particular truth may be chosen as a centre in relation to which all other truths may be arranged. It is not surprising, therefore, that able and discriminating minds have fixed on different points in the wide circumference of truth as the central idea of the Church of God. To go back, as some do, to the eternal purpose of God for the origin of the church,* is to go back to the origin of all facts dependent on the will of God. To find

* In Robinson's Church of God, §§ 4, 5.

the developing idea of the church in the purpose of God "to redeem a body of elect sinners, an organic body with all its parts related to each other, and the Mediator himself the Head thereof,"* is not only to seek the form in a very remote germ, but is to mistake harmony between two co-related ideas for identity of substance. Besides, unless the *ἐκλεκτοί*, the elect of the covenant of redemption, become the *κλητοί*, the called of the manifested purpose of God, this ingenious theory is a mere figment of the imagination. But in point of fact, if we are to believe that all dying in infancy are to be saved, then the vast majority of the heavenly *ἐκκλησία* were never called by the external *κλήσις* of the word, and were never members of the external *ἐκκλησία* on earth; † while, on the other hand, vast numbers in the church at all times, and in some periods of its history almost the entire number of its constituted members, may not be regarded as belonging to the elect of God. We cannot, therefore, grant that "the elementary conception of the church, which must enter into every definition of the church, is of that elect body of men which was contemplated in the covenant of redemption as constituting the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ, and for the sake of which body he undertook the work of salvation." ‡ God never meant us to conceive of the church as being what it is not. If it is almost certain that a majority of the elect, thus far in the world's history, never belonged to the church on earth, and if it is equally certain that multitudes of those who have belonged to the church were not elect, then it is simply impossible to conceive of the church "as constituting the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ" and composed of that "elect body of men for whom Christ undertook the work of salvation." At this day, if we embrace all the Roman Catholic, the Greek and other oriental churches, and all Protestant denominations holding to the Apostles' creed, in the church of God, many are called, *κλητοί*, but few are chosen, *ἐκλεκτοί*. The constant attempt to identify the church in Heaven with the church on earth, has confused all intelligible definitions of the church; has made it

* See Robinson's Church of God, § 6.

† Ib. § 8.

‡ Ib. § 7.

necessary to invent impossible discriminations between the church invisible and the church visible; and has put evangelical Christians at immense disadvantage in repelling, on the one hand, the imposing claims of the Church of Rome to be the only true and holy Catholic Church, and on the other hand, the superb arrogance of sacramental sectarians, who embrace both the Heavenly and the earthly churches within the narrow confines of their own denominational enclosures.

We advance nearer to the germinal idea of the church when, leaving the general purposes of God and the particular purpose of God in redemption, we proceed to the fact that in the manifestation and execution of His purpose of redemption, it has pleased God to adopt the method of "*successive covenants.*" From time to time God has bound Himself by covenant compacts with men whom He has "called" to be "a peculiar people," to bear His name among their fellow-men, to be the recipients of certain benefits on condition of fulfilling special obligations, and, on forfeiture of the same, to be liable to certain penalties. Those who are embraced in these covenant relations to God constitute the Church of God, in any correct definition of that term; and the conditions of the covenant must determine the idea and theory of the church from which its external structure takes its form and character.

The idea of the church then proceeds from God's entering into special covenant with an *ἐκκλησία*, a church, called to be His; and related to Him by special promises on His part, and by special obligations on theirs. The members of this church do not constitute all the *ἐκλεκτοί*, might possibly embrace none of them, but are the instruments through whom God pursues His purposes of grace and redemptive love. They are His church, for specific ends to be accomplished on earth; but a church that does not include all who shall be saved, nor insure salvation to those who are in it by any necessity of its construction. It may be a church of sinners, unpardoned, unregenerate, not elect, yet it is the Church of God, the

instrumentality He chooses to use for the salvation of souls, and which eventually will become the church of the redeemed, the church triumphant, the church in Heaven.

If the church is composed of those who are in covenant with God, then the covenant itself, in its terms, conditions and peculiarities, must determine who those persons are, and how they are to be unified, controlled and governed.

Our next point is, that the character of the covenant must be evolved from the signs and seals that confirm that covenant. In the patriarchal church down to the time of Abraham, the only seal of the covenant seems to have been that of animal sacrifices, the father of the family acting as the priest. To Abraham and his seed was given the sacrament of circumcision. To this was added by Moses the sacrament of the Passover, looking to a bloody sacrifice, and the family of Aaron were constituted the priests of God to offer that sacrifice. In our Christian dispensation of God's covenant, we have the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the latter referring to the sacrifice of the cross and pointing to our Great High Priest in Heaven.

What do these sacraments signify? What is their intent? What is their efficacy? On the answer to these questions depend the elucidation of the true theory of the church and the right determination of its outward form and structure.

Three distinct theories have been propounded in reference to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

One is, that they directly and immediately communicate the grace of God. Baptism regenerates. The elements of the Lord's Supper contain and impart the real life of Christ.

The second theory is, that these sacraments are signs and seals of the covenant of grace, which may and often do convey that grace but do not invariably and necessarily convey and impart it.

The third theory denies to the sacraments any special virtue, and regards them merely as religious ordinances, which do good to the

recipients only by impressing truth on their minds, as preaching does, and in no other way. They are sermons addressed to the eye, as sermons preached are addressed to the ear. Baptism is a decorous form of dedicating the person baptized to the service of God. It implies no special grace on God's part. Its only efficiency is found in the motives of the parents who present the infant for baptism, or in the sincerity of the adult who demands and receives it. The Lord's Supper is merely a memorial service, calling to mind the death of our Lord Jesus Christ; a sort of celebration in the Christian Church, very similar in its spirit and aims to the celebration of the Fourth of July by patriotic Americans. The only benefits of the ordinance are derived from the pious emotions of those who participate in it.

Each of these theories of the sacraments, as it is very easy to see, is in harmony with a particular form or structure of church order and polity, towards which it inevitably tends and in which alone it can have its proper and entire development.

(1.) The first inevitably tends to prelacy and a hierarchical government. The administrator of the sacraments makes men Christians and imparts Christ to them. This presupposes an order of men, or, if it does not presuppose, sanctions and encourages belief in such an order of men, who by the laying on of hands can impart the Holy Ghost, so that the person thus ordained can himself impart regenerating and sanctifying grace in the administration of the sacraments. Thus the doctrine of *apostolical succession*, with all its difficulties and absurdities, becomes a logical necessity. Only a man who has received the Holy Ghost by direct descent from the Apostles can transmit the Holy Ghost to others; only such a man can with propriety say, after having baptized a child, "Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks, etc." The man who thus makes the church is of right a ruler in the church of his own creation. The doctrine of efficient grace in the sacraments inevitably

tends to clerical rule in the church and culminates in diocesan episcopacy. It would do so, if only from the moral power over men's consciences, which they, who can make Christians, "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of eternal life," must acquire. And hence, prelacy in its highest development absorbs all authority, power and rule in the clergy, and excludes the laity from any participation in them.

(2.) The third, or lowest Zwinglian doctrine of the sacraments, never grew into any particular form of church organization, or became identified with the structure of any national or completely organized church. I believe it has never been distinctly formulated in the symbols of any *living* church. It has been wrongly claimed that this theory is propounded in the form for the administration of the Lord's Supper in the liturgy of the Reformed (lately the Reformed Dutch) Church of this country. It is not difficult to see, however, that its affinities are with the lowest forms of Brownism or Independency. Its tendency is to destroy any necessity for the existence of an ordained ministry, and to the neglect, or complete disuse of the sacraments themselves. The Society of Friends, or Quakerism, is the direct result of these low views of the sacraments. The next step to depriving the sacraments of all grace, is to deprive the ministry of all authority.

(3.) The second theory of the sacraments can hardly develop itself under any other form of church order and government, than that which combines the essential elements of Presbyterianism. According to this theory, the sacraments are signs and seals of the covenant of grace. They are, therefore, to be administered only to those who are in covenant with God, namely, to those who profess faith in Christ together with their children. All the *κληροί*, all whom God calls (and the only evidence we can have of their call is their profession of faith), are to be baptized. But they do not come alone: with themselves, all their children are brought into covenant relations with God, and are therefore to be baptized. In all God's

covenants with men, *children have been included with their parents*. It will not be denied that this was the theory of the Jewish Church. When our Lord Jesus came, He announced that He had not come to destroy, but to fulfil, *πληρῶω, to make full*. It would have been strange, indeed, if after saying this, the first thing He should do were to cast out of the church all the little children and root out the principle that had been observed in every preceding administration of the covenant of grace, that God included children in the promises made to their parents. Christ Himself and all His Apostles were born in the church. Is it at all likely that He would abrogate the principle that constituted His own birth-right and enabled Him to fulfil the conditions of the covenant? Peter did not so understand Him, for on the first occasion of his preaching to *the Jews*, after the ascension of our Lord, he declared that “the promise is to you *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off [*i. e.* the Gentiles], even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” We can only understand from this that the Gentiles were to be called into covenant relations with God on the same terms that had been vouchsafed to the Jews. The same *promise* made to the Jews was now to be made to them, and it would not be the *same* promise unless it included their children. Our doctrine, therefore, is, that wherever a man accepts and professes the gospel, he is to be recognized as one called of God, a *κλητός*, and therefore within the terms of the covenant. He is already in the church and is to be baptized, and as he is in the church his infant children are in the church and are to be baptized. Baptism, therefore, does not make Christians or members of the covenant, but only recognizes those that are such already, and “is not to be administered to any that are out of the pale of the church.”

We are now to consider this germinal principle as it develops itself in the order and polity of church government. Every one born into the line of transmission, or brought into it by a profession of faith, is a member of the church, or what is the same thing, is included in God's covenant with His church, and is baptized, not

to make him a member of the church, but in recognition of the fact that he is already by profession at least, a member of Christ, a child of God and an inheritor of eternal life. No person, therefore, is made a member of the church and brought into covenant relations with God, by the will or act of a certain clerical or priestly order, endued of Heaven with special grace for this purpose. Consequently the prior existence of such a clerical or priestly order is not necessary to the existence of the church. The idea of the church and its members is first, in the order of time, and these members of the church create and constitute, out of themselves, the clerical or priestly order as stewards of God, to minister to them the precious things which are theirs by a divine inheritance.

The inheritance of children in the covenant made with their fathers leads us to seek for the true idea and theory of the church in the family. The family is the type of the church. The church is the family. The church, in its highest and perfect development, is the family of Heaven. God Himself the Father; Christ the Elder, and Elder Brother, who has made the members of His body, children of God, and if children, then heirs of God, and priests and kings unto God, possessing in themselves those rudimental ideas of priestship and kingship that enable them to confer the office and authority of ministering in holy things and ruling in the church of God. The family is the church. Marriage is sanctified. It is the mystery of Christ and His church. Man and wife "married in the Lord," the children are born "in the Lord." So scrupulous is the covenant to its conditions that the believing husband sanctifies the unbelieving wife, and the believing wife the unbelieving husband. If either parent is in covenant with God, the birth-right is transmitted to the children; the children are, according to St. Paul, federally "holy," or, in the words of our standards, "born in the pale of the church." The idea of the church, then, must be found in that of the family where every child has a birth-right, and where government is first exercised by

the parents. Therefore, "Honor thy father and thy mother," has the next place in the moral law of the church to honoring God. But as the family increases, and its heads multiply, and as an elective power is naturally exercised by adult members between the various heads who might claim authority, the eldership, or government by *elders*, is the legitimate result. This is, and ever has been, the government of the church of God, where the divine idea of the church has been preserved, a government of elders.

This theory of the church is fully developed in the structure of Presbyterianism, the essential features of which are, (1.) the parity of the ministry, (2.) a lay eldership, (3.) courts of review and control, to which we must add, (4.) as common to it, with other forms of church government, a diaconate. The principle that underlies this whole structure is that of the family and the inheritance of children as a birth-right in the covenant that God has made with their parents.

We are prepared now, from this theory of the church, to evolve the specific functions of the preacher, the pastor and the presbyter.

The preacher is chosen by the people and ordained in the name of the Lord, to preach or proclaim, *κηρύσσειν*, as a herald, *κήρυξ*, the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Kingdom of God, calling and persuading men to accept of the covenant, and become disciples of the Lord, *μαθητεύσαντες*, baptizing them into the name of the adorable Trinity, continuing to instruct them in Christian doctrine for their edification "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Lord has commanded," and by fair inference, administering to them from time to time the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper (Matt. 28: 19, 20; Mark 16: 15, 16, 20; Luke 24: 45-49). This completes the idea of the ministry as prescribed by the Saviour Himself.

The pastor is one chosen by God's children in the Christian church or family, to stand to them in the place of a father, to become the priest and king of that Christian household, their typical representative before the world, and their real representative in the courts of the church.

The presbyter is a ruling elder, chosen to his office by the people, empowered with the authority of that office by Christ the Head of the Catholic Church or the completed family of God. The presbyter, in the official sense in which we here use the word, is simply a ruling elder, whether he be a clergyman or a layman. The presbyter may be a preacher. The preacher is not of necessity a ruling elder. If in our church the office of the ministry is regarded as including that of the ruling eldership; this is not due to any principle of common law, lying at the foundation of our theory of the church, but to special statute law, or to long prevailing custom that has acquired the sanction and power of law. The church of God, in all dispensations of grace, has been governed, not by an order of men consecrated to administer its ordinances of worship, but by a body of ruling elders especially appointed for this purpose, and chosen largely, if not almost exclusively, from persons engaged in the ordinary secular pursuits of life. It was so with the descendants of Abraham during their servitude in Egypt, in their reorganization under Moses, during the period of the Judges, in the days of the monarchy, in both the kingdoms of Judah and of Israel, among the Jews of the captivity, and after the restoration to their own land down to the days of Christ and His apostles, and down to the destruction of Jerusalem and the final dispersion of the nation. During all these centuries of history, the facts of which are so fully recorded in the Bible and by profane writers, it does not appear that the High Priest, Priests and Levites, or those who were specially consecrated, set apart and devoted to the religious service of God and the church, were by that ordination endowed with power to govern the church. A priest might be an elder, but was not of necessity an elder. The High Priest might and did, in time and by custom, become the permanent presiding officer of the body of ruling elders, but was not such by any original virtue of his priesthood. On the contrary the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron had their elders as well as the other tribes and families of Israel. If then the holy priesthood did not

confer upon the individual the powers of a ruling elder, we cannot think that the modest office of a preacher of the Gospel does. The distinctive office of a minister is to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. In which part of this office do we find authority to rule? Surely not in preaching. We license candidates for the ministry to preach the Gospel; but we are very jealous of their exercising any authority in the church. We will not even allow a licentiate a seat in the session of a church over which he is placed as a stated supply. Do we then connect the right to rule with the administration of the sacraments? How can we, unless we assume that the sacraments constitute the church, and the administrator of the sacraments withholds or imparts, at his own volition, the grace which alone can make a man "a member of Christ, a child of God and an inheritor of eternal life?" Our Presbyterian principles tremble to their very foundations at the mere thought of attaching "the power of the keys" to the administration of the sacraments! But it may be urged that the minister of the Gospel, who alone can baptize and consecrate the Lord's Supper, must determine when, where and to whom he will administer the sacraments, and that this constitutes of itself the power of discipline, power to admit or exclude from the church, power therefore to rule the church. I deny the entire premises. God forbid that any such power should be given to a minister of the Gospel! God Himself has prescribed the terms of the sacraments. The ruling elders of the Christian family must determine, in accordance with those terms, when, where and to whom the sacraments are to be administered. The minister, as such, is only the *minister, i. e. the servant* of the family and must obey the commands and lawful authority of its ruling elders.

We are forced then to the conclusion that the office of the ministry does not of necessity include the office of a ruler in the house of God. But here, we must observe, that ordination by the laying on the hands of the Presbytery includes something more than ordi-

nation to the ministry of the word and of the sacraments ; it is in fact ordination to *the eldership*, that includes in it the distinct functions of the minister or preaching elder and of the ruling elder. These distinct functions, of what is in reality but one office, may be conferred upon one man or distributed among different men. In the New Testament and in the purest records of the earliest church, we find but *one ordination*—"elders were ordained in every church." But we also find that the different functions of the eldership were distributed among different men, according to their gifts and the grace given to them. Some were specially appointed to preach, some to teach, some to be "helps and governments," and some were designated as bishops or pastors, both "ruling well and especially laboring in word and doctrine." So with us, ministerial ordination confers authority to preach and administer sacraments, and also authority to exercise rule over the churches ; but in his capacity as a ruling elder the minister can claim no pre-eminence over the lay elder. It was no expression of humility and condescension on the part of the Apostle Peter, when he wrote, "The elders which are among you, I exhort *who am also an elder*;" but it was the assumption of the highest authority belonging to the permanent organization of the Christian church.

If these principles are correct, then the minister should only exercise the functions of a ruling elder or presbyter, when he stands in some relation to the people equivalent to that of a pastor, whom a particular church has chosen to be its presiding elder, the moderator of its session, and the representative of that church in the higher courts. Our church—the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—has constituted its Presbyteries and Synods of all ministers, with or without pastoral charges, living within their bounds, with one ruling elder from each church, unless two or more churches have one pastor, in which case they are entitled to only one elder between them. This is, undoubtedly, a radical departure from first principles. The church, nevertheless, has derived great benefit and has suffered little injury from this constitution of Presbytery and Synod.

The piety and wisdom which have so wonderfully characterized the ministry of our church, have been largely represented by ministers without charges, especially by aged men who have been obliged to relinquish active labor, who have greatly added to the efficiency of our ecclesiastical courts. We could not have afforded to dispense with this valuable element in our deliberative and legislative bodies. We cannot now afford to lose it. And yet the time may come when a general deterioration in the character of the ministry, and a disposition on their part towards clerical usurpation and "lording it over God's heritage," may render the large majority of the clerical vote in our Presbyteries and Synods a serious and perilous evil. Even now it is esteemed by some an actual evil. It contributes to the overshadowing, not to say the overpowering, of the lay-eldership in our higher judicatures, and it renders our often repeated assertion that the Presbyterian government is a representative government, untrue in point of fact. We tell our people that they cannot be "priest-ridden," because they are represented in the church courts by their elders, they are governed by men elected by themselves. But how many grains of truth do we find in this statement when we come to the absolute facts? A feeble country church was captivated by a young licentiate, who ought never to have been licensed. A facile Presbytery yielded to the importunity of that church and ordained the young man to the ministry and installed him as pastor. In a few weeks his stupidity and ignorance became apparent even to his rustic parishioners, and they ejected him from the pastorate. Years have passed, and that man has never found another church willing to call him to the pastorate, or even to tolerate him in the pulpit. Yet he continues, as a member of Presbytery and Synod, to rule the churches of Christ that do not know him, or knowing him do not esteem him. Whom does that man represent? Has the choice of a little country church, made long ago, and long ago repented of, so long ago that the church itself may have passed out of existence, clothed that man with irrevocable powers as a

ruler in God's house? Take another instance. A church of 1,000 communicants and 3,000 souls, is represented in Presbytery and Synod by the pastor and one elder, or two votes; while a church of 100 members and 300 souls, that may happen to have within its fold five ministers besides the pastor, can command, whenever its interests require it, seven votes. Does this constitute a fair representation of the people in our courts. Is this consistent with the boast that a lay eldership protects the people against clerical misrule and oppression? Take another illustration. At a small meeting of Presbytery, where a majority of those present were ministers without charge, a pastoral relation was dissolved, and the minister thus released was allowed to accept a call to a distant field. That minister, on returning to his home, was met with such indignant remarks as these: "Who were the men that voted to have you go away from us? They were not pastors. They did not represent the sentiments of the churches. Had this matter been put to a fair vote of the people of our Presbytery, they would never have consented to your leaving them. The ministers have done this, and the people have not even been asked for their consent. The vote of the Presbytery was not the voice of the church, but the private opinion of men who are not identified with our churches." These and similar mutterings of a casually excited disapprobation indicate an under-drift of popular thought and feeling, that those who guide the ecclesiastical ship should not disregard. There is in our church a lamentable want of intelligent apprehension of the real principles that underlie its structure; but there is also among those who comprehend these principles, a shrewd suspicion that these fundamental principles, as we call them, are not the living, animating principles of our Presbyterianism, as it actually is. On stated occasions, such as ordinations, organization of new churches, or moderator's sermons, these principles are unearthed and cleansed from the dust of their ordinary obscurity, and polished by keen logic and adorned with florid rhetoric, till they glow with splendor, and dazzle and delight

the eyes of an admiring people. But the occasion over, these precious principles sink back so deep into the theoretic foundation of the church that they cannot be seen, and are left to moulder in the dust amongst the disused relics of antiquity. In vain the people are assured, on such occasions, that the Presbyterian church is an ecclesiastical republic, where all are equal in the eye of the law, and all are represented in its legislation and administration, and the individual is respected, and, however humble, his rights are protected and his privileges secured; for all these assurances, the dear people are in their own minds of the opinion that the Presbyterian church is wholly controlled by its clerical members. Nor do they object to this. They are willing to have it so, at least as long as ministers continue to be the wise and good men that they are. The people are quiescent and passive, and willing to let well enough alone. But who does not see that they feel less interest and zeal in ecclesiastical matters than they would if they were actively participating in their management. What is needed now, at this time, to revive the love, to quicken the zeal, and to kindle the enthusiasm of the people for our Presbyterian church, is this,—to develop that element of popular government that lies inactive and almost unrecognized, in the fundamental principles of our church. Let the people understand that this church is *par eminence* their church, the people's church, let them feel that they are not only in it, but alive in it, a working element of its power, deriving life to their own souls from its communion and communicating that life to others, and then with holy, passionate earnestness they will labor for the expansion and increasing glory of our Presbyterian church, and will regard it, as what it truly is, next to the Saviour Himself, the most precious boon that God has bestowed upon the children of the covenant.

Most courteous hearers, I know that your patience must be exhausted. Yet, I cannot resume my seat without at least glancing at one question to which, when I began the preparation of this address, I intended to give the most prominent place. *What do the times in*

which we live demand of the Christian ministry? How can we in this Seminary best fit these young men for the work they are to do in these times and in this country and in foreign lands?

Amidst the surging waves of modern progress we have seen the solid foundations of what once constituted ministerial influence, sadly disintegrated, and one element after another swept away by the rapid current of events, that are producing their inevitable changes in the thoughts, opinions and habits of mankind. If we are not awake, alive and alert, we may yet see our Presbyterian ministry left, like a stranded vessel on a lee shore, by the waves of progress that have retreated from it to return no more. The old-fashioned minister, whom your fathers honored and almost adored, grave and decorous, soundly orthodox, laboriously working over long-winded sermons that never rose to great heights, nor sunk beneath a respectable level, is not the minister for these days. He may still find some place of usefulness in settlements remote from the centres of commerce, trade and manufacture. But where the confluence of the streams of modern activity meet, he is out of place. He belongs to the rubbish of times that are past and effete, and must be swept off the stage of action to prepare the way for the coming man. The minister of the future is not, like Jeremiah's hero, to run with the footmen and contend with the horses, but he is to run and not to be wearied in the race with the rushing locomotive, nor outstripped by the lightning telegraph. This minister must be possessed of a spiritual energy, commensurate in its powers with those physical forces of steam and electricity that are now determining the rapid and intricate developments of human society. But what is to give the minister of the future this energy and power to contend against and overcome the united forces of the physical and spiritual kingdoms, whence the Prince of this world is gathering his resources for the final conflict between truth and error, Heaven and Hell? Is it *learning* that will give to the minister of the future the power he needs? It is no longer possible for the ordinary minister to com-

pete with the men of this world in the field of knowledge: The graduate of the modern university not only has studied languages, literature, history and mathematics, but he has pursued the sciences to their latest discoveries and their most adventurous speculations, and thus equipped for future researches, he must soon leave far behind him the minister who is absorbed in the work of his pulpit and his parish. Will *eloquence* give the minister the power he needs? It may attract the multitudes, may win the attention of the few; but it comes into close and arduous competition with the eloquence of the bar and the senate, of the political orator and the rhetorical lecturer, and of every fanatical advocate of error and untruth. Learning, eloquence and genius may be the minister's allies, but not the reservoirs of that power that shall make him the victor over the world, the flesh and the devil. He, whose providence is driving on the progress of events in society,—He, who created the physical forces and discovers to men the methods of their application to the useful arts, that are now in turn creating wealth, stimulating thought, and re-energizing human souls,—He must Himself be the source of that power that shall overcome these physical and human agencies and convert them into the instruments of establishing His kingdom on earth. The ministry of the future must derive its power directly from the grace and Spirit of God. Its power must be that of the life of God in the soul of man, manifested in man's outer life; the power of the Spirit of God accompanying the word spoken in His name, in His church, and by His command. When the minister speaks, the people must be compelled by the Divine Spirit to listen and believe, and when they listen and believe, they must find that the word of God in them is a well of water springing up into eternal life, and that from this word of God they obtain what wealth, science, literature, art and society cannot give, but what every sinful heart of man is secretly longing for—mercy, pardon, grace—“assurance of God's love,

peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, increase of grace and perseverance therein to the end.”

Let us not fear for the future. Infidelity may threaten. Worldliness may flow into the church like a flood. The ministry may seem powerless, by any learning, zeal or eloquence of theirs to stem the tide. But when they can preach in the power and demonstration of the Holy Ghost, and give to man in exchange for the world, not merely words and promises, but realizations—the hidden treasure, the pearl of great price—men will hear them willingly and rejoice in gospel truth with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Piety, always needed in ministers, is now more than ever essential to success. It is the one and only qualification that insures success. It is the greatest want of the times. The minister of the future is to be a man of prayer, of devout heart, living in close communion with God, and “full of faith and the Holy Ghost.”