

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—JANUARY, 1888.—No. 1.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—PROGRESS IN THEOLOGY.

BY J. L. WITHROW, D.D., CHICAGO.

THEOLOGY is a progressive science. The knowledge of God which the antediluvians had was alphabetic compared with the understanding of the Divine nature which Abraham had. It is the common faith of evangelical believers that God made man "perfect, in knowledge." But this knowledge extended only to the understanding of what is right. Adam was no more a philosophical theologian than he was a sculptor, painter or poet. If Adam and Eve heard Jehovah tell the serpent, the seed of the woman "shall bruise thy head," that seems all they could have known of what has followed in the course, conquests and kingdom of redemption through Christ. When the Lord revealed to Abraham an index idea of the covenant of grace, granting him a glimpse of the Lamb of God suffering as a substitute for the sons of men, that was a vast advance in theologic knowledge over anything the antediluvians knew. But the theology of Moses was much deeper, broader and better built than that of Abraham. For the eye of Moses was so opened upon the purposes and plans of Jehovah's providence and love, that Christ the Lord Himself said later, of Moses, "He wrote of me." The patriarchs, judges and their contemporaries may have had faith in the fact of the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked; but, if they had, history of their opinion we have not, our first distinct intimation of this doctrine having come from David and Daniel. Bending over the open grave and burying in it, may be, his best beloved, we hear poor Job of a previous age asking, "If a man die shall he live again?" But when Daniel was putting the finishing strokes upon his prophetic picture of the end of earthly things, he drew with a vigorous dash this thrilling declaration: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting contempt." That discloses to us a sweeping progress in the theological knowledge of the after life, which Job appears to have known nearly nothing of that could give him conviction or comfort.

Reviewing the writings of the prophets of Israel and Judah, and

Paul, he would willingly be accused; acquainted with all that has been written on his special topic in Germany and in England, he has produced a work of inestimable value. It is the work of a man who is equally well acquainted with the learning and religious thought of three nations. Original on every page, every statement carefully weighed, volumes of learning packed away in single paragraphs, we have here a book to be slowly, patiently and thoughtfully read, and to be re-read many times. There can be little risk in pronouncing it by far the most elaborate, comprehensive and satisfactory work of the kind in the English language. It is the only work in which the events connected with the closing scenes of our Lord's earthly life are treated with anything like the thoroughness and success of the treatment of the events in the early years of his ministry.

Prof. Weiss' work (published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh) is in three volumes. Like most German works of its class, it is severely critical. Even scholars will have need of a good deal of patience in order to read it understandingly. Its author is a profound scholar and a thorough master of the destructive criticism of his countrymen. His views of inspiration would hardly satisfy English and American scholars; yet he is a believer in what he calls the historicity of the New Testament, and in the miracle of the resurrection. In order to be in complete sympathy with its author one ought to have some knowledge of the schools of criticism against which he writes. From the author's point of view it is hard to see how an abler book could be written. He treats of the life of Christ in seven books: The Sources, The Preparation, The Seed Time, The First Conflict, The Crisis, The Jerusalem Period, The Time of Suffering. An adequate notice of the work within the limits allotted to this paper is impossible. Perhaps it is enough to say that it is a work which no one who cares to follow the course of religious thought and criticism in Germany can afford to overlook.

V.—SHALL WOMEN BE LICENSED TO PREACH?

NO. II.

BY HENRY J. VAN DYKE, SR., D.D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE first essay in this symposium is admirable for its sincerity, courage and enthusiasm; and these good qualities ought perhaps to be accepted, even in an exaggerated form, as an excuse for some others that are not so agreeable. The writer denounces ecclesiasticism and ecclesiastical leaders in unsparing terms. She maintains that the great obstacle to the progress of the gospel is not the offense of the cross, but the polity of the Church; even going so far as to affirm that "it is chiefly ecclesiasticism and not Christianity that Robert Ingersoll and Elizabeth Cady Stanton have been fighting." In all this, Miss Willard seems to forget the fact that she is herself an ecclesiastic of a very

pronounced type. She is, however, fully conscious of being the leader in a movement in the Church whose avowed purpose is to overturn the ecclesiastical polity of all the Christian ages and reorganize the working force of Christianity upon a new plan, the boasted invention and outgrowth of the nineteenth century.

Not content that women should "license themselves" and exercise the large liberty of prophesying which this age and country afford them, she demands their official recognition and co-ordination with men as preachers, pastors and rulers in the Church. This demand is enforced by prophetic warnings. Notice is served upon "the few leaders who are insecurely seated on the safety valve of that mighty engine, Progress." The new organization called the W. C. T. U. is introduced and eulogized not only for its influence in the temperance cause, but as illustrating the capacity and the desire of women for the work of the ministry. Its evangelistic department is described as having the elements of an ecclesiastical system by which all things are to be made new. If the Church will adopt and adjust her polity to these new theories and agencies, the advocates of them will gladly take their places under her supervision; but, if not, "the women of this age are surely coming to their kingdom," and the conservative sons of the Church who "will not yield to the leadings of Providence and the importunities of their more progressive brothers" must take the inevitable consequences.

If in this brief summary we have misconceived or misrepresented one jot or tittle of Miss Willard's views, whether in their letter or their spirit, we shall be profoundly sorry. Still more sorry shall we be if any reader of this article shall infer from it that we are insensible to the excellency or jealous of the legitimate influence of women in their appropriate sphere as defined by the word of God and the constitution of their own nature. To Miss Willard's praise of *good* women we heartily respond, and could add to it largely out of the heart of a son and husband and the long experience of a Christian pastor. The successors of those who ministered to Christ and his apostles, and assisted them in their work, have been an ever-increasing multitude in all the Christian ages. Their good works and the alms-deeds that they do are fully recognized and blessed of God and men, even in "the hierarchical Presbyterian, Episcopal and Roman Catholic Churches." There are organizations of Christian women, more numerous and powerful than the W. C. T. U., who are wearing the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit and working the works of God in their respective Churches without making any attempt to revolutionize their ecclesiastical polity. But this is extraneous to the subject before us. Let us stick to the question.

Miss Willard correctly defines its scope, as referring not only to the licensing of women to preach, but their co-ordination with men in the

pastoral office, the administration of the sacraments and the government of the Church. As her essay is perhaps the best argument that has been or can be made on the affirmative side, it will not be improper to present the negative in direct antagonism to her position. We hope to do this with the utmost candor, and, at the same time, with the utmost courtesy.

I. *Women have no special qualifications for the work of the ministry.* They are not holier by nature than men, and if they were this would not make them better ministers. An angel from heaven is not more fitted to preach the grace of Christ than was Saul, the chief of sinners. The assertion that Christ "did not designate women as His followers; *they came without a call*;" is not only new Theology, but new History. Miss Willard intimates that if the twelve apostles had been women there would have been no traitor among them, and asks whether the choice of Judas is to be regarded as a precedent. She charges upon men, as separate from women, all the corruption and cruelty that have stained the pages of church history. "*Men have invented hierarchies, lighted inquisitorial fires, and translated the gospel, so suitable to the proclamation of a woman's lips, into terms of sacerdotalism, dogma and martyrdom.*" This also is new history. 'There were two in the apostolic church who were struck dead for lying to the Holy Ghost, and one of them was a woman. Catherine de Medici, the wife of one French king and the mother of two, had "a woman's heart that never changes." And yet her heart devised and her voice directed the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Bloody Mary, Queen of England and head of the Church, turned back the Reformation, rekindled the fires of Smithfield, and went beyond her own bishops in the spirit of persecution. We need not continue the catalogue. But going back to the beginning of all human woe, we are reminded that it was the woman who was first in the transgression, and it was part of the condemnation of man that he had "hearkened unto the voice of his wife." It is not pleasant for us to repeat these things. But we cannot sacrifice the truth of history on the altar of gallantry, nor set aside the foundations of Christian theology for the misty sentimentalism that expatiates on the natural goodness of woman. She also is a fallen being, and needs the effectual calling and washing of the same grace that man needs. Even the Virgin Mary was not immaculate. We are sure that Miss Willard will agree to all this, though in her enthusiasm for her cause she seems to forget it. But if women are not morally better than men by nature, have they not by virtue of their womanly endowments and instincts a clearer insight of the grace of God, and are they not thus better qualified than men to preach the gospel and to shepherd the flock of Christ? Miss Willard affirms this in the strongest terms. She says "the mother heart of God will never be known to the world until translated into terms of speech by mother-hearted women." We are not disposed to dispute

what is said about "the dual-natured founder of Christianity," though we dare not dogmatize on what is not revealed. It may be that the analogy between the first Adam and the last Adam (I Cor. xv : 45) extends to the fact that the first man was made male and female (Gen. i : 27), including the woman in his side ; and so "the second man, who is the Lord from heaven," may have been endowed with all the sinless qualities of both the sexes. But, whatever may be the mysteries of His Holy incarnation, the fact remains that He came in the form of *man*, and not of *woman*, and in all His ministry He said not one word about the *mother* heart of God. Did he not rightly and fully declare the Father from whose bosom He came forth? Did not John and Peter and Paul, and the multitude of uninspired but divinely illuminated men, who are their true successors as preachers, understand the grace of Christ and feel the tenderness of His love, as well as any woman? Into what "terms of speech" does this new order of preachers "with the sweet Madonna halo about their head" propose to translate the Gospel? Will they alter the Lord's Prayer and make it say "Our *Mother* which art in heaven"? Will they say to the sorrowful and careworn, "Your *Mother* which is in heaven knoweth ye have need of all these things"? These views about the motherhood of God are not new. They are the essence of Mariolatry. They are also embodied in the doctrine of the sect known as Shaking Quakers, who hold that the incarnation of what they call the Christ Spirit in the person of Jesus was not complete, but has been perfected by a second incarnation in the person of a woman named Ann Lee.*

II. *Women have special disqualifications for the ministry.* We have no sympathy with any form of rivalry between the sexes, with any claim of personal superiority on the part of man as such, with any form of masculine tyranny. The woman is the glory of the man, and if we did not worship God we would prefer her to every other idol. "Either sex alone is half itself," and the highest ideal of "the single pure and perfect animal" is the two-celled heart beating with one full stroke." In this the modern poet does but interpret the ancient apostle, "Neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord." The principle which underlies the divine ideal of marriage applies to all the relations of men and women in the family, the state and the church. Counterparts are things that differ in order to agree. Harmony is the just adaptation of parts to each other. The agreement must always recognize the difference and be based upon a definite order. Order, which is heaven's first law, necessarily involves subordination. The *subordination* of woman (not her inferiority) is written upon the constitution of her nature, in the history of her creation, and in all Christian theology. "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man. For the man

*See Shaff-Hertzog Cyclopedia.

is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created *for* the woman, but the woman *for* the man." (I Cor. ii : 3, 8, 9.)

Miss Willard tells us that "nature has given woman but a single disability : that she can never be a father ; and this is offset by man's single disability : he can never be a mother." This is quite startling ; but we must not hold her too rigidly to the terms of the antithesis. It means only that you cannot make a woman out of a man, nor a man out of a woman. The author tells us again that "men preach a creed, women declare a life ; men deal in formulas, women in facts ; men reason in the abstract, women in the concrete ; a syllogism symbolizes the one, a rule of life the other." Women, then, differ from men, not only in the physical capabilities of their sex, but in mental characteristics and habits of discourse. This is certainly true, though the statement of the truth is very much exaggerated for the sake of the antithesis. There are multitudes of men who preach a life and deal in facts, and there are women who understand and can use a syllogism, though we are not sure that their legitimate influence is thereby increased. But, accepting the statement as correct in general, we see in it the disability of women for the work of the ministry. The Church never has been and never can be sustained without a creed. Christianity consists not only in facts but in revealed doctrines lying back of and interpreting those facts. Paul before Agrippa *reasoned* concerning temperance, righteousness and judgment to come. The kind of preaching which ignores reasoning and throws aside doctrine, and despises catechisms and consists in appeals to the feelings, is another gospel than that which Paul preached, and will not promote the kind of life which the Church needs. The cure for dead orthodoxy is not to throw away the orthodoxy, but to quicken it anew with the zeal which reasons out of the Scriptures and declares the whole counsel of God.

But the great disability of woman for the work of the ministry is directly connected with her physical constitution, with the fact that she *can* be a mother, and that motherhood with all its burdens and blessings is her divinely-appointed destiny. "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." (I Tim. iii : 14). Any state of society, and any form of ecclesiastical polity, which forbids or discourages marriage is contrary to nature and to the Word of God. Miss Willard denounces the Romish doctrine of the celibacy of the ministry as a defrauding of both manhood and womanhood of their rights to the sanctities of home. In this we fully agree with her, and trust she will not shrink from the logical consequences of the doctrine. If it is not good for man, and especially for ministers, to be alone, it must be equally not good for women, and especially for preaching women, to be alone. The perils of a ministry composed of female celibates are even greater than those which surround the celibacy of men. We trust,

therefore, that the advocates of this new departure do not propose to require or even encourage women to remain single in order to enter or continue in the ministry. They will not abolish, but only alter, the apostolic precept, so that it will read, "A bishop must be the *wife* of one husband, one that ruleth well *her* own house, having *her* children in subjection with all gravity."

Now, without speaking all that is in our heart and mind on this delicate point, we will only say that a child-bearing woman and a nursing mother is disqualified for the exposure and nervous strain of the pulpit and the exhausting duties of the pastoral office, by a regard for public decency, for her own health and the health of her offspring. To lay this new burden on her soul and body is a refinement of cruelty. We are well aware that this argument applies equally to other occupations and professions. And if the scope of this essay would permit, it would be easy to show that, instead of devising new ways in which women can work for their own living, it would be a higher mark of civilization and Christianity to remove the obstacles in the way of marriage, and to teach men "how that so laboring *they ought to support the weak.*"

III. *Women are not authorized to enter the Christian ministry.* There is no Scripture warrant for it. Miss Willard quotes from the Revised Version of the Psalms "that wonderful and blessed prophecy (Psalm lxxviii : 11), 'The Lord giveth the Word: the women that publish the tidings are a great host.'" Any one who reads the context will see that this is not a prophecy and has no reference to the future. The whole Psalm is a thanksgiving to God for the past victories of the Israelites over their enemies, for which a great host of women sang the song of triumph; as when Miriam, at the Red Sea, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and dances, or when the women celebrated the victory of David over Goliath. To take this statement of a historic fact and turn it into a prophecy that women are to be the preachers of the gospel only shows what an utter dearth of proof-texts there is on that side of the question.

If it is an evangelical prophecy, Christ and His apostles strangely ignored and acted contrary to it. The fact that Mary Magdalene, to whom the Saviour first appeared, was sent to announce His resurrection to the other disciples, or that many women *were present* when the Saviour preached and when He gave His final instructions to the apostles, are far-fetched and little worth as proofs that women ought to be ordained to the ministry. Equally irrelevant is the statement that Christ "by no utterance of His marks woman as ineligible to any position in the church He came to found." He did not mark the ineligible, He only marked the eligible. If He came to found a church, to set up a kingdom, to establish the order of a new dispensation which is

to continue till His second coming, not His silences, interpreted according to our imaginations and wishes, but His positive utterances and acts are to be the rule and measure of our loyalty to Him. He chose twelve apostles, to whom He gave extraordinary powers, not only for the preaching of the gospel, but for the organization and government of the Church. Not one of these was a woman. There is a reason and an abiding force in this exclusion. To say that in this, or in any other act or word, He only complied with the prejudices of a barbarous age, is to attribute to Him an unworthy motive. The Acts of the Apostles whom He inspired and endowed with plenary authority are recorded for our learning, and there is not in the whole book a single instance in which any woman was ordained to any office in the church or took any public part in its instruction or government.

All the instructions in the Pastoral Epistles in regard to preaching and ruling the church are addressed to men. We read about the wives, but nowhere about the husbands of bishops and deacons. (See I Tim. iii.) This utter want of Scriptural authority seems to be conclusive. But this is not all.

IV. *The word of God expressly excludes and prohibits women from the work of the ministry.* It is admitted "that Christ, not Paul, is the source of all churchly authority and power." But then the question at issue in this discussion is, Who is the better qualified to know and the more authorized to declare the mind of Christ—an inspired apostle of the first century or an uninspired woman of the nineteenth? As between these two we are of Paul. What he says Christ says. So the Christian Church has held in all ages and will continue to hold even to the end of the centuries. "Whoever," says Miss Willard, "quotes to the intelligent and devout women of the American Church to-day the specific instructions given by Paul to the illiterate and immoral women of Corinth does so at the expense of his manhood, not to say his scholarship." The testimony which it is thus attempted to strike out is as follows: "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church. What! Came the word of God out from you, or came it unto you only?" On this passage we make the following observations:

(1) There is no kind of evidence that the women in the Church at Corinth were either illiterate or immoral. The assertion that they were so is a gratuitous assumption to sustain a foregone conclusion.

(2) The apostle expressly declares that his instructions are not specific, or applicable only to that one Church. He speaks not of Corinthian women, but of women *as such*. He censures the Church at Corinth for introducing a practice which was unknown elsewhere.

“What! Came the word of God out from you?” “Is the Church at Corinth the *mother Church*? Was it first established, or has it been alone in sending forth the word of God? You have adopted customs which are unusual. You have permitted women to speak in a manner unknown to other Churches.”*

(3) If the ignorance or immorality of these women had been the reason for the injunction of silence, Paul was man enough to say so. But he assigns very different reasons, which are universal and applicable even to the best of American women. This reason is twofold—*first*, it is contrary to the law, which enjoins the subordination of women, and, *secondly* it is a *shame* for women to speak in the Church.

Both the injunction and the reason for it are repeated by the apostle in a passage where the application cannot possibly be restricted to any church or any period of Christianity, because the reason is rooted in the history of creation and in the divinely appointed relation of the sexes. “I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.” (II Tim. ii : 12-14.)

We have no apology to offer for these words nor for the quotation of them. There is not space to expound their meaning and attempt to adjust them to the varied relations of our modern church life. It is not necessary for the purposes of this discussion to do so. For, whatever else they forbid or permit, they certainly do prohibit women from assuming the office of the Christian ministry. The real scholarship of the church has always so understood them. And, moreover, the great majority of women, especially of those who reverence their husbands and are loved by them even as Christ loved the church (Eph. vi: 25-33), bow to their authority, while their own womanly instincts confirm the wisdom of the teaching. And so we believe it will always be.

VI.—CLUSTERS OF GEMS.

BY REV. ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D., PHILADELPHIA.

NO. 1.—ILLUSTRATIONS OF GRACE.

Mephibosheth an illustration of Grace.—I. Sam. ix. He was a son of Jonathan; a cripple, lame in both feet; so obscure that even his existence was unknown until David investigated. Yet called to Jerusalem by God's anointed king; given a place at the royal table, and admitted to the position of a king's son; endowed with an estate, under care of competent trustee and servants. And all this was “*kindness shown to him*” for another's sake. “So,” says Guthrie, “it was not man's merit, but man's misery that was the magnet that drew the Saviour from the skies.”

“*He will abundantly pardon.*”—Isa. lv : 7. God “pardons like a God.” There is wonderful variety in presentation of this idea, in Scripture. Some

*Albert Barnes,