

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 3.

NOVEMBER, MDCCCLXVI.

ARTICLE I.

Origins of Christianity. Vol. I. The Life of Jesus. Vol. II. The Apostles. By ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut. Translated from the original French. New York: Carleton, Publisher, No. 413 Broadway. Paris: Michel Levy Frères. 1864 and 1866: pp. 376, 353, 12mo.

The cordon of war thrown around us on land and sea by the late civil contest, if it has kept from our knowledge much that is useful and good, has shut out also much that is evil. The first of the volumes whose title is given above, was published in Paris in 1863, and had a wide and almost unexampled circulation in France, having reached the seventh edition in 1864. It soon appeared in an English dress, both in Great Britain and America. Like the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss, it contemplates the Author of Christianity from a point of view wholly rationalistic, and is suited and was designed to unsettle the faith of men in the evangelical history as a divinely inspired record, and in Jesus Christ as any other than a merely human and fallible teacher. Joseph Ernest Renan, the author, we learn from other sources, was born of humble, it is said of Jewish parents, at Treguier, in Brittany, Feb. 27, 1823, and was educated for the

VOL. XVII., NO. 3.—1.

generations will wonder that in the nineteenth century men gravely disputed whether God could interpose, in the direct exercise of his power, in the world he has made. The miracle, a century hence, will be made as credible as any common fact. Let the earth be explored; let its physical history be traced; and a mighty voice will come to us from the tombs of its perished races, testifying, in a thousand instances, to the miraculous hand of God. Geology and the Bible must kiss and embrace each other, and this younger daughter of science will be found, like the eastern magi, bringing her votive offerings to the cradle of the Prince of peace. The earth can never turn traitor to its God, and its stones have already begun to cry out against those who attempted to extract from them a lesson of infidelity or atheism."

The method of M. Renan would destroy the genuineness and credibility of all those ancient writings which are the study of scholars, and have been the instructors of all succeeding generations; and it would extinguish in respect to salvation all the yearnings of the anxious and guilty soul, and annihilate the hopes of man.

ARTICLE II.

THE SCIENCE OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.*

We believe that there is a SCIENCE of Pastoral Theology; though we can hardly tell why we think so, unless we infer that it exists from its manifest necessity. There has never been made, so far as we know, a distinct enunciation of its fundamental principles, much less has there ever been a systematic combination of them in scientific form.

* These pages owe their origin to the question, "Is there such a thing as a *Science of Pastoral Theology?*" very earnestly propounded to the writer, by a young friend and relative, who was, at the time, engaged in the study of the subject under the direction of a recently appointed Professor in a Theological Seminary.

Science is systematized knowledge. A complete science of any subject, is the orderly arrangement of all the knowledge that we possess concerning it, in such a manner as to exhibit the mutual relations of all the parts to each other and to the whole system. In order to a perfect science, it is necessary that we have all attainable knowledge consistently wrought into one grand system. We had fondly hoped that the creation of the science of pastoral theology was to be the special work of the Church of our own age; but from the manner in which the subject is treated by the leading minds of the Church, and especially from the manner of dealing with it in the theological seminaries, we begin to fear that the task is reserved for a future generation.

The idea of pastoral theology which has prevailed up to this time, is exemplified in such works as Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, Bridges on the *Christian Ministry*, sketches of striking incidents of pastoral life by various authors, and with some little attempt at scientific statement in the work of Vinet. We may therefore safely affirm that, so far as there is now existent any thing claiming to be a science of pastoral theology, it is simply empirical, consisting of generalisations from very limited personal experience and observation. We do not mean the experience of the individual writer alone; but his own combined with that of a few others upon whose wisdom and sagacity he has been accustomed to rely.

The greatest difficulty in the way of constructing a true science of administrative theology, is that the whole subject has always been regarded as a matter of purely subjective experience. No one seems willing to learn any thing except from what he himself has felt, or from the experience of some other man, to whom he has committed the duty of doing his thinking and feeling for him. On this subject hardly any one seems ever to suppose that any thing can be learned from the experience of the whole Church in all past ages.

Take, for example, the "revival measures" with which young ministers are so often brought in contact. By this we can test the question, whether there exists any science to guide us in so important a matter. We can at the same time convince our-

selves of the necessity of having one for this and many other cases of momentous practical interest. Indeed, we shall find that the whole subject of revivals of religion, the most important with which pastoral theology has to do, is in a state of absolute chaos. No man seems to know what principles are involved or how they ought to be applied to the practical government and guidance of the Church.

Let any one ask a dozen or more of his friends or acquaintances who advocate the use of "anxious seats," why they employ that measure or instrumentality? It is probable that each one will give a different answer. The difference may not at first be very apparent; but if he will push his inquiries, so as to ascertain how the subject lies in their minds, he will find that hardly any two of them agree. If they answer with one accord, that they adopt the "measure" only as a convenient method of finding out who are deeply concerned for their soul's eternal salvation; then let them be asked why they wish to know, and require them to give their whole theory from that point: it will be found that their views are very various. If the opponents of such measures are asked why they reject them, there will be found just as great a diversity, going even to the extent of discrediting revivals, or dictating to the Lord how he shall carry on the administration of his grace. On both sides, as a general rule, they proceed upon the results of their own experience, upon what they themselves have felt, or upon what their eyes have seen. One will say, I was present in the church at A. during a great revival of religion or a powerful and glorious work of grace, and the Rev. Dr. B. (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) employed the "anxious seat" with great success. Many were hopefully converted, and there was no manifestation of undue or injurious excitement.

A careful analysis will show that the reasons contained in these answers may all be referred to the personal experience of the individual combined with his unbounded confidence in the wisdom of Dr. B. Whatever science there is here, is simply empirical. It is a generalisation from the very limited experience of two individuals, or rather, as a farther analysis would

prove, from the exceedingly contracted experience of the man himself. But suppose that the other party has felt, in precisely the same circumstances, something which he regards as injurious, he will draw the inference that such measures are calculated to work mischief, and ought never to be used. This is very unsatisfactory. Both will then try to fortify their own experience by the testimony of others. To which then shall we incline? To him who can produce the longest catalogue of names? But who shall decide as to the relative weight and importance of the cited testimonies?

If the question is to be determined empirically, that is, by experience and observation, it is evident that we ought to have an induction from the experience of the whole Church at least of one age, if not of the Church universal from the beginning. Here we see at once the necessity and the absence of science.

“Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.”

We want a true science to determine the very data of such a controversy. We must verify the accuracy of the observations. We must ascertain the truth of the experiences. Did the one really derive benefit, and the other incur injury from the use of these measures? Is the question to be settled by the feelings of either party or by their judgment as to the feelings of others? Or is there some higher and well ascertained truth to which the feelings and observations of all may be referred as to a test or standard? The discovery of such higher truth and the method of its application to this case, will constitute the science of pastoral theology so far as it relates to “revival measures.”

This casual glance, simply for purposes of illustration, at one aspect of one part of the great subject of revivals of religion, may well convince us of the necessity of a true science in this department of administrative theology. We want something more than a mere experimental science, even though our generalisations should embrace the experiences of the whole Church of all ages.

If we take up the subject of church discipline, we shall find the same chaotic confusion. So also of Homiletics, or the

science of preaching, and indeed throughout the whole range of the Christian activities of the pastor, elder, and also the deacon.

It is not enough, however, for us to find fault, or merely to indicate the necessities of the case. Although it may argue unusual temerity, we are bound to show that a *science* of pastoral theology is possible, which we can not do, without making an effort, however feeble, to construct it.

If there be a science of pastoral theology, all its materials must be found in the Sacred Scriptures. We do not believe that it is possible to build up *any* science of theology from the materials given in Church history, *i. e.* from the recorded experience of the Church of all ages, much less from that of one age, one country, one denomination, one congregation, one minister, one man, one woman, or one child. The office of ecclesiastical history is rather to illustrate than to originate the science of theology. It exhibits the actual working, in the midst of a thousand discordant elements, of the true principles of this eminently practical science.

History may be a clew to guide us to the principles of true science. This is emphatically true of Church history in its relations to theology. The clew is fastened at one end in the truth of divine revelation, the other hangs loose in our individual experience. With reference to administrative theology, we may begin at either end. Taking up the thread at its loose end, we may trace it back along the line of the experience of the Church, and we shall then have an inductive or experimental science, which will be true and valuable, if we actually ascend to the great principles taught in the word of God. In point of fact, however, the clew is too attenuated, and it has been too much deflected from its course by the disturbing forces which have convulsed the Church, to make the experimental method sure and safe.

Having the infallible source of all knowledge of God and duty in the Holy Scriptures, by far the wiser and safer process is to begin with the great principles as God has revealed them, to arrange them in system according to their mutual relations, and then to trace their action and influence along the track of time

until we come to our own days and the sphere of our own personal and official activities in the Church of Christ. Therefore, in arranging the departments of the one great science of Theology, we would place them in the following order :

1. Exegetical Theology.
2. Didactic or Dogmatic Theology.
3. Executive or Administrative Theology.
4. Historical Theology.

The two departments of dogmatic and administrative theology really constitute but one science. They can be distinguished by the analysis of thought, but they can not be disjoined. They are related to each other as light and its effulgence.

The great work of Exegetical theology is to ascertain, by all legitimate means, the exact meaning of the Scriptures,—to learn just what God has revealed of himself, and of our relations to him. The results thus obtained are handed over to the second department, and are by it arranged into a harmonious system, which leaves out no truth of revelation, but shows them all in their mutual relations and dependence.

This beautiful system thus arranged, so that every part may be brought forth at once and used for the special ends for which it was designed, is passed over to the third department, or administrative theology, in order that it may be actually reduced to practice.

The historical department shows how this divine system has wrought in the actual life of the Church of God, amidst all the disturbing elements from within and without, which have retarded her onward march toward the grand consummation of God's glorious plans and purposes.

From these statements it would appear that the sphere of each of these departments is identically the same. They each work by different instruments and diverse processes in the same field, and in all parts of its broad area. In order that we may have a complete science of theology in its widest acceptation, every one of these separate departments must embrace and systematize, according to its own specific nature and design, but in mutual harmony with all the others, every truth and principle

contained in the Scriptures. It must also rigidly exclude every thing not given in the revelation of God. They must all embrace and teach "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Every result given by the interpretation of the Scriptures must be wrought into the system of Christian doctrine. The practical working of this whole system, in the life of the Church in its conflicts, its disasters, and its triumphs, amidst heresies, sins, and apostasies, must be clearly exhibited by ecclesiastical history. All the results thus obtained, but especially those embodied in the great system of Christian doctrine which we call didactic theology, must be wrought into the science of pastoral or administrative theology, or into whatever system claims to be a scientific statement of the principles by which the government of the Church of Christ is to be administered.

A science, constructed of these materials and based upon this broad foundation, ought to supersede the shallow empiricism which has hitherto regulated the practical operations of the Church.

There is another arrangement of the four great departments of theological science, by which our views may be brought out more clearly. It assigns also a higher position to the department of history, especially the history of Christian doctrine.

1. Exegetical Theology.
2. Historical “
3. Didactic “
4. Administrative “

According to this classification, the first and second furnish the material of which the third is constructed, while the fourth takes the finished result, and working it over again, moulds it all into forms and formulæ which render the whole system practical. Thus every truth taught in the Scriptures, illustrated in the history of the Church, and systematized by the labors of gifted and pious men, is incorporated and actually reduced to practice by the science of pastoral theology. Thus viewed, the department of administrative theology, demands more learning, profounder views, and more constructive genius, than any of the others. Whoever undertakes to teach this science, will find

himself under the necessity of creating it. He must not only construct it out of the materials furnished by the other three departments; he must also use up all those materials, and leave no rubbish which could not be made to fit anywhere in his building. So far as we know, the first course of this grand edifice is is yet to be laid.

It would be presumptuous in us to undertake to build up a complete science where none of the great men of the Church have dared to make a beginning. We may, however, without subjecting ourselves to the charge of arrogance, volunteer to do the work of the common laborer in clearing the ground and preparing the way for the master-builder. We will first suggest an analysis of the whole science of theology, which we do not present as exhaustive, nor do we claim perfection for our nomenclature. It is offered as simply suggestive.

We place, then, first in order, Exegetical Theology, embracing Introduction and Hermeneutics. Introduction embraces criticism, including all that belongs to the text of the sacred writings, inspiration, natural history, botany, geography, and archæology. Hermeneutics includes philology, linguistic grammar, and logic, resulting in version or translation. The whole is summed up in Exegesis, or the bringing out of the fulness of the meaning of God's word—the complete exhibition of the mind of the Spirit as expressed in the Sacred Scriptures.

The second grand division is Dogmatic Theology, which may be divided into two departments, sometimes designated as theoretical and practical, the same as that intended, as we suppose, by Dr. Breckinridge, in his distinction of Objective and Subjective. We prefer to characterise them as the theology of the truth and the theology of the life, which, according to our scheme, must be absolutely coincident. As all the revealed truth of God is practical, so every thing given in the theology of the truth must be shown in its practical bearings in the theology of the life. The science of the truth will embrace the knowledge of God and of man,—theology proper and anthropology.

Theology proper will embrace the whole teaching of the Scriptures concerning God, the Trinity, Christ, and the Holy Spirit :

and the whole plan and purpose of God with reference to human salvation. Anthropology will consider man under three aspects, as unfallen, as a sinner, and as a saint.

The science of the life will show how all the truths and doctrines of revelation are wrought into the experience of the saint as the source of his eternal life, and all the means and instrumentalities by which his salvation is accomplished, comprising soterology, and then ecclesiology or the science of the Church.

The next grand division is historical theology, which traces the operation of divine truth in producing eternal life, together with the influences of all kinds which have withstood its working or modified the results actually accomplished in the world. The great problem of Church history is to determine precisely what results are to be attributed to the truth of God, and what to other and adventitious causes, and to discriminate accurately between them.

Then comes the science which is yet to be created, by which the relations of the Church to the life, then to the truth, are to be clearly ascertained and scientifically stated. The great central idea of administrative theology is **THE CHURCH**, as the sphere of its operations. The science will therefore show the relation of the Church to man the sinner, and man the saint; to salvation as a present reality, to faith, repentance, and all graces; then to effectual calling, to election, to the persons of the Godhead, the Spirit, the Son, the Father. It will show also the reverse process, the relations of the Church to the Father who chose, the Son who redeemed, and the Spirit who effectually calls; and so through election, redemption, calling, faith, repentance, and every grace, we come back to the sinner saved, or the saint—the member of the Church of God. Then, as the second branch of the subject, it will be necessary to trace the relation between all that we have thus learned, to the visible organisation of the Church, the form of its government, its nature and powers, its officers, courts, members, and ordinances. A true science of Church government must necessarily exhibit the correspondence between the great end for which the Church was instituted, viz., the glory of God in the salvation of men,

through the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, and the form which, under divine direction, the Church has assumed, with all its officers and their functions.

Then the administration of the affairs of this Church, so constituted and so related to man and to God, is the business of the pastoral office, by whomsoever exercised. Pastoral theology, therefore, is the science by which the details of this administration are shown in their relations to the design of the Church, and the whole of the grand system of truth of which the Church is the pillar and ground.

The system, as God has revealed it, is a grand harmonious unity, and a true science of pastoral theology will exhibit this harmony and unity down to the minutest details of daily pastoral work. It will show the principles embodied in the whole system of divine truth in accordance with which all the functions of the Church, its officers, courts, and councils, ought to be used and exercised.

Pastoral theology will then include the discussion of the functions of the officers and courts of the Church, and the time and manner of their exercise. These functions are two, teaching and ruling; the use of the key of doctrine and the key of discipline—the actual employment of the *potestas ordinis*, and the *potestas jurisdictionis*. The fundamental principle of pastoral theology as a science is that every power and function of the Church must be used in accordance with the system of doctrines taught, and the end for which Christ gave his Church authority to rule. The science must show this agreement. The Church, to its minutest fibre, must be pervaded by the energy of a divine life, and this life must be supported by the truth as it is in Jesus. Orthodoxy and living piety must be inseparably blended in the manifestations of the activity of the Church. Take away the life, and the Church of course is dead; take away the truth, and she is insane. We shall then have madness first, and then death. The theology of the truth and that of the life must be coextensive.

In this we have the germinal principle of the science of revivals of religion. If from this we would develop the science so

far as revival measures are concerned, which is the case selected for illustration, we must determine the following points: 1. The end aimed at; 2. The agent in its accomplishment; 3. The method of the agent. It is obvious, then, that the action of the instrument must conform itself to the nature of the work, the character of the agent, and his mode of operation. The nature of the subject to be operated on must also be taken into consideration, and our views of the work of the instrument will be very much modified, according as we make the agent or the subject most prominent. It will therefore be necessary to decide which of the two ought to exert the greater influence in determining the acts of the instrument. This question can only be solved by one who is well acquainted with the science of theology proper, and with the science of anthropology also.

The great end to be accomplished is the glory of God in Christ. The agent is the Holy Spirit. The method is the building up of Christians in all the graces of the Spirit, and the regeneration and conversion of sinners, through faith and repentance. The means employed is the truth of God as revealed concerning his Son Jesus Christ. The instrument is the preacher of the gospel. The subject upon whom this work of regeneration is to be performed, is either a child of the covenant—a member of the Church—or else an unbaptized person, both now considered as unconverted, and standing in equal need of the grace of the Holy Spirit, yet certainly standing in very different relations to God, his truth, and his Church. It must therefore be carefully examined and decided whether this difference requires any diversity in the treatment of the two cases.

In order, then, to determine any question relating to the employment of revival measures upon truly scientific principles of pastoral theology, it is necessary to take into consideration all these points; and to show the correspondence of the proposed measure with the whole system, and to point out its own peculiar place in the scheme of administration of which the end is the glory of God; the agent, the Holy Spirit; the means, the truth of Christ and concerning Christ; the instrument, the Church of God, in teaching and ruling, by the action of its divinely

appointed offices; the subject a sinful man, either in the Church or out of it. The functions of the Church being restricted to teaching and ruling, it will be necessary to inquire whether the measure proposed is for purposes of instruction or discipline. If for instruction, what is its significance? What does it teach, and is this lesson in accordance with the system of truth revealed? If it is a measure of rule and government, does it come within the scope of the authority committed to the Church; and is it adapted to accomplish the ends of discipline? We do not propose to enter upon the discussion of all these grave questions. Our whole design is to give an example of what we suppose to be essentially requisite to the satisfactory determination of this question upon the principles of a scientific pastoral theology; and to give some faint illustration of the stupendous nature of the work which yet lies before the Church. It is a work which, sooner or later, must be accomplished. The science of administrative theology must be built up and settled as truly and strongly as our science of dogmatic theology.

We are well aware of the crude and undigested character of these suggestions. We are travelling in an unknown land, where a few pilgrims have preceded us, but no surveys have been made, no highways cast up, no land-marks established. If we have succeeded in giving ever so rude and incomplete a map of the country, it is more than we dared to hope for, perhaps more than any one will allow that we have accomplished. If, however, what we have written shall induce some abler mind, and more vigorous and graceful pen, to discuss this subject, which to us seems to be of transcendent importance, our utmost expectations will be realised.