

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—DECEMBER, 1888.—No. 6.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE STUDY OF SCIENCE BY MINISTERS.

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

THERE lies open before me a choice edition of a delightful and suggestive book, White's "Natural History of Selborne." It was once said of it, that "it proves in how laudable and useful a manner a parish priest may employ his leisure time, and how serviceable he may be to the natural history and antiquities of his country." Christopher North, in *Blackwood*, has a more glowing encomium: "Who ever read, without the most exquisite delight, White's 'History of Selborne'?"* It is, indeed, a Sabbath book worth a whole library of sermons, nine-tenths of the Bampton Lectures included, and will make a deist of an atheist, of a deist a Christian." The book was published in 1789, while the author was curate at Selborne. Allibone specifies fifteen different editions of it. In fact, it is a classic in English literature. Its story is simple. While fulfilling his parish duties, White was a careful and constant observer of nature. He studied the habits of the birds, the trees and shrubs, the insects, the reptiles which made Selborne their habitat. One of Mr. Darwin's latest scientific studies was the earthworm. I think a reference to White's thirty-fifth letter to Hon. Daines Barrington would show that White anticipated Darwin by a century in his notice of these creatures, which he introduces by saying, "earthworms, though in appearance a small and despicable link in the chain of nature, yet, if lost, would make a lamentable chasm." In a series of letters to his friends, charmingly written, White gives all his observations, often very minute, sometimes very striking, always fascinating. It is a book to make one love the outer world. It will rank in literature with "Walton's Angler," and I pity the clergyman who does not appreciate both. Yet Gilbert White was a parish priest, declining all church preferment, and finding his life not in ecclesiastical rivalries nor theological subtleties, but in simple and devout study of God's works about him. In Dr. McCosh's "Typical Forms and

* Bennett's Ed., revised by Harting. London.

II.—CHRYSOSTOM AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., NEW YORK.

NO. II.

AFTER the death of Nectarius (successor to Gregory Nazianzen), toward the end of the year 397, Chrysostom was chosen, entirely without his own agency and even against his remonstrance, Archbishop or Patriarch of Constantinople. He was hurried away from Antioch by a military escort, to avoid a commotion in the congregation and make resistance useless. He was consecrated February 26, 398, by his enemy Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who reluctantly yielded to the command of the Emperor Arcadius, or rather his Prime Minister, the eunuch Eutropius, and nursed his revenge for a more convenient season.

Constantinople, built by Constantine the Great, in 330, on the site of Byzantium, assumed, as the eastern capital of the Roman Empire, the first position among the patriarchal sees of the East, and became the center of court theology, court intrigues and theological controversies. The second œcumenical council, which was held there in 381, under Theodosius the Great, the last Roman Emperor worthy of the name, decided the victory of Nicene orthodoxy over the Arian heresy, and gave the Bishop of Constantinople the title of Patriarch, next in rank to the Bishop of old Rome—a position which was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon, but disputed by Pope Leo and his successors.

Chrysostom soon gained by his eloquent sermons the admiration of the people, of the weak Emperor Arcadius, and, at first, even of his wife Eudoxia, with whom he afterwards waged a deadly war. He extended his pastoral care to the Goths, who were becoming numerous in Constantinople, had a part of the Bible translated for them, often preached to them himself through an interpreter, and sent missionaries to the Gothic and Scythian tribes on the Danube. He continued to direct by correspondence those missionary operations even during his exile. For a short time he enjoyed the height of power and popularity.

But he also made enemies by his denunciations of the vices and follies of the clergy and aristocracy. He emptied the episcopal palace of its costly plate and furniture and sold it for the benefit of the poor and the hospitals. He introduced his strict ascetic habits and reduced the luxurious household of his predecessors to the strictest simplicity. He refused invitations to banquets, gave no dinner parties, and ate the simplest fare in his solitary chamber. He denounced unsparingly luxurious habits in eating and dressing, and enjoined upon the rich the duty of alms-giving to an extent that tended to increase rather than diminish the number of beggars who swarmed in the streets and around the churches and public baths. He disciplined the vicious clergy and opposed the perilous and immoral habit of the clergy to live under one

roof with "spiritual sisters," against which, in an earlier age, Cyprian had to raise his protest. His unpopularity was increased by his irritability and his subservience to a proud and violent archdeacon, Serapion. The Empress Eudoxia was jealous of his influence over Arcadius and angry at his uncompromising severity against sin and vice. She became the chief instrument of his downfall.

The occasion was furnished by an unauthorized use of his episcopal power beyond the lines of his diocese, which was confined to the city. At the request of the clergy of Ephesus, and the neighboring bishops, he visited Ephesus in January, 401, held a Synod, and deposed six bishops convicted of shameful simony. During his absence of several months he left the episcopate of Constantinople in the hands of Severian, bishop of Gabala, an unworthy and adroit flatterer, who basely betrayed his trust and formed a cabal headed by the Empress and her licentious court ladies for the ruin of Chrysostom. On his return he used unguarded language in the pulpit, and spoke on Elijah's relation to Jezebel in a manner that Eudoxia understood it as a personal insult, which she could not forgive. The clergy were anxious to get rid of a bishop who was too severe for their lax morals.

At this time Theophilus of Alexandria, a haughty and contentious prelate, jealous of Chrysostom, interfered, and in connection with Eudoxia and the disaffected clergy, brought about the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom on false charges of immorality and high treason.

The indignation of the people and a violent earthquake caused his recall, but soon afterwards he was banished a second time by the ambitious Empress, who was severely rebuked by Chrysostom for erecting a silver statue of herself on the Forum before the Church of St. Sophia for public adoration. He ascended the pulpit on the commemoration day of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, and was reported to have uttered the imprudent words: "Again Herodias is raging, again she is dancing, again she demands the head of John on a platter." The comparison of Eudoxia with Herodias, and himself (John) with John the Baptist, was even more directly personal than his former allusion to the relation of Jezebel and Elijah. Whether he really spoke these words is at least doubtful, but they were reported to Eudoxia, who, as a woman and an empress, could never forgive them. She demanded from the Emperor signal redress. In the conflict of imperial and episcopal authority, the former achieved a physical and temporary, the latter a moral and enduring, victory.

The enemies of Chrysostom flocked like vultures down to their prey. Theophilus directed the plot from a safe distance. Arcadius was persuaded to issue an order for the removal of Chrysostom. He continued to preach and refused to leave the church over which God had placed him, but had to yield to armed force. He was dragged by imperial

guards from the cathedral on the vigil of the Resurrection in 404, while the sacrament of baptism was being administered to hundreds of catechumens. "The waters of regeneration," says Palladius, "were stained with blood." The female candidates, half-dressed, were driven by licentious soldiers into the dark streets. The eucharistic elements were profaned by pagan hands. The clergy in their priestly robes were ejected and chased through the city. The horrors of that night were long remembered with a shudder. During the greater part of Easter week the city was kept in a state of consternation. Private dwellings were invaded, and suspected Joannites—the partisans of Chrysostom—thrown into prison, scourged and tortured. Chrysostom, who was shut up in his episcopal palace, twice narrowly escaped assassination.

At last, June 5, 404, the timid and long-hesitating Arcadius signed the edict of banishment. Chrysostom received it with calm submission, and after a final prayer in the cathedral with some of his faithful bishops, and a tender farewell to his beloved Olympias and her attendant deaconesses, he surrendered himself to the guards and was conveyed at night to the Asiatic shore. He had scarcely left the city, when the cathedral was consumed by fire. The charge of incendiarism was raised against his friends, but neither threat, torture or mutilation could elicit a confession of guilt. He refused to acknowledge Arsacius and Atticus as his successors; and this was made a crime chargeable with degradation, fine and imprisonment. The clergy who continued faithful to him were deposed and banished. Pope Innocent of Rome was appealed to, pronounced the Synod which had condemned Chrysostom irregular, annulled the deposition, and wrote him a letter of sympathy, and urged upon Arcadius the convocation of a general council, but without effect.

Chrysostom was conveyed, under the scorching heat of July and August, over Galatia and Cappadocia to the lonely mountain village Cucusus on the border of Cilicia and Armenia, which the wrath of Eudoxia had selected for his exile. The climate was inclement and variable, the winter severe, the place was exposed to Isaurian brigands. He suffered much from fever and headache, and was more than once brought to the brink of the grave. Nevertheless the bracing mountain air invigorated his feeble constitution, and he was hopeful of returning to his diocese. He was kindly treated by the Bishop of Cucusus. He received visits, letters and presents from faithful friends, and by his correspondence exerted a wider influence from that solitude than from the episcopal throne.

His 242 letters are nearly all from the three years of his exile, and breathe a noble Christian spirit, in a clear, brilliant and persuasive style. They exhibit his faithful care for all the interests of the Church, and look calmly and hopefully to the glories of heaven. They are

addressed to Eastern and Western bishops, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, monks and missionaries; they describe the fatigues of his journey, give advice on a variety of subjects, strengthen and comfort his distant flock, urge the destruction of heathen temples in Phœnicia, the extirpation of heresy in Cyprus, and encourage the missions in Persia and Scythia. Two letters are addressed to the Roman Catholic bishop Innocent I., whose sympathy and assistance he courted. Seventeen letters—the most important of all—are addressed to Olympias, the deaconess, a widow of noble birth, personal beauty and high accomplishments, who devoted her fortune and time to the poor and sick. She died between 408 and 420. To her he revealed his inner life, upon her virtues he lavished extravagant praises which offend modern taste as fulsome flatteries. For her consolation he wrote a special treatise on the theme that “No one is really injured except by himself.”

The cruel Empress, stung by disappointment at the continued power of the banished bishop, forbade all correspondence, and ordered his transfer by two brutal guards first to Arabissus, then to Pityus on the Caucasus, the most inhospitable spot in the empire. The journey of three months on foot was a slow martyrdom to the feeble and sickly old man.

He did not reach his destination, but ended his pilgrimage five or six miles from Comana, in Pontus, in the chapel of the martyr Basiliscus, on the 14th September, 407, in his sixtieth year, the tenth of his episcopate. Clothed in his white baptismal robes, he partook of the eucharist and commended his soul to God. His last words were his accustomed doxology, the motto of his life: “Glory be to God for all things. Amen.” He was buried by the side of Basiliscus, in the presence of monks and nuns.

He was revered as a saint by the people. Thirty-one years after his death, January 27, 438, his body was transferred with great pomp to Constantinople and deposited with the emperors and patriarchs beneath the altar of the Church of the Holy Apostles. The young emperor, Arcadius II., and his sister, Pulcheria, met the procession at Chalcedon, kneeled down before the coffin, and in the name of their guilty parents, implored the forgiveness of Heaven for the grievous injustice done to the greatest and saintliest man that ever graced the pulpit and episcopal chair of Constantinople. The Eastern Church of that age shrunk from the bold speculations of Origen, but revered the narrow orthodoxy of Epiphanius and the ascetic piety of Chrysostom.

The personal appearance of the golden-mouthed orator was not imposing, but dignified and winning. He was of small stature (like David, Paul, Athanasius, Melancthon, John Wesley, Schleiermacher). He had an emaciated frame, large, bald head, a lofty wrinkled forehead, deep-set, bright, piercing eyes, pallid, hollow cheeks, and a short, gray beard.

THE CHARACTER OF CHRYSOSTOM.

Chrysostom was one of those rare men who combine greatness and goodness, genius and piety, and continue to exercise by their writings and example a happy influence upon the Christian Church in all ages. He was a man for his time and for all times. But we must look at the spirit rather than the form of his piety which bore the stamp of his age. He took Paul for his model, but had a good deal of the practical spirit of James, and of the fervor and loveliness of John. The Scriptures were his daily food, and he again and again recommended their study to laymen as well as ministers. He was not an ecclesiastical statesman, like St. Ambrose; not a profound divine, like St. Augustin; but a pure man, a practical Christian, and a king of preachers. "He carried out in his own life," says Hase, "as far as mortal man can do it, the ideal of the priesthood which he once described in youthful enthusiasm." He considered it the duty of every Christian to promote the spiritual welfare of his fellowmen. "Nothing can be more chilling," he says in the 20th Homily on Acts, "than the sight of a Christian who makes no effort to save others. Neither poverty, nor humble station, nor bodily infirmity can exempt men and women from the obligation of this great duty. To hide our light under pretense of weakness, is as great an insult to God as if we were to say that He could not make His sun to shine."

It is very much to his praise that in an age of narrow orthodoxy and doctrinal intolerance he cherished a catholic and irenic spirit. He by no means disregarded the value of theological soundness, and was in hearty agreement with the Nicene Creed, which triumphed over the Arians during his ministry in Antioch; but he took no share in the persecution of heretics, and even sheltered the Origenistic monks against the violence of Theophilus of Alexandria. He hated sin more than error, and placed charity above orthodoxy.

Like all the Nicene fathers, he was an enthusiast for ascetic and monastic virtue, which shows itself in seclusion rather than in transformation of the world and the natural ordinances of God. He retained as priest and bishop his cloister habits of simplicity, abstemiousness and unworldliness. He presents the most favorable aspect of that mode of life, which must be regarded as a wholesome reaction against the hopeless corruption of pagan society. He thought with Paul that he could best serve the Lord in single life, and no one can deny that he was unreservedly devoted to the cause of religion.

He was not a man of affairs, and knew little of the world. He had the harmlessness of the dove without the wisdom of the serpent. He knew human nature better than individual men. In this respect he resembles Neander, his best biographer. Besides, he was irritable of temper, suspicious of his enemies, and easily deceived and led by such men as Serapion. He showed these defects in his quarrel with the

court and the aristocracy of Constantinople. With a little more worldly wisdom and less ascetic severity he might, perhaps, have conciliated and converted those whom he repelled by his pulpit fulminations. Fearless denunciation of immorality and vice in high places always commands admiration and respect, especially in a bishop and court preacher who is exposed to the temptations of flattery. But it is always unwise to introduce personalities into the pulpit, and does more harm than good. His relation to Eudoxia reminds one of the attitude of John Knox to Mary Stuart. The contrast between the pure and holy zeal of the preacher and the reformer and the ambition and vanity of a woman on the throne is very striking and must be judged by higher rules than those of gallantry and courtesy. But after all the conduct of Christ, the purest of the pure, towards Mary Magdalene and the woman taken in adultery is far more sublime.

The conflict of Chrysostom with Eudoxia resulted in his exile, and in this way was overruled for his own benefit. For in his exile his character shines brighter than even in the pulpit of Antioch and Constantinople. His character was perfected by suffering. The gentleness, meekness, patience, endurance and devotion to his friends and his work which he showed during the last three years of his life are the crowning glory of his career. Though he did not die a violent death, he deserves to be numbered among the martyrs, who are ready for any sacrifice to the cause of virtue and piety.

CHRYSOSTOM AS A PREACHER.

The crowning merit of Chrysostom is his excellency as a preacher. He is generally and justly regarded as the greatest pulpit orator of the Greek Church. Nor has he any superior or equal among the Latin fathers. He remains to this day a model for preachers in large cities.

He was trained in the school of Demosthenes and Libanius. He was not free from the defects of the degenerate rhetoric of his age, especially a flowery exuberance of style and fulsome extravagance in eulogy of dead martyrs and living men. But the defects are overborne by the virtues, the fulness of Scripture knowledge, the intense earnestness, the fruitfulness of illustration and application, the variation of topics, the command of language, the elegance and rhythmic flow of his Greek style, the dramatic vivacity, the quickness and ingenuity of his turns, and the magnetism of sympathy with his hearers. Gibbon, who read only a few of his Homilies, attributes to him "the happy art of engaging the passions in the service of virtue, and of exposing the folly as well as the turpitude of vice, almost with the truth and spirit of a dramatic representation." Dean Millman called him an "unrivalled master in that rapid and forcible application of incidental occurrences which gives such life and reality to eloquence. He is at times, in the highest sense, dramatic in manner."

But what gives his Homilies a permanent value is, after all, their

instructive and edifying matter. He knew how to draw, in the easiest manner, spiritual nourishment and lessons of practical wisdom from the inspired text, and to make it a divine voice of warning and comfort to the heart and conscience of every hearer. He was a most faithful preacher of truth and righteousness, and fearlessly told the whole duty of man. If he was too severe at times, he erred on virtue's side. He preached morals rather than dogmas, Christianity rather than theology; an active, practical Christianity that proves itself in holy living and dying. He was a martyr of the pulpit, for it was chiefly his faithful preaching that caused his exile.

The effect of his preaching was largely due to the magnetism of his personality, and cannot be fully estimated by reading a translation or even the Greek original. The living voice and glowing manner are far more powerful than the written and printed letter. He attracted large audiences, and among them many who would rather have gone to the theater than hear any ordinary preacher. He held them spell-bound to the close. Sometimes they manifested their admiration by noisy applause, and when he rebuked them for it they would applaud his eloquent rebuke, "You praise," he would tell them, "what I have said, and receive my exhortation with tumults of applause; but show your approbation by obedience; that is the only praise I seek."

The poet of the "Divina Comedia" assigns to Chrysostom a place in Paradise between Nathan the prophet and Anselm the theologian; probably because, like Nathan, he rebuked the sins of the court, and, like Anselm, he suffered exile for faithfulness to his conviction.

III.—LE CONTE ON EVOLUTION AND MATERIALISM.

BY SAMUEL P. SPRECHER, D.D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

IN his book on "Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought," Professor Le Conte assures us that a decided reaction has set in "against materialistic evolution." "Thinking men," he says, "are fast coming to see that 'the materialistic philosophy is an unwarranted inference from the law of evolution.'"

This would be mere commonplace if it meant simply that thinking men are coming to see that evolution may be held in a way that is consistent with theism. Thinking men have always seen this. Evolution itself is not hostile to the idea of design. It is easy to see that it may be the divine method of creating. It makes no difference how God created things, whether at once or by a process of evolution. The ghost of materialism does not rise at this point. It is only when evolution comes in the shape in which Professor Le Conte holds it that it is considered questionable. If he means that a reaction is going on against the materialistic interpretation of evolution as it is expounded in his book we may indeed chronicle a new departure. This is taking higher ground than thiestic evolutionists have generally ventured upon.